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PREFACE

The late Mr. Brajendranath De, as a result of sustained work for nearly 20 years, prepared a collated edition of the text of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akhbār of Khwāja Nizām-ud-din Aḥmad. The first half of the first volume of the text was issued in July 1911, and the final or third volume was completed after Mr. De's death on 28th September, 1932, by Khan Bahadur M. Hidāyat Ḥosain from his manuscript and issued in July 1935. The first two volumes of the English translation by the same author were issued in 1927 and 1936 respectively. The first 80 pages in page-proof and an unreviewed and partly incomplete translation of the remainder of the third volume was found amongst Mr. De’s papers, and the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal recently requested the undersigned to edit and complete the work. It was hoped that the undersigned would have the collaboration of Prof. M. Mahfūz-ul-Ḥaq in this work, but this has not been possible, and for the work, as now issued, the entire responsibility must rest with the undersigned. The first 80 pages were printed as corrected and revised by Mr. De, and in the remainder the work of Mr. De has, as far as possible, been preserved. The undersigned has, however, to prevent errors and omissions, verified the entire translation and checked citations and references as far as possible. Further, as no standard scheme of transliteration had been followed, it was thought desirable to follow a slightly modified form of the scheme adopted by the International Oriental Congress of 1894 for the transliteration of Arabic and Persian works.

In view of the size of the publication it was decided to issue the translation in two parts. The first part is now being issued, and the second part with a detailed preface and comprehensive indices to both the parts will, it is hoped, be ready for issue sometime during the year.
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PREFACE

In the Monthly General Meeting for August 1864 of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, Dr. W. N. Lees, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Society, read a memorandum detailing the progress of Persian historical works in the Bibliotheca Indica series and the policy decided on in connection with the publication of such works. In discussing the projected publication of the 'Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh or the Tārikh i Bādāoni', which had been suggested by Mr. E. B. Cowell in 1862, he referred to the 'Tārikh i Nizāmī or the Tabaqat i Akbari' as a very important work of reference and added that it is "well worth consideration, however, whether in conjunction with this work, we should not publish in lieu thereof a certain portion of the Tabaqat i Akbari which Abd al-Qādir professes only to have abridged and which all later historians have made good use of"; the consideration of this suggestion, however, was deferred to a future meeting. In 1868 he wrote, "it is inconceivable to me why so erroneous an estimate seems to have been formed of the Tabaqat-i-Akbari-Shāhī that it has not attracted more attention. It is the history which joins on to the Tārikh-i-Fīroz-Shāhī, and is admitted by all contemporary and subsequent authors to be the standard history in continuation of those authorities. Unquestionably then the thread of the narrative as given by Nizām ud-din Aḥmad should be taken up where the authors of the Tārikh-i-Fīroz-Shāhī have dropped it, giving him the preference to 'Abd al-Kādir of Bādāon, or any other author, however excellent." Blochmann in 1869 remarked "It is a matter of regret that the printing of the Tabaqät i Nizām i Bakhshī was allowed to be deferred". Unfortunately nothing further happened till the

---

4 Blochmann, op. cit., p. 115 (1869).
work was taken up by Mr. Brajendranath De in 1911, and the first fascicles of the text and translation of the first volume were issued in 1913. After this date the work remained in abeyance till the author was induced to take it up again in August 1925, and publication of the text and translation of the first volume ending with the fall of the Afghan Kings of Delhi was completed in 1927. The second volume of the text, ending with the 38th year of Akbar’s reign and accounts of the Amir or high rank, the Shaikhs of Hindustan, the Hakims and the poets of the reign of Akbar, was issued in 1931, while the printing of the English translation was completed in 1936—some 4 years after the death of Mr. De. The text of the third volume was completed by Shams-ul-Ulama Khan Bahadur Hidayat Hosain from an incomplete manuscript prepared by Mr. De in 1935. The work of editing and completing the third volume of the translation was assigned to me in April 1939; it was hoped that I would have the collaboration of Prof. Maftuz-ul-Haqiq in this work, but this has not been possible. The first half of the volume was published in July and the concluding part is now issued.

It is a matter of regret that a historical work of such importance, which the Society hoped in 1864 to publish at an early date, should have been delayed for almost three quarters of a century, but this was due to a variety of causes among which may be mentioned several large works which were being published by the Society, lack of funds and probably also the issue of a lithograph edition of the Tabaqat by the Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, in 1875.

The subject-matter in the following pages of the preface has been arranged under the following heads:
1. Life of Khwajah Nizamuddin Ahmad Bakhsi.
2. Tabaqat-i-Akbari, its sources and importance.
3. Life of Mr. Brajendranath De, M.A., I.C.S. (retd.), the editor and translator of the work.

Life of Khwajah Nizamuddin Ahmad Bakshi.

The author is variously styled as Mirza Nizamu-d-din Ahmad, Khwajah Nizamu-d-din Ahmad or Nizami (vide Lowe’s
translation of ‘Muntakhab‘ut-Tawārikh’, vol. II, p. 479, 1924). In Ma‘āthir-ul-Umarā he is called Khwājah Nizāmuddin Aḥmad, while by Abū-l-Faḍl 1, Mīr Abū Turāb 2, Fīrishtah, and others the appellation of Bākhshī is added after his name.

Unfortunately the information about the life of the author is very limited, and the two accounts in Ma‘āthir-ul-Umarā 3 and by Elliot 4 seem to be based only on casual references in Tabaqāt-i-Akbari, Akbarnāma, Ā’in-i-Akbari and Muntakhab-ul-lubāb. None of the authors give the date or year of the birth of Khwājah Nizāmuddin Aḥmad, and the information in this connection from contemporary sources is rather conflicting. Mrs. Beveridge in her translation of Bābur-Nāma 5 states that Nizāmuddin Aḥmad was not born till 20 years after Bābur’s death. As Bābur died on Jumādā I, 937 A.H. (December 26, 1530 A.D.) this would mean that the Khwājah was born in 956 or 957 A.H. (1549 or 1550 A.D.). According to Al-Badāoni (vide Lowe, op. cit., pp. 411, 412) Mirzā Nizāmuddin Aḥmad died at the age of forty-five in the 38th year of Akbar’s reign of a burning fever on the 23rd Šafar, 1003 A.H. (7th November, 1594 A.D.), which would mean that he was born some time in 958 A.H. (1551 A.D.). According to Shaikh Ilāhdīd Faiḍl Sirhindī, the author of Akbar-Nāma (vide Dowson in Elliot’s History of India, vol. VI, p. 130, 1875) he died at the age of nearly 48 years on the 22nd Šafar, 1003 A.H. in the 39th year.

1 Akbarnāma, text edition, vol. III, p. 605 (1886) and Beveridge’s translation of vol. III, p. 924 (1912–1939). In these notes various volumes of the Akbarnāma and the Ā’in-i-Akbari are cited as they have been issued in the Bibliotheca Indica series. It may, however, be noted that the Ā’in, which has been issued in three volumes, really formed the third and final volume of Akbarnāma (see Blochmann’s Preface to the first volume of the Ā’in, Philott’s edition, p. v, 1939).
of Akbar's reign. Al-Badā'omi's statement, in view of the fact that he was a close friend of Niẓāmuddin Aḥmad, and was actively associated with him in the compilation of the Ṭabaqāt, appears to be more reliable, and I have little hesitation in accepting it as correct. The year of his birth may, therefore, be taken as 958 A.H. or 1551 A.D.

Unfortunately we have very little information about Khwājah Niẓāmuddin Aḥmad's ancestry beyond the fact that he was the son of Khwājah Muqīm Harawi (of Herat), who was one of Bābur's officials and about the close of his reign was the Dīwān-i-buʃūtī. After the death of Bābur, when Gujarāt was conquered by Hūmāyūn and the province of Aḥmadābād was entrusted to Mīrzā ‘Askari in 1535 A.D., Khwājah Muqīm was appointed his waṣīr. He accompanied Hūmāyūn to Agra when the latter fled after his defeat by Sher Khān Sūr at Chausa in Bihār on 26th June, 1539. Khwājah Muqīm also, according to the Tabaqāt (De's translation of vol. I, p. i) and Maḥfīẓ-ul-Umarā, served under Aḥmad; this is again referred to in the Tabaqāt (De's translation of vol. II, p. 336) where in the account of the twelfth year it is stated "the author's father remained in Agra, performing government work."

We know very little about the earlier years of life or the education of the young Khwājah, but according to Dowson he was one of the pupils of 'Mullā Aḥī Sīr', a learned man, and the father of Faiḍī Sīrhindi, the author of Akbar-Nāma. There can be little doubt, however, that Niẓāmuddin Aḥmad was a well-educated and well-read young man who, "according to the instructions of his worthy father, occupied himself with the study of historical works, which brightens the intellect of the

---

1 According to Mrs. Beveridge "a Barrack-officer" (Bābur-Nāma, vol. II, p. 703, note 2), but Dowson translates Dīwān-i-buṣūtī as the Dīwān of the household (Elliott's History of India, vol. V, p. 178, 1873).
2 Elliott's History of India, vol. VI, p. 116 (1875).
3 In this connection also see Mrs. Beveridge's remarks where she conjectures that Khwājah Muqīm lived long enough "to impress the worth of historical writing on his son" and probably "transmitted his recollections to him" (vide Bābur-Nāma, vol. II, p. 693, 1921).
studious and inspires the intelligent with awe; and by the study of the accounts of the travellers in the stages of the journey of existence, which is like a progress of the soul rubbed off the rust of his nature." ¹ In addition to being a student of history and literature Khwājah Nizāmuddin Aḥmad was a patron of poets and apparently himself used to write poetry, though except for the few stray verses in the Ṭabaqāt, no extensive poetical work by the author is known. ² A reference, however, to Al-Badānī ² shows that various poets such as Aḥānī, Baqā‘ī, Ḥayāthi and Sārfti were invited to Gujarāt by the Khwājah during the seven years of his stay in that province, and they flourished under his patronage. It was also during this time that he started writing his Ṭabaqāt, and had as his associate Mīr Ma‘ṣūm of Bhakkar, who was distinguished as a man of learning and historian ³. The interest of Khwājah Nizāmuddin Aḥmad in historical matters and his skill as a writer is evidenced by the fact that when the Emperor Akbar ordered the preparation ⁴ of a history of the Kings of Islām in 990 A.H. (1582 A.D.) he employed the Khwājah as one of the seven authors for its compilation. According to Elliot (1849, op. cit., p. 179) “the compiler of the Sahihu-l-Akhbār attributes another work on Indian History under the name of Ħā‘īkh-i-Ṭī‘īrī, to the author of the Tabakāt-i-Akberī, but I am not aware that there is any good authority for the statement.” I have also not been able to find any other reference beyond a reference in the account of Sārūp Chand’s ‘Sahihu-l-Akhbār’ in Elliot’s History of India, vol. VIII, p. 314 (1877).”

¹ Ṭabaqāt, De’s translation of vol. I, p. iv (1911).
² Muntakhabu’t-tawārikh, Haig’s translation of vol. III (1925).
⁴ Vide Muntakhabu’t-tawārikh, Lowe’s translation of vol. II, p. 328 (1924). This is the famous Tārikh-i-Alfi, the introduction of which was written by Abū-l-Fadl, but curiously the Emperor commanded its preparation in 990 A.H. even though the history was to deal with the events that had happened “in the seven zones for the last one thousand years.” See A‘īn-i-Akbari, translation of Blochmann, vol. I, revised by Philott, pages xli and 113 (1939).
people (Lowe translates اهل سماوات as the people of piety), who were accompanying the army or were absent, prepared by the Șudr-i-Jahān, he arranged that Al-Badāoni, who was absent, be shown in the return as sick. In the 29th year of Akbar’s reign (991 A.H., 1583 A.D.) the government of Gujarāt was transferred from Shihābuddin to ʃtmād Khan who, after the murder of Sultan Mahmūd, had been the virtual king of Gujarāt till its conquest by Akbar in 980 A.H., and Khwājah Niẓāmuddin Aḥmad was appointed the Bahshah 2. Abū Ţurāb’s

Niẓāmuddin Ahmad’s activities at Āgra in 974 A.H. referred to above and in the Mustakhab (text, vol. II, p. 99), states that Al-Badāoni met him at Āgra in 974 “and became his warm friend.”

1 Khwājah Niẓāmuddin Aḥmad in the ʃtabaqūt (De’s translation of vol. II, p. 561, 1936) includes this in the account of the events of the 29th year which begins on page 558 and is followed by Al-Badāoni (Lowe’s translation of vol II of Mustakhabut-tawārikh, p. 332) and in Maṣḥir-ul-Umarā (text edition, vol. I, p. 661). Abū-l-Faḍl in Akbarnāma (vol. III, text edition, p. 403, English translation, p. 596) states, these appointments took place in the 28th year of the reign. In this connection reference may be made to De (Tabaqūt, English translation of vol. II, p. 559, note 1) where several discrepancies in the dates between Akbarnāma and ʃtabaqūt are pointed out; the former places the various events enumerated by De a year advance of the dates given in the latter. Inaccuracies in regard to the reckonings of the years of Akbar’s reign on the part of Niẓāmuddin Ahmad are pointed out by Al-Badāoni (vide Lowe’s translation of vol. II, pp. 353, 363), and he explains these as being due to the author having not taken into account “the intercalated days, which every three years makes a difference of one lunar month, there is a difference in each cycle of a whole year, between the solar and lunar years”, and his being away from the Imperial Camp in Gujarāt. After the death of Niẓāmuddin Ahmad the dates in the ʃtabaqūt were checked and at least one corrected by his son Muḥammad Sharif. In spite of the above, as Al-Badāoni follows the ʃtabaqūt, it seems that the dates as they now stand in the ʃtabaqūt are the corrected dates.

According to Denison Ross (A History of Gujarāt, introduction, p. 5, 1909) the year in which ʃtmād Khan was made governor of Gujarāt was 992 A.H. (1583 A.D.).

2 Niẓāmuddin Ahmad’s name is included in the list of Bahshahs of Akbar’s reign (vide Philott’s edition of Blochmann’s translation of A’in-i-Akhbar, vol. I, p. 596), and apparently at this time no distinction was made between Bahshah and Mir Bahshah, as what is called Bahshah
account (loc. cit., pp. 100, 101) of these appointments is rather vague, but in the Ṭabaqāt (p. 563) the author refers to his joining I'tmād Khān at Bijāpur en route to Aḥmadābād after his appointment as the Bakshī. The vacillating policy in reference to the affairs in Gujarāt1 adopted by I’tmād Khān and the disturbances due to the intrigues of Shihābuddīn Aḥmad Khān and Qutbuddin Khān led to Aḥmadābād being occupied by Nannū or Muẓaffar Gujarātī, and the rout of the Imperial forces outside the town. The Khwājah sent an account of all that had happened to Akbar, and as a result Mirzā Khān 2 son of Bairām Khān was sent with a well-equipped army to quell the disturbances in Gujarāt. It is not necessary to deal here with the campaign against Sultān Muẓaffar of Gujarāt, but a review of the period distinctly shows that throughout the campaign and earlier Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad proved a very valuable officer, and whether as a commander, and even as an active fighter, he gave a very good account of himself.

He successfully carried out negotiations with Shihābuddin, made arrangements for the defence of Aḥmadābād in the

in the Ṭabaqāt is Mir Bakshī in Muntakhab-ut-tawārikh. Abū-l-Faḍl in his introduction of the Āʾīn (vide Phillott, loc. cit., p. 5) mentions the Mir-bakshī as one of the nobles of the State, and Blochmann gives “Paymaster of the court” as its equivalent. For an account of Bakshī see Banāusi Prasad, History of Shahjahān (1932), page 276, from which it appears that this officer “was the head of the Military Department, and looked after recruitment, reviews, and other similar affairs connected with the army.” Further distinction had been introduced in reference to the Mir or Chief Bakshī, while separate Bakshīs were attached to each division during military campaigns. According to Sarkar (Moghul Administration, p. 24, 1924) there were three subordinate Bakshīs at the end of ‘Aurangzib’s reign’. In view of the above and the active part played by Nizāmuddin Ahmad in the military campaigns and the administration of Gujarāt, the equivalent pay-master (De, op. cit.) and paymaster-general (Lowe, loc. cit., p. 393) hardly appear to be appropriate. For a detailed discussion of Bakshī and its various grades see Irwīn—The Army of the Indian Moghuls, pp. 37–40 (1903).


absence of the main force, defeated the forces of Sher Khān at Jūṭānāh, arranged for the attack on Muṣṭaffār’s forces by Quṭbuddin Khān from Bahroj and Baroda, attacked Muṣṭaffār’s army from the rear at Sarkhej which resulted in its defeat, and later was mainly responsible for the defeat of Muṣṭaffār in the hills of Nādot. For his services in the Gujarāt campaign he was honoured with the gift of a horse and a robe of honour and an increase in his stipend. Later he carried out a successful campaign in Sorath and in the Ran of Kach. Mirzā Khān, who had meanwhile been honoured with the title of Khān Khānān, was, at his own request, recalled to the Royal Court, and Nizāmuddin Aḥmad with Qulij Khān and Naurang Khān was left in charge of Gujarāt. During the Khān Khānān’s absence Nizāmuddin Aḥmad proved a very energetic officer, and successfully carried out a protracted campaign against Muṣṭaffār and his partisans in the Ran of Kach, and later subjugated the Kōla and Grāssyāhs in the neighbourhood of Aḥmadnagar. His skill as a commander and administrator is indicated throughout all these campaigns by the fact of his skillfully arranging the movements of the troops, attacking the enemy before its forces could be consolidated, his ruse for the relief of Akhār, launching vigorous rear attacks in various battles, the establishments of thānas or military posts and the construction of forts.

This very successful term of office culminated in the Khwājah’s being summoned to the Imperial Court in 996 A.H., when Aʿẓam Khān was appointed as the Governor of Gujarāt. Nizāmuddin Aḥmad traversed a distance of some 600 karohā in the course of twelve days, and reached Lāhere on the 3rd Nauroz of the 35th year of Akbar’s reign. According to Al-Badā’oni, Akbar gave orders that the camel-drivers should appear before him in the Mahjar in the same condition in which they had arrived, and they were a wonderful spectacle. After that he received boundless favours from the Emperor, and gained a great ascendency over the mind of his royal patron. It was

1 For details see Taḥqīq, De’s translation of vol. II, pp. 563-595, where references to other works and several discrepancies in dates and the different accounts are noted.

about this time that he was appointed in-charge of the provinces of Ajmir, Gujarát and Málwah, apparently of the Khálsa lands. Towards the end of Sha'bán, 999 A.H., he was granted the par-ganah of Shamasábád as his jágir and was allowed five months' leave of absence to arrange matters there. In the year 1000 A.H. (1591-92 A.D.) when Āsaf Khán Bakhshí was appointed to the Kábul campaign, Nizámuddín Ahmad was appointed as the Bakhshí in his place.

Nizámuddín Ahmad accompanied Akbar to Kashmir, and apparently was a great favourite of the Emperor at this time. His account of Kashmir is not very detailed and the history of Akbar terminates with the end of the 38th year of his reign. The author describes it as having been written "in a summary manner by the pen of broken writing" ... "but most of the great events have been succinctly narrated". "If life helps (me) and God's favour helps (me), the events of the coming years also, if the dear God so wills, will be noted down, and will be made a part of this worthy book. Otherwise, anyone who may be guided by the grace of God, having engaged himself in writing it down, will attain to great good fortune."  

While staying at Láhore in attendance on the Emperor, Nizámuddín Ahmad laid out or purchased a garden, and it was in this garden that he was buried after his death. At this time he is described by Al-Badáoní as having "entered on affairs with great energy and activity. He became the focus of all sorts of favours from the Emperor, and the recipient of his perfect trust with regard to his ability, good sense, sincerity, honesty and perseverance." He would probably have risen to much greater heights, but "suddenly at the very acme of his eminence, and the height of his activity, to the disappointment of the hopes of friends and strangers a dreadful blow was received from Fate, and at the age of forty-five he succumbed to a burning fever."  

1 See Beveridge's translation of Akbarnáma, vol. III, p. 924.  
2 See Lowe's translation of Muntakhabu't-tawârîkh, vol. II, p. 393. According to Lowe, Bakhshí was the paymaster-general.  
3 Vide Ţabágát, De's translation of vol. II, p. 852. The last sentence is quoted incorrectly in the life of the author in Ma‘áthir-al-Umrá.  
The events preceding his death are described in greater detail in Akbarnāma 1 wherein it is stated that on 14th Šafar, 1003 A.H. (19th October, 1594 A.D.), at Shāhām 'Alī, near Lahore, he developed high fever while on a hunting expedition with the Emperor. His sons obtained leave to convey him to Lahore, but he died on the 23rd 2 Šafar (28th October, 1594 A.D.) on the banks of the river Rāvi.

In the Akbarnāma (loc. cit.) it is stated that Akbar's "discerning heart was somewhat grieved, and he begged for forgiveness for him at the court of God. Strangers and acquaintances mourned, and honesty (rāstī) indulged in grief."

Al-Badāoni's account (vide Lowe, op. cit., p. 412) is more detailed and is quoted here to indicate the regard and reverence in which he was held by all:

"There was scarcely anyone of high or low degree in the city, who did not weep over his bier, and recall his gracious qualities, and gnaw the back of the hand of regret."

The last line of the Qiṭḥah which was composed on this occasion gives the year (1003 A.H.) of his death:


3

(A priceless pearl has left the world.)

TĀRĪKH-I-AKBARĪ: ITS SOURCES AND IMPORTANCE.

Before dealing with the work itself it would be useful to add a note here regarding the various names assigned to it. The author in his introduction 4 designated it the Tabaqāt-i-

---

2 Faḍlī Sirhindī in Akbhar-Nāma, as noted already, gives 22nd Šafar, 1003 A.H. as the date of death of Khwājah Niẓāmuddin Ahmad Bakshī (vide Dowsen in Elliot's History of India, vol. VI, p. 130, 1875); this is certainly incorrect.
4 See De's translation of vol. I, p. 6 (1911). The date comes to 1001 A.H. (50+900+1+40+10) or 1592 A.D. The author died in 1003 A.H., 1594 A.D., and he was apparently working at it for several years before his death. See Rankin's translation of Muntakhab us-tawāriḵ, vol. I, pp. 9,
Akbar-Shāhī and stated that the word Nizāmī, the name of the author, gives the chronogram of the date of its compilation. In Rauḍat-ut-Tāhirin by Tāhir Muḥammad, the work is called Tāriḵ-i-Sultān Nizāmī, but this name has not been adopted by any of the later writers. The work is called the Tāriḵ-i-Nizāmī by Muḥammad Hāshim Khāfī Khān in Muntakhab-ul-lubāb (vide text-edition in the Bibliotheca Indica series, vol. I, p. 238, 1869). The same name was also used by ‘Abd-ul-Qādīr, also known as Al-Badāonī, in his Muntakhab-ul-tawārikh, but he also calls it ‘Nizāmu-t-Tawārikh’ (vide Ranking’s English translation in the Bibliotheca Indica series, vol. I, pp. 9, 10, 1898). Firishtah (Tāriḵ-i-Firishtah, Persian text, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, p. 4, 1884) designated it as the Tāriḵ-i-Nizāmu’d-Dīn Ahmad Bukhshī, and Col. Briggs in his translation (History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India, vol. I, Author’s Preface, p. xlviii, 1829) calls it ‘History of Nizam-ood-Deen Ahmad Bukhshy’. Blochmann (loc. cit., p. 115), as noted already, calls it ‘Tabaqat i Nizām i Bakhshi’. Several manuscripts, however, bear the name Tabaqat-i-Akbari, and under this name the work is cited in various descriptive catalogues of Persian Manuscripts in most well-known European libraries (for details

10, footnote 2, 1898). In this connection reference may also be made to Al-Badāonī’s remarks where in his description of the events of the year 1002 A.H. he says “Let not the intelligent reader be ignorant of the fact that as to that which has been written up to this point the source of the greater part of it is the Tabaqat-i Akbari Shāhī (sic), the date of which, I, this erring author, after much thought found to be Nizāmī. Having persuaded the said author to allow me, I wrote a part of the book myself.” (Lowe’s translation of vol. II, p. 403).

Vide W. H. Morley, A Descriptive Catalogue of Historical Manuscripts, p. 68 (1864), and Dowson in Eliot’s History of India, vol. V, p. 177 (1873). For details of the work Rauḍat-ut-Tāhirin see Beveridge, Journ. As. Soc. Bengal (n.s.) vol. XIV, pp. 269-277 (1918). Unfortunately the only manuscript of this work in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. 42, vide Ivanoff’s Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts, p. 13, 1924) is incomplete, and I have not, therefore, been able to verify this reference.

2 For a critical note in reference to Al-Badāonī see Blochmann, loc. cit., pp. 119, 120 (1869).
see M. Hidāyat Ḥossain’s preface to Ṭārīḵh-i-Shāhī, p. vii, footnote 1, 1939). This name was apparently first adopted by Elliot ¹ who remarked that “the name by which it is best known in literary circles is Tabakāt-i-Akbar”, and this was also selected for the edition issued by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in preference to Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbar-Shāhī, to avoid confusion with a work of the same name by Khwājah ‘Aṭā Beg Qazvīnī written about 1014 A.H., 1605 A.D. According to Ranking (loc. cit.) the work is simply known as ‘Ṭabaqāt,’ while Lees (Journ. Roy. As. Soc. (n.s.) vol. III, p. 455, 1868) erroneously designates it as the ‘Ṭārīḵh-i-Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbar-Shāhī’.

Beveridge ² in dealing with the sources of Akbarnāma stated that the ‘Ṭabaqat-Akbari’ and ‘Badayuni’s abridgment thereof’ (Muntakahḥab-ut-tawārīḵh) “were probably written under Akbar’s orders or inspired by his action.” In the introduction to Akbarnāma ³ while referring to Abū-1-Fadl’s love for sources or the Quellen, he remarked that “to him we owe not only the Akbarnāma but also the Memoirs of Gulbadan Begam, Jauhar the ever-bearer, Bajazat (Bāyazīd) Biyat and perhaps Nizāmu-d-dīn’s history”. Neither of the two views is upheld by a study of the contemporary sources. The work was started and completed by the author at his own initiative and there is no mention anywhere of either Akbar or Abū-1-Fadl having sponsored or inspired its compilation. He certainly was helped ⁴ in the work by such friends as Mir Ma’sūm of Bhakkar ⁵, ‘Abdul Qādir Al-Badāoni ⁶ and others, but the major part of the work

¹ Elliot’s Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muḥammadan India, vol. I (the only volume ever issued), p. 179 (1849). Also see Elliot’s History of India, vol. V, p. 177 (1873).
⁵ For an account of this great author, historian and administrator see A’in-i-Akbari, Philott’s edition of Blochmann’s translation of vol. I, pp. 578–580 (1939).
was his own composition, based on a study of several historical works and such independent information as he could collect from various sources by research and industry. His history of the Akbar's reign is based on personal observations, on information obtained from firsthand sources and probably to some extent on Abū-l-Faḍl's *opus magnum* the *Akbarnāma*.

In the introduction and dedication of the *Tabaqāt Khwājah Nizāmuddin Ahmad* explains the genesis of the work as follows:

"It came to the dull understanding of the author that he should, with the pen of truth and candour, write a comprehensive history which should present in a clear style, in its different sections, an account of the Empire of Hindustan from the time of Sabuktigin which began with the year 367 A.H., when Islam first appeared in the country of Hindustan, to the year 1001 A.H., corresponding with the thirty-seventh year of the Divine era, which was inaugurated at the epoch-making accession of His Majesty, the vicegerent of God; and should embellish the end of each section with the story of the victories of His Majesty's glorious army, which is as it were an introduction to the sublime chronicle of renown; then he should give a comprehensive account of all the victories and events and occurrences of His Majesty's reign each in its own place. The details of these events are contained in the great history called the Ākbar-nāmah, which that embodiment of all excellence, the learned in all truths and knowledge, the personification of worldly and spiritual perfection, the favoured of his Majesty the Emperor, the most erudite Sheikh Abul Fazl who is the preface of all excellence and

---

1 The words in *Madshir* (*loc. cit.*) are

و جنرال رازی و دقت در تلقیم اخبار و سعی نمایند بقاهم آوردن

*مواد بکار برده*

2 I have included *Akbarnāma* as one of his sources, as it is mentioned in the introduction, but in view of various discrepancies in the accounts in the *Tabaqāt* and *Akbarnāma* it is very doubtful whether he really utilized it to any extent in the compilation of his own History.
eminence has written with his wonder-inscribing pen, and has made a chronicle for all times."¹

The history actually starts from about 377 A.H. corresponding to 986-987 A.D., and not 367 A.H. as stated by the author in the introduction; an account of the earlier years in a few lines merely introduces ‘Amir Nāṣīruddin Sabuktīn and can by no stretch of imagination be regarded as a history of those years. According to the author, as will be seen from the quotation above, he deals with the history of India up to the year 1001 A.H. corresponding to the thirty-seventh year of Akbar’s reign, and apparently it was this which was responsible for Mr. De describing it on the title-pages of volume I, both of the text and the translation, and of the text edition of volume II, as ‘A History of India from the early Musalmān Invasions to the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Akbar’. The work, on the other hand, as is clear from a perusal of the author’s concluding

¹ De’s translation of the ‘Tabaqūt, vol. I, p. v. The corresponding passage of the Persian text runs as follows:

بِخَاطِرُ فَاطِرِ رَسُولِ اللهِ - كَهْ تَأْرَىُ فِيهُ كَهْ جَامِعِ وَ مَشَتَّلِ بِتَنَابِي اِحْوَالِ مَعَاكِ

The history actually starts from about 377 A.H. corresponding to 986-987 A.D., and not 367 A.H. as stated by the author in the introduction; an account of the earlier years in a few lines merely introduces ‘Amir Nāṣīruddin Sabuktīn and can by no stretch of imagination be regarded as a history of those years. According to the author, as will be seen from the quotation above, he deals with the history of India up to the year 1001 A.H. corresponding to the thirty-seventh year of Akbar’s reign, and apparently it was this which was responsible for Mr. De describing it on the title-pages of volume I, both of the text and the translation, and of the text edition of volume II, as ‘A History of India from the early Musalmān Invasions to the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Akbar’. The work, on the other hand, as is clear from a perusal of the author’s concluding

It will be seen that ‘Jāmi‘ and ‘Mash’ṭall has been translated by Mr. De as “comprehensive”, ‘Makama‘ and ‘Sudād as “with the pen of truth and candour” and ‘Bayyarštī and ‘Ašt as “in a clear style”.”
paragraph of the account of Akbar’s reign, succinctly narrates the events up to the end of the 38th year corresponding to 1002 A.H. (1593-1594 A.D.), and this is confirmed by a reference to the Akbarnāma. The consultation with the Khān Khānān regarding the Deccan campaign, which took place after the 8th Din (or Dī) of the 38th year near the town of Sultānpūr (or Shaikhupūr), is mentioned in the penultimate paragraph of the account of Akbar’s reign in the Ṭabaqāt. The mistake was corrected on the title-page of the translation of volume II, but to avoid ambiguity it would have been better to add the words ‘the end of’ before “the thirty-eighth year” or still better to use ‘to the thirty-ninth year of Akbar’s reign’.

Excluding the Akbarnāma the author cites the following twenty-eight works which he utilized in the compilation of his Ṭabaqāt:

1. Tārikh-i-Yamini.
2. Tārikh-i-Zain-ul-Akhbār.
3. Raḍdat-us-Safā.
5. Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāširī.
7. Tugluk-Nāmah.
8. Tārikh-i-Fīrūzshāhi by Ḍiyā Bārnī.
10. Tārikh-i-Mubārakshāhi.
11. Futūh-us-Salāṭīn.
12. Tārikh Maḥmūdshāhi Hindūi (Mandvi according to Rieu).
13. Tārikh Maḥmūdshāhi Khurd Hindūi (Mandvi according to Rieu).
14. Ṭabaqāt-i-Maḥmūdshāhi Gujarāti.
15. Maāthir-i-Maḥmūdshāhi Gujarāti.
16. Tārikh-i-Muḥammadī.
17. Tārikh-i-Bahādurshāhi.
18. Tārikh-i-Bahāmanī.

1 Ṭabaqāt, De’s translation of vol. II, p. 652 (1936).
19. Tārikh-i-Nāṣiri.
20. Tārikh-i-Muṣaffarshāḥi.
21. Tārikh-i-Mirzā Haidar.
22. Tārikh-i-Kashmīr.
23. Tārikh-i-Sind.
24. Tārikh-i-Bāburi.
25. Wāqi‘at-i-Bāburi.
26. Tārikh-i-Ibrāhīmshāḥi.
27. Wāqi‘at-i-Muṣhtāqī.

Unfortunately some of the works cited in the Tabaqāt are not traceable, but I give below short bibliographical notes on the authorities referred to in the above list.

1. Tārikh Al-Yamini by Abū Naṣr Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-‘Utbi is a history of the first two Ghaznavid sovereigns Subuktigin and Maḥmūd. It was written about 411 A.H. (1020 A.D.). This work has been translated into Persian, and an English translation of the Persian version by Reynolds was published for the Oriental Translation Fund, London, in 1858. Full bibliographical details of this work were published by M. Hidāyat Hosain in his Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Buhar Library, vol. II, pp. 260, 261 (1923).

2. Kitāb Zain-ul-Akhlāq by Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd-ul-Ḥayy bin ad-Daḥījak bin Maḥmūd Gardezī is a very rare historical work. Only two incomplete manuscripts of this work are known, one in the library of King’s College, Cambridge (213), and the other in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Ouseley, 1928).

---

1 Rieu (Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum, vol. I, p. 220, 1879) cites numbers 19 and 20 as a single work under the title ‘Tārikh-i-Nāṣiri-u-Muṣaffarshāḥi’, but in the text the two read as:

- تاریخ نامی و تاریخ مظفر شاهی

2 ترجمه بهینی in Firishtah and ‘Tarjooma Yemuny’ in Briggs (loc. cit., p. xlix).

240); it has further been suggested that the Bodleian manuscript is only a copy of the one at King’s College, Cambridge.

Zain-ul-Akhbār is a general history of Persia from the Pishdādiyān dynasty, dealing particularly with the governors and rulers of Khurāsān up to ca. 440 A.H. (1048 A.D.). Unfortunately a large portion of the work is lost, but an edition of the first thirteen sections of the text was published by Muḥammad Nāżīm ¹.

As is pointed out by Muḥammad Nāżīm, Khwājah Niẓāmuddin Ahmad Bakhsī was the first author to utilize this work for his account of the Ghaznavid sovereigns in the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbārī, and the discovery of this rare work must remain to his credit. Firishtah also includes Zain-ul-Akhbār amongst the sources of his Ṭārīḵh, but in view of the fact that his account of the period dealt with in the Zain was based mainly on the Ṭabaqāt, it seems likely that he had only taken this reference from Niẓāmuddin Ahmad’s list.

3. Rauḍat-us-Ṣafā by Muḥammad bin Khāwand Shāh bin Maḥmūd. Very little information is available about the birth or early life of the author, but he is stated to have died at Herāt in 903 A.H. (1497 A.D.). Rauḍat is a work on general history, from the creation of the world to the author’s time. For details see Ḥabib-us-Siyar, Bombay edition, volume II, pp. 198, 339, and Rieu’s Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum, vol. I, p. 87 (1879). A full account of the work and translations of some extracts by Sir H. M. Elliot are published in Elliot’s History of India, vol. IV, pp. 127-140 (1872).

4. Taḥ-ul-Maʿāthir by Ḥasan Niẓāmī of Nishāpūr deals with the history of part of the reign of Muʿizuddin (assassinated 602 A.H., 1206 A.D.), the entire reign of Quṭbuddin Aibak

¹ Vide note 3, p. xxii. The editor cites Elliot’s History of India, 1869, as the first notice of this work. This is incorrect, as Elliot in his Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammadan India, p. 83 (1849), had published a detailed note regarding the Ouseley Manuscript No. 240 which is now preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford; this was reprinted in Elliot’s History of India, vol. IV, pp. 557, 558 (1872), while the 1869 reference cited by the editor is only a casual notice of the work in vol. II of the same publication (p. 432).

5. Ṭabaqat-i-Nāṣirī by Minhāj Sirāj Jūzjānī is a very valuable historical work from the earliest times to 658 A.H. (1259 A.D.). The author in honour of his patron Nāṣiruddin Mahmūd Shāh, king of Delhi (644–664 A.H., 1246–1266 A.D.), named it Ṭabaqat-i-Nāṣirī. A detailed account of the work was given in Elliot’s History of India, vol. II, pp. 259–383 (1869) and vol. VIII, pp. i-xxxi (1877), and full bibliographical references are given in Rieu’s Catalogue, vol. I, pp. 72, 73 (1879).

6. Khazāin-ul-Futūḥ or the Tārīkh-i-‘Alāī by Amīr Khusrau is a short but very important contemporary history of the reign of ‘Alā’uddin dealing with the period 695–711 A.H. (1296–1312 A.D.). The work is very rare 1, only two manuscripts, one in the British Museum (Or. 1638) and the other in King’s College Library, Cambridge, are known. A lithograph edition 2 based on the British Museum manuscript was published under the editorship of ‘Moinul Haq’ in 1927, but, as has been pointed out by Dr. Mirzā 3, it is “full of mistakes, due either to faulty transcription or to careless editing.”

In his excellent study of Amīr Khusrau Dr. Mirzā (pp. 222–225) has given a detailed list of contents of the historical material of the Khazāin-ul-Futūḥ and discussed its literary peculiarities; Prof. M. Habib 4 in his introduction to the text-edition had also dealt with the literary peculiarities and the historical importance of this work.

---


3 M. W. Mirza, op. cit., p. 225.

7. *Tughluq-Nāmah* by Amīr Khusrau was quite unknown till recently, as no copies of it are preserved in any of the European or Indian libraries. Al-Badāoni (*Muntakḥbūt-tawārīḵh*, Rāking’s translation of vol. I, p. 301) remarks that it was the last of Amīr Khusrau’s works, and “was written in verse in honour of the Sultān and in obedience to his order”. Ethé in his *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office*, p. 405, in the account of *Haft Iqlīm*, notes that the work consisted of 3,000 *baits* (verses). A manuscript entitled *Jahāngīrīnāmah* by Ḥayātī Kāshī in the personal library of Maulānā Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān Shirwānī of Ḥabibganj was recently identified as the *Tughluq-Nāmah* of Amīr Khusrau by the late Maulvī Rashid Aḥmad Anṣārī. A detailed introduction, a summary of this work by the editor Saiyid Ḥāshmī Faridābādī, an incomplete descriptive note by Maulvī Rashid Aḥmad in Urdu, and the text was published at Aurangābād, Deccan, in 1352 A.H. (1933 A.D.).

Relying on the statements in *Kashf-uz-Zunūn* and ‘Abd-ul-Qādir Al-Badāoni’s *Muntakḥbūt-tawārīḵh* the *Tughluq-Nāmah* is believed to have been composed in 725 A.H. (1325 A.D.), but some part of the work had been lost even in Akbar’s time, and in 1019 A.H. (1610 A.D.), Jahāngīr commissioned Ḥayātī Kāshī to supply the missing parts to complete the work. The work, as published, is believed to be what has been preserved of Ḥayātī’s revised version, and consists of 2,920 verses. In view of the presence of a *ṭalā* (catch-word) on the last page of the manuscript and a statement by Ḥayātī (vide verses 168–177) that he intends to complete the work by adding some further verses at the end, it is surmised by the editor that some of the folios at the end are missing. 179 verses in the beginning of the work are definitely identified as Ḥayātī’s work, leaving a balance of 2,742 verses ¹

¹ There is apparently a mistake in the number of verses assigned to Amīr Khusrau, as after deducting 179 of Ḥayātī’s verses from the total number of 2,920 verses in the work, the number should be 2,741 and not 2,742 as given on p. 2 of the work. In this connection also see the critical account of M. W. Mirza, *op. cit.*, pp. 245–253. He rightly does not include the *ahyāt-ī-sīsūlah* or the rubrics in verse in the number of verses, and is of the opinion that only 2,717 verses should be accepted as
by Amīr Khusrau. The editor in his introduction directs special attention to the historical importance of the work in connection with the following:—the murder of Sultān Qutbuddīn, the last of the Khaljī kings (716 A.H., 1316 A.D.), annihilation of the ‘Alāī dynasty; Khusrau Khan’s short-lived reign of a few days, insurrection of the Tughluq (Ghāzī Malik later Ghiyāthuddīn Tughluq I), his correspondence with various Amīrs, advance to Delhi and victory over the usurper Khusrau Khan after two big battles, capture of Khusrau Khan and his brother, and finally his execution. This period (1316–1320 A.D.) marks the fall of the Khaljī and the rise of the Tughluq Dynasty. On comparing the accounts in Tughluq-Nāmah with that in the Tabaqāt, it appears almost certain that the author of the latter did not make much use of the former in compiling his account of the period under reference.

8. Tūrīkh-i-Fīrūzshāhī by Dīyā Barnī is a history of the Sultāns of Delhi from the accession of Ghiyāthuddīn Balban, 662 A.H. (1266 A.D.), to the sixth year of Fīrūzshāh’s reign, 758 A.H. (1357 A.D.). It is the most important history of the period and was apparently the authority on which Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad and Firishtah based their works. The work was published in the Bibliotheca Indica series (1860–1862). A translation of the introduction and of the major part of the work was published by Dowson in Elliot’s History of India, vol. III, pp. 93–268 (1871).

9. Futūḥāt-i-Fīrūzshāhī by the King Fīrūzshāh Tughluq (752–790 A.H., 1351–1388 A.D.) is a record of “the edicts and ordinances of his reign, the abuses and evil practices which he has put down, the buildings, monuments and works of public utility which he has carried out.” A translation of the entire work is published by Dowson in Elliot’s History of India, vol. III, pp. 374–388 (1871).

being by Khusrau. For a detailed analysis of the work also see Husain’s The Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughluq (London, 1938).

1 The period of Khusrau Khan’s reign, who took the name of Nāṣir-ud-dīn Khusrau, was exactly two months, vide Tughluq-Nāmah, pp. 18, 19, from the 1st of Jumādā II to 1st Sha’bān, 720 A.H. (9th July to 6th September, 1320 A.D.).
10. Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhi by Yahya bin Ahmad bin ‘Abdullah Sirhindī is a history of the Sultāns of Delhi from the time of Mu’izzul-‘Dīn bin Sām, the founder of the Ghūrī Dynasty, to 838 A.H., 1434 A.D. It is the most reliable and in fact the only source for the history of the first three kings of the Saiyid Dynasty from 817 A.H. (1414 A.D.) to 838 A.H. (1434 A.D.), and the accounts in the Tabaqāt and Firishtāh’s History are not only based on it, but in most cases are verbatim copies of Yahya’s account. An account of this work with extracts is published in Elliot’s History of India, vol. IV, pp. 6-88 (1872) and the entire work was issued in the Bibliotheca Indica series in 1931 under the editorship of M. Hidāyat Ḥosain. An English translation by K. K. Basu was published in the Gaekwād Oriental Series, No. lxiii, in 1932.

11. Futūh-us-Salāṭin by ‘Īsāmī (Khwājah ‘Abd-ul-Mulk ‘Īsāmī according to Ethé 1) is a very important historical work in verse, from the time of Subuktīgīn of Ghaznī to Muhammad bin Tughluq. The Futūh, like the Kitāb Zain-ul-Akhbār, is a very rare work and only two manuscripts 2 of it are known. Like the Zain it was first mentioned in the sources of the Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī by Niẓāmuddīn Ahmad, and it appears that the references in Firishtāh 3 and Al-Badāuni 4 are only taken from the Tabaqāt. Briggs 5 was not personally acquainted with the work, but remarked that the Futūh is an unimportant book of historical romances.

The text 6 of the Futūh, based on the manuscript in the India Office Library, was issued in 1938 by Dr. A. Mahdi Ḥusain

---

5 Ranking in his translation of this volume, p. 314 (1898), note 9, remarks: “I can find no mention of this work.”
6 Vide Note 2 supra.
of Agra. In the Urdū and English prefaces of this edition the editor briefly discusses the historical and literary merits of the Futūḥ, while a short critical notice is published in his monographic study 1 of Muhammad bin Tughluq. Prof. A. S. U’sha of Madras has also published an ‘Īsāmī Nāma and discussed the merits of ‘Īsāmī’s publications, but I have unfortunately not been able to refer to his publications 2; his views have been adversely criticized by M. Ḥusain and M. Ḥaq 3. A critical review 4 of the work is also being published in the Urdū monthly Maʿārif by Ṣabāḥuddin ‘Abd-ur-Raḥmān.

Futūḥ-us-Salāfīn originally consisted of about 12,000 verses, but according to the editor, only 11,524 verses were found in the India Office manuscript; of these, nineteen verses (Nos. 11294–11312) are quite illegible. The work was completed in five months and nine days (10th December, 1349–14th May, 1350 A.D.). For his sources the author does not specify any special works, but states 5 that he based his account on the Ḥadīth, various descriptive works, old legends, information gathered from friends and personal observations.

Dr. M. Ḥusain sums up the historical importance of the work as follows 6:—“It presents in tolerably accurate chronological order events of the political history of India for over three hundred years, and it also throws light on the beginning of the Bahmani rule in the Deccan; on the psychology of the 14th century India; on the principal towns and their respective distances; on the nature of punishments then inflicted; on the Hindu amirs and princes; and on the Hindi words and idioms then in Muslim usage.” He further regards the Futūḥ as a

2 References to Prof. U’sha’s contributions are given in M. Ḥusain and M. Ḥaq.
literary work of exceptional merit, and Ḥiṣāmī as the best epic writer of the age.

Ṣabāḥuddīn ‘Abd-ur-Raḥmān in his critical review after comparing Ḥiṣāmī’s accounts with some contemporary sources, such as the Rihla of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Tārikh-i-Fīrūzshāhi, Tabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī, Tārikh-i-Mubārakshāhī and other works, is of the opinion that most of the legends and stories in the Futūḥ are not based on any historical facts. The historical data of the Futūḥ, on the other hand, are generally correct, and, even though involved and jumbled at times, are valuable in supplying additional information and for clearing up details of several doubtful events. It is, however, not possible to adjudge the extent to which the Futūḥ was utilized in the compilation of the Tabaqāt.

12, 13. It has not been possible to identify the two works Tārikh Mahmūdshāhī Manduī and Tārikh Mahmūdshāhī Khurd Manduī. The works seem to be lost and no accounts of either beyond the references in the Tabaqāt and Firishtah’s History are now available.

14. Tabaqāt-i-Mahmūdshāhī Gujarātī. No work of this title is known, and it has not been possible to identify it with any other History of Gujarāt.

15. Maāthir-i-Mahmūdshāhī Gujarātī. This is also an unknown work, but Rieu in his Catalogue, vol. III, p. 967 (1883), has suggested its possible identity with Tārikh-i-Mahmūdshāh of unknown authorship (manuscript No. Or. 1819, pp. 966, 967), and given full details of its contents.

16. Tārikh-i-Muḥammadī. In the absence of the name of the author, and in view of there being several works of this name, it is difficult to be certain regarding the work referred to in the Tabaqāt, but if one were to hazard a guess, it seems likely that the work cited is no other than the general history, by Muḥammad Bihāmad Khānī, from the time of Muḥammad to 842 A.H. (1438 A.D.), with special reference to India, which is described in detail in Rieu’s Catalogue, vol. I, pp. 84–86 (1879).

17. Tārikh-i-Bahādurshāhī. This work is referred to as a source of reference in various histories, but it has not been possible to trace it. In Elliot’s History of India, vol. VI, p. 484 (1875), it is referred to as a work by “another individual who
wrote all the rest of the annals of Sultān Firoz's reign, as well as those of the Gujarāt sovereigns, under the title of *Tārikh-i-Bahādur Shāhī*.

18. *Tārikh-i-Bahāmani* is another lost work which is only referred to in several historical works, but no copies of which are now available.

19. *Tārikh-i-Nāṣirī*. The work referred to is probably the History of Mālwah entitled *Tārikh-i-Nāṣirshāhī* by an unknown author described by Rieu in his *Catalogue*, vol. III, p. 968, MS. No. Or. 1803, and not the famous *Tārikh-i-Nāṣirī* by Abūl-Faḍl Baihaqī which was edited by W. H. Morley and printed in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series in 1862.

20. *Tārikh-i-Muẓaffarshāhī* by an unknown author is apparently a very rare work. The only known manuscript (No. Add. 26, 279) of this history, so far I am able to find from the various sources, is preserved in the British Museum, London. It is described by Rieu in his *Catalogue*, vol. I, p. 287 (1879), as being an account of the siege and capture of Mandū by Muẓaffar Shāh II, king of Gujarāt, in 924 A.H. (1518 A.D.).

21. *Tārikh-i-Mīrzā Ḥaidar*. The correct title of the work is *Tārikh-i-Rashīdī*, but in the *Tabaqāt* it is cited as the *Tārikh* of Mīrzā Ḥaidar, after the name of its author. This work is of special value in connection with the history of Kashmir. An English translation with annotations was published by N. Elias and E. D. Ross (1895).

22. *Tārikh-i-Kashmir*. The name of the author is not mentioned, but the work referred to in the *Tabaqāt* is probably the Persian translation of the *Rājatarangini* in Sanskrit which was completed by Mullā Shāh Muḥammad of Shāhābād and revised by 'Abd-ul-Qādir Al-Budāonī in 999 A.H. (1590 A.D.). A full account of the work is given in Rieu’s *Catalogue*, vol. I, p. 296 (1879).

23. *Tārikh-i-Sind* by Mīr Maṣūm Bhakkarī is also known as the *Tārikh-i-Maṣūmī*. It deals with the history of Sind from the Muhammedan conquest to its final absorption in the Moghul Empire during Akbar’s reign in 1001 A.H. (1592 A.D.). A detailed account of it is published in Elliot’s *History of India*, vol. I, pp. 212–252 (1867), and the work has recently (1938) been printed
under the editorship of Dr. U. M. Daudpota in the Government Oriental Series of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

24. **Tārīkh-i-Bāburī.** No work of this name can be traced and it appears as if the author of the *Tabaqāt* had confused one of the Persian translations of *Tuzuk-i-Bāburī* under this name (*vide infra*).

25. **Wāqi‘āt-i-Bāburī.** In reference to this work also it is not possible to decide which of the Persian translations of the *Tuzuk-i-Bāburī* is referred to by the author of the *Tabaqāt*. The translation of Shāikh Zain or ‘Zainu‘d-din of Khwaf’ was made during the lifetime of Emperor Bābur (*vide* Mrs. Beveridge’s *Bābur-Nāma*, preface p. xl, 1921, and Rieu’s *Catalogue*, vol. III, p. 926), a second one by Ḥāyandah Ḥasan Ghaznavī and Muhammad Quli Mughal Ḥiṣārī was begun in 991 A.H. (1583 A.D.), and completed in 994 A.H., 1586 A.D. (*vide* Mrs. Beveridge, *op. cit.*, pp. xlii, xlii, and Rieu’s *Catalogue*, vol. II, p. 799), and finally a third by ‘Abd-ur-Ḩām Khaṅ Khānān, which “was made at Akbar’s orders to help Abū‘l-faḍl in the *Akbar-nāma*”, and on its completion was presented to Akbar in 998 A.H., 1589 A.D. (*vide* Mrs. Beveridge, *op. cit.*, p. xliv, and Rieu’s *Catalogue*, vol. I, p. 244).

26. **Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhimshāhī.** No work of this name is known, and appears as if Ibrāhimshāhī is a *lapseus calamii* on the part of the author of the *Tabaqāt* for Ibrāhīmī. The *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmī* 1, also known as *Tārīkh-i-Humāyyūn*, by Ibrāhīm bin Ḥarīr (probably Jarīr as suggested by Ethé) is “a general history of the world from Adam to a.H. 596 (a.D. 1199)” —see Ethé’s *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office*, p. 33, No. 104 (1903).

27. **Wāqi‘āt-i-Mushtāqī** by Mushtāqī, commonly known as Rizq Ullah, “is a collection of detached narratives and anecdotes relating to the sovereigns of the Lodi, Timuride and Sur dynasties.” An account of the work with translations of some extracts

---

1 Not to be confused with *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmī* which is another name for Firishtah’s History, *vide* Elliot’s *Biographical Index of the Historians of Muhammedan India*, p. 336 (1849).
is published in Elliot’s History of India, vol. IV, pp. 534–557 (1872), while details regarding the almost unique manuscript in the British Museum are given by Rieu in his Catalogue, vol. II, pp. 820, 821 (1881).


On comparing the above list with Firishtah’s sources it is found that the latter gives a list of 35 main works consulted by him for the compilation of his History, while another twenty are cited in the body of the work. Of the works cited in the Tabaqāt Firishtah does not mention Khazāin-i-Futūh, Tughluq-Namāh, Tārikh-i-Nāṣirī, Tārikh-i-Mirzā Hāidar, Tārikh-i-Bāburi and Tārikh-i-Ibrāhīmshāhī, while I have doubtfully identified Firishtah’s Tārikh-i-Jāmī (or Hājī) with Muḥammad Bihāmād Khān’s Tārikh-i-Muḥammadi of the Tabaqāt. In addition there are twenty works which are mentioned in the body of Firishtah’s Tārikh and which are included in a subsidiary list by Briggs. Of these, two, Futūh-i-Salāfīn and Wāqi‘āt-i-Muṣhtāqī († Travels of Abūl Nūṣr Nusktay—No. 7 of Briggs’s list), are also included in the Tabaqāt. Firishtah’s list includes the following additional works which are not mentioned in the list of the authorities in the Tabaqāt:

2. Bahman-Nāmah of Shaikh Aḏhari.
3. Tārikh-i-Binakītī.
4. Tuhfat-us-Salāfīn Bahamānī by Mullā Dāūd Bīdārī.
5. Tārikh-Alfī.
6. Ḥābīb-us-Siyār.
7. Tārikh-i-Bangālāh.


The importance of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbār lies in the fact that it was the first comprehensive history of India and that it served as the authority on which several later historical works were based.

The opinion of ‘Abd-ul-Qādir, Al-Badā’oni, the author of the Muntakhab-ut-tawdārikh, has already been referred to. Up to the year of Niẓāmuddin Aḥmad’s death, his history, though embellished with additional facts, is an abridgment of the Ṭabaqāt and Tārikh-i-Mubārakshāhī. He corrected some of the dates of the Ṭabaqāt, but mainly relied on it for the historical facts.

Several chapters of the Rawdat-ut-Ṭāhirin by Ṭāhir Muḥammad, which was written between 1011 A.H. (1602-1603 A.D.) and 1015 A.H. (1606-1607 A.D.) are, according to Elliot (op. cit., p. 300), copied verbatim from the Ṭabaqāt.

Muḥammad Qāsim Fīrishtah pronounced the Ṭabaqāt to be defective, but “borrowed from it very freely and has formed his own history of Hindustan and the Deccan entirely on the same plan” (Elliott, op. cit., p. 178). This opinion is fully borne out by the running commentary of the Tārikh provided by Mr. De in his very valuable footnotes in the translation of the Ṭabaqāt, particularly in volume III.

The Tārikh-i-Shahi (or Tārikh-i-Salāṭin-i Afghānī) was composed soon after the compilation of the Ṭabaqāt (before 1594 A.D.) and before 1020 A.H. (1611 A.D.) when the Makhzan-i-Afghānī was written (Elliot’s History of India, vol. V, pp. 1, 2, 1873). The author Ahmad Yādgār mentions Niẓāmī’s History or the Ṭabaqāt and Ma’dat-i-Akhbār as his authorities and, as M. Ḥidāyat Ḥosain has recently shown, he has copied verbatim the account of the reign of Humāyūn from the Ṭabaqāt.

1 According to Elliot’s Bibliographical Index of the Historians of Muhammadan India, p. 221 (1849), Al-Badā’oni in his work ‘Niẓātu-r-Rashid’ designates his own history “as a mere abridgment of the Talakāt.”

2 Vide M. Ḥidāyat Ḥosain’s text edition of Tārikh-i-Shahi, Preface, pp. 6, 7 (1939).
Ma'āthir-i-Rahimi by Mullā 'Abd-ul-Bāqī Nahāvandi was composed in the year 1025 A.H. (1616 A.D.). The first volume of this work dealing with the general history of India appears, from its contents and descriptions, on almost identical lines, to be based mainly on the Tabaqāt. Ma'āthir's style and language are superior to those of the Tabaqāt, but there can be little doubt that the historical part is only a copy of the latter. This view is confirmed by the fact that the detailed account of Akbar's reign in the Ma'āthir ends with the 38th year of his reign; the author in this connection adds that as the narrative in the Tabaqāt ends with this year and as he has not been able to obtain any detailed history of the remaining fourteen years of the reign, he has not been able to include a detailed account of this period.1

M. 'Abdul Muqtadir in the Preface2 to the Haft-Iqlim (completed 1002 A.H., 1593 A.D.) of Amīn Aḥmad Rāzī remarked that "for the Indian portion of the history he relies mainly upon the Tabaqāt-i-Akbari".

Muntakhab-ul-lubāb by Muḥammad Ḥāshmi, better known by his nickname of Khāfi K̑hān, is a very valuable general history of India from the Muhammadan conquest to the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, Emperor of Delhi (1719–1748 A.D.). It was published in 1145 A.H. (1732 A.D.). The author3 states that Nizāmuddīn Harawi, who was one of the Bakhshīs of the Emperor Akbar, wrote a comprehensive history of the twenty-one Šābas of the Deccan and included in it the history of Akbar up to the 37th year of his reign. His account of the Sulṭāns of the Deccan in general is not reliable, and with reference to the accounts of the Sulṭāns of this region the author has not come across any other historical work, except that of Muḥammad Qāsim Firishtah, which can be fully relied upon. As Nizāmuddīn had, however, been in the service of the Emperor Akbar throughout his life, his

narrative of the reign of this King can be fully relied upon, and he bases his account of the Panj hazāri and Chahār hazāri Amirs and of some of the religious great men and poets on the Ṭabaqāt.

Akbar-Nāma of Shaikh Ilāhdād Faiḍī Sirhindī is, according to Dowson ¹, except for the account of the services rendered by his patron Shaikh Farid Bukhārī and “some scraps of poetry and some wonderful stories”, only a compilation from the Ṭabaqāt and Akbarnāma of Abū-l-Faḍl. It ends with 1010 A.H. (1602 A.D.), the year in which Abū-l-Faḍl’s work was completed.

Various other historical works of a later date have either based their accounts on or borrowed from the Ṭabaqāt, but it is not necessary to deal with them here.

Of the authors in English it is only necessary to note that the Ṭabaqāt is regarded by Elliot, Erskine, Elliot and Dowson, Lees, Ranking, Wolseley Haig, Beni Prasad and others as “amongst the best Persian histories and the most reliable sources of our information” ².

It was the first comprehensive work which dealt with the history of India to the exclusion of the other Asiatic countries, and in which the histories of different provinces were dealt in a strict historical sequence. It must also be remembered that the author was primarily a court official, an administrator and a soldier not a wāqi‘ah-navis or a court historian. Historical work was with him a labour of love, and being an officer with other more pressing duties, this was carried out by him with the help of his protégés under very unsettled conditions of life. His work also must not be judged by the modern standards. As Elliot admirably summed up in his learned preface ³, the works of the Muhammadan historians can hardly be regarded as ranking higher than annals. “They comprise, for the most part, nothing but a mere narration of events, conducted with reference to chronological sequence; without speculation on causes or effects; without a reflection or suggestion which

---

¹ Dowson in Elliot’s History of India, vol. VI, pp. 116–146 (1875).
² Vide Beni Prasad, History of Jahangir, p. 442 (1930).
³ Vide Elliot, Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammadan India, Preface, pp. v–xxx (1849).
is not of the most puerile or contemptible kind; and without any observation calculated to interrupt the monotony of successive conspiracies, revolts, intrigues, murders, fratricides, so common in Asiatic Monarchies.” With the restraining influences of ostracism and even death under the despotic monarchs during whose times these histories were compiled, there could hardly be any chance for the development of individual character or the expression of unbiased opinions. In common with the authors of the times, and this was not restricted to Muhammadan authors only, Islam in the Ṭabaqāt is lauded above all other religions, the Muhammedans are of the true faith and all others are infidels; when the former are killed in battle or otherwise they drink “the cup of martyrdom”, while the souls of the infidels “are despatched to hell”. Patriotism and bravery of the Kāfirs are condemned in very strong terms, while even cowardice, intrigues, wholesale massacres and desecration and demolition of the religious institutions of the Hindūs are applauded. All the same the author deserves full credit for being far in advance of his times and to a great extent free from religious bigotry when he, as against Diyā Barni, the author of the Tārīkh-i-Firūzshāhī, who describes Khusrav Khān on the occasion of his battle with Ghazī Malik “as the effeminate wretch who could not bear the attack of men”, applauds him as “having with great bravery and courage fought to the end of the day.”

Similarly in narrating the chivalrous treatment of Sultān Maḥmūd at the hands of Rānā Sānkā (Sangrāma Singh, Rānā of Mewār) and restoring to him the kingdom of Mālwah after the former’s defeat and capture by the latter, Khwājah Nizāmuddīn 2 shows himself a true historian untrammelled by any religious bigotry or prejudices. In dealing with Akbar, his king and patron, he employs the usual eulogistic high sounding

---

1 Fide De’s translation of vol. I of the Ṭabaqāt, p. 207.
2 Ṭabaqāt text edition, vol. III, p. 203:
titles and phrases, but cannot, like Abū-l-Faḍl, be accused of uncouth flattery, both in form and style, or of wilful concealment of facts. As a historian he casually mentions the "Divine Faith", but does not go into any great detail regarding the observances of the faith or criticize the Emperor, Abu-l-Faḍl and any of the other followers. He was writing a history of the period from personal observations and information collected from all available sources and has succeeded more than any other author of his time in producing what Dowson rightly styles a contemporary history of very high authority.

The Tabaqāt does not exhibit much literary talent and is not written in any ornate style. The language is fairly simple and vigorous, but not grandiose and highly polished; it is more of the Afghan type which is quite different from the almost pure Persian of Iran, used by Firishtah or Mullā 'Abd-ul-Baqī Nahāvandī, the author of Maḥfīr-i-Raḥimi. Arabic quotations are only sparingly used, but the dates are invariably given in Arabic rather than Persian. The narrative, owing to long sentences, is often involved, rather disjointed and even fragmentary, but as few metaphors and similes are used, there is seldom any difficulty in comprehending the exact meaning of the author.

Brajendranath De

(1852–1932).

Mr. Brajendranath De was born at Calcutta on the 23rd of December, 1852, in his maternal grandfather’s house in Simla,

---

1 See Blochmann’s A’im-i-Akbārī (Phillott’s revised edition), Preface, pp. vii, viii (1939); Beveridge’s translation of Akbarnāma, vol. III, introduction, pp. xi, xii (1939), and Wolseley Haig in Cambridge History of India, vol. IV, p. 111 (1937).


3 The life of the author is based on a typescript of an autobiography entitled Reminiscences of Mr. Brajendranath De, an Indian Member of the Indian Civil Service which was kindly placed at my disposal by his son Mr. H. K. De, Barrister-at-Law, to whom I tender my grateful thanks. A short Life of Mr. De, written by M. Ḥidāyat Ḥosain, was published in the Proceedings for 1932, pp. c1xxv–c1xxxvii, in Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, vol. XXIX for 1933 (1934).
near the Cornwallis Square. His parents were Kayasthas and, as the author writes, belonged to "the middle class section of well-born or as they are commonly called bhadralok people". His mother was one of the garhkāṭā Basu families of Anarpur. His early days were spent partly in the home of his maternal ancestors and partly in his paternal home at Bhawanipur which in those days formed one of the suburbs of Calcutta. Brajendranath was the eldest child of the family, and though he had nine or ten brothers and sisters, all except one died in their infancy. The author remarks "it is, therefore, curious that I have lived so long, and on the whole have enjoyed such remarkably good health. I have no doubt that it is due to the fact that I have lived an abstemious, active and regular life, have taken considerable care of myself and have been more or less well-occupied." During his childhood, however, he suffered from various ailments, but he notes that he was in good health from 1862 onwards when his father migrated to Lucknow. He was very fond of religious stories and sankirtans (religious musical performances in honour of Krishna or Vishnu) and apparently these greatly impressed him during the early years of his life. He was a favourite companion of his grandmother, and her austere, religious and simple life greatly influenced him in his younger days.

Like all Hindu boys of the period, he had to go through what was known as the hāte khari (chalk in hand) ceremony. This took place when he was 5 years old, on the 'Sripanchami and Saraswati Puja' day; the old family priest after offering 'pujas to the family Saligram and Saraswati' (the Goddess of Learning) placed a small cylindrical piece of hard grey chalk in the boy's right hand and guided him in writing the entire Bengali alphabet on the hard floor of the room where the ceremony was performed. In connection with his earlier education the author remarks, "My father had a deep-rooted antipathy equally to indigenous pathsalas and to missionary schools, which was perfectly justified in the case of the former, but not so well in the case of the latter; and I therefore never went to any institution of either of these classes." He was first sent to a school in Chakraberia, but soon afterwards was transferred
to the Nandan Brothers’ Academy; both these institutions were located in Bhawanipur. He then migrated to a school in Chorbagan and later to the Colootolah Branch School, now known as the Hare School, and it was here that he was educated up to the Vth standard.

The migration of his father to Lucknow in 1862 to take up his appointment in Government service has already been mentioned, but the family, including the young Brajendranath, did not join him till 1865. Lucknow in those days, as the author remarks, was “in every way different from Calcutta. The men and women were differently built, more sturdy and stalwart than the puny men and women we had known in Calcutta. They were differently dressed, and spoke a different language. The houses were built in a different style . . . . .”, and in fact the entire atmosphere was quite different from that of Calcutta.

At Lucknow young Brajendranath was admitted in the Canning School which later developed into the Canning College and finally into the Lucknow University of the present day; it was there that he suddenly blossomed forth into what he styles “a veritable prodigy”. In spite of the fact that he was greatly handicapped by having to learn an entirely new second language, he reached the top of his class at the end of 8-9 months, and for the six or seven years during which he was at this school he was always at the top of his class. He passed the Entrance (the Matriculation) Examination in December, 1867, in the 1st division. The Intermediate Examination he passed in 1869, standing 4th in order of merit in the whole of the Calcutta University. He passed the B.A. Examination in the 1st division and, after studying for a few months more, the M.A. Examination in the 1st class in 1871.

He started studying Sanskrit for his Intermediate Examination and his fondness for this language continued unabated to the end of his life. During this period also he started learning Persian with a Maulvi (Persian teacher) at home, who, according to the author, was given “the magnificent monthly salary of Rs.4 for two hours’ tuition every day.” With this Maulvi he used to read various Inshā’ā’s or collection of letters, among which he mentions Inshā’-i-Mādhūrām. Even at this age
young Brajendranath was very good in languages, particularly in English, Sanskrit and Persian, but he was rather deficient in Mathematics, and in spite of hard work he was not able to make up this deficiency.

After passing the M.A. Examination and even before he had been thinking of going to England to compete for the Indian Civil Service, the authorities of the Canning College, in view of his brilliant career, recommended the award to him of a scholarship of Rs.200 a month, but the Chief Commissioner of the province turned down the proposal on the grounds of his being a Bengali and the son of a ministerial officer of the Government. The College authorities, however, awarded him a scholarship of Rs.50 a month for a period of about 6 months till he could appear in the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service. The family finances at the time were in none too flourishing a condition, so in the middle of July, 1872, young Brajendranath, with only Rs.1,300, sailed for England. On his arrival in London he joined the University College, and appeared in the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service held in April, 1873. Only 35 of the 350 candidates that appeared for this examination that year were selected for the Indian Civil Service, and Brajendranath was 17th in the list. The author attributes this rather low position to his having selected Mathematics as one of the subjects, in which he obtained very low marks; his proficiency in English, Sanskrit, Persian and Mental Science, however, enabled him to pass the Civil Service Examination and secure a fairly high place amongst the selected candidates. *En passant* it may be mentioned that he was the 8th Indian who passed the I.C.S. Examination.

Brajendranath De in the meanwhile had joined the Middle Temple Inn and was studying for the Bar. Without much work he passed the law examinations, and having kept the full complement of twelve terms, was called to the Bar. After being selected for the Indian Civil Service, he went into residence at the Oxford University, and before leaving England, in July 1875, was awarded the Boden Sanskrit Scholarship. In addition to this during the period of his probation in England he won a number of prizes in the half-yearly examinations for proficiency in
languages. At Oxford he attended the lectures of Prof. Max Müller and Mr. Ruskin, and also used to attend regularly the meetings of the Union of which Mr. H. H. Asquith (later Earl of Oxford) was the President.

On the return journey he travelled extensively on the Continent and returned to Calcutta in September, 1875. Soon afterwards he was posted to Arrah as the Assistant Magistrate-Collector, and during his service he served as a Collector in various districts of Bengal, and twice officiated as the Commissioner of the Burdwan Division. After full thirty-five years' service he retired in September, 1910, from Hooghly where he was then serving as the Magistrate and Collector.

Shortly after his return he turned his attention to the language examinations which had been instituted with a view to inducing young civilians and other officials to acquire proficiency in classical languages like Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic and the Indian vernaculars. Being a Bengali by birth and in view of his having been educated at Lucknow, he was debarred from appearing in the examinations in vernaculars such as Bengali, Hindi and Hindustani, but the examinations in classical languages were open to him. There used to be 3 examinations in each language, (1) the Higher Standard, for which there was a prize of a comparatively small monetary value, (2) the High Proficiency, for which a prize of Rs.2,000 in each language was awarded to each successful candidate, and (3) the Degree of Honour, for which there was a prize of Rs.5,000 for Sanskrit and Arabic and Rs.4,000 for Persian. He passed the Higher Standard Examination in Sanskrit and High Proficiency Examination in Persian. In the Degree of Honour Examination for Sanskrit he appeared without even passing the High Proficiency Examination and was declared successful on the very first occasion. Here it would not be out of place to mention that in connection with the Persian examinations he had to face a serious difficulty in regard to his pronunciation. As he says, "Persian is pronounced in one way by Delhi and Lucknow Maulūs or scholars; and in another way by the Persians themselves. I had read Persian originally in Lucknow, and I pronounced Persian as it is pronounced there." His examiners
did not consider this correct and to acquire the pure Persian accent he studied for two months with Shaikh Maḥmūd Gīlānī, a famous Persian coach in Calcutta of those days. During this period he read through various text-books with the help of the learned Shaikh, and in addition studied a work called Qaṣā‘id Badar-i-Chāch or the Odes of Badar Chāch. Brajendranath was not greatly impressed by the literary merits of this work, as he considered its language “very inflated and involved”, but he read it for his examination, and this training was later useful to him in the preparation of the text and translation of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī.

After his retirement Brajendranath settled down in Calcutta and in view of his early love for Persian, volunteered to prepare for the Asiatic Society a properly collated edition of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī for publication in the Bibliotheca Indica series and also to translate this important historical work into English. He started this work in 1911, but, as has been remarked earlier, the publication of the work did not proceed smoothly; in fact after the issue of the first fascicles of the text and translation in 1913 the work remained in abeyance till 1925. The exact position about the end of 1924 is summed up by the author as follows: “I had commenced the work in 1911, but had given it up owing to some difference with the authorities of the Asiatic Society. I now took up the work again at the request of Mr. van Manen, the General Secretary, who sent Shamsul Ulema Maulvi Hidayat Hosain to my house to ask me to do so. I readily consented, and I have gone on with the work as quickly as the state of my health and my other occupations have allowed me to do.”

In view of the rather unsatisfactory nature of the available manuscripts and the peculiar style of Nizāmuddin Aḥmad, the work of collation and translation of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī must have been not only difficult, but extremely arduous. In spite of all these difficulties and his failing health Mr. Brajendranath De persevered in his task, and produced six volumes of the text and translation which will stand as monuments to his industry and scholarship. Only those who have attempted translating Persian works into English can realize the onerous
nature of such undertakings. As Ranking\textsuperscript{1} rightly remarked, "The inherent differences of idiom in the two languages, the rich expansiveness of the one, and the rigid inflexibility of the other, render the attempt to fitly represent the glowing colours of Persian in the dull monotone of modern English, all but hopeless. It has been said that the test of a translation is not its literalness, but its truth; that is to say, not its fidelity to the author's expression, but its response to his inspiration. It must not merely reproduce the latter, it must embody the spirit of the original composition."

Mr. De's work fully conforms to these high ideals for a faithful translation, while the numerous very critical footnotes in the various volumes add materially to its importance as a work of reference. It is sad that the work could not be completed before his demise on the 28th of September, 1932, at the ripe old age of about 80 years.

The author summed up his autobiography as follows:

"I am over 76 years of age, which, considering the short-lived race and family from which I have sprung, must be considered a very great age. I have enjoyed fairly good health, and have had an active life, except during the last four or five years, when my age and the infirmities which are incidental to it, have had their usual effect on my health and my activities and energy. I am thankful however to remember that I am not bed-ridden, but can still attend to the ordinary business of life, and to my literary pursuits, such as they are. A certain amount of success has crowned my life, though, in my discontented moments, I have sometimes thought, that it has not been all that I have deserved; but I am fully aware of the limitations and deficiencies under which I have worked; and probably in this well-ordered world, no one gets more or less success than he merits. I have lost some very near and dear ones, but I thankfully remember that others are left to cheer and comfort me in my old age."

\textsuperscript{1} Translator's Preface to the translation of vol. I of the \textit{Manṭanāš abu-l-lāwdrīš}, p. i (1898).
Mr. Brajendranath De had a charming personality. His circle of friends was wide and all who knew him respected him for his honesty, straightforwardness and gentle nature. Though rather shy and somewhat reserved, he was very generous and kind hearted, and was possessed of a subtle sense of humour.

He joined the Asiatic Society of Bengal as a Member in 1904, but retired in 1912. He rejoined the Society in 1926, and served as a member of the Council during the years 1928-29 and 1929-30. During these periods the writer of this note had exceptional opportunities of working with him as a colleague and well remembers his genuine interest in the work of the Society, particularly in its Oriental publications. He resigned his membership of the Society in 1931.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

Normally I would have started this preface with an *apologia*, but on maturer consideration I decided to leave this unpleasant infliction till the end. I have no pretensions to being either a historian or a scholar of Persian, but I must confess to having a more than usual interest for the history of my country, while from my childhood Persian has been like a second mother tongue to me. In April last when the Publication Committee of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal had to face the Augean task of resuscitating and completing several publications which had lain dormant for many years, the question of completing and editing the translation of the third and final volume of the Tabaqāt-i-Akbari also came up for consideration. As scholars with the rare combination of an expert knowledge of Persian and English, and of Indian History are rather rare, and none with the necessary leisure to do this voluntary work for the Society could be found amongst its members or well-wishers, this work, in accordance with the couplet of Hāfiz:

آسماً بِنِ امالَئْ نَتوانُتْ كشید

فرعَةٌ فَلَ بَنَامٌ مِّنْ دَيوانِه زَدَنَد

was assigned to me. None of my critics would be more capable of disapproving this unbecoming choice, but rather than let the
work remain incomplete, with the serious consequences of an already almost illegible manuscript becoming quite useless if left till such time when some really suitable editor could be found for completing it, I agreed to undertake the work. Even good intentions and resolutions have their limitations, and on looking through the material I found an almost impossible task before me. The manuscript, as remarked above, was very nearly illegible; it had been written in a type of shorthand which, though it would have been quite simple for its author to transcribe, was quite beyond an ordinary reader; it took me a long time to master and the deciphering of the diacritical marks involved a great deal of labour. There was also an uncorrected typewritten copy, but this differed materially from the manuscript. Further, there were long blanks and very few, if any, of the text quotations or references had been filled in. Even in the manuscript the references were without page indications and this involved a great deal of reading of the original sources. The quotations from different works were often incorrect, being paraphrases by the author rather than the original versions, while the names of persons and places, though given in inverted commas, were, almost without exception, spelt differently from what they were in the originals. This should not, however, be understood to mean that I am in any way trying to disparage the work of the author or to cast any aspersions on his scholarly attainments, but in fairness to him and myself, I have considered it essential to explain the situation with which I was faced. Several times I felt like giving up the task, but, knowing, as I did, the great amount of time and labour which, in spite of his failing health and eyesight, my late lamented friend Mr. Brajendranath De had put into the work I persevered in completing it as best as I could. My own share in the publication is limited to standardizing the transliteration as far as possible, checking, verifying and correcting the all too numerous references, supplying missing passages in the translation, comparing it with the text-edition which had been changed materially since the translation was prepared, pointing out variations between the text and translation where it would have meant changing the entire account, and finally seeing the work through
the press. All this has involved a tremendous amount of work, more particularly as I could, with the responsibilities of my official position, only devote my few leisure hours to this work. In presenting the work, as now issued, I am fully conscious of its shortcomings and while craving the indulgence of my readers, only hope that in view of the circumstances explained, they will make due allowances for the defects.

Acknowledgments. In preparing these volumes for the press I have been materially assisted by my friend Shams-ul-"Ulama Khan Bahadur Hidayat Hosain, the Joint Philological Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, and I take this opportunity of offering him my very grateful thanks for the help which he gave so ungrudgingly at all times. I am also indebted to Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti for help in connection with the revision and correction of the Sanskrit portions in the Kashmir section of the work. My thanks are also due to Messrs. P. Knight, N. A. Ellis, and G. E. Bingham of the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, for assistance in connection with the printing of this work. Owing to its multi-lingual nature this work presented exceptional problems, both in type-setting and the correction of the proofs, but, as usual, the Baptist Mission Press rose fully to the occasion, and the close co-operation and ever-ready help of the gentlemen mentioned above made it possible for me to complete the publication in a little over six months. The index is being prepared under my supervision by Shah Mu'inuddin Ahmad, the 1st Maulvi of the Society, and will be issued as soon as possible.

Museum House, Calcutta.
28th October, 1939.

BAINI PRASHAD.

1 Unfortunately widely different schemes for the transliteration of the names of authors and their publications are adopted by different authors. The originals are strictly followed for the citations in the footnotes, but the transliterations in the text are, except where within inverted commas, in accordance with the scheme recommended by the International Oriental Congress of 1894.
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SECTION I. THE SULTĀNS OF THE DAKIN, TWENTY-NINE PERSONS

The 1 Dakini section, 29 persons, and the period of their rule began with the year 748 A.H., and ended in 1002 A.H., and lasted for 254 years.

Historians are agreed, that when the sun of the greatness of Sultān Muhammad Tughlāq Shāh passed from its zenith, and declined towards its setting, there were troubles in all parts of his kingdom, the hearts of his soldiers became averse to obedience; and many rebellions were brought forth from the womb of time. The real cause of the occurrence of these rebellions was this, that the Sultān entrusted great works to men of mean and evil nature. 3 These men, under the influence of their greed and avarice undertook difficult tasks, and 4 laid unreputable deeds on the ground. As their determinations did not bear fruit, they became annoyed with men, who had any marks of greatness, and caused sorrow to the latter.

Couplet:

3 To exalt the heads of the unworthy,
   To hope for good from any of them,

1 The lith. ed. has شیعة سلاطین دکن, which is better.
2 This is the period mentioned in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. The Bahmani kingdom however only lasted for about a century and a half. The Cambridge History of India has a list of 18 Sultāns whose reigns extended from 749 A.H. (1347 A.D.) to 934 A.H. (1527 A.D.).
3 The MSS. have این گو.
4 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have و عملهایی غیر مکرر بر زمین نهادند, the meaning of which is not at all clear.
5 The first four lines were quoted in connection with the employment of base and unworthy men in the History of Muhammad Tughlāq Shāh; see page
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Is utterly to lose the thread of thy actions,
And is like a snake, in thy pocket, to keep.
As on the worthless, thou placest charges great,
Know that from salt land thou hop'st for fruit.

Among the most important incidents was that of 'Azīz Khāmār, on account of whom the amīrs Sadhā (amīrs of hundreds) of Gujrat rose in rebellion, and the whole country became full of disturbances and rebellion. Sultān Muhammad advanced towards Gujrat in order to put them down. He sent Malik Lājin (Lāchn) to summon the amīrs of hundreds of Daulatbād. As the pardoning of offences, and patience were not ingrained in the creed of the Sultān, the amīrs of hundreds being frightened of their awe of him, and of the wrath of his greatness, slew Malik Lājin on the way; and going to Daulatbād seized all the property, and wealth which were in Dhārāgarh, and having blown up the dust of disturbance, raised the standard of rebellion. The details of this brief statement, have been written down in their proper places by this pen of broken writing.

In the end, during the lifetime of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq, 1 Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, who is celebrated as Hasan Gāngu, and was one

216, Vol. I, Persian text of this work. The appointment of such men and the result of such appointments were fully described in the History of Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh.

1 Compare Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas, Vol. I, page 37 et seq., where it is stated that "Sultan 'Alla-ud-dīn Hoosein Kango Bahminee" (as the name is written there) "was a man of the name of Zuffir Khan" (Zafar Khān) "who had originally been the slave of a Bramin, an inhabitant of Dehli named Kango, who having discovered his merits, gave him liberty and assisted him, as well as foretold his subsequent fortune. On being raised to empire Zuffir Khan did not forget his protector and appointed him in charge of the treasury; and had the honour of giving the appellation of Bahminee to a dynasty of Patan kings". The year of the accession is there put down as 1347 A.D. See also Elphinston's History, page 465. Firishtah, in the beginning of his 3rd section about the Sultāns of the Dakin, gives a long account of Hasan, and his gradual rise to power, of his receiving the title of Zafar Khān and finally of his accession. It will be seen that Nizām-ud-dīn omits all mention of the Brahman, who laid the foundation of, and foretold Hasan's fortune; and it will also be seen, that according to him, it was Shāīkh Nizām-ud-dīn Auliyā who first gave indications of his rise to sovereign power. Firishtah mentions the
of the common soldiers of that country, raised in concert with a body of low people and adventurers, the standard of government in Daulatābād in the Deccan in the year 748; and gave himself the title of Sultan 'Ala-ud-dīn.

Sultan Muhammad had no opportunity of putting him down, on account of the disturbances in Gujarat; and at that very time, he died in the neighbourhood of Thatha. The currency of the rule of the Bahmānya Ṣultāns was on such a grand scale from the aforementioned year, which was the year of the accession of Sultan 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan till the year 887, which was the date of the

prophecies of both the Brahman and of Shaikh Nizām-ud-dīn Auliyaː but he does not refer to his alleged descent from Bahman, the son of Isfandiar. It is unnecessary here to mention the details, but Firishtah's conclusion is that "As the name of Kānku or Gāngu Bahman (Brahman) became a part of the name of Sultan 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, he has been called Bahmanī but poets and historians, who wanted to flatter him having got hold of an argument (دستاویزی) have shown the matter in a different garb." The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 170, says Hasan's claim to descent from the half-mythical hero Bahman, son of Isfandiar, seemed to mark him out for the honour of royalty. Nizām-ud-dīn does in one place say that he made such a claim; but according to Firishtah it was poets and historians who manufactured this claim. The Cambridge History of India calls 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh, Bahman Shāh and Sir Wolsely Haig in a paper published in the J.A.S.B. extra no. 1904 gives certain cogent reasons in support of this name. Yet it is curious that if he styled himself Bahman Shāh he should have called his capital Hasanabād and not Bahmanabād.

The Cambridge History of India brushes aside Firishtah's story about Kānku or Gāngu Brāhman as an absurd legend, yet it finds it difficult to explain the name of Kānku or Gāngu which frequently occurs in connection with the names of the Sultāns of the dynasty. It is admitted in note 3 on p. 170 that the meaning of the addition Kānku has not been established, but in p. 373, it says that it has been credibly explained by Maulavi 'Abd-ul-Wali as a scribe's corruption of Kaikās. I have carefully read the Maulavi's short paper, and I must say with all deference to him and to Sir W. Haig that the explanation is utterly flimsy. Kaikās was to have the final س struck off and the كیکار which would be left, might be changed to Kaikān, Kankān, Kānku, Gāngu, Kāku. How Kaikān (کیکار) can be changed to Kānku (کانکو) or Gāngu (کانکو) and why of all the variants these should have been selected and adopted by historians neither the Maulavi nor Sir W. Haig condescend to explain. I may say that even Zia-ud-dīn Baranī has Hasan Kānku.
accession of 'Muhammad Shāh, and which comes to a period of 139 years, that any increase over it cannot be conceived. Hasan Gāngu declared that he was a descendant of Bahman, son of Isfandiyār, and on that account, the attribution of the name of Bahmanya to him and his descendants is not inappropriate. And from the year 887 A.H. to the year 935 A.H. which comes to a period of 148 years, the name of Sultān has been attributed to the descendants of Bahman Shāh. But the wretched (Be Daulat) Barīd and his descendants had, on account of their evil spirit, kept their sovereign princes in confinement, in their house, and had themselves performed the functions of the sovereign power.

The five amirs, who had been the principal nobles of the Bahmanya empire, divided the Dakin amongst themselves; and each took possession of his share, and became independent in it.

Also in the year 935, 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāvēlī having made his submission to Sultān Bahādur of Gujrat, had the Khuṭba (public prayers) read and the Sikka (coin) struck in his own territory in the name of Sultān Bahādur. After a year Sultān Bahādur marched into the Deccan at the instigation of 'Imād-ul-mulk. As Nizām-ul-mulk and the other amirs had not the strength to oppose him, they also read the Khuṭba in his name.

During that time, Malik Barīd, son of Barīd, had the helpless Sultān Kālīm-ul-lāh imprisoned in the city of Bidar. In the matter of the fixing of the period of the rules of the Bahmanya Sultāns, different accounts have come under my notice; but as the book (called) Sīrāj-ut-Tawârikh written by Khwāja Muhammad Lārī during the time of those Sultāns, and from that date till to-day, namely 1002 A.H., a period of sixty-seven years, Dakin was governed by four dynasties, viz., the descendants of Nizam-ul-mulk called Nizam-ul-mulkīya, the descendants of Adīl Khan called Adīl Khanīya,

1 This should, I think, be Mahmūd Shāh, the period from the accession of 'Ala-ul-dīn in 748 A.H. to that of Mahmūd in 887 A.H. is 139 years.

2 The meaning of the following sentences is not at all clear. The period is 148 years in one MS. But only 48 years in the other and in the lith. ed. The correct period from the accession of 'Ala-ul-dīn to the end of the reign of Kālīm-ul-lāh, the last Sultān of the dynasty in the year 935 A.H. which is mentioned in the text, is 186 years. The last five Sultāns were puppets in the hands of Barīd and his descendants.
the descendants of Qutb-ul-mulk called Qutb-ul-mulklyya, and the descendants of Malik Barid called Malik Barid, as I will detail later.

1 Sultān ‘Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh, eleven years and 2 ten months and seven days.

2 Sultān Muhammad Shāh, son of Sultān ‘Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh, eighteen years and seven months.

3 Sultān Mujāhid Shāh, one year and one month and nine days.

4 Sultān Dāūd Shāh, one month and three days.

5 Sultān Muhammad Shāh, son of Mahmūd Shāh, nineteen years, nine months and twenty-four days.

6 See note.

7 Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, 6 son of Muhammad Shāh, five months and seven days.

8 Sultān Firuz Shāh, twenty-five years and seven months and eleven days.

9 Sultān Ahmad Shāh, seven-twelve years and nine months and twenty-four days.

---

1 Compare the names and the periods of the reigns of the Bahmani Sultāns as given in a note in page 40 of Grant Duff’s History of the Mahrattas. These names, the note says, were taken from Firishtah’s History. Compare also Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 702.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have two months. The other MS. has ten months. The date of his accession is given as August 3rd, 1347. The date of his death according to Firishtah is 1st Rabī-ul-Awwal, 959 A.H., 2nd February, 1358. There is one coin of his of 760 A.H. but it is believed to be posthumous. (See note 1, p. 10, which gives a summary of the history of the reign as given by Firishtah.)

3 Both MSS. have eighteen years, but the lith. ed. has thirteen years. According to the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, he reigned from 759 A.H., 1358 A.D. to 776 A.H., 1375 A.D.

4 As to the correctness of this name, see note 2, p. 22. Firishtah calls him Sultān Mahmud.

5 In the list given in Grant Duff’s History, the name of “Sultān Ghazee-ood-deen Shah Bahmani” is given as that of the sixth Sultān between Sultān Mahmud Shāh and Sultān Shams-ud-dīn. The correct name is Sultān Qhiyās-ud-dīn; and although it is omitted from the list in the MSS. and also in the lith. ed., a short account of his reign appears in its proper place. The name is given in the list in p. 702 of the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III.

6 One MS. has “son of Muhammad Shāh” but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. do not have these words.

7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have the period as given above in the text; but the other MS. has, i.e., the period of his reign (was)
Sultan Ahmad Ghiyās-ud-din Shāh, twelve years, and nine months and twenty-four days.

Sultan 'Ala-ud-din, twenty-three years and nine months and twenty-two days.

Sultan Humayūn Shāh, son of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din, three years and six months and five days.

Sultan Nizām Shāh, one year and eleven months and ten days.

Sultan Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī, nineteen years and four months and fifteen days.

Sultan Mahmūd Shāh, forty years and two months and three days.

Sultan Ahmad Shāh, two years and one month.

Sultan 'Ala-ud-din, one year and eleven months.

Sultan Wali-ül-lah and his brother Kalim-ul-lah, three years and one month and twenty-seven days.

The total period of the rule of the Bahmanī Sultanate, seventeen persons, and one hundred and eighty-seven years and two months.

After that, the four amirs having gained their independence, have been ruling with complete independence from that day till this day, which is (in) the year 1002 A.H. and the 38th year of the Ilahi era, which amounts to a period of sixty-seven years. Up to the present time the Dakin is in their possession. Let it not remain concealed, that the foundation of the rule of the four amirs took place in the year 887 A.H. and they became completely independent in the year 935 A.H.

one month and twenty days. According to Firista, he reigned for twelve years and two months; and according to the Cambridge History of India from 825 A.H., 1422 A.D. to 839 A.H., 1435 A.D.

1 This name occurs in one MS. but does not occur in the other and in the lith. ed.; and it appears from the history of the reigns, that there was no Sultan of this name. Apparently the name of Sultan Ghiyās-ud-din which was omitted from its proper place was inserted here by mistake, with Ahmad prefixed to it.

2 The text is according to the reading in the MSS. but the lith. ed. has حکومت دکن در تصرف ایشان از این می گذشت سال الی ایشان ولادت بارو لازم بود که با انداختن، i.e., the rule of the Dakin was in their hands but they had for thirty-eight years the titles and the name of sovereignty in the Bahmani dynasty
The Nizām-ul-Mulkiah:
Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri.
Ahmad Nizām-ul-mulk, four years.
Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk, forty-eight years.
Hasan Nizām-ul-mulk, thirteen years.
1 Murtaza Nizām-ul-mulk, twenty-six years.
2 Hasan Nizām-ul-mulk, son of Murtaza, two months.
Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, two years.
Murtaza Nizām-ul-mulk, who is at present the ruler, two years.

The 'Ādil Khāniyas:
3 Yusuf 'Ādil Khān, seven years.
Isma‘īl 'Ādil Khān, twenty-five years.
4 Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān, twenty-five years.
'Ali 'Ādil Khān, twenty-five years.
Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān, fourteen years.

The Qutb-ul-mulkiah:
5 Sultān 'Ali Qutb-ul-mulk, twenty-four years.
6 Ahmad Qutb-ul-mulk, seven years.
Ibrāhīm Qutb-ul-mulk, thirty-five years.
Muhammad Quli Qutb-ul-mulk 7 thirty-eight years.

An account of the reign of 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh.
The chroniclers of events have narrated, that 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Bahamani, who is celebrated as Hasan Gāngu, came to the capital city of Dehlī, according to the vicissitudes of time, in the reign of

---

1 The text is according to one MS. and the lith. ed., but the other MS. has Isma‘īl Nizām-ul-mulk.
2 The text is according to one MS. and the lith. ed., but the other MS. has Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk instead of Hasan Nizām-ul-mulk.
3 The name is Yusuf in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but it is Isma‘īl in the other MS.
4 According to one MS. and the lith. ed. 'Ali 'Ādil Khān comes between the two Ibrāhīms, but according to the other MS. he precedes them and one Ibrāhīm succeeds the other.
5 His name occurs in one MS. but is omitted from the other MS.
6 He is Ahmad in one MS., Jamshid in the other, and has no name in the lith. ed. but is simply called فَتَحُّ الْمَلِكَ.
7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have thirty-eight years, but the other MS. has thirty-five years.
Sultān ¹Tughlaq Shāh. One day the Polestar of all those who have known God, Shaikh Nizām-ud-din Dehlavi had issued a general invitation; and Sultān Muhammad and all the great men were present. When the table cloth was removed, and Sultān Muhammad took his leave, the Shaikh said to an attendant, "One Sultān is gone, and another is at the door; go, bring him". The attendant went outside. He saw Hasan Gāngu at the door. He took him to wait on the Shaikh. Hasan, in the purity of his faith, placed his head of exaltation on the foot of the Shaikh; and expressed his devotion. The Shaikh placed a round piece of bread on his finger, and gave it to Hasan. The bread and the Shaikh's finger took the shape of an umbrella. So that all who were present and Hasan came to know the glad tidings given by the Shaikh. Hasan in great pleasure and joy went out of the presence of the Shaikh; and accepting the joyful news, turned towards the Dakin, in concert with a body of Afghāns. When they arrived there, at that time there were disturbances in that country. Hasan Gāngu killed the ²Superintendent of the city of Gulbarga, and took possession of the neighbouring tract of country. From there, he went to Daulatābād, in concert with the Mirān-Sadhā (the chiefs of the hundreds). 'Alam-ul-mulk, brother of Qutlagh Khān shut himself up in Daulatābād. As Hasan was under obligations to Qutlagh Khān, he gave safe conduct to 'Alam-ul-mulk, but took possession of the property belonging to Muhammad Shāh, which was in Dhārāgarh. Then in concert with the soldiers, he placed an Afghān of the name of ³Isma'il Fath on the throne of sovereignty, with the title of Nāsir-ud-din.

¹ One MS. has Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh, but the other and the lith. ed. omit Muhammad.

² There are slight variations in the readings. One MS. has سجنہ گلبرک را کشت, while the other has گلبرک را کشت. The lith. ed. has ایک کشت گلبرک را کشت. It appears from Firishtah that Hasan Gangu had already assumed the title of Zafar Khān, and had become well known (اختصاص باندہ) in Bakri and Rāibagh and Mirīgh and Kalhar Hasanabād Gulbarga and killed Bharūn Rāy, the governor of the fort of Gulbarga, who was one of the trusted servants of Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh.

³ According to Firishtah Isma'il Fath was an amir-i-dukhārī (an amir of two thousand horse); but Col. Briggs says "an officer of one thousand horse";
When this news reached Sultān Muhammad, he started from Bahroj for Daulatābād, in order to have his revenge. The rebels fought with him, and were defeated. Isma'il Afgān crept into the fort of Dhārāgarh (Daulatābād?) and Hasan marched away towards Gulbarga. Sultān Muhammad Shāh halted at Dhārāgarh for some days. At this time scouts brought the news that Taghī, a slave of Saffdar-ul-mulk, had revolted in the neighbourhood of Nahrwala Pattan, had taken possession of that place, and was besieging the fort of Bahroj. Muhammad Shāh nominated 'Imād-ul-mulk for overthrowing Hasan; and left some of the amīrs round the fort of Dhārāgarh; and himself marched towards Gujrat. Hasan by such machinations, as he could employ, defeated and slew

and he was also the younger brother of Malik Gul Afgān. (Col. Briggs calls him Mallick Moogh) who was one of the great nobles of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh, and had a large army for the defence of Malwa, who would, if it became necessary, assist and aid his brother. It does not appear that all the amīrs of the Dakin agreed to Isma'il Fath's being made the Sultān; for Firishtah says, "That all the amīrs of the Dakin, whether they liked it or not (खुशी ना खुशी) agreed to make Isma'il Fath Afgān, Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh; and held the umbrella of sovereignty over his head". The Cambridge History of India says that the man whom Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah call Isma'il Fath has been called Mukh, Muyh and Fath, but it has followed the Bibliotheca Indica text of Barāni and called him Isma'il Mukh the Afgān. Barāni however calls him only مُخْبَر which may be transliterated Makh or Mukh Afgān.

1 Firishtah says that Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq was joined on the way to Daulatābād by 'Imād-ul-mulk Tabrīzī, his son-in-law, and governor of Berar, and Malik Gul Afgān; and he describes in some detail the varying fortunes of the battle. He also says that after the battle, the rebel leaders decided that it would not be advisable to have another drawn battle; and that Nāsir-ud-dīn should remain at Daulatābād with a sufficient force to defend it; and Hasan should remain in possession of Gulbarga with twelve thousand men. Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh besieged Daulatābād; and the garrison was reduced to great straits, when the news of the revolt of Taghī came from Dehli.

2 The name is Taghī in the MSS., and in Firishtah. The lith. ed. has wrongly زف، Zafar.

3 One MS. has the word "Sultān" before "Muhammad Shāh ", but the other MS. and the lith. ed. omit it.

4 Firishtah does not mention any machination or treachery. He says that Hasan Gāngu met 'Imād-ul-mulk near Ahmadābād Bidar. For twenty days neither army felt strong enough to attack the other; but 'Ala-ud-dīn having
'Imād-ul-mulk. He then went to Daulatābād, and placing the umbrella (of sovereignty) over his own head, assumed the title of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn. Sultān Muhammad considered the overthrowing of Taghī of primary importance, and did not turn his attention to the suppression of the disturbances in the Dakin. And during the course of that year, he was united with the Divine mercy in the neighbourhood of Thatha; and the empire was settled on Hasan without a dispute and an enemy. He gave the name of Hasanābād to Gulbarga, and made it his capital.

1 After a time he fell ill, and when he had no hope of living longer, he gave advice and direction to his son, Muhammad Khān,

received reinforcements of fifteen thousand infantry from the Rāy of Telengana, who was aggrieved with Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq, and of five thousand horsemen from Nāsir-ud-dīn attacked 'Imād-ul-mulk. The battle was well contested and lasted all day. In the end victory declared itself for 'Ala-ud-dīn; and 'Imād-ul-mulk was killed.

1 Nizām-ud-dīn does not give any account of the events of 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh's reign. It appears from Firishtah that he proclaimed himself as Sultān on Friday, the 24th Rabi'-ul-Āṣhār, 748 A.H., corresponding with Friday, August 3rd, 1347 A.D. Firishtah goes on to say that one of his first acts was to send for Ghānū Brāhman, and to place the account office of his kingdom (daftar-i-muhāsiba-i-mumālik Maḥrūsa-i-khud) in his charge. He also combined the name of the Brāhman with his own by styling himself, "the smallest of the slaves of the holy Presence 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Gānū Bahmani". He brought the neighbouring territories under his rule, took possession of the fort of Bidar and KANDHAR from the officers who were in charge of them under Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh by peaceful means, and restored the Jāma' Masjīd and the fort of Gulbarga which had become dilapidated. Then he heard of the death of Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh, and becoming assured of there being no further danger from him, set about to make his rule permanent. He married his son to the daughter of Malik Saif-ud-dīn Ghūrī with great pomp. It appeared that when the marriage festivities were going on, his wife expressed her sorrow that at such a time, her sister, the aunt of the prince, could not be present. The Sultān inquired where she was, and found that she was in Multan; so without telling her anything, he sent men to bring the lady; and protracted the marriage festivities for seven months, till the old lady was brought, in a dāli, to the great joy and surprise of the queen.

After the marriage festivities were over, Ismā'īl Fath, who had at one time been raised to the throne as Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh, but had afterwards been made amir-ul-muqta and sipah-sullār became disaffected, because Saif-ud-dīn Ghūrī was given precedence over him. 'Ala-ud-dīn put him to death, but as he had
and accepted the summons of death. The period of his reign was eleven years and two months and seven days.

Verse:

No one doth live in this garden for aye,
Each one for a moment doth in it play,
In it, each moment a new fruit doth grow;
One goes away, and another arrives.

1 An account of the reign of Sultan Muhammad Shāh, son of 'Ala-ud-dīn Ḥasan Shāh.

When the term of rule came to Muhammad Khān, he sat in the place of his father, and assumed the title of Sultan Muhammad Shāh.

promised, did not punish any of those whom he had got to enter into a conspiracy with him; and also did not punish his son or any other relation of his, but maintained them in their rank and position. The Rāy of Tilang, who had before this been inclined to be refractory, now became submissive and sent the tribute, which he had formerly sent to Delhi. 'Ala-ud-dīn then made most grandiose proposals for the conquest of all the surrounding country; but later modified them on the advice of Malik Saif-ud-dīn Ghūric. He sent an army to the Karnatik, which looted and devastated the country, and brought immense quantities of booty and tribute. He also extended his territory as far south as the Tungabhadra. He then started for Malwa and Gujarāt, and sent Shāhzāda Muhammad with twenty thousand horsemen in advance. When the prince arrived at the town of Nausāri, he found the forests full of wild animals and began to hunt them. He also sent information to his father, and the latter went and joined in the hunt. There he had fever; in spite of which, he indulged in wine and kābūb of the meat of the animals killed. He became seriously ill and returned quickly to Gulbarga. There he obtained absolution from the hand of the Sadr-ush-sharif Samarqandi; and then divided his kingdom into four parts and placed them in charge of four nobles. He was ill for six months, during which time he occupied himself in doing justice to the poor and oppressed among the people. He also ordered the release of all convicts, except six, about whom he left directions with his son. He died on the 1st Rabi'-ul-Awwal, 759 A.H., corresponding with the 2nd February, 1358. The Burhān-i-ma'sir gives 761 as the year of his death and says he reigned for thirteen years, ten months and twenty-seven days, but these figures are not accurate.

1 Firishtah's account of the reign of Muhammad Shāh contains a lot of matter which have not been referred to at all by Nizām-ud-dīn, and I consider it unnecessary to mention it here. It appears however that the gold and silver coins of the Bahmani Sultāns were being melted down in large quantities.
He was a young man, adorned with (a sense of) justice and equity. The people were happy and contented during the period of his rule;

by the Hindus of Bijānagar (Vijayanagar) and Warangal; and numbers of the Hindu merchants were put to death to put down this practice. In connection with the conquest of "Bilampatan", it appears however that Sultān Muhammad sent much treasure to Mecca and Medina with his mother. This gave rise to some dissatisfaction among the nobles, and the Rāy of Bijānagar, coming to know of this, sent ambassadors, demanding that all the territories as far as the river Krishna and all the forts and parganas in it should be left in his possession. The Rāy of Tīlāng, who had ceded Kōlās as a tribute to Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, also at this time sent ambassadors with the message that his son Nāgdeo had rebelled against him, and was demanding the recovery of the fort of Kōlās, and it was advisable that Sultān Muhammad should restore it to him instead of having recourse to warfare. Sultān Muhammad kept the ambassadors on various pretexts, in his capital, for a year and half; and during that time he destroyed all the amirs, about whom he had any suspicion, and collected those who were loyal to him. He then sent for the ambassadors at a great majlis and directed them to write at once to their masters to send elephants loaded with gold and gems and other presents to the Sultān. The ambassadors sent reports to their masters. When the Rāya of Bijānagar and Tīlāng received these reports, the latter sent his eldest son Nāgdeo (his correct name appears, according to Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar", p. 31, to have been Vināyaka Deva; Col. Briggs calls him Vinaik Dew) from Warangal with a large army of infantry and cavalry towards Kollās; and the former sent twenty thousand horse and foot to reinforce Nāgdeo's army. The Sultān sent Bahādur Khān, son of Isma'il Fath, whom he had made his commander-in-chief, with the armies of Bidar and Berar against Nāgdeo. The latter was defeated and his army fled. Bahādur Khān pursued him as far as Warangal, and returned with much booty.

Then one day, towards the end of the year, when the Sultān was seated on a kūrsī (chair?) and making his ablutions, it was reported to him that some merchants had brought horses for sale. The Sultān at once sent for them, and inspected the horses, but found that they were not good enough for his use. On asking the merchants, they said that they were bringing fine horses for the Sultān, but Nāgdeo who was at "Wailampatan" as deputy of his father had taken the horses intended for the Sultān, in spite of their protests. The Sultān was greatly annoyed, and immediately mounted a horse and went out of the city. He stayed there for ten days apparently to collect the forces, and then started on his march. When he arrived at Wailampatan he sent a body of Afghāns in the guise of merchants. They went to the gate, and complained that they had been attacked by robbers, and their merchandise had been looted. While they were thus engaged, the Sultān came to the gate and entered the
and the country of Dakin, became, on account of the peace (which it enjoyed), and the gathering together of the great men, the envy of all the country of Hindustan; and there was a fresh splendour in the affairs of the state. Applying all his energies to the conquest of territory, and the reviving of the customs of religious warfare (jehâd), he in the spring-time of his reign, and in the beginning of his grandeur, collected a well-equipped army and started for Bilampatan, and in the course of the march, he seized many villages and towns

city; and his soldiers put every one they met to the sword. Nâgdeo fled to the citadel and attempted to defend it, but it was soon taken. When Nâgdeo was brought before the Sultân, the latter asked him why he had taken the horses intended for him; he was so frightened that he gave a harsh reply! The Sultân who was inclined to be merciful and wanted to pardon him, became enraged and had his tongue cut out, and ordered him to be burnt alive. He then passed fifteen days in the city in the enjoyment of much pleasure.

I have endeavoured to compress about three quarto pages of lithograph in the above note. Firishtah's language appears to me to be harsh and cruel. He says for example that the burning alive of Nâgdeo was سیاست چک لایق بکفار

I have not been able to identify Bilampatan or Wailampatan. Gulharga and Warangan and Cullian or Kallian which last is mentioned by Firishtah as having been passed by, the Sultân on his march to Bilampatan are in the map. It appears from Mr. Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar", p. 31, that Villumpattan which according to Mr. Sewell is how the name, as given by Firishtah, should be spelled, and Filampatan, according to the author of the Burhân-i-Ma'asir was the city (capital) of the Râya of Warangal. Mr. Sewell does not mention the story of the horses; but according to him, apparently, Muhammad reached the capital of Warangal in the first expedition. The Sultân "commanded a pile of wood to be lighted before the citadel and putting Nâgdeo in an engine (catapult), had him shot from the walls into the flames in which he was consumed".

Mr. Sewell, as far as I can see, makes no attempt to identify Wailampatan. In a note on page 302, Vol II of his "Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India" Col. Briggs, however, makes such an attempt. He says he knows of no place of this name (Wailampatan). "Vilum Conda or Bellum Conda (the sugar hill) was the seat of government of a powerful Raja nearly two centuries afterwards, and perhaps Bellum Conda ought to be the true reading. The terminations of pattan (town) and conda (a hill) being frequently used synonymously, if the town lie under a hill, as it does in this case. One principal objection to this surmise however arises from the towns of Kowlâs and Kallian which are here mentioned, not lying on the nearest road between Koolharga and Bollumconda."
belonging to the enemy, and included them in his own kingdom. The Rāy of that country, being proud of the strength of his fort, shut its gates on himself. The amirs and soldiers having arranged the necessary appliances for the conquest of the fort, commenced hostilities; and with Divine help and heavenly aid, seized the citadel, and carried out the practices of slaughter and taking prisoner. After this victory, the Sultan made arrangements for the government of that neighbourhood, and returned to Gulbarga; and having arranged a great festival, granted to every one a share from the board of his benefactions.

It so happened that one day a messenger came from 1 Badhūl and reported to the Sultan, that the Rāy of Bijānagar had come

---

1 The readings are different. One MS. has آز بدھول رسیده, coming or arriving from Badhūl. The other MS. has آز دھول رسیده, coming from Dhūl, but in the next line we have بدھول رسیده, not to arrive in the country of Badhūl. So that بدھول, Badhūl appears to be the correct reading. The lith. ed. has بدھول رسیده, having arrived at Dhūlpūr. This is clearly incorrect. I cannot find any place called Badhūl in a map. There is a place called Mudhal to the south of the river Krishna about half way between Bijānagar or Vijayanagar and Gulbarga or Koolbarga, but a long way to the west of the line connecting them, which may be the place. I cannot find any mention of the place in Firishthah, but there is a story there about Sultan Muhammad having sent an order (Barāt) for the payment of certain musicians to the Rāya of Bijānagar. I cannot understand the meaning of this proceeding unless it was meant to be an insult for provoking hostilities. The order was given, according to Mulla Dāūd of Bidar, who was seal bearer to Sultan Muhammad (as quoted by Mr. Sewell, page 33) in a festive assembly, “when the spring of the garden of mirth has infused the cheek of Muhammad Shāh with the rosy tinge of delight,” or to use somewhat less romantic language, when he was flushed with wine. The order was so extraordinary that the minister hesitated to despatch it. The Sultan however penetrated his thoughts and compelled the minister to send it.

The Rāya who was proud of his power became angry, and paraded the men, who carried the order, mounted on a donkey all round the city of Bijānagar and immediately collected thirty thousand horse and nine hundred thousand foot soldiers and three thousand elephants for the conquest of the Bahmani kingdom. He established a camp in front of ودینی چنگ (Adoni in the map). Sultan Muhammad ordered the army of Daulatābād to assemble (those of Bidar and Berar being exhausted with the campaign against Tilang) and after proper religious observances set out to oppose the Rāya of Bijānagar. The latter
by rapid marches, with a large body of horse and foot to the country of Badhūl, and had seized the fort and made martyrs of the Mussalmans being assured of safety owing to the Krishna being in flood was engaged in besieging the fort of Mudkal (Madgall in the map N.-W. of Adoni). The fort was at last taken, and all the garrison was put to the sword, except one man who concealed himself and who escaping from the fort and crossing the Krishna, went and gave information to Muhammad Shāh at Hasanābād Gulbarga. I have stated in an early part of this note that Badhūl may be identical with Mudhal; but from the context of both the Ṭabaqât and Firishtah Mudkal is more likely to be identical with Badhūl.

Firishtah's account of the conquest of Mudkal is different from that of Nizām-ud-dīn. Firishtah begins his account by saying that Sultan Muhammad on hearing what the fugitive had to say, ordered the poor man to be put to death; the reason given by him, being that he could not bear the sight of a man who has seen the death of so many men. He started at once and when he reached the bank of the Krishna, after some bragging about his own greatness, he said that he was not afraid of the river in flood, or of the grandeur and might of the infidel army. He sent back his son, who afterwards became Mujāhid Shāh, to Gulbarga, making him his heir; and with only twenty elephants and nine thousand horsemen he crossed the river in the course of three days. The Rāy, in spite of his having such an immense army, was so astounded and perplexed by the Sultan's crossing the river, that he sent back all his troops in the darkness of the night; and remained jarida (alone or with a small retinue), so that he might decide in the morning, whether he would fight or not. When the news of the retreat of the Rāy's army became known in the Sultan's camp, he left it and everything behind, and with horse and whip started for the enemy, who fled at once, leaving everything behind. When the Sultan arrived at the Rāy's camp he gave an order for a general massacre, and seventy thousand persons, men and women, and young and old, and slaves and free men were put to the sword. He passed the rainy season in Mudkal, and having received reinforcements, started towards the fort of Udni (Adoni). Firishtah has a great deal more about further conquests in Bijānagar, but as there is no reference to them in the Ṭabaqat, I refrain from noting them. But it may be briefly stated that the Sultan seized Adoni, and after much more fighting, and much more slaughter of Hindus, in which neither women nor babes at their mothers' breast escaped, laid siege to Bijānagar itself; but although he tried his best for about a month he was unsuccessful. He then had recourse to the stratagem, which according to Nizām-ud-dīn he had used at the time of the siege of Badhūl or Mudkal. He threw himself on the bed of weakness, and the commanders of his army conducted it back across the Tumhandra (Tungabhadra) river, and arrived on a level plain, where they halted. Kishan Rāy, the Rāy of Bijānagar who is however called Bukka I, in Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire"
there. Immediately on hearing this, the Sultān collected an immense army; and set forth to punish the Rāy. The latter on receiving information of the vast multitude of the Sultān’s army, fled and took shelter in a strong fort. The Sultān sat down round the fort for some days, but when he saw that by doing so, the hand of his hope would not reach the skirt of success, he made an invalid of himself (i.e., pretended that he had fallen ill) and returned towards Gulbarga. When he had crossed the Krishna, the Rāy opened the gates of the fort, and gave his men leave to go to their respective places. The Sultān, making Divine help the vanguard of his army, made a rapid march of eighty-one karoḥs, and presented himself in the neighbourhood of the fort; and with great activity and smartness fought with and defeated the Rāy; and much booty, in which were included eight thousand prisoners, fell into his hands. The Sultān then returned to Gulbarga, crowned with prosperity and success; and made the people happy by his benefactions.

A long time had not elapsed after this, that swift messengers brought the news, that 1Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy had placed

also encamped at a distance of three or four karoḥs. The Sultān then convened a majlis, but still feigning illness left it early. He then sent for his commanders in secret, and ordered them to array the army for battle. At midnight he joined the army, and advanced towards the Bijānagar camp; where the Rāy and his commanders, presuming on the Sultān’s illness were engaged in drinking and looking at the dancing of Nautch-girls. When they became aware of the Sultān’s approach, they were completely helpless, and the Rāy fled, and did not draw rein till he arrived at Bijānagar. There the people reviled and reproached him; and he at their instance sent emissaries to the Sultān to sue for peace. The latter was at first unwilling to grant their request, but demanded that his original demand for the payment of the musicians should be complied with. The emissaries at once agreed, and in fact there and then paid the amount. Then at the request of the emissaries, the Sultān said that hereafter he would never order the massacre of prisoners and the general slaughter of the people. After this he returned to his capital.

1 Nizām-ud-din does not say anything about the cause of the rebellion of Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy; but it appears from Firishtah, that owing to the Sultān’s having feigned to have fallen ill, before Bijānagar, the report of his death became published all over the kingdom; and there being no leading men in the country of Daulatābād, the leaders of the army being at Bijānagar, Bahrām Khān Māzandarānī, whom Sultān ‘Ala-ud-din Hasan had given the
their feet outside the bounds of the road of obedience, and had scratched the face of loyalty and devotion, with the finger nails of hostility. Upon this he started by successive marches towards Deogarh, and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of that place fear came in the hearts of Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy; and they immediately went to Shaikh Rukn-ud-din, who was one of the great Shaikhs of the age, and behaved with great meekness and humility.

name of son, and Kumbh Deo Marhata sardār rose in revolt. The Govind Rāy of the Ṭabaqāt may be the Kumbh Deo of Firishtah; and in fact Col. Briggs calls him Govind Deo Maratta. The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 382, calls him Kondba Deva. Deva is pure Sanskrit, but I do not know what Kondba is; I should think that Kumbha Deva or Govinda Deva more likely to be correct than Kondba Deva. According to the Cambridge History of India, Bahrām Khān resented the succession of Muhammad, and invited Firūz Tughlaq to recover the Deccan; and although he failed in this, he now rose in rebellion, as he felt stronger owing to Muhammad’s armies being engaged in the south. There is no mention in the Cambridge History of any intercession by any pious Shaikh. On the approach of Muhammad the rebels dispersed and fled, and were pursued to the frontiers of Gujrat where they took shelter. Firishtah’s account of the rebellion is much longer and more elaborate; and the end is also different. The Shaikh to whom the rebels went is there named Zain-ud-din (Col. Briggs calls him Shaikh Ein-ood-deen), and not Rukn-ud-din; and he did not intercede with the Sultān for their pardon; but told them to escape to Gujrat; and they went there. The Sultān pursued them but being unable to seize them, returned to Daulatabad, in great anger. He then sent word to the Shaikh, with whom he was already angry, because he had not made his submission to him, like the other Shaikhs, at the time of his accession, because he drank intoxicating liquors and did other things, not allowed by the law of the Prophet, either to appear before him, or to send a writing containing his submission. The Shaikh refused to do either. Then the Sultān ordered him to leave the city. The Shaikh, taking up his few belongings, went and sat down at the rouza (tomb) of Shaikh Burhān-ud-din, and challenged all and sundry, to move him from the place, if they dared. The Sultān now became repentant and he and the Shaikh exchanged civilities; and the Sultān went back to Gulbarga after receiving the title of Ghāzi from the Shaikh. Firishtah goes on to say that after this, the Sultān shut up all shops for the sale of intoxicants; and ordered that all robbers and turbulent people should be put to death; and accordingly in the course of six or seven months not one of them was left alive; and according to Mullā Dāūd Bidari, the heads of about twenty thousand of them were brought into Gulbarga.
Sultān Muhammad Shāh immediately on arriving at Daulatābād, went to visit the Shaikh. His reverence interceded for the pardon of the offenders; and the Sultān agreed to pardon them, on condition of their immediately leaving his dominions. Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy then went away to Gujrāt, hanging down their heads in shame.

After arranging the affairs of that sūba the Sultān returned to Gulbarga. The amirs and the great men of the city went forward to welcome him, and made 1 joy offerings. He remained for a few days in a garden, which was near the gate of the city; and had the bed of pleasure and enjoyment spread there. From that delightful place, he came into the city, and made the Saiyyads and learned men and the Shaikhs of the city happy by allowing them to partake of his extensive benefactions, and of the board of his enjoyment. He also made enquiries and investigations into the condition of the raiyyats and all helpless people. He redressed with kindness and justice any wrongs that might have been caused to anybody.

Suddenly the hand of death tore asunder the garment of life on his body; and drew off the robe of life from his soft bosom.

Verses:

The world hath to ashes burned many such heaps of grain;
Thou shouldst not try to teach tricks to such a magician old.

---

1 One MS. inserts here یالا i.e., praises or applause; the sentence would then be "Greeted him with applause and made joy offerings".

2 According to Firishthah Sultān Muhammad appears to have lived for several years after his return from Daulatābād; for it is said, that every year he went on hunting expeditions to one of the four sides of his dominions and spent three or four months in these excursions. Firishthah gives the 9th Zi-qa'ada which would be 776, but the year is given in figures as 775 and the period of his reign is said to have been 17 years and nine months and five days. Col. Briggs says he died on the 19th Zakada, 776 A.H., 21st March, 1375. Mr. Sewell quotes the date given by Firishthah, but he makes the English date the 21st April, 1375. He also says that according to the Burhān-i-Ma'āl in the Sultān died in 775. According to the list in the note on page 40 of Grant Duff's History of the Maharratas he succeeded his father in 1357 and died in 1374 and therefore reigned for 17 years. According to the Cambridge History of India, Muhammad Shāh ascended the throne on the 21st March, 1365, and died in the spring or early summer of 1377.

3 One MS. substitutes یالا for یالا.
Be not secure that this turbulent stream,  
Hath forgotten its habit of devouring men. 

The period of his reign was eighteen years and seven months.  

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF MUJĀHID SHĀH.  

He was the son of Muhammad Shāh. After the latter's death he succeeded him. He continued to maintain the praiseworthy qualities and the good attributes of the former Sultāns. He made the supporting and cherishing of his raiyyats and the giving of justice his special habits; and fully maintained generosity and liberality and manliness. In the first spring of his reign he marched towards 2Bijānagar. When he crossed the river Krishnā some of  

1 It appears from Firishtah that he was nineteen years of age when he ascended the throne.  

2 According to Firishtah, Mujāhid Shāh wrote to the Rāy of Bijānagar, that the territory and the forts between the rivers Krishnā and the Tungābhadrā were held jointly by them; and there were, therefore, many disputes between them. It would, therefore, be better if the Rāy would cede that territory to him. The Rāy did not agree, and said that the whole of the tract had from ancient times belonged to Bijānagar, and should be left in his possession. Mujāhid Shāh then collected his army, and crossing the Tungābhadrā laid siege to Udui (Adoni). He left Saifdar Khān Sisānī to carry on the siege, and marched quickly towards pargāna Kankawati, where he was informed that Kisan Rāy (according to Mr. Sewell his real name was Bukka I) was encamped. The people informed the Sultān of a ferocious and man-eating tiger that infested the jungle there, and he, with only seven companions, entered the forest, on foot, and when the tiger made its appearance, he told his companions to do nothing, and with his first arrow he shot the animal dead. This so frightened Kisan Rāy, that although he had a large army, he fled into the trackless forests (Mr. Sewell says the forests in the valley of Sandūr), and the Sultān pursued him for six or seven months. Then Kisan Rāy and his sons fell ill. He said he had been wandering about in the forest, because he had thought that the Sultān would fall ill, but instead of that he himself had fallen ill. He then went to Bijānagar and fortified himself. The Sultān left his commanders, to carry on the siege of Bijānagar, and himself went on to Setban (Setubandha) Rāmesar (the site of the bridge built by Rāma); and there he repaired a mosque, which Sultān ‘Ala-ud-din Khaljī had built; and demolished the idol temples. As regards this see Sewell, pp. 41, 42, and also notes in Briggs' History, II, pp. 332, 333. 

On returning to Bijānagar, he seized the city; and demolished the great golden temple ornamented with gems. Then a great battle took place, and
the inhabitants of the country represented to him, that there was a tiger in the neighbouring forests, which was desolating those parts. Mujahid Shâh went to hunt the animal, and with the strength of his arm killed it. After that, he ravaged a portion of the country of Bijânapur, and obtained much booty. Kishan Rây, who was the

Kishan Rây was nearly defeated, when his brother arrived with a fresh army of eighteen thousand horsemen and six lakhs of foot soldiers. These are the numbers in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs has twenty thousand cavalry and a body of infantry. The battle was renewed but the Sultân was unable completely to conquer the kingdom. He therefore retraced his steps and came to Ûdîn (Adoni).

When the Sultân was attacking Bijânapur his uncle Dâûd Khân had been left with six thousand horse and some infantry to occupy a post called Dahnâ-i-Sodra, or the mouth of the defile of Sodra. It appears from Sewell that this was the way of approach to the city along a narrow and difficult road, which approached along the valley of the Sandûr, or along the valley which now carries the main road from Bellâry to Vijayânagar, between the Sandûr hills, and the hills that surround the latter city. Col. Briggs calls the place Dhuna Sodra. I now quote from Col. Briggs: "On hearing that the engagement began at dawn, and the enemy were not yet defeated, perceiving also that re-inforcements were joining them at every instant, he (Dâûd Khân) became alarmed of the safety of the king, and quitting his station joined in the battle, in which he behaved with surprising gallantry. He had three horses killed under him, and was frequently obliged to fight on foot. The king on seeing the standard of Dâûd Khân was far from pleased, but stifled his resentment, till victory declared for the faithful. He then called Dâûd Khân before him, and gave him a harsh reprimand for quitting his station."

On arriving at Ûdîn (Adoni) he found that his officers were still besieging it. He also was unable to capture it. So a sort of treaty was concluded and the Sultân continued his journey. At Mudkal he left the army behind, and with four hundred companions went to Raichûr (Râichore). There he occupied himself with hunting. He sent back Safdar Khân Sîštânî and A'azam Humâyûn Sîštânî to their respective governments of Berar and Daulatábâd. Dâûd Khân, who was grieved owing to the Sultân's having abused him (this is also mentioned in the Tabaqât), conspired with Munzad 'Ali Khân Muhammad and Masa'ûd Khân, who had grievances of their own; and Dâûd Khân entered the pavilion in which the Sultân was asleep at night, after he had crossed the river Krishnâ, and had been engaged in fishing in the river during the day, and with the help of Masa'ûd Khân slew him. This happened on the 17th Zi-hijja, 779, April 4th, 1378. Mr. Sewell makes the date April 16th. The period of Sultân Mujâhid's reign did not extend to three years.
leader of the rebels, came out of the citadel, and surrendered the fort, and made submission the stronghold of his honour.

1 At the time of the return, scouts brought the news that some turbulent men had taken shelter on the top of a high hill, which was in that neighbourhood, with much wealth and treasure in their possession. The Sultân marched in that direction, and left Dāūd Khân, who was the son of his uncle (i.e., cousin) on the road, by which those men would be likely to try to escape; and himself engaged in plunder and pillage. After the division of the booty, he reprimanded Dāūd Khân by word of mouth, as he found there had been negligence and carelessness on his part, in guarding the road of escape of the turbulent men. Dāūd Khân nourished malice and hostility in his heart, conspired with a number of his intimates, and when they had all crossed the river Krishnâ, he one night entered the private pavilion of the Sultân, and slew him with his dagger. The period of Mujâhid Shâh’s reign was one year and one month and nine days.

A NARRATIVE OF THE REIGN OF DĀŪD ShâH, 3 SON OF THE UNCLE OF MUJâHID SHâH.

After the assassination of Mujâhid Shâh, 4 Dāūd Khân, who was the son of his uncle, took his place on the throne of sovereignty, and

1 The real cause of the enmity of Dāūd Khân and the manner of the assassination, and the length of Mujâhid Shâh’s reign are given differently by Firâštâh. See the latter part of the last note. According to the list of the Bahmani Sultâns given in a note in page 40 of Grant Duff’s “History of the Mahrattas,” Mujâhid Shâh succeeded his father in 1374, and was assassinated by his uncle in 1377, so that he reigned for three years, and the period mentioned by Nizâm-ud-dîn although it is so definite is not correct. According to the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, also Mujâhid Shâh reigned from 776 to 779 A.H., 1375 to 1378 A.D. or for about three years. Dâūd Khân was a son of Sultan ‘Ala-ud-dîn Hasan, and so he was an uncle of Sultan Mujâhid Shâh, and not a cousin.

2 See note 1. He was an uncle and not a cousin of Mujâhid Shâh.

3 See the preceding note.

4 There are slight differences in the readings. The new Sultân is called simply Dāūd in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. he is called Dāūd Khân. I have affixed Khân to his name. Then one MS. says he took his seat on the 1رايتک سلطنز ت و 즊ند ایالت 1رايتک سلطنز ت و 즊ند ایالت The other MS. has ارايتک سلطنز ت و 즊ند ایالت
the seat of greatness. Most of the amirs and the great men of the country agreed with him. The sister of Mujahid Shah bound the girdle of hostility and the belt of enmity, in retaliation of the murder of her brother; and tempted some of the amirs by gifts of money. On a Friday, in the Jama Masjid they wounded Da'ud Shah. He was carried to the palace, while there was still a little breath left in him. Then the brave men of the two parties and the warriors of the opposite sides came out armed and equipped for strife and battle; and in the end the enemy (the party who had assassinated Da'ud Shah?) were defeated; and the city was devastated. When the news of this reached Da'ud Shah, he gave the word of acceptance to the summoner of God. The period of his reign was one month and three days.

2 An account of the reign of Sultan Muhammad Shah, son of Mahmud, son of Bahman Shah.

The rule of the country of the Dakin was in the grasp of his power for a period of nineteen years. Nothing that may be worthy

The account of the reign of Da'ud Shah, as given by Firishtah, does not differ much from that given in the text. Firishtah, however, says, that the amirs did not at first all unite in acknowledging him. There were two parties; one on the side of Da'ud Shah, while the other was in favour of Sultan Mahmud Shah the youngest son of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din Hasan; but Malik Nabi Saif-ud-din Ghuri had the public prayers read in the name of Da'ud Shah, in spite of the opposition of the sister of Mujahid Shah, who bore the name of Ruh Parwar Aga. She persuaded a young man of the name of Baka, who had been high in the favour of Mujahid Shah, on account of his sincerity and bravery, to avenge his patron's murder; and he agreed to devote his life in the attempt. On Friday, the 21st of Muharram, 789 A.H., May 19th, 1378 A.D., he slew Da'ud Shah in the Jama' mosque, and was himself cut down by Massad 'Ali Muhammad Khan. According to Firishtah, Da'ud Shah reigned for one month and nine days. According to the list in the note on page 40 of Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas, he reigned for about one month. It is said there also that he was assassinated at the instigation of Roopurwur Aga.

2 The history of the reign of Muhammad Shah, which extended to nineteen years, is given by Nizam-ud-din in a few lines. Apparently he knew very little
of mention has come under my notice among the particulars connected with him. Towards the end of his life ¹ the thānadār of about the history of the reign. Even the name is incorrect, the correct name according to Firishtah being Sultān Muhāmd Shāh; but see note 2 in page 47 of Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar", from which it would appear that the name on all the coins of this Sultān is Muhammad (Dr. Codrington, Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, Vol. XVIII, page 261) and not Muhāmd; and this is confirmed by the Burhān-i-Maṣāir and two other authorities (Major King, in Indian Antiquary, July, 1899, page 183, note 39) so that, after all, Nizām-ud-dīn is right and Firishtah wrong. But the Sultān's relationship with the previous Sultān was probably not known to Nizām-ud-dīn. According to Firishtah he was the youngest son of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, the founder of the dynasty; and Mr. Sewell also says that he was 'Ala-ud-dīn's youngest son. But according to one MS. of the Ṭabaqāt he was the son of Muhāmd, son of Bahman Shāh; and according to the other he was the son of Muhāmd, son of Shāh Bahmani; and according to the lith. ed., he was the son of Muhāmd, son of Hussain Shāh. The name of Bahman Shāh (incorrectly Shāh Bahmani) supports the statement made by the Cambridge History of India that the founder of the dynasty styled himself Bahman Shāh. The Husain Shāh of the lith. ed. is of course a mistake for Hasan Shāh. As I am not translating Firishtah's history, it is not necessary for me to go through the whole of the history of the reign, as written by him, which extends over nearly three quarto pages of closely printed lithograph. I can only refer to such portions of it as will explain the one fact, which is mentioned in a very doubtful form, at the end of Nizām-ud-dīn's account.

¹ I have taken this from Firishtah. The readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are doubtful. One MS. has تیاندار گلعمہ چکرلِ یور باپی بوذ شد; the other has the same reading, but omits the word یور بوذ which is clearly superfluous and incorrect. The lith. ed. has تیاندار گلعمہ دار اور باپی شد. What really happened, according to Firishtah, was that Bahā-ud-dīn, son of Ramzān Daulatábādī, became a favourite of the Sultān, and was made the Thānadār and governor of the fort of Sāghir. He had two sons, Muhammad and Khwāja, who acquired much power, and became the object of much envy and malice. People complained of them to the Sultān, and although he did not believe the accusers, Muhammad and Khwāja, thinking that they were suspected, revolted; and forced their father to join them. They defeated two armies sent against them. A third army was sent under Yūsuf Azhdar, and in the course of its operations, an arm of Muhammad was cut off by Saiyyad Muhammad Kālapahār, an officer of the Sultān's army, in a single combat. Khwāja also came out of the fort and the two brothers remained outside. Then the men in the fort sent a message to Yūsuf Azhdar to the effect that they would cut off the head of Bahā-ud-dīn and open one of the gates of the fort; and he should
the fort of Sâghir rebelled against him; the Sultân marched against him; and defeated him. In the course of the same journey he took the way to the other world. He reigned for a period of nineteen years and nine months and twenty-four days.

1 AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTân GHYîs-ud-DîN.

Ghiyâs-ud-din sat on the masnad of sovereignty in the place of his father, on the 7th Rajab; and all the amîrs and the attendants

send a body of chosen men to the gate, when he would be able to capture the fort. In accordance with this plan the fort was seized. The reference to Sâghir or Sâgar as it is called in the Cambridge History of India is brief and, I venture to think, slightly confused. It is said there that Muhammad II imprisoned Khân Muhammad, who had been a general in the service of Muhammad I, but who had afterwards been Dâdî’s principal supporter, in the fortress of Sâgar, where he shortly afterwards died, and punished his accomplices.

The account of Bahâ-ud-din’s rebellion in Sâghir as given in the Ṭabaqâs agrees practically with that given by Firishtah. A short time after this the Sultân died of fever on the 21st Rajab, 799, April 20th, 1396; and his reign extended according to Firishtah to nineteen years, nine months and twenty days. According to the Cambridge History of India, Muhammad II was a man of peace and a lover of poetry and literature. At the instance of the Sadar-i-Jahân Mir 'Inâyutullah of Shirâz he invited the great poet Hafiz to come to his Court. Hafiz started but he was so alarmed by a storm in the Persian Gulf that he went back to Shirâz. The Cambridge History of India also says that there was a great famine in the Deccan between 1387 and 1395; and describes the relief measures as displaying a policy of combination.

1 There is not much difference in the readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. There is also not much difference between the accounts given by Nizâm-ud-dîn and Firishtah. Of course, the latter gives more particulars and details. The name of the Turki slave, who engineered the transfer of the sovereignty, appears according to Firishtah to have been Taghalkhân. Col. Briggs calls him Lallehin; Mr. Sewell does not give his name, but describes him as an ambitious slave. He was dissatisfied, because other nobles had received high dignities and he had been left out in the cold. He had a very beautiful daughter, who was highly skilled in Indian music, and the Sultân was greatly enamoured of her. The latter accepted Taghalkhân’s invitation with alacrity, because he expected that his host would offer his daughter as Peshkush or tribute, and in the same hope, he ordered all his attendants to leave the place, at the instance of his host. The latter went into the zenana as if to bring his daughter; and after a little while, came back with a naked dagger in his
of the Sultān, and the commanders of the army placed their heads of fealty on the ground of service. It happened, however, that a slave of his father, of the name of Taghalji, who had been honoured, by increase of dignity, and proximity in rank, wanted that the sovereignty should be transferred to another brother (of the Sultān). In order to carry out this resolution, he arranged a great feast, in the course of which he imprisoned the Sultān; and on the 17th of Ramzān, 799 A.H., he drew a pencil over his world-seeing eyes; and raised Sultān Shams-ud-din on the throne. The period of Sultān Ghīyās-ud-din’s rule was one month and twenty days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN, BROTHER OF SULTĀN GHIYĀS-UD-DĪN.

As ¹ Sultān Shams-ud-din sat on the masnad of sovereignty, by the exertions of Taghalji the amirs and the great men made their submission to him, but the two ² Shāhzādas Firuz Khān and Ahmad

hand. The Sultān, who was a lad of seventeen, and was more or less intoxicated made a struggle for his life, and tried to escape. Taghalchīn caught him by the hair of his head and rooted out his eyes, with the point of his dagger. He then sent for the nobles and the attendants of Sultān Ghīyās-ud-din, on the pretext that the latter was calling for them; and as they appeared, one by one, murdered 24 of them; and he then sent for the younger brother of Ghīyās-ud-din, who was called Shams-ud-din, and who was a lad fifteen years of age and placed him on the throne. Sultān Ghīyās-ud-din was kept in imprisonment, for two months, in the fort of Sāghir. It does not appear what happened to him after that.

The account of Ghīyās-ud-din’s short and tragic reign as given in the Cambridge History of India does not differ materially from that given above. The man who blinded and imprisoned Ghīyās-ud-din is described in it as Taghalchīn the chief of the Turkish slaves, and the cause of his anger is said to have been Ghīyās-ud-din’s refusal to appoint him Governor of Gulburga and lieutenant of the kingdom.

¹ According to Firishtah, Sultān Shams-ud-din was only Sultān in name, and all the power was in the hands of Taghalchīn, who had received the title of Malik Nābī, and the rank of Amir Jumlagī or the amir in charge of everything.

² These were sons of Sultān Dāūd Shāh. The Cambridge History of India says they were sons of Ahmad Khān one of the younger sons of Bahman Shāh. According to Firishtah they were only six or seven years of age when their father was killed; but Sultān Mahmūd had had them properly trained
Khān then attempted to regain their hereditary dominion; and commenced to gain the amirs over to their side. Sultān Shams-ud-

and had given them his daughters in marriage, and up to the time that he had no sons, had said that he would make prince Firūz his heir. Afterwards Sultān Mahmūd directed them to be loyal and faithful to his son and heir, Sultān Ghīyās-ud-dīn; but when Taghbalchīn blinded and imprisoned Ghīyās-ud-dīn, the wives of the two princes, who were the sisters of the blinded Sultān, incited them to avenge the outrage committed on the latter. On the other hand Taghbalchīn incited Sultān Shams-ud-dīn and the queen mother to seize them. Then they fled to Sāghīr; and Sīdūh, the governor of the place, did everything in his power to help them. They were still faithful to Sultān Shams-ud-dīn; and wrote to him, telling him that they were not hostile to him, but they only wanted the punishment of Taghbalchīn. The Sultān, however, incited by Taghbalchīn and the queen mother wrote a reply, which could only inflame their enmity. They then raised three thousand horse and foot and advanced towards Gulbarga, with the hope that the troops there would come and join them; but when they came to the river Pithora (that appears to be the name in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs calls it the river Beema) no one joined them. They held a consultation; and afterwards proclaimed Firūz Khān to be the Sultān, and again advanced towards Gulbarga. Then there was a battle with Sultān Shama-ud-dīn’s troops in the neighbourhood of Marqul (Col. Briggs calls it Merkole); and Firūz Khān and Ahmad Khān were defeated, and retired towards Sāghīr. The parties of Taghbalchīn and the queen mother became stronger than ever; but the people of Gulbarga were dissatisfied with them, and sent word to Firūz Khān and Ahmad Khān that they should get an agreement from Sultān Shams-ud-dīn and come to Gulbarga; and when a suitable opportunity occurred should accomplish their object. At this time a Dīwānah Kashmīrī (a Kasmīrī mad man) came from Gulbarga and called Firūz Shāh by the name of Rūz-āfzān Shāh and said he would take him to Gulbarga and make him bādehān. Taking this to be a happy omen the princes started for Gulbarga and arrived there. Both Firūz Khān and Taghbalchīn were suspicious and afraid of danger, and took great care of themselves. Then on Thursday, the 23rd Safar 800 A.H., November 15th, 1397 A.D., Firūz Khān entered the Darbār attended by twelve sīladārs (armed men); and then by a sudden coup he imprisoned Shams-ud-dīn and Taghbalchīn and ascended the masnad, and took the title of Sultān Rūz-āfzān. Sultān Ghīyās-ud-dīn was brought from the fort of Sāghīr, and in spite of his blindness, he slew Taghbalchīn who was placed before him, with one blow of his sword. Sultān Shama-ud-dīn was blinded and he and his mother were allowed, at their own request, to go to Mecca. He is said to have lived there for many years, and during his life-time Firūz Shāh made him a liberal allowance of five thousand golden ashorfās and also
din attempted to seize them; and they fled to the fort of Shakar (according to Firishtah, Sāghir). The thānadār there was a slave of the name of Sādhū. He considered the advent of the Shāhzādas to be a matter of advantage and gratitude, and supplied all that they wanted. Firūz Khān then collected troops and advanced for war. Sultān Shams-ud-din gathered an army, and came out of the city. After the troops had been arranged in battle array, Sultān Shams-ud-din fled; and did not halt anywhere till he had gone to the city (Gulbarga). Firūz Khān, owing to the purity of his faith, and the goodness of his nature, took the path of peace and procrastination, and came to the Sultān. But it became patent after a few days, that the Sultān breaking his agreement with him and his brother Ahmad Khān, wanted to seize them. Then Firūz Khān forestalled him, and had three hundred well-armed men concealed in his house, under the charge of his brother Ahmad Khān. He himself went to the palace, and as he found that the royal seat was unoccupied, he made bold, and going up to it, sat down on it. As the people were on his side, those who were present in the assembly, placed their heads of fealty on the ground of service. About the same time Ahmad Khān arrived there with the three hundred armed men. Those who were on the side of the Sultān (i.e., Shams-ud-din) left the assembly and dispersed. The Sultān concealed himself; but after some days he was seized; and, according to another statement, was slain. The throne of the empire was adorned with the grandeur of the accession of Firūz Shāh. The period of the reign of Shams-ud-din was five months and nine days.

**AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN FIRŪZ SHĀH.**

Sultān Firūz Shāh was a bādshāh of great splendour and magnificence and vigour and learning and wisdom. He sat on the throne of grandeur on 1Thursday, the 24th Safar 800 A.H. 2In the splendid

sent him annually rich clothes. This differs greatly from Nizām-ud-din's statement, that he was imprisoned, and according to another statement put to death.

1 According to Firishtah (see last note) the 23rd Safar was Thursday; so the 24th was Friday.

2 Nizām-ud-din is rather vague and indefinite in his laudation of the virtues of Firūz Shāh. Firishtah is more precise. He gives him credit for
period of the days of his rule, the laws of generosity and the customs of truth and honesty and the foundation of justice and equity became stronger. And all sections of the people had peace and comfort under the wings of his justice and beneficence.

Couplet:

His justice, by the sword, did clean the page
Of the time, from the signs of falsehood and pain.

In difficult affairs and troublesome matters his mind sought the help of those who sat in privacy in corners, praying in humility and tribulation. He himself also in his prostrations and risings prayed for assistance in his victories from the great Holy God. Therefore of a necessity in whichever direction he turned the bridle of his attention, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of his standards.

As all matters connected with his government were properly regulated after his accession, he made the conquest of Bijānagar the bravery and activity, and says he was engaged in twenty-four campaigns, for extending his kingdom, and for his generosity; but he says he was addicted to the drinking of wine, to the listening of music and to women. He made excuses, and said that music elevated his soul to the contemplation of God; and wine did not create a disturbance in his mind. As to women, he took the opinions of learned men; and as Mīr Fazī-ul-īlah Anjū told him that in the time of the Prophet, Mutā' (temporary) marriages were allowed, but the Sunnis did not allow them, while the Imāmīa or Shi‘a did, Firūz Shāh following the Shi‘a received “three hundred females” according to Col. Briggs “in one day”; but the lit. ed. of Firishtah says that eight hundred women were introduced into the harem in the course of one month. Firishtah also says that Firūz Shāh married a princess of the Bijānagar family; and that this was the first time such a marriage took place. The Cambridge History of India says “Firūz at the time of his accession was an amiable, generous, accomplished and tolerant prince, possessed of a vigorous constitution and understanding, both of which he undermined by indulgence in the pleasures of the harem.”

Firishtah does not mention the rebellion, or of the rebels fortifying themselves in the fort of Shakar or Sāghir, as Firishtah calls it, as we have already seen; but he says that when Sultān Firūz, on hearing that Deo Rāy of Bijānagar had invaded his kingdom, marched from Gulharga to Sāghir, he seized one of the zamindārs of Sāghir, who was a bold and reckless kāfīr, and had a force of seven thousand or eight thousand Hindūs (Kolis), and had him put to death. The Cambridge History of India calls it a rebellion of the
object of his (martial) spirit. As some refractory people had taken up a position in the fort of Shakar, he turned in the first instance, to punish them. Immediately on hearing the news of his advance, the

Kolis headed by a Hindū chieftain on the north bank of the Krishnā. Firishtah also says that when Sultan Firūz was still at Sāghir, news was brought that Narsingh Rāy the ruler of the fort of Kehrlā (Wali Qila'-i-Kehrlā, the Hindu kingdom of Kerala) or more properly Perhaps the Rāja of Kehrlā as Col. Briggs describes him, had invaded the country of Berār and plundered and devastated as far as the fort of Mānhār and had caused much insult and loss to many Musalmāns; and that he had done this at the instigation and with the aid of the rulers of Mandā and Asīr (i.e., the Muhammadan kings of Malwa and Khāndesh), and also at the instigation and motion of the Rāy of Bijnā Nagar. The Sultan had, therefore, to send back the armies of Berār and Daulatābād to redress these matters; and he himself started for the Krishnā with twelve thousand horsemen. This invasion by the Rāja of Kehrlā has not been mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn; but the Cambridge History of India agrees with Firishtah. It calls the Rāja of Kehrlā, Narsingh the good Rāja of Kherlā.

Firishtah does not say that Firūz Shāh wanted to conquer Bijnā Nagar. On the other hand he has a great deal to say about the Sultan’s harem, which contained nine ladies from Arabia, nine from ‘Ajam, besides ladies from Turkey, Firang (Europe), Khita (China), and Afghānistān and Rājputāna and Bengāl and Gujrat and Tilang and Kanāra and Mahratta. These ladies had attendants from their own countries, so that they might conform to their own customs, and speak their own languages; and the Sultan conversed with every one of them in her own language.

Firishtah also says that according to various historians he carried on Ghazāl (religious war) with the kāfīr twenty-four times, that Mulla Dāūd Bidārī, and the author of the Sirāj-ut-tawārīkh have described some of them in detail; but he does not himself mention particulars of any of them. Then he goes on to say that in the year 801 A.H. Deo Rāy of Bijnā Nagar invaded the Doab of the Tungabhadrā and the Krishnā with a large army for the conquest of the forts of Mudkal and Rāichore and some of the parganas in their neighbourhood.

Mr. Sewell, see page 50 of his “A Forgotten Empire”, says that there was peace between Bijnā Nagar and the Bahmani kingdom during the reign of Hariharā II of Vijayanagar; and then he quotes the passage from Firishtah about the invasion of the Doab in 801 A.H. He places the movement of the Hindū army at the beginning of the cold season of 1398 A.D., probably not later than December of that year. The Hijri year 801, extending from 13th September, 1398 to the 3rd September, 1399. Mr. Sewell thinks that Hariharā II was too old to lead the invasion himself, and that it was probably a bold dash made by his son Bukka II, who afterwards succeeded him towards the end of 1399, with his permission.
rebels fled and concealed themselves in nooks and corners. The Sultān leaving the dāroghah (apparently the officer-in-charge of the government), proceeded by successive marches, and encamped on the bank of the river Krishnā. But as it was impossible to cross the river at that time, there was necessarily a delay there. The Rāy of Bijānagar came with a great army, and took up a position on the other side of the river. The Sultān was very anxious and distressed, on account of these obstacles and delays; and had frequent consultations with the loyal amirs. Then one day 1 Qāzī Sirāj, who was one of his special advisers and friends, and had very great reputation for bravery and cleverness informed him that the solution of this problem could only be effected by having recourse to trickery and deceit; and this slave (i.e., he himself), with some of his companions, on whom he had complete faith and reliance, would in any way that may be possible, cross the river and reach the Bijānagar army. Let a noble order be issued that the men should arm themselves and be ready. The easiest way would be that 2 pushtudras should be made of wood and grass, and placing the necessary furniture and things on them, he and his companions would cross the river; and as soon as there would be a great noise and uproar in the army of

---

1 The Cambridge History of India calls him Qāzī Sirāj-ud-dīn and describes him as an inferior officer of the Court.

2 The word is pushtudrā in the MSS. and pushtadra in the lith. ed. I suppose some kind of rafts or basket boats. In the corresponding passage of Firishtah, it is said that “two hundred sabots (baskets), which in the idiom of the people of the Deccan were called Naukras covered with cow-hides were made ready”. In Scott’s Firishtah, page 76, they are called hurdles covered with leather, but Col. Briggs calls them baskets; and he says in a note (Vol. II. page 371) that “the same sort of basket boats, used in the Tigris, in the time of Herodotus, are still employed there, and are almost the only description of passage boats known in the Indian Peninsula, at this day, to the natives of the country. A detachment of the British army crossed its heavy guns, without even dismounting them over the Toongbudra in 1812 in these basket-boats”. 
the enemy, order should be given that the soldiers should without any hesitation cross the river. There was hope, that the beautiful form of victory and triumph should appear in the mirror of their purpose and aim.

The Sultān having accepted this counsel, Qāzá Sirāj with seven other men crossed the river, and mingled with the army of the Rāy of Bijānagar. They took up their quarters in the house (or quarters) of the musicians. As the Qāzá had great skill in the art of music, and showed some of the finer and subtler points of the art to the musicians, after a few days, when the Rāy of Bijānagar held a great festival, and summoned all the musicians, the Qāzá and his companions also went to the majlis with the other musicians. After the Rāy of Bijānagar and the other Rāys had become intoxicated, the Qāzá showed some feats, the like of which the Rāy had never seen in his life; and everyone acknowledged the superiority and mastery of the Qāzá in the art. The latter having waited for a suitable opportunity plunged his poisoned dagger into the malevolent breast of the Rāy, and tore it open; and his companions, also, drawing their daggers cut off the heads of the other Rāys. When the shouts

1 It would appear from the Qāzá’s plan, and the success which attended it, that it was not so much the tumultuous waters of the Krishnā that the Sultān’s army was afraid to cross, as it was the fact of having to cross the river in the face of a strong and vigilant hostile army; for as soon as the Qāzá, by assassinating the Rāy and his commanders threw that army into disorder, the Sultān’s army had no difficulty in crossing the river.

2 The words in one MS, and in the lith. ed. are در انیه عمراد; in the other MS. they are در انیه عمراد و مغلوب.

3 The account of what the Qāzá and his companions did is given in much greater detail by Firishtah; and there are also many differences in matters of detail, which it is not necessary to mention here, except that according to Firishtah, the Qāzá and one of his companions entered the majlis having assumed the female garb, ogling and smiling and dancing and playing on the mandals; and making no doubt very grotesque figures of themselves. One matter of detail is however of very considerable importance, namely that it was the Rāy’s son and not the Rāy himself, that was holding the majlis and that it was the Rāy’s son that was assassinated. This is confirmed by Mr. Sewell also, who says that after his son had been murdered, “Bukka reached Vijayanagar in safety, and took refuge behind its fortifications".
and uproar of the Hindūs reached the Sultān, he in his own person crossed the river. He made that crowd, without a head, food for the sword, and those who escaped the sword were carried off as slaves. So much booty fell into his hands, that the accountant of time found it difficult to make a note of it all. The Sultān made Fūlād Khān governor of that sūba, and returned to his capital. There he arranged a great festival, and made all the well-known amirs happy by his favours and great rewards. The grand assemblage and the festivities for the conquest of Bijānagar had not yet been concluded, that a messenger came from Badhūl, and submitted the report, that Deo Rāy had on account of his great pride and hauteur sent an army of three hundred thousand infantry to that neighbourhood, for the following reasons, viz., that he had

1 There are also greater details in Firishtah, of what happened after the assassination of the Rāy’s son. First a body of four thousand men crossed the river; and then the Sultān also crossed it, before the morning. The Rāy made no efforts for resistance, but fled taking the dead body of his son with him. The Sultān’s army pursued the Hindūs to the vicinity of Bijānagar, taking much booty and many prisoners, and defeating the Hindūs in several actions. The Sultān also sent the Khān Khānān and Mīr Fazl-ul-lah Anjū Shīrāzī to ravage the Rāy’s territory south of Bijānagar which was very fruitful and populous. As many Brahmins had been taken prisoners, their relations and the other raiyyats prayed that emissaries should be sent to the Sultān to try to effect their release. Mīr Fazl-ul-lah carried out the negotiations, and the prisoners were released on the payment of eleven lakhs of hūns (a hūn according to Col. Briggs, amounts, on an average, to three and a half to four rupees, or about eight shillings), ten lakhs going to the Sultān’s treasury, and one lakh to Mīr Fazl-ul-lah as his remuneration. After this the Sultān released the prisoners; and returned towards his capital, leaving Fūlād Khān to assume charge of the Deod.

2 Contrary to this, it appears from Firishtah, that several things happened between Firūz Shāh’s first and second campaigns against Bijānagar. The first campaign took place in 801 A.H. In 802 A.H., the Sultān invaded the territory of Narsingh Rāy of Kehrū, and reduced him to subjection. In 804 A.H., Firūz Shāh sent an embassy to Taimūr, who it appears was then contemplating the conquest of Hindūstān, and offering his submission and proposing to render help and send reinforcements, in the event of his sending an army to conquer Hindūstān. The embassy was graciously received by Taimūr. After this the rulers of Gujrat, Mālwa and Khāndesh sent embassies to Firūz Shāh asking for his friendship; but at the same time, they sent messages to the Rāy of Bijānagar offering to help him, if necessary, in his wars against Firūz Shāh.
received information, that there was a maiden in those parts, who had the shape and form of a pari, and the face like the full moon, and who had no rival under the blue dome of the sky; and his men had, after much search and investigation, had to return disappointed.

As to the beautiful maiden, Firishtah, on the authority of Mullah Daud Bidari says, that she was the daughter of a goldsmith who lived in a village in the neighbourhood of the town of Mudkal. Mr. Sewell apparently on the authority of Firishtah makes her the daughter of a farmer living in the town of Mudkal; but both the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Col. Briggs say that she was the daughter of a goldsmith living in a village near Mudkal. According to the lith. ed. of Firishtah her name was بپرثیلال Parthil and Mr. Sewell calls her Parthil, but Col. Briggs gives her the name of Nehai. Her parents, following the customs of the country, wanted to betroth her in her girlhood to a youth of her own caste, but she prayed that the ceremony might be delayed, with such earnestness, that they consented. Then a Brahman, who was returning from Benares saw her and was struck with her beauty. He taught her music and dancing, and then went to Bijnagar, and went to the Ray. According to Mr. Sewell the reigning Ray was Bukka II’s successor and brother, Deva Ray I, who began to reign in November, 1405 A.D. On hearing the Brahman’s account of the girl’s beauty and accomplishments, the Ray sent him back with rich gifts to bring the girl, and her parents to Bijnagar. The parents were overjoyed, but when they attempted to throw a beautiful jewelled necklace, which the Brahman had brought, around her neck, and the wearing of which would be the mark of her betrothal, she with tears besought them to desist, and told them, that if she became a Rami of Bijnagar, she would never again be allowed to see them or any of her other relations. Her parents acceded to her tearful requests, and the Brahman had to go back disappointed to Bijnagar. The maiden afterwards told her parents that she had long had an inward conviction, that she was destined to be the wife of a prince of the faith of Islam; and asked them to await the will of Providence. Nizam-ud-din does not say so, but it may be mentioned here, in passing, that she afterwards became the wife of Hasan Khan the son of Sultan Firuz, who did not, however, succeed him.

On hearing the Brahman’s account of the failure of his mission, the Ray was much annoyed. He at once marched out with an army, and on reaching the bank of the Tungabhadra, sent five thousand selected horsemen across the river to march to Mudkal; and to bring the maiden and the whole of her family with them, but without doing them any injury. As the Ray had not sent the Brahman back, to apprise the family of the maiden of his intention, they like all the other villagers fled to distant places and the troops had to return unsuccessful. They, however, devastated the country; and when Fulad Khan, after collecting his army opposed them, they outnumbered his men, and he had to fall back.
and discouraged. When this news had reached Fūlād Khān, he had at the time of the return of the Bijānagar army obstructed their passage; and had sent many of them to their real place (i.e., hell).

After receiving the information of these occurrences, the Sultān sent a special robe of honour and Arab horses to Fūlād Khān; and himself turned his attention to the punishment of Deo Rāy. He marched by successive stages with a large army, and passed into the kingdom of Bijānagar. He stretched his hands to ravage and devastate the country; and so much plunder came into his hands, that it was beyond the bounds of estimation. After plundering the country, he advanced to the fort (of Bijānagar); the approaches to which were extremely narrow. Although the amirs and the loyal servants of the Sultān pointed out, that it was not advisable for him to enter them, he did not listen to them; but relying on his high destiny, and the assistance of heaven, he penetrated into them; and when he arrived close to the fort, he arranged his troops, and placed himself in the centre of the line. Deo Rāy also came out of the fort with nine lakhs of infantry, and arranged them in front of the Sultān’s army. As the numbers of the enemy exceeded the estimate, Sultān Firūz commenced the engagement in his own person, and made blood to flow in streams, from the enemy’s army. He galloped about in the battle field, and challenged warriors of the hostile army to single combat. Suddenly an arrow from the bow of fate struck his hand; but tying up the wound, he stood firm on the field of bravery and the plain of heroism. The Khān Khānān, Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān, who was the commander of the vanguard, also performed feats of valour.

When the world-illuminating sun bound the black veil over his bright forehead, the drum of return was beaten, and the army took up its former position. The next day 2 Sultān Firūz Shāh

1 The words in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. are بیو پاک ہے. I cannot make out the meaning of بیو پاک. According to Firishtah the Sultān did not show any distress, but drew out the arrow with his own hand, and, without dismounting, tied up his arm.

2 Firishtah says that the Sultān’s plans were more extensive and far-reaching. He sent the Khān Khānān with ten thousand horse to lay waste the country to the south of Bijānagar, and sent Mīr Fazl-ul-lah Ānjū Shirāzi to take
devastated and ravaged the country surrounding the fort; and for some days was engaged in measures of pillage and destruction, and the whole country was laid waste. Then Deo Rāy with (great) humility sent an ambassador, and prayed for the pardon of his offences, and making promises of loyalty sent much tribute, consisting of elephants of the size of mountains, and various kinds of fabrics and stuffs. The Sultān, on account of his innate kindness accepted his excuses, and turned his bridle for his return.

As Fīrūz Shāh’s heart was always engrossed with the conquest of new dominion, he marched with a well-equipped army for the conquest of the Marhatta country, at a moment which the astrologers declared to be auspicious. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Mahūr, the thānadār there offered many fine and beautiful presents.

the fort of Bankāpūr, one of the most celebrated fortresses of the Karnātik. The Khān Khānān returned with sixty thousand prisoners and much plunder; and Bankāpūr was captured. It was then decided that the Khān Khānān should be in charge of the operations against Bijānagar; and the Sultān and Mir Fazl-ul-lah should march against Adoni. Deo Rāy then sent some of his chiefs to sue for peace. The Sultān at first refused to listen to his prayers; but at last agreed to the following conditions: viz., that the Rāy should give one of his daughters in marriage to the Sultān, besides, much money and pearls and elephants and thousands of slaves. The marriage was celebrated with great pomp and splendour; but, in the end, the Sultān was offended because the Rāy did not accompany him all the way to his camp, when he returned to it, at the end of the marriage festivities. So in spite of the alliance there was still enmity between them. The Sultān then returned to his capital.

1 Fīrūsthāt places this campaign in 802 A.H. 1309 A.D., long before the war against Bijānagar, which took place in 809 A.H. The campaign, according to Fīrūsthāt, was also of longer duration. Narsingh Rāy the Rājā of Kehrīā (Nizām-ud-dīn calls him Harsingh Rāy) met the Sultān’s army, at a distance of two mānsilā or stages from his capital (Col. Briggs says two coss from Kehrīā); and there was a severe conflict, and the Sultān’s army was at first beaten, and it was reported that the Khān Khānān had been slain. Mir Fazl-ul-lah, however, fought bravely; and he was joined by the Khān Khānān; the Hindūs were defeated and Kosal Rāy (called Gopāl Rāy by Col. Briggs) the son of Narsingh Rāy was taken prisoner. Kehrīā was then besieged, and after two months the garrison being reduced to great distress, Narsingh sued for peace, which was soon concluded; Narsingh Rāy giving one of his daughters, in marriage, to the Sultān, and also valuable presents including 45 elephants and a large sum of money.
He then traversed many stages, and arriving at Kehrlā (the ancient Kērāla), laid siege to that fortress and devastated the country all round it. Harsingh Rāy the Rāy of Kehrlā, having with great humility, made his submission petitioned for the pardon of his offences; and bringing some valuable presents, gems and gold, and twenty \(^1\) chains of elephants came to render homage; and presented the keys of the forts. The Sultān gave him a seat in front of the throne, and having given him Arab horses and a gold embroidered robe and a jewelled belt gave him permission to go back (to his capital).

Returning from there, after a few days, he sent bodies of men to different parts of his dominions to collect the revenue; and the men, who were sent, brought after a time immense quantities of treasure and elephants and gold and gems.

\(^2\) At this time also, the engineer of his thoughts planned a city on the bank of the river, into all the houses in which there should be running water. After it had been finished, he gave it the name of Firūzābād. He built a noble mansion, the turrets of which raised their heads and claimed rivalry in altitude with the stars, for his own palace.

---

1 The word سلسلة, *Silsila* a chain. I have never seen it used before, with reference to elephants. The expression for an elephant is *ek zinjīr fil*. *Silsila* probably is synonymous with *zinjīr*. A *halqa* of elephants is the collective name for one hundred elephants.

2 Firishtah mentions the building of Firūzābād, but the date of the building of the city cannot be ascertained. From what is said in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, it would appear that Firūz Shāh’s love for fair women had something to do with the building of the city. It is said there سلطان جون بزنان تو میں غلیب تمام داشت شهری برو کنار نہیں بارش میں. بیٹے میں اباد بنا کرہ تخاک خوش گردانید. Col. Briggs, however, does not say anything of the kind. He simply says, “Firūz Shāh built a town on the bank of the river Beema”.

Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs says anything about the flowing water being brought into all the houses; but they say that a canal was brought from the river into the fort, and along this, kiosks were built for the ladies. It may be mentioned here, that the palace at Firūzābād was, later on, allotted by Ahmad Shāh, the next Sultān, to Hasan Khān, the indolent and lotus-eating son of Firūz Shāh.
1 And about this time, news came that 2 Amir Saiyyad Muhammad Gisu-daraz, who was one of the holy men of the age, and among the disciples of Shaikh Nasir-ud-din Muhammad Daudi, was coming from the direction of Dehl. His Majesty the Sultân was highly pleased and happy on account of the grandeur of the noble advent of that great Saiyyad, and went forward to welcome him. After having the pleasure of meeting him, the Sultân suggested that as that country had now become illuminated by the reflection of the sun of his grandeur, he hoped that the shadow of the safety conferred by his presence should continue to be spread over the people of the country. His holiness the Saiyyad acceded to the prayer, and took up his residence in the city of Gulbarga.

1 Firishtah places the arrival in 815 A.H., 1412 A.D.
2 He is called Amir Saiyyad Muhammad Gisu-Daraz in one MS., and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. and in Firishtah he is called Mir Saiyyad Muhammad Gisu-Daraz. There is considerable difference between the statements of Nizäm-ud-din and Firishtah as to the treatment accorded to the holy man. According to the former, Firuz Shâh showed great respect and reverence to him, but he was annoyed with him when he refused to bless his son Hasan Khan, and said that Ahmad Khan, his brother, and not Hasan Khan, would succeed him. On the other hand Firishtah says that Firuz Shâh at first received him with great respect, but when he found him deficient in natural sciences, specially those founded on the reasoning faculty, he did not pay him so much attention as before; but the king's brother Ahmad Khan had very great belief in him, and continued to attend on him. Nizâm-ud-din says, that Firuz Shâh took his son Hasan Khan to the holy man, and telling him that he had made him his heir, asked for his benediction, when the Saiyyad told him that his son was not fashioned for the robe of a Sultân; but Firishtah says that Firuz Shâh, after declaring Hasan Khan his successor, and giving him all the paraphernalia of royalty, sent men to the Saiyyad for his blessings, the latter said, that when the Sultân had already declared Hasan Khan to be his successor, what necessity was there for his prayers in his favour. When the Sultân again sent men to him and asked with greater insistence for his prayers, then he said, that it was his brother, and not his son, that would succeed him.

Firishtah goes on to say, that the Sultân sent word to the Saiyyad that his residence was too near the fort (palace); and there was always a great crowd there; and that he should therefore go out of the city. The Saiyyad had to comply with the order, and he took up his residence outside the city, where his adherents soon erected a fine house for him, at the spot where his tomb now stands. Col. Briggs adds in a note, that the tomb now standing was either
1 It is said that one day, Sultān Firūz Shāh had his eldest son, who bore the name of Hasan Khān, arrayed in a special dress, and made him his heir. He then took him with himself to his holiness the Saiyyad; and informed the latter that as he had selected the prince to be his heir, he hoped that his holiness should cast an eye (of favour) on his affairs and should not withdraw the hand of his training from over his head. The holy Saiyyad declared, that the fashioner of providence and fate had prepared the robe of sovereignty for the person of the Khān Khaṇān Ahmad Khān, and no one can object to the ordinances of fate. The Sultān was annoyed at these words, and left the place.

As the rainy season was now over, 2 he marched with a large army towards Arankal (Warangal). When he arrived in that country, he saw a fort built of hard stone, which raised its head to the blue dome of the sky, and round it there was a deep ditch dug, which was thirty dira' (yards) in breadth, and which was connected with (or filled with) water from a spring. His Majesty, the Sultān, remained for two years at the foot of the fort, and was, in spite of that, unable to carry out his object; and on account of the (bad)

built or erected by a descendant of the Saiyyad, Muhammad Amin Husainî in 640 A.D., in the reign of Muhammad ‘Aud Shāh of Bijāpūr.

1 There are slight variations in the readings here. One MS. has حکایت, i.e., an anecdote, they say. The other MS. has only گوند, they say; while the lith. ed. has روابط کافدند, they narrate.

2 According to Firishtah he did not march against Warangal or Telingāna, but in 820 A.H., 1417 A.D., he sent ambassadors to the Rāy of Telingāna demanding arrears of tribute; and the latter sent enough in money and goods to satisfy him. Then Firūz Shāh marched against the fort of Pāngal, which Firishtah says, was in his time called Bilkonda, and was situated at a distance of eighty farangs (240 miles) from the fort of Adoni. Col. Briggs says in a note that at the present time Pāngal has no other name, and is 70 miles from Adoni. Nizām-ud-din apparently mixes up the two incidents of the demand of tribute from the Rāy of Telingāna, and the siege of Pāngal. He does not give the name of the fort, but it is clear that it was Pāngal that he was referring to. It would appear, however, from what Nizām-ud-din himself said, that Pāngal was in Bijānagar and not in Telingāna; and Firishtah also says, that he besieged the fort, completely disregarding his relation with the Rāy of Bijānagar. Mr. Sewell, however, calls it the Warangal fortress Pāngal (page 65).
climate of the place, most of the men and quadrupeds (in his army) were destroyed. When Deo Rāy of Bijānagar became acquainted with what had happened, he took advantage of the opportunity, and sent a large army of cavalry and infantry, and obstructed the entrances and the exits. The Sultān was compelled, therefore, to leave the place for the return journey. Deo Rāy's soldiers attacked the army with arrows and spears. The warriors belonging to the Sultān's army then attacked Deo Rāy's troops, but as the ways were narrow they were unable to accomplish anything. They represented to the Sultān, that at such a crisis, it would be fit and proper for him to hasten away and reach a place of safety; for the safety of the army, they said, was bound up with the safety of the sovereign. The Sultān said, "How can it be allowed in the religion of manliness and humanity, that I should go to a place of safety, and leave my soldiers to perish or to be taken prisoners". At this conjuncture, a person having the form of a demon and the nature of an evil spirit, coming from the enemy's army, inflicted a wound on the Sultān, and fighting bravely, escaped out of the orbit of the Sultān's army. The amirs, seizing the Sultān's bridle took him out of the danger, and carried him away to 3 Gulburga.

The Sultān then wrote letters, giving an account of the events, and couched in sincere language, to Sultān Ahmad of Gujrat; and

---

1 Firishtah's account is different, and altogether more probable. He says that Mr Fazl-ul-lah, rallying the soldiers, nearly defeated the Bijānagar army, when a Hindū of Calhara, who had been a long time in his service, but who had been seduced by the promise of a high dignity by Deo Rāy, killed him by inflicting a serious wound on his head. The Sultān's army was now routed, and the Sultān with the assistance of Ahmad Khan escaped, with the remnant of his army. Firishtah does not mention the Sultān's being wounded by a person with the form of a demon and the nature of an evil spirit.

2 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has "فرس سلطان" while the lith. ed. has "فرس سلطان". Firishtah goes on to say that the Hindūs (I am quoting from Col. Briggs) "made a general massacre of the Musalmans" and subsequently took many towns, broke down mosques and other holy places, slaughtered the people without mercy; and by their savage conduct seemed desirous to discharge the vengeance and resentment of many ages". 
asked for help from him. But the army of Gujrat had not yet arrived, when the Sultan fell ill from excessive anger (or mortification); and as his illness increased, some of his adherents wanted that they should seize the Khan Khanan, prince Ahmad Khan, and should draw a pencil across his world-seeing eyes. The Khan Khanan receiving information of this, withdrew himself into the corner of safety. The soldiers, however, came from all sides and joined him. Firuz Shah sent one of his slaves with twenty thousand horsemen and some elephants to crush him. After the two armies had met, Firuz Shah’s army fled. The latter, in spite of his illness

1 According to Firishtah, however, Sultan Ahmad (of Gujrat) having only recently ascended the throne, and his affairs being still unsettled, the message had no effect; but the king’s brother Ahmad Khan, the Khan Khanan, opened the door of the treasury, collected a new army, and drove the Bijanagar troops out of the kingdom.

2 Firishtah says, that when Firuz Shah’s illness was prolonged, the management of affairs fell into the hands of two slaves, named, respectively, Hushiyar ‘Ain-ul-mulk and Bidar Nizam-ul-mulk, and they told the Sultan, that as Ahmad Khan was very powerful and popular, his son Hassan Khan could only succeed him, if Ahmad Khan could be removed, and Firuz Shah also remembered what Saiyyad Muhammad Gisui Darzi had told him about the succession, and he determined upon depriving Ahmad Khan of his eye-sight.

3 According to Firishtah, the Khan Khanan did not have such an easy success. He first of all went to Saiyyad Muhammad Gisui Darzi, taking his son Alau-d-din with him. The Saiyyad took his own turban from his head and divided it into two parts, and bound them on the heads of the father and the son. Col. Briggs says erroneously, that it was ‘Alau-d-din’s turban that was cut into two portions. After that the Khan left home early the next morning with only four hundred tried soldiers. At the gate he was joined by Khalf Hasan of Basrah, who was an old friend of his. He dissuaded him from attaching himself to his hopeless cause, but Khalf Hasan refused to leave him; and it was his advice and help that conduced to his success. Firishtah agrees with our author in saying that after the Khan Khanan’s first success Firuz Shah got into a palankin, and advanced against the Khan Khanan; but he says that before doing this, he had the umbrella of sovereignty placed over the head of his son Hasan Khan. In the second battle, which took place at a distance of three karaha from Hasanabad Gulbarga, Firuz Shah fainted owing to his great weakness, and the report got about that he had been killed. The soldiers then went over to the Khan Khanan. The latter out of regard for his brother did not pursue him. Firuz Shah entered the fort, and the Khan Khanan encamped outside. Then Hushiyar ‘Ain-ul-mulk and Bidar Nizam-ul-mulk began to
got into a palankin and advanced to the battle field. At the time, however, when the troops were arrayed for battle, most of the soldiers fled and joined the Khān Khānān. On seeing this state of things, he returned to the city, and turned the men out of the diwān khāna (audience hall); and sent the keys of the fort and the treasuries, by the hands of the great men of the city, to Ahmad Khān.

Verses:
He (alone) is wise, who in all things,
Sometimes accepts flowers and sometimes thorns.
With every morsel, thou can’st not sugar find;
Sometimes comes the clear (wine) and sometimes the dregs.

The Khān Khānān, desirous of rendering the rights, which his brother had by having trained him, and brought him up, went alone into the palace and kissed the ground of service. Firūz Shāh descended from the throne, and took him into his arms, and holding his hand led him up to the throne. He opened his mouth with pleasant and kind words, and filled Ahmad Khān’s ears, with the precious gems of advice. They both wept out of brotherly love, and Firūz Shāh commended his children to the care of his brother; and on the night of the 4th of Shawwāl 825 A.H., when the dawn raised its head over the turrets of the horizon, the hand of that marauder, Death, plundered the capital of his life. 2 According to

discharge cannon and musket shots at the Khān Khānān’s camp, and one cannon ball struck his tent, and some of his attendants were killed; and he had to move his camp further back.

After this Firūz Shāh told Hasan Khān, that the soldiers having joined his uncle, it was not possible for him to ascend the throne. He also ordered the gates to be opened, and sent for his brother, who came and placed his head on his feet. Firūz Shāh then surrendered the sovereignty to the Khān Khānān and placed his son in the latter’s charge. The same day, the 5th Shawwāl 825 A.H., September 15th, 1422 A.D. Ahmad Khān, Khān Khānān, ascended the throne, and called himself Ahmad Shāh Bahmani. Ten days later Firūz Shāh died.

1 See the latter part of the last note. Mr. Sewell quoting Sott’s translation of Firishtah, page 95, and counting the length of Firūz Shāh’s reign, gives the 7th Shawwāl 825 A.H., 24th September, 1422 A.D. as the date of his death.

2 This gives one a shock, after the somewhat idyllic picture of brotherly love just painted; but Firishtah has something equally bad, if not worse.
another statement poison was given to him. The period of his reign was twenty-five years and seven months and twenty days.

1 A NARRATIVE OF THE REIGN OF SULTÂN AHMAD SHĀH BAHMANI.

When the throne of the empire and the seat of government was adorned by the accession of Ahmad Shāh, all sections of the people were very happy with the perfection of his justice, and his all-comprehending beneficence. He acted with such justice and equity, that the habit of tyranny and the custom of oppression became obsolete among men.

Couplet:

The door of justice was opened so wide,
That the sparrow of the hawk, a house mate became.

In the scales of his spirit, dust and gems appeared to have the same price. He was in the society of learned and great men at most times; and lavished much wealth on them. In following the law of the Prophet, he never showed himself to be deficient, in any way, as far as it lay in his power. He showed his respect and veneration to the descendants of the Prophet and to the successors of saints and holy men, in a way, that it was impossible to conceive anything in excess of it. 2 In connection with this, they relate this story of him. He had an amīr of the name of Shir Malik, into whose hands he had entrusted the reins of the government. Shir Malik was returning after capturing a great fort which was famous in

He says

و در بعضي كتب بنظر دو امدة كه احمد شاه بوسوسه و تجريف خواهرزاده خود شير خان فيروز شاه را ختفه كرده بكشت و الله عامم بعضه المعل

which may be translated as “And it has come to my notice, in some books, that Ahmad Shāh had Firuz Shāh strangled to death, at the instigation of his sister’s son Shir Khān; but God only knows the real truth of the matter.

1 There are variations in the heading. One MS. has ذكرسلطان احمد شاه سلطان؛ the other leaves out the word ذكر. The reading in the lith. ed. ذكرسلطان احمد شاه بن فيروز شاه بهمن is altogether incorrect. Ahmad Shāh was the brother, and not the son of Firuz Shāh.

2 This summary and barbarous punishment for insulting a Saiyyad occurred very near the end of the Sultān’s reign. It is mentioned by Firishtah as having occurred in 837 A.H., and Ahmad Shāh died the next year.
that country, and came to a sea port. On the way a Saiyyad of the name of Nāsir-ud-din 'Arab, to whom Sultān Ahmad had entrusted a large sum of money, so that he might go to Karbalā, and open out a stream of water there, met him. Saiyyad Nāsir-ud-din did not show such respect to Shir Malik, as the latter had expected. He merely met him, mounted as he was. Shir Malik told his servants, and they made Nāsir-ud-din dismount from his horse. The Saiyyad returned from that place, and came into the presence of the Sultān, and informed the latter of what had happened. The Sultān comforted him and sent him back. After some days Shir Malik arrived near (the place where the Sultān was); and high and low hastened to meet him; and brought him to the royal threshold. And at the very instant, when the Sultān’s eye fell on him, he ordered that an elephant of the name of 1 Qassāb might be brought in to the presence; and at that very moment, without any talk or discussion, Shir Malik was thrown under the elephant’s feet. The Sultān said, “This is the punishment for insulting Saiyyads.”

2 When the Sultān was established on the throne of State, news came that the army of Sultān Ahmad Gujrāti, which Sultān Firūz had summoned, had arrived at the frontier. Ahmad Shāh sent presents and gifts for Sultān Ahmad; and gave permission to the amirs of Gujrāt to return; and he also sent presents to the amirs, in accordance with their condition and rank.

3 As Deo Rāy had been guilty of unmannerly conduct during the reign of Firūz Shāh, Sultān Ahmad Shāh, in retaliation of that,

---

1 The name appears to be قصاب in the MSS, and تاسب in the lith. ed. It is قصاب (butcher according to Col. Briggs) in Firishtah.

2 I cannot find any mention of this in Firishtah. On the other hand the latter says سلطان أحمد شاه حاق و معلم راج مطيع و منفاذ خود ساختم و سرحد کچرات را بابری معنی سربند خانه از راه طرف جمع کود which means that Sultān Ahmad Shāh . . . . . made high and low submissive to himself, and placed the frontier of Gujrāt in charge of trustworthy amirs, and thus assured his mind on that side.

3 Instead of the very vague and sketchy account of the campaign which follows, Firishtah has a long and graphic account, which may be summarised thus. The Sultān advanced with forty thousand horsemen to the Tungābhadrā. The Rāy of Bijānagar also advanced to the river, after summoning the Rāy of
advanced towards Bijānagar, on the first Nauroz after his accession. After traversing many stages, when he arrived within the territories

Warangal to his help. The two armies halted for forty days on opposite banks of the river. Then weary of the delay, the Sultān called a council of war; and finding his officers impatient to cross the river, he despatched some of them with a body of men. They crossed the river at a ford at some distance, and by daybreak reached the Ray’s camp. The Ray of Talingāna had already deserted his ally and marched away. The Ray of Bijānagar was sleeping in his tent when the vanguard of the Musalmān army arrived, and, being alarmed, fled almost naked into a sugar-cane plantation. Here some Musalmān soldiers found him and taking him to be an ordinary villager, made him carry a bundle of sugar-cane. Then when the Sultān had crossed the river, the soldiers hoping to find more valuable plunder than sugar-cane, left him; and he, with great trouble, about midday came up with some of his officers, who recognised him and received him with great joy. He, however, considered the late accident as a bad omen and fled to Bijānagar. The Sultān without waiting to besiege the Ray’s capital, overran the open country; and put men, women and children to death without mercy; and whenever the number of the slain amounted to twenty thousand, he halted for three days, and held a great festival. He also demolished Hindū temples (Būtqānhā Wa Kanāis, which Col. Briggs translates as “Idolatrous temples and colleges of the brahmins”). Then five thousand Hindūs took an oath to kill the Sultān in revenge for these outrages. They attacked him one day when he was separated from his attendants, while out hunting. He took shelter in a small mud enclosure used as a fold for cattle, and was in great danger, till ‘Abd-ul-qādir, his armour bearer, came up with a body of men, and after a severe conflict the Hindūs were defeated. After this the Sultān closely blockaded Bijānagar; and the people being in great distress the Ray sued for peace; and the Sultān agreed, on condition that the Ray should send all arrears of tribute, laden on his best elephants, with his son. The Ray agreed, and sent his son with thirty elephants laden with the treasures. The Ray’s son was received by the Sultān, and was presented with a robe, a sword set with gems, twenty beautiful horses of different countries, a male elephant, some hounds for the chase, and a leash of hawks; and was dismissed from the banks of the Krishnā; and the Sultān returned to Gulbarga.

Mr. Sewell’s remarks on the above narrative are, (1) the fact of the Ray’s camp being close to a sugar-cane plantation indicates that it was probably close to one of the old irrigation channels supplied by dams constructed across the river by the Rays; (2) that it is difficult to reconcile the story with the fact that the Ray (Deva Rāyā II) was then quite a boy; and that the Musalmān chroniclers, from whom Firishtah obtained the facts, mistook some adult member of the Ray’s family, who commanded the army, for the Ray; and (3) that it is useless to speculate as to the locality where the Sultān was
of Bijānagar, he commenced to plunder and ravage (the country). Deo Rāy, who had been rubbing his head with the zenith of the revolving sky, now withdrew his hand from the reins of government, and sent one of his trusted adherents, with gifts and presents to attend on Ahmad Shāh, and asked for pardon of his offences. The Sultān drew the pen of forgiveness over his guilt, and sent farmāns couched in friendly language. Deo Rāy then came forward with humility and submission, and sent everything that he had promised to send; and became included in the band of the Sultān's friends and adherents. The Sultān returned with victory and triumph, and when he arrived at the capital, he distinguished the amīrs with promotion in rank and robes of honour; and gave them permission to return to their own thānās.

After a short time, the Sultān wrote a letter to Nasīr Khān of Asīr proposing a marriage for his true son Sultān 'Alā-ud-din; and sent it by the hand of 'Azīz Khān Nāmt. When the letter reached Nasīr Khān, he agreed to the alliance, prepared the necessary things for the chaste and pure veiled one; and sent her with his sons and attendants and servants and troops to the capital (Ahmadābād Bidar or Gulbarga) so that the usual rites and ceremonies of festivity might be performed, and gave permission with all politeness and respect, to 'Azīz Khān to return. Sultān Ahmad welcomed the delightful advent of the guests with pleasure and gratitude, and made them happy with his great lavishness and surrounded, and had to take shelter in a mud enclosure; but as he was riding, he was probably riding down antelope.

---

1 One MS. inserts the word مناسب (suitable), after مناسب.
2 The marriage, according to Firīshṭāh, took place some time after 830 A.H., 1426 A.D., and after the expeditions to Talingāna, which according to Nizām-ud-din occurred in 826 and 828 respectively, so that according to the correct chronological order, the account of the marriage should succeed and not precede the account of the Talingāna campaign. The ruler of Asīr is called Nasīr Khān ruler of Asīr. He claimed to be a descendant of his holiness 'Umar Fārīq, in the Persian text of Firīshṭāh; but Col. Briggs calls him "Nuseer Khan Farooky ruler of Kandeish". The bride was sent, according to Firīshṭāh, to Ahmadābād Bidar, and was lodged in a garden outside the city. The festivities continued for two months, and the bride was brought into the city, and at an auspicious moment the marriage took place.
benefactions; and spread the shadow of safety and of his kindness on
the guests and the residents; and kept open the gates of pleasure and
enjoyment, so that men might occupy themselves in various plea-

sures; and 1 take what was due to them from the cup bearer of time.
The Sultān summoned the Qāzīs and the learned men, and the
men possessing the knowledge of God, and the great men of the city
and arranged the marriage assembly; and (afterwards) he sent back
the sons and the adherents of Nasir Khān after showing them every
honour, and conferring on them many marks of his kindness.

In the year 826 A.H., Sultān Ahmad Shāh collected an immense
army; and 2 advanced towards the country of Tilang; but on
account of certain matters connected with the kingdom, he returned
from the way, and came back to Gulbarga. Then in the year
3 828 A.H., 1424 A.D., he again advanced towards Tilang; and certain

1 The meaning is not quite clear. The actual words are ُساقي وقت داد خود ُساقي داد وقت خود ُستاند, according to the MSS. The lith. ed. has ُساقي وقت داد، خود ُستاند.

2 Firishtah does not mention this expedition which ended so abruptly. The affairs of state, which Nizām-ud-dīn refers to, but does not describe, were the total failure of rain in 826 and 827 A.H. In 826, no rain fell, streams and
wells became dried up, and the ground parched. Sultān Ahmad Shāh opened the
doors of his treasury, and supported his troops. He also opened the doors of the
public granaries, and fed the poor and the needy. The next year also there was
no rain, and the Sultān in great distress called upon the learned and pious
men and Shaikhs to pray for rain; but this had no effect, so the people became
seditious, and spoke of the reign as unlucky. Then the Sultān in great sorrow
went out to the open country, and going on an eminence bowed down in prayer,
and placing his head on the ground made lamentations and supplications.
About this time clouds gathered together, and rain began to fall. This is the
translation of the passage in the lith. ed.; but Col. Briggs says that “the
Sultān repaired to the mosque in state to crave heaven’s mercy for his subjects”.
The Persian text goes on to say, that so much rain fell, that the men who
had accompanied the Sultān began to shiver, and they acclaimed the Sultān with
the title of Wali or Saint.

3 Mr. Sewell says that 828 A.H. began only on November 23rd, 1424, but the
campaign was very short and may have been finished before the end of Decem-
ber. The account of the expedition as given by Firishtah is different from that
given in the text. According to Firishtah the Sultān marched to Golkonda,
where he halted for a month and twenty days, and sent Khān A’azam ’Abd-ul-
forts, which at the time of the catastrophe (in Firūz Shāh’s reign), had passed out of the Sultān’s possession, again came into it. He then took tribute from the Kalāntars or chiefs of Rājkonda and Deorkonda; and returned to Gulbarga.

In the year 829 A.H., news came that the Rāy of Māhūr had strayed from the path of allegiance, and was bent on war and bloodshed. Sultān Ahmad Shāh collected an army, which was beyond all calculation, and advanced to punish him. The Rāy fortified himself in the fort of Māhūr. The Dakini army ravaged the neighbourhood of the fort, and rased everything to the ground. In the end the Rāy came forward with humility and repentance, and joined the band of the Sultān’s loyal adherents; and whatever had been in his possession came again into the Sultān’s possession.

Latif as commander of the vanguard. When he advanced again, news came that the Rāy had arrayed his army for battle, but had been defeated and slain with seven thousand of his cavalry and infantry. The Sultān on reaching Warangal took possession of the city, and all the treasure which the Rāy and his ancestors had collected. He then gave a suitable reward to the Khan A’azam ‘Abd-ul-Latif, and sent him to conquer the other portions of the kingdom; and he returned to the Sultān at Warangal, after conquering the whole country in the course of three or four months. If this account be accepted, then Mr. Sewell’s remark that the campaign might have been finished before the end of 1424 cannot be correct.

As to Nizām-ud-dīn’s account, I cannot find any mention in the other accounts of this expedition of Rājkonda or Deorkonda, or their Kalāntars. But it appears from the accounts of the reign of Sultān Humāyūn, grandson of Sultān Ahmad Shāh, as given by both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah, that the Telugus of Deorkonda offered a stout resistance to the generals of Sultān Humāyūn. This is also mentioned by Mr. Sewell in page 98 of his book, where he calls the place Devarkonda. And in page 132 of his book, he says that Sultān Quli Qutb Shāh of Golconda “took Rāζukonda and Devarakonda, fortresses respectively S.E. and S.S.E. of Hyderābād in Telingāna”. Rāζukonda (which is apparently identical with Rājkonda) and Devarakonda are both shown in the map of South India, opposite to page 76 of Mr. Sewell’s book; so there may be some foundation for Nizām-ud-dīn’s statement.

1 Contrary to this, Firishtah says that after the Zamīndār of Māhūr had submitted, the Sultān breaking his engagement with him, had him and five or six thousand Hindūs put to death, and imprisoned their sons and daughters, and forced them to become Musalmāns. Firishtah also says that at this time the Sultān took possession of the fort of Kalan (Briggs calls it Kullum), and also of
After the conquest of Māhūr, as the kingdom became more extensive, the amirs submitted that one of the Shāhzádas might be declared to be the heir apparent; and sūbas might be allotted to the others, so that the rule of sincerity and friendship might continue among the "brothers of purity." The Sultān said, "Please tell me whatever might have been decided in your minds on the subject of the heir apparent." The amirs submitted "Shāhzáda 'Alā-ud-din is endowed with high attributes and is most anxious and painstaking in the management of measures for the amelioration of the condition of the raiyyats, and for improving the condition of the poor and oppressed." The Sultān applauded the opinion of the amirs and appointed Shāhzáda 'Ala-ud-din to be the heir apparent and made Muhammad Khān over to him. He conferred the country of Māhūr with its dependencies on Shāhzáda Mahmūd Khān, and he gave the fort of Rāijūr (Rāichur) with its surrounding country to Dāūd Khān, and took an engagement from all his sons, that they should never be hostile to one another, and should keep the raiyyats, and the poor and oppressed, who have been entrusted to them by God, in comfort. He also directed them that they should treat the following four noble classes among men with special respect and

---
1 The date of these transactions is not given either by Nizām-ud-din or by Firishtah, but it appears that they took place between 829 and 833 A.H.
2 The meaning of this is not clear: but the following passage from Firishtah, who after saying that the Sultān made 'Ala-ud-din his heir says which means, that he made his (i.e., 'Ala-ud-din's) youngest brother, Shāhzáda Muhammad Khān who was his youngest son, co-sharer in the kingdom with him (i.e., with 'Ala-ud-din).
3 According to Firishtah the distribution was different. He says Ramgar (Ramgar according to Col. Briggs) and Māhūr and Kalan and a small part of Berār were given to Shāhzáda Mahmūd Khān; and Shāhzáda Dāūd Khān was sent, with the insignia of royalty, and some old and trustworthy amirs to assume the government of Tilang.
4 It may be mentioned that the four noble classes of the community here mentioned somewhat resemble the four sections of the Indian people as originally classified by the Indian Sāstras of Brāhmaṇa, Kshatriya, Vaiṣya, and Śūdra, though of course they were not castes, as they later became in India. Firishtah
esteem; viz. first, learned men, for their minds are the fountains of
philosophy and Divine knowledge; second, writers, as this great band
adorn the cheek of the country, and the face of the state with 1 constructive guidance, by the tongues of their pens.

Couplet:
As the Shāh-in-shāh’s sword lays the foundation of the state,
The tongue of the pen, of rules becomes its guide.
The third are the men of arms, for the well-being of the people ('ibad, literally the servants of God), and the putting down of all disturbances in the country, are bound up with (the existence of) this body; and the 2 flashes of the light of their lances, which put down all disturbances are the guardians of religion and of the state; and the tongue of the ruthless swords explain the texts of victory and triumph. The fourth are the cultivators, for the stability of the world, and the continued existence of mankind are bound up with and sustained by the exertions of this body. For if they show any negligence, and permit idleness to find its way into their limbs, the supply of food, which is the means of the maintenance of life and of the sustenance of existence, would be completely cut off. And after giving necessary counsel and directions he sent Mahmūd Khān and Dāūd Khān to the subas to which they had been nominated.

Then in the year 830 A.H., he appointed Khalif Hasan 'Arab who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār to conquer the 3 island of

does not say anything about the Sultān’s direction and precepts about these classes.

1 The words the meaning of which is obscure appear to be بعَال تَعْمِير in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and عيَال تَعْمِير in the other MS.

2 The words here are also somewhat obscure. The words in one MS. are "و لم يغت دان نواسان فتنة نشال تَغَامِيل دين و دولت"; the other MS. has left out the whole passage from لمعان to دولت. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MS. but substitutes for لمعان نواسان, and for تَغَامِيل for تَغَامِيل. I think that نواسان and لمعان are both incorrect; and the proper reading should be تَغَامِيل نواسان and تَغَامِيل is probably better than لمعان. I have adopted this reading.

3 The words which I have translated as the island of Mahāím look like جَزِيرة بِهَابِي in one MS. but they are clearly جَزِيرة بِهَابِي in the other. In the lith.
Mahāim (Māhim). The Malik-ut-tujjār, by the strength of his arms, and his bravery and courage took possession of that country. The Rāys there, who were Musalmāns, went to the presence of Sultān Ahmad of Gujrāt for aid. The latter sent a farmān to Shāhzhāda Zafar Khān, who was at Sultānpūr Nadarbār, that he should advance to help those Musalmāns. The Malik-ut-tujjār wrote an account of what had happened, and sent it to Gulbarga. Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn was sent from that place to reinforce the Malik-ut-tujjār. When the two armies met the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Zafar Khān’s standards. Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn fled and went back to his own territory, and the Malik-ut-tujjār also joined him. These matters will be narrated with greater details in the section about Gujrāt.

ed. they are جریان یشم. There is no mention in Firishtah of the Malik ut-tujjār or any one else being sent in 830 A.H. to conquer the island of Mahāim. But it appears from Firishtah that towards the end of 833 A.H., the Sultān sent the Malik-ut-tujjār to purify the land of Kōkan (Concan), which is situated on the coast of the Arabian sea, from the taint of all rebels and disturbers; and to destroy all the Rājas, who had gone beyond their bounds. The Malik-ut-tujjār carried out the orders within a short time, and sent much tribute to the Sultān, who sent him a special robe of honour and other rewards. The Malik-ut-tujjār then, in the excess of his zeal, conquered the island of Mahāim (Māhim) which was in the possession of the king of Gujrāt. The latter sent his son Zafar Khān to recover possession of Mahāim; and Sultān Ahmad also sent his son ‘Alā-ud-dīn to reinforce the Malik-ut-tujjār. The two Shāhzhādas remained encamped on opposite banks of an inlet of the sea, and neither had the courage to cross it. Then ‘Alā-ud-dīn became ill and retired some stages; and Zafar Khān attacked the Malik-ut-tujjār, and various engagements took place. The Malik-ut-tujjār’s brother was taken prisoner, and two other chiefs of the Deccan army were slain; and that army was completely defeated; and all the elephants and horses and equipages belonging to it fell into the hands of the Gujrātis. Sultān Ahmad then advanced to reinforce the Malik-ut-tujjār; and Ahmad Shāh of Gujrāt also collected a large army and advanced to meet him. The Deccan army at first surrounded the hill fort of Tambolā in Baglāna, but on the approach of the Gujrāt army raised the siege. The two armies confronted each other for some time; but at last, on the intervention of learned men, peace was restored on the terms that each country should remain in possession of the territories, which it had held from before the war.

Col. Briggs in a note says that Mahāim or Māhim is identical with Bombay.
In the year 832 A.H., a letter of Narsingh Rāy, who was one of the associates of the line of Ahmad Shāh (i.e., I suppose one of the

See note 3, pp. 49, 50. Firishtah places the war with Sultān Hūshang in 830 A.H., whereas Nizām-ud-dīn says it took place two years later in 832 A.H. To understand the relation between Narsingh Rāy, Sultān Ahmad Bahmani and Sultān Hūshang of Mandū, it is necessary to go back to the events of 829 about the Rāy of Māhūr as described on p. 47 ante, and Firishtah’s version referred to in note 1, p. 47. According to Firishtah, after treacherously slaying the zamindār of Māhūr, Ahmad Shāh remained at Elichpūr and erected and repaired fortresses there. He had obtained a grant of Khandesh, Mālwa and Gujāt from Taimūr, and his object was to take possession of these territories, and afterwards conquer Bijānagar. Sultān Hūshang, having received information of these ambitious projects, tried to seduce Narsingh Rāy from his allegiance to Sultān Ahmad; but Narsingh Rāy did not agree. Then Sultān Hūshang twice invaded his territory; but was defeated both times. He sent a third army, and the omārs commanding it laid waste Narsingh Rāy’s country, and took possession of some parganas; and Sultān Hūshang prepared to invade the country in person. After this Narsingh Rāy, in great distress, sent the petition in 832 A.H. to Ahmad Shāh, asking for his help. The latter sent a farmān to ‘Abd-ul-qādir the Khān Jahān, governor of Berar, to march to the help of Narsingh Rāy; and he also himself advanced with six thousand horsemen to Elichpūr on the pretext of going on a hunting expedition. As Sultān Hūshang was yet in his own territory, he spent two months in hunting. Sultān Hūshang, thinking that the delay was due to Sultān Ahmad’s weakness, marched rapidly to Kehlā, and besieged it. Sultān Ahmad then advanced towards Kehlā, but at this time some learned men told him, that no Bahmani Sultān had, up to that time, waged war with a Musalmān ruler; and it would bring discredit on him if he, in order to aid a kōfīr, went to war with Sultān Hūshang. Sultān Ahmad heard this with sorrow, and although he had arrived within twenty karōhs of Sultān Hūshang’s army sent an emissary to the latter, and pointed out to him that Narsingh Rāy was an adherent of his, and that it was desirable that he would return to his own country, as he was himself returning to his own, at the suggestion of men learned in the law of the Prophet; and he commenced to retire even before his emissary had arrived at Sultān Hūshang’s camp. The latter became angry on receiving this message; and presuming upon the fact that his army consisted of thirty thousand horsemen, while that of the Deccan did not exceed fifteen thousand, followed in close pursuit of Sultān Ahmad Shāh. The latter now summoned the learned men, and pointed out to them that he had acted upon their suggestion, and had brought this dishonour on himself; but on the following day he was going to fight anybody that might stand in front of him, whoever he might be; and he accordingly arranged his army, placing the two wings under ‘Abd-ul-qādir, Khān Jahān and ‘Abd-ul-lah.
latter's tributaries) arrived, to the effect that Sultān Hūshang, the ruler of Mandū, had, with violence and in great force, invaded his territory, and was laying it waste. Sultān Ahmad marched by successive stages to that country. He had not, however, yet arrived there when news came that Narsingh Rāy had removed the yoke of allegiance to the Sultān (i.e., Ahmad Shāh), and had submitted to Sultān Hūshang. Sultān Ahmad Shāh, therefore, turned the rein of his attention, and halted at a place three stages behind, as he did not wish to prolong a war with Musalmāns. (Another) account is this, that Sultān Ahmad had besieged the fort of Kehrla when the Rāy summoned Sultān Hūshang to his aid, and agreed to pay him three lākhs of tankas daily towards his expenses. Sultān Hūshang arrived near; and Sultān Ahmad, raising the siege, halted at a place three stages further back. Then Sultān Hūshang pursued him along those three stages and raised the dust of disturbance. The next day, when the fire of battle blazed up, and the field of bloodshed became hot and streams of blood began to flow from the opposing armies, Sultān Ahmad came out of ambush, with two thousand five hundred well tried warriors, and fell on the centre of Sultān Hūshang's army; and in accordance with the words that the beginner (or the aggressor) is the oppressor or is to blame, the army of Mandū was routed. The harem of Sultān Hūshang with all its inmates fell into the hands of the army of the Dakin. Sultān Ahmad with great generosity kept his army back from pursuit; and after some days, sent the inmates of Hūshang's harem back to Mandū, after making all arrangements for them, with an escort of five hundred horsemen, and after sharing the plunder, divided the country among the jāqīrdār amīrs.

At the time of returning, when they arrived in the city of Bidar,

Khān, the grandson of Isma'il Fath, respectively, and the centre under Shāhzāda 'Alā-ud-dīn. He placed four hundred elephants in different groups, and himself with three thousand selected horsemen and twelve elephants remained in ambush. Sultān Hūshang arrived with seventeen thousand horsemen; and before he could arrange his troops, the battle began, and Sultān Hūshang was defeated, as mentioned in the text.

1 This is the battle referred to in the latter part of the last note.

2 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. call it शहर बदर, the city of Badar or Bidar; but Firish tah in the corresponding passage says و سلطان در همان یورش چوی
they found the ground verdant, and the fields pleasing to the heart, and the Sultān selected the place for his capital; and at the moment fixed by the astrologers, laid the foundation brick of the citadel in the ground, and divided it among the amīrs; and for the palace, made a plan of a grand mansion. After its completion, the poets, who had accompanied him in the journey, composed verses to be used as inscriptions on it. Shaikh Āzūrī, who was with him in that expedition, wrote some couplets which were inscribed on the gate.

Couplets:
Oh brave! such a palace strong, that for its grandeur great,
The sky itself is the threshold of its gates sublime,
The sky could not say, that this transgresses courtesy's rule,

'Tis the palace of the world emperor Ahmad Shāh Bahman.

The writer of the "Tārīkh Bahmanī, Wal-ahadat-'Alia" says that the Sultān gave Shaikh Āzūrī a reward consisting of twelve thousand packages of stuffs.

When the country of the Deccan was purified of the weeds of all enemies, and came into the uncontested possession of Sultān Ahmad, from which it appears that the city or fortress of Bidar is referred to. Firishtah indulges in high praise and loud eulogy of the beauty and salubrity of the place; and recalls the fact that it was the site of the ancient Hindū city of Vīdarbhā, the scene of the loves of Nala and Damayantī, daughter of Rājā Bhūma Sena of Vīdarbhā.

1 There are some variations in the reading of the last line. The MSS. have قصر سلطان جهان إحمد بھین شاہ است. These couplets are also quoted by Firishtah. According to him the second line is اسمان سعدة از پایہ این درگاه است; and the last line is identical with that in the MSS. of the Tabaqāt. According to Firishtah, the reward paid to Shaikh Āzūrī was forty thousand white tamps, each of them being one tola of silver, besides twenty thousand more paid to him for the expenses of his journey, as he was then about to return to his own country, Khurāsān. It appears also that Shaikh Āzūrī wrote the Bahman-nāmā, a chronicle of the Bahman dynasty in verse, which he continued to write even after his return to Khurāsān; and after him Mulla Nazārī and Mulla Sāmā'ī and others continued it.

According to Firishtah, the fort or citadel of Ahamadābād Bidar, which was the name given to the new capital, was finished in 836 A.H., 1432 A.D.
he, in the year 835 A.H., marched to capture the fort of Tanbūl, which is situated on the boundary of Gujrat, and arriving near it by successive marches, surrounded it. When the siege had been prolonged for two years, Sultān Ahmad of Gujrat, at last, with great amity and courtesy sent an emissary with this message: "If this faqir had been present at the (wedding?) festivities of Shāhzāda All-ud-din, he (Sultān Ahmad Bahmani) would have shown him some courtesy. It is now the prayer of the faqir, that in place of that courtesy, he would leave this fort in the possession of its owner." Sultān Ahmad Bahmani, turning from the high way of generosity and the path of politeness, began to take the course of having a consultation on the matter. Some of his vazirs said that the right of gift can only be exercised, if the fort comes into his (i.e., the Sultān's) possession; while another body said that the prayer of Sultān Ahmad Gujratī should be honoured with the courtesy of acceptance. The Sultān preferred the first opinion; and sent a reply, that when the fort should come into his possession, it would be made over to his (Sultān Ahmad Gujratī's) servants. The latter was enraged on receiving this reply, and sent a large body of troops to reinforce the garrison of the fort; and when this news reached the ear of Sultān Ahmad Bahmani, he withdrew his forces from the foot

1 Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says that after the defeat of Khalīf Hasan in his attack on Māhim, Sultān Ahmad collected a large army, and Sultān Ahmad of Gujrat also did the same, and came forward to meet him. The Deccan army at first besieged the fort of Mābiūl; Col. Briggs says that "the Deccanis in the first instance laid siege to a hill fort, (in a footnote of Tembola) in Buglana"], which was in the possession of the adherents of Sultān Ahmad Shāh Gujratī; but when the latter came to the neighbourhood, he raised the siege and the two armies remained facing each other for a long time, neither party daring to commence the fight, till at last the learned men in the two armies intervened, and peace was concluded, each Sultān being satisfied with his own possessions, and neither was to attempt to seize any part of the other's dominion. Firishtah refers to the slightly different versions of the affair given in the Tārīkh-i-Allī and other histories.

The Cambridge History of India (see p. 401) calls the fort Bhaul on the Girnā, which was held for Gujrat by Malik Sa'ādat. In p. 299 in the chapter which contains the history of Gujrat and Khāndesh apparently the same fortress was called Btūl which it was said there was gallantly defended by Malik Sa'ādat, an officer of Gujrat.
of the fort; and the Gujrät army also halted some distance behind. The Sultän, having removed the dream of capturing the fort from his head, went to Gulbarga. The writer of the Kitáb-i-Bahádurí has narrated these transactions in a different manner. If the great God so wills it, the pen of the writer will describe it in the section about the Sultáns of Gujrät.

1 In the year 838 A.H., an illness overtook the person of the Sultän; and with a sound resolution and true intention he repented of all his offences and sins, and gave counsel and direction to his eldest son Sultän 'Alá-ud-dín in the presence of the amírs and fażírs. He then spoke thus to the amírs: "I have this hope from you that you will pray for the absolution of my sins to the great God. I am hoping that as in my time the hand of tyranny was too short to reach the skirts of the oppressed and helpless, so the great and holy

1 The following incidents which occurred in 836 and 837 A.H. and which are mentioned by Fírishtah have not been referred to by Nizám-ud-dín: (1) the completion of the city of Ahmadábád Bidar in 836 A.H.; and (2) the execution, by order of Sultän Ahmad, of his nephew Shír Khán, at whose instigation he had caused Frúz Sháh to be strangled to death, and whose continued existence appeared to be likely to be the cause of his son being deprived of the empire. This also was in 836. And in 837 A.H., Húshang Sháh of Mílwa, seeing the hostility between the Sultáns of the Dakin and of Gujrät, invaded the territory of Narsingh Ráy, and the latter was slain in battle, and Húshang Sháh seized the fort of Kehrla. Then Sultän Ahmad advanced towards Kehrla when Násir Khán of Aśır intervened; and peace was concluded on the condition that Kehrla should belong to Sultän Húshang and Berar to Sultän Ahmad, after that Ahmad Sháh marched into Talingána, and after his return he ordered Shír Malik to be thrown under the feet of an elephant. This was mentioned by Nizám-ud-dín in the beginning of his account of Sultän Ahmad's reign. Fírishtah also gives a rather long account of Sultän Ahmad's veneration for learned and holy people, and of his sending emissaries to Sháh Nia'mat-ul-lah of Kirmáś, and the latter's sending one of his favourite disciples, Mullá Qutb-ud-dín, and later on his grandson Mír Nur-ul-lah.

After Sháh Nia'mat-ul-lah's death, his son Sháh Khalíl-ul-lah came to the Deccan with his family, and his sons Sháh Habib-ul-lah and Sháh Muhibb-ul-lah. Sháh Habib-ul-lah married a daughter of Sultän Ahmad Sháh, and Sháh Muhibb-ul-lah, a daughter of Sultän 'Alá-ud-dín and they attained to great distinction. One of them was distinguished as a military commander and received the title of Ghází, and the town of Bír and the surrounding country as his jā'ígír.
God would forgive my offences". He delivered his life to the creator of life between sunset and the time of sleeping at night, on the 120th of Rajab with the text of the unity of God on his tongue. The period of his reign was twelve years and nine months and twenty-four days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, 2 SON OF AHMAD SHĀH

When on the 29th of Rajab of the afore-mentioned year, (he) sat on the place of his father, he gave himself the title of 3 'Alā-ud-dīn Shāh. He devoted all his energy on the strengthening of the rule of justice and of the foundations of equity; and he placed the weak and infirm in the cradle of safety, peace and repose. Therefore, of a necessity, the great and holy God gave him his help and aid, day after day, and in the very beginning of his youth he 4 acquired great fame for experience and knowledge of affairs. He entrusted the reins of the management (literally binding and loosening) of all affairs to the wise hand of 5 Dilāwar Khān, who had the title of Khān A’azam Khān.

1 The date of Sultān Ahmad’s death is the 20th Rajab, according to the MSS. as well as the lith. ed. The period of his reign, according to the MSS., is twelve years and nine months and twenty-four days. The lith. ed. has only twenty days. According to Firishtah the date was the 28th Rajab 838 A.H.; and this is probably correct as the date of the accession of 'Ala-ud-dīn is put down in the Tabaqāt as the 29th Rajab. Firishtah does not give the length of the reign. Col. Briggs says in a note that the date on his tomb in Bidar is 839, the year probably in which the mausoleum was completed.

2 In the heading of the narrative of Sultān ‘Ala-ud-dīn’s reign, the word son (of) is left out in the lith. ed., but is in both MSS.

3 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have Sultān Ahmad Shāh; but this is clearly a mistake, and I have corrected it to ‘Ala-ud-dīn Shāh.

4 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has شهروت عظيم علىه کرده; the other omits the word عظيم بانه. The lith. ed. has شهروت عظيم بالانه,

I have adopted I have adopted شهروت عظيم بالانه.

5 This agrees with Firishtah, who however says that Dilāwar Khān was made Vakil-ul-shāh. He also says that Khwajā-i-Jahān Astrābādī was made Vāzir Kūl, (Minister-in-charge of all departments), and ‘Imād-ul-multk Ghūri was made Amīr-ul-Umrā.
In the year 839 A.H., Nasir Khān, son of 'Ālam Khān, the ruler of Asir, raided a part of the territories of the Dakini kingdom. The

1 Firishtah does not mention this invasion of 839 by Nasir Khān, who, it will be remembered, was Sultān ‘Alā ud-dīn’s father-in-law; but contrary to what is said here, he says that in 841 Āghā Zainab, who had the title of Malka-i-Jahān, Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn’s queen, and the daughter of Nasir Khān, sent a letter to the latter, that the Sultān was altogether cold to herself, and was paying all attention to the daughter of the Rāja of Sonkehr (which Col. Briggs says has not been identified), whom Dilāwar Khān had, after defeating her father, brought with him, and had presented to the Sultān, who was charmed by her beauty, and her great knowledge of music, and had given her the name of Zibā Chehra (Col. Briggs calls her Peri Chehra) (having the face of a fairy). On receiving this letter, Nasir Khān planned the conquest of Berār. The Sultān of Gujrāt promised to support him. Nasir Khān also made secret overtures to the amirs of Berār; and they promised to join him as he was a descendant of ‘Umār Fārūq and they would become Ghazīs and Shahids if they died fighting on his side; and he marched into Berār, with his own army, and that sent by the Rāja of Gondwāra. The Berār amirs wanted to take Khān Jahān, the governor of Berār, prisoner, and to take him to Nasir Khān; but he shut himself up in the fort of Tarnāla (Col. Briggs calls it Narnala); and sent a report to Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn. The latter held a council of war, when the amirs suggested that the Sultān should march in person against Nasir Khān, as the latter would be joined very probably by the Sultāns of Gujrāt and Mālwa, as well as the Rāy of Gondwāra. The Sultān suspecting treachery on the part of his advisers appointed Khalf Hasan Malik-ut-tujjār to the command of the army. The latter accepted the appointment, but pointed out that his defeat at Mahālim was due to the treachery of the Dakini and Habshi amirs, who were envious of the foreigners like himself. He hoped to be successful, if the Sultān placed under him only foreigners (Mughals), without any Dakinis or Habshis. The Sultān complied with his prayer; and he marched to Daulātābād, where he deputed the Dakini and Abyssinian amirs to guard the frontier of Gujrāt and Mālwa. Then with seven thousand ‘Arab horsemen he marched into Berār. At this time Khān Jahān came out of Tarnāla and joined him. Khalf Hasan sent him to Elichpūr to prevent the Rāy of Gondwāra to enter Berār by that route, and himself marched to Rohankehra where Nasir Khān was encamped. At the foot of the ghāt he was met by a body of Khāndesh troops, whom he routed with great slaughter. Nasir Khān, considering this defeat to be an evil omen, retreated with precipitance to Burhānpūr. Khalf Hasan, after recovering possession of the neighbouring country, pursued Nasir Khān to Burhānpūr. The latter was unable to meet him, and shut himself up in the fort of Laling. (Col. Briggs says, in a note, that Laling is a small and now insignificant fort, but Nasir Khān apparently considered it his safest retreat).
Sultän sent Khalf Hasan Malik-ut-tujjär to oppose Nasir Khan. After the parties had met, Nasir Khan fled, and went back to Asir. Malik-ut-tujjär pursued him as far as Asir, and after raiding and laying waste the part of that territory returned; and in the same year Nasir Khan became the subject of the inevitable (i.e., died); and according to another statement, this happened in the year 840 A.H.

As at the time of dividing his kingdom among the princes, Ahmad Shâh had placed Shahzâda Muhammad Khan in charge of Sultän 'Alâ-ud-din, the latter wanted to give him a proper training and to raise him to the higher grades of leadership and greatness; and in order to carry out this intention, he sent him with an army

Khâlif Hasan levied large quantities of gold and gems from the citizens of Burhânpur; and then devastated the country around, and returning to Burhânpur burnt down the palace and dug up its foundations, and then gave out that he was marching back to the Deccan; but instead of doing so, he marched rapidly during the night, and appeared before Laling with four thousand horsemen. Nasir Khan, thinking that Khalf Hasan's soldiers must be quite exhausted, met him with twelve thousand horsemen and a large body of infantry, but he was completely routed, and many of his chief men and the rebel amirs of Berâr were slain. Khalf Hasan then returned to Ahmadâbâd Bidar, and he was received with great honour and distinction.

I have said in the beginning of this note, that the campaign against Nasir Khan, which is mentioned by Nizâm-ud-din as having occurred in 839, is not mentioned by Firishtah; but on further consideration, I think that the two campaigns, namely that mentioned by Nizâm-ud-din and that described by Firishtah as having occurred in 841, both refer to the same series of events. Khalf Hasan commanded the Deccan army in both, and he is said, in both, to have pursued Nasir Khan to Burhânpur and to have laid that place waste.

1 Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says that Shahzâda Muhammad Khan was sent with 'Imâd-ul-mulk ûhûrî, who was made Amîr-ul-umra, and Khwâja Jahân against Bijanagar, as the Rây had not sent five years' tribute. They marched into Canâra, and began to plunder and ravage the country. The Rây in great distress sent the tribute with valuable presents. When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Mudkal, some discontented officers told Muhammad Khan that the Sultân should either place him by his own side on the mosnad, and allow him to act with himself in the management of affairs, or should give him half the kingdom. The Shahzâda was deceived by these words; and he tried to induce 'Imâd-ul-mulk and Khwâja Jahân to join him. They refused to do so, whereupon they were
to conquer Bijānagar.  

Malik ‘Imād-ud-dīn Ghūrī, who was in those parts from before the time when the Shāhzāda was sent, when he heard that the Shāhzāda had arrived at the bank of the river Krishnā, joined his army without any hesitation. As the Shāhzāda was not satisfied with the fact that the kingdom should belong to the Sultān, and was waiting for an opportunity, he put Malik ‘Imād-ud-dīn, who was perfectly innocent, to death, and raised the standard of revolt and hostility. The Sultān, on receiving information of these occurrences, advanced to punish Muhammad Khān. When the armies met, victory and triumph blew on the plumes of ‘Alā-ud-dīn’s standards. Muhammad Khān frightened and depressed fled with shame and disgrace.

Couplet:

‘Gainst thy benefactor, if thou dost transgress,
If thou art high as the sky, low thy head will fall.

The Sultān kept his troops back from pursuit, on account of the relation of kindness, and halted where he was. At this time an

both put to death. The rebels then collected an army with the help of the tribute obtained from Bijānagar; and took possession of Mudkal, Rāichore, Sholāpūr and Naldurg. Col. Briggs also mentions Bijāpur, but I cannot find it in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Mr. Sewell also mentions Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān’s rebellion (see page 71 of his book). He says that the prince took Mudkal, Rāichur, Sholāpūr and Bijāpur and Nalkīrak from the Sultān’s governors. The Sultān was in great grief for the murder of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, who, he said, was like a father to him. He then advanced against Muhammad Khān. In the battle which followed the Sultān was victorious, and most of the men who had incited Muhammad Khān were taken prisoners, while Muhammad Khān himself fled to the hills and jungles. ‘Alā-ud-dīn returned to Ahmadābād Bidar. He pardoned the rebel leaders, and wrote admonitory letters to his brother, and induced him to come back to him, and, after showing him much kindness, conferred on him the fort of Rāichur and the neighbouring country in Tīlang, which had been previously given to prince Dāūd, who was now dead, and sent him there.

1 The wording of the sentence in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. appears to me to be somewhat illogical. It is قَبْلـٰ از فرستادن ملک عماماد الدين غوری كه درايان سرحد بون جون شند. The proper form of the sentence would be ملک عماماد الدين غوری كه قبل از فرستادن شا زاده درايان سرحد بون جون شند كه وی بکنار اب كس رسید; and I have changed the sentence and translated accordingly.
uncle of the Sultân, who had been in the army of Muhammad Kháń, was brought before him. The Sultân pardoned his offence, and granted favours to him. When he was again firmly seated on the masnad of government, he sent a farmân containing much good advice to Muhammad Kháń to the following effect: that God the ruler of the world and all who are in it chooses whomsoever He likes among the created beings; and as the rule of eternal grace draws the line of distinction on the page of the condition of that chosen one, He entrusts the keys of success and greatness in the world into the grasp of his power. The tree of grandeur which is watered by the stream of Divine favour never receives any injury from the whirlwinds of calamity; and the sublime mansion which is raised by eternal grace is not endangered by the engines of deceit and treachery.

Couplet:

One who is made great by Him, the sky cannot make him small;
One who is made dear by Him, the world never can wreck.

The result of these comforting arguments is, that one should be satisfied with the justice and grace of God and should not be proud of his own greatness and strength; for the standards of the greatness of such men are always beaten and cast down. It is right and proper that, that fortunate brother should not place his foot outside the path of obedience, and the highway of submission; and should not dispute the will of the great and one holy God, and should not break any engagement and agreement, for such things are evil. And specially after having obtained forgiveness from those who are his elders, he should make his excuses for what has happened, and should not let the dust of distress reach his heart; for the screen of pardon has covered them up. I am conferring 1 Mouzah Ráijûr in the territory of Tilang on him. He should go there without any delay, and should draw the goods and chattels of life into that corner of safety; and should no longer run after absurd things. When this farmân reached Muhammad Kháń, he trod on the path of

---

1 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have موضع رانجل, Mauza' Ranjal, but I have changed it to Ráijûr.
obedience and submission; and went to Rāijur; and the Sultān returned to the capital.

In the year 1 849 A.H., Khalīf Ḥasan ‘Arab, who bore the title of Malik-ut-tujjār, advanced to capture the fort of Sangesar which is one of the largest fortresses on the sea coast. The people of the country, relying on the strength of the jungle fastnesses and the difficult paths, came forward to give battle. The Malik-ut-tujjār, on entering that country, first of all seized the fort of Rāja who had the name of Sarka by the strength of his brave and heroic arms, and making Sarka prisoner, gave him the choice between death and

---

1 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have i.e., 849 A.H., but this is clearly incorrect. Firishtah has 840 A.H.; and as the war with Naṣr Khān, which arose out of Sultān ‘Allu-ud-din’s love for Zibā Chehra or Peri Chehra, who was brought by Dilāwar Khān as part of the booty obtained in this expedition, and his coldness to his queen Aḡā Zainab or Malka-i-Jahān, took place in 841 A.H., the date mentioned by Firishtah, namely 840 A.H., is clearly correct. The accounts of the expedition against the Rāyas of Kōkān (Conean) as given by Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah are altogether different. First, there is the difference in the date. Then Nizām-ud-dīn says it was led by Khalīf Ḥasan, while according to Firishtah the leader was Dilāwar Khān. It appears however from Firishtah that Khalīf Ḥasan or Malik-ut-tujjār was the leader of another expedition into the Conean in 858 A.H. 1453 A.D., when he was waylaid and slain in circumstances somewhat similar to those mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn. It would appear that the latter has mixed up the two expeditions.

2 The name is Sakar in one MS. Shankar in the other and Sangesar in the lith. ed. Firishtah, lith. ed., has Sangesar, but Col. Briggs has Sonkehar; and he says the situation of the place has not been ascertained. There is a place called Sangameswar in the map attached to Elphinston’s history, not far from the coast, about half way between Jīnjīra and Gheria, which may be the place. There is not much difference between the names in the map and in the lith. eds. of the Tābaqāt and of Firishtah. The latter only requires a to be inserted.

3 Col. Briggs says in a note in page 437 of Vol. II of his translation of Firishtah that “Sirkā or more properly Sirkey (the Sirkey of the excellent Marratta History) is the name of one of the most ancient families of the Konkan. The mother of the present Rāja of Sātāra was of that house.” I have consulted Grant Duff’s History of the Marhattas. Sirkay is mentioned in the index with 129 against it; but I have not been able to find it in that page or elsewhere.
the acceptance of Islām. That deceitful man told him, "You will gain nothing by slaying me, but the difficulties of the road and the great extent of the jungle are known to everybody. If you allow me to live, I shall lead the army, by a road in which not a single thorn will reach the skirts of any horseman." The Malik-ut-tujjār trusting his words made him the pioneer of the army and its guide, and commenced to traverse that country. Although the leaders of the army told him, that it was not proper to place any reliance on the words of an enemy, he did not pay any attention to their words; and the misleading guide took them along a road the sight of which, would have frightened even a demon. They were at last brought to a place on three sides of which there were hills and jungles, and on the fourth side, a deep ravine of water which flowed into the jungle; and at this place Sarka gave intimation to the enemy; and that midnight about forty thousand foot soldiers fell on them; and Khalif Hasan with a body of Musalmāns became martyrs; and the remnant of the army, with great trouble and privation returned to Jālān, which was Khalif Hasan's place of residence.

1 According to Firishtah, Sarka offered to guide the Malik-ut-tujjār against Rāy Sangesar, who was in the neighbourhood of fort Gandhāna, and who was his rival. He also said that after defeating him the Malik-ut-tujjār might make over his territory to Sarka, or to one of the Musalmān amirs. Then he (Sarka) would at once accept Islām, and be a loyal tributary of the Sultan. The Malik-ut-tujjār trusting him commenced the journey in 850 A.H., when most of the Dakini and Abyssinian amirs deserted him. Sarka took him along a broad and easy road for two days and everybody was highly pleased with him; but on the third day he led him along a path which, to quote Firishtah's language, "was so terrible that for fear of it a tiger would become a tigress", (which apparently, according to Firishtah, is a very timid creature) "and which was more tortuous than the ringlets of fair ones, and thinner than the sighs of lovers". The Malik-ut-tujjār became ill at this time of a bloody flux; and consequently there was very little order in the army; and at nightfall the soldiers lay down where they could. Sarka disappeared, and Sangesar on receiving a message from him came with thirty thousand armed soldiers, and Sarka joined him with his own men; and they slew seven thousand or eight thousand soldiers like so many sheep; and then fell on Khalif Hasan and his five hundred Bani Hasan 'Arabs and slaughtered them also.

Col. Briggs calls Rāy Sangesar of Gandhāna, Sankar Rāy of Kehlā.

2 Called Ḏāktā in the thirteenth ed. of Firishtah, where it is described
The Dakini vāzīra, in whose creed enmity to the great was ingrained, reported these matters to Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn in a very

as the خلف حسن بصرى, the residence of Khalf Hasan Basri. Col. Briggs calls the place the town of Chakun, and does not say anything about its being the residence of Khalf Hasan Basri. I have not been able to find Gandhāra or Kehlna or Jālāna or Jākta in the map; but there is a Galna between Dhūlia and Maligong, but that appears to be too far north, and there is a Chacun, a short distance to the north of Puna or Poona.

1 The fate of the Saiyyads and other Musalman foreigners (then commonly called Mughals) is described in greater detail and somewhat differently by Firsihtah. According to him, some of the Mughals said imprudently, at the time of going away to Jākta, that it was the treachery of the Dakini amīr, that caused the defeat and death of the Malik-ut-tujjār, and the Saiyyads; and that as soon as they would arrive at Jākta, they would send petitions to the Sultān stating all the facts. The Dakinis on hearing this, forestalled them, and sent representations to the Sultān, that Khalf Hasan had, in spite of their remonstrances, gone into the jungles under the guidance of Sarka, and thus brought on death and disaster; and that the Saiyyads and Mughals, who had escaped had refused to join them in an expedition against Sarka and the Rāy of Sangesar, but had gone away to Jākta, after speaking ill of the Sultān; and it appeared from their acts that they intended to join the Rāys of Kokan, and create disturbances. They sent these reports to Mashir-ul-mulk (Col. Briggs calls him Sheer-ul-mulk) who was the greatest enemy of Khalf Hasan and he submitted them to the Sultān, and reported the acts of the Mughals in the worst possible light. The Sultān was enraged and without making any enquiry, ordered Mashir-ul-mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk, son of Malik 'Imād-ud-dīn Ghūrī, who were both thirsting for the blood of the Mughals, to go and slay the amīrs who were at Jākta. The Saiyyads and Mughals on hearing this shut themselves up at Jākta, and sent reports stating the true state of things. These reports fell into the hands of Mashir-ul-mulk, and were torn up. The Saiyyads and Mughals then sent other reports by the hands of their old and trusted Hindūstāni servants; but these men treacherously made them over to Mashir-ul-mulk, who tore them up also. The Saiyyads and Mughals, having no other alternative, fortified themselves in Jākta and collected provisions.

Mashir-ul-mulk then summoned the Dakini amīr, who had deserted from Khalf Hasan, and in concert with them besieged Jākta; and for two months slaughter and bloodshed went on. Mashir-ul-mulk sent repeated petitions to the Sultān that the Saiyyads and Mughals were bent on hostility and intended to deliver Jākta up to the Sultān of Gujrat; and the Sultān sent repeated farman directing their total destruction. Then the Saiyyads and Mughals finding that their provisions were becoming exhausted, determined to leave the women and children under a guard in the fort; and to march rapidly to
unfavourable light; and as the latter had made over the reins of (the management of) affairs into the grasp of power of the cazîrs, those

Ahmadâbâd Bidad, and explain the facts to the Sultân. Mashîr-ul-mulk and Nizâm-ul-mulk then decided that if the Saiyyads and Mughâls did this, they would have to pursue them, and a considerable number of them would be slain. They therefore determined on fraud and deceit; and sent a message, that they had reported their helpless condition to the Sultân, and the latter had ordered that there should be no injury to their lives and properties, and they should be allowed to go where they liked. Mashîr-ul-mulk and Nizâm-ul-mulk swore on the Qurân to testify to the truth of their statements. The Saiyyads twelve hundred in number and the other Musalmân foreigners thirteen hundred in number then came out of Jákta with their women and children. As they had no beasts of burden, they encamped in front of the fort. The Dakins abided by their agreement for three days, but on the fourth day they invited the Saiyyads to the fort and all, except Qâsim Beg Sâfâshikan and Qârâ Khân Gurd and Ahmad Ekkatâz in all about three hundred men of rank, accepted it. When they sat down to the feast, armed men attacked them and slew them, and about four thousand Dakins attacked all the males who were outside, even the babes at their mothers’ breasts; and treated the women with all the insult that their lust and barbarity could provoke. Qâsim Beg and the others who were in camp at a distance of two miles then armed themselves and fled towards the capital. Mashîr-ul-mulk and Nizâm-ul-mulk sent two thousand horsemen under Dâûd Khân to pursue them; and they also sent orders to all jâgîrîrâs and raîyyûts to intercept and slay them. Qâsim Beg, however, held on his course, only turning round to attack the pursuers when they pressed too close on them. When they arrived at Bir, Dâûd Khân called upon Hasan Khân the jâgîrîrâr, to help him in intercepting and slaying the rebels. Hasan Khân, however, knew Qâsim Beg, who had once saved his life in battle, and replied that if Qâsim Beg had been a rebel, he would have gone over to Gujrât, which was only three days’ journey from the place where they had been. Dâûd Khân then arrayed his followers for a drawn battle and Qâsim Beg met him. Dâûd Khân was at this time hit by two arrows and was slain, but his men continued to fight vigorously, and Qâsim Beg was in great difficulty. Then Hasan Khân appeared with his men. Qâsim Beg, thinking, that they were coming to reinforce Dâûd Khân’s men, was seriously alarmed at this new danger; but Hasan Khân’s men told his men that they were coming to help them. Then they became more hopeful and defeated the Dakins, who went back to Jákta carrying the corpse of Dâûd Khân with them.

Qâsim Beg and Hasan Khân now sent representations to the Sultân, who sent for Qâsim Beg. When the latter appeared before the Sultân, and explained matters to him, he ordered Mustafa Khân, the head of the political department, who had destroyed the petitions of the Saiyyads and Mughâls to be beheaded,
deceitful men sent Rāja Rustam, who had the title of Nizām-ul-mulk and Sālār Hamza who bore the title of Mashīr-ul-mulk with a blood-thirsty army towards (or to seize, ba-qasād) Jālāna. When Nizām-ul-mulk and Mashīr-ul-mulk arrived in the vicinity of Jālāna, they gave assurances of safety to twelve hundred Saiyyads of true and pure descent, and a thousand other foreigners; and made them expectant and hopeful by strong and well-confirmed oaths; and gave them valuable robes of honour, and sent them to their places of residence. On the following day, they arranged a great entertainment and concealed three thousand men inside the house after putting ornaments on their dresses, and invited the Saiyyads to the feast and showing them all honour and respect made them sit down. They took thirty of them outside on the pretext of giving them their food, and poured the sharbat of martyrdom into the gullet of each one of them. So that twelve hundred Saiyyads, who were distinguished by the purity of their descent were sent to the grade of martyrdom. In no time whatever, since the time of Yezid the impious and the accursed, had such a calamity occurred.

Couplet:

Iron and steel from the same mine come out;
But the one a mirror becomes, and the other a donkey’s shoe.

He also appointed Qāsim Beg in place of Khalīf Hasan, and made him the commander of the army of Daulatābād and Jānīr. The other leaders of the Mughals were also rewarded; and fresh Mughal levies were ordered to be raised. Mashīr-ul-mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk and all their confederates were punished. They were ordered to be brought from Jākta to Ahmadābād Badar on foot with chains and fetters on them. The houses and property of Mashīr-ul-mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk were appropriated to the Sultān’s use; so that their children wandered about homeless and starving. Besides this, Mashīr-ul-mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk were afflicted with leprosy in the course of the year.

1 There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have بقضية حائلة, i.e., to the town of Jānā.

2 The Caliph Yezid who made the attack on Husain at Karbalā. There are some differences in the readings. One MS. substitutes for ملحن مصري, which is in the other MSS. and in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. has_after, but this is omitted in both MSS., and both MSS. substitute for اين نوع مصبي، اين نوع واقعد.
In their old age, both Mashir-ul-mulk and Nizam-ul-mulk became afflicted with leprosy, so that (it may be imagined what would happen to them) in the after life. Oh! holy God, such a father that he cast his own vazir under the foot of an elephant for insulting one Saiyyad; and such a son that he caused the massacre of twelve hundred Saiyyads without any reason whatever.

As the Râys of Kokan (Concan) vaunted of their independence, and did not make their submission, the Sultân nominated Dilâwar Khân to conquer that country, after conferring on him a special robe of honour; and sent farmâns to the amirs on the frontier that they should collect their men and should join Dilâwar Khân. When the latter arrived at the town of Kankûla, he sent Asad Khân and

---

1 Contrary to this Firishtah says that Dilâwar Khân started on the expedition on the Nauroz (Muharram 1st) of 840 A.H. Nizâm-ud-din gives no date, but he mentions it after the death of Khalf Hassan and connected events, which took place according to Firishtah in 858 A.H., though Nizâm-ud-din unfortunately does not give any date; (2) Firishtah says that Dilâwar Khân sent the daughter of the Râja of Sangesar or Sonkehr, who received the name of Zibâ Chehra, and became the cause of Nasir Khân's invasion of Berar, and his subsequent defeat. Nizâm-ud-din says that Dilâwar Khân sent the daughters of two Râys, viz., those of Sangesar and Râhal, but he does not say anything about what happened to them after they arrived in the Sultân's camp; and (3) Nizâm-ud-din says vaguely that the Sultân turned against Dilâwar Khân at the instigation of envious people; but Firishtah says, that the Sultân learnt that Dilâwar Khân had received bribes from the Râjas of Konkan, and had not done his best to reduce their fortresses. Firishtah also says that after Dilâwar Khân had retired, the eunuch Dastâr-ul-mulk was placed in charge of affairs.

2 Kankûla does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. He only mentions according to the litth. ed. the Râys of Râhal and Sangesar. Col. Briggs calls them the Râys of Sonkehr and Raiere. As to Sangesar or Sonkehr see p. 61, note 2.

3 There are differences in the reading. One MS. has the other has the litth. ed. agrees with the reading of the first MS.
Füläd Kháń and Sáfdar Kháń; and they devastated the country, and burnt down houses and other structures. The Rây of Sângesar, who was the chief of the country, owing to great weakness and exhaustion sent an emissary to Dîlawar Kháń and promised to send a large tribute with his daughter; and also engaged that henceforward they would not place their feet outside the path of obedience. Dîlawar Kháń agreed to his prayer, and sent the Rây’s daughter, and the heavy tribute to the capital; and himself advanced to capture the fort of Râhal which was one of the most important forts of that country. On arrival at that neighbourhood Sáfdar Kháń and Füläd Kháń and a body of men commenced to plunder the wealth of the country, and to destroy it. The inhabitants availing themselves of a fit opportunity made a sudden attack and in that action the brother and the son of Dîlawar Kháń became martyrs. Dîlawar Kháń with the help of the great and holy God collected his soldiers and dispersed the assailants; and made many men food for the blood-drinking swords. After repeated battles and much bloodshed, the Rây of that district spread the bed of excuses; and sent his own daughter with a large quantity of tribute to Dîlawar Kháń. The latter pardoned his offences; and returned to the presence of the Sultân; and was distinguished by kindnesses and favours. When the greatness and power of Dîlawar Kháń reached their zenith, the disposition of the Sultân turned against him at the instigation of envious people; and so he withdrew his hand from the Sultân’s service, and retired into a corner of safety.

As the Rây of Bîjânagar got information of this delicate state of affairs, and knew that the Sultân would not march in person, he in the year 847 A.H. plundered certain parganas on the frontier and

---

1 The name looks like رايل, or رایل in the MSS. It is رايل in the lith. ed., Firistahî litt. ed. also has راهل; and I have accordingly retained راهل. Col. Briggs has Râree.

2 There are differences of readings here also. One MS. has صفر خان و فولاد خان و جمعي كه در نسب اموال و عارض ازواج شروع كردنده the other MS. has صفر خان و فولاد خان و جمعي كه در نسب اموال و عارض ازواج شروع كردنده the lith. ed. has صفر خان و فولاد خان و جمعي كه در نسب اموال و عارض ازواج شروع كردنده The readings of the 2nd MS. and the lith. ed. appear to me to be nearly correct, but the word گدن should be omitted, and a گدن inserted before جمعی in the lith. ed.

3 This campaign is mentioned both by Firistahî and by Mr. Sewell. The date given by Nizâm-ud-dîn, 847 A.H., (1443 A.D.) is correct; but the campaign
carried away cattle and other goods and chattles. The Sultān, having received information of this unfortunate occurrence, advanced

took place, while the Malik-ut-tujjār was yet alive, and he took part in it as will be seen later on, so that although the date is correct, the chronological order of Nizām-ud-din’s account is incorrect. Fīrishtāh commences his account by saying that the Rāy of Bijānagar convened a council of chiefs and Brahman, to consider how it was, that in spite of the fact that his country, the Carnātic, was larger in extent, and had more population and revenue than the Bahmani kingdom, the ruler of the latter was always victorious in all campaigns. The Brahman, like the Brahman of Lakshman Sen’s court at once quoted their Sāstras and said that according to these, they were to be subject to the Musalmāns for thirty thousand years. Others said that the Musalmāns had stronger horses and better archers; and the Rāy ordered that Musalmāns should be enlisted in his service, and jāqīrs should be granted to them, and a mosque should be erected in Bijānagar for their use; and no one should interfere with them in the exercise of their religion; and a copy of the Qurān should be placed in front of his throne, so that the Musalmāns might salute it. He also ordered his soldiers to be trained in archery, so that he soon had ten thousand Musalmāns and sixty thousand kāfīr horsemen, who all had knowledge of archery, and three lakhs of infantry. He then crossed the Tungābhadrā, and conquered the fort of Mudkal and sent his sons to besiege Rājore and Bankāpūr; and stationed himself on the bank of the Krishnā; and his soldiers raided as far as Saghir and Bijāpūr. Sultān ‘Allā-ud-din ordered his forces to assemble, and when fifty thousand cavalry and sixty thousand infantry were ready, the Sultān at an auspicious moment marched out with artillery and other munitions of war. Deo Rāy advanced to the fort of Mudkal. The Sultān sent Khalīf Hasan Basri, Malik-ut-tujjār, with the army of Daulatābād against the sons of Deo Rāy; and Khān Zamān with the army of Bijāpūr and Khān A’azam with that of Berār against Deo Rāy himself. Khalīf Hasan advanced to Rājore and fought with the elder son of Deo Rāy, so that he was wounded and had to flee. He then advanced towards Bankāpūr, and he had not yet reached that place, when the younger son of the Rāy fled and joined his father. Then there was a great battle near Mudkal, and both sides suffered heavy losses, the Musalmāns suffering more than the Hindūs. Then a second battle was fought, and the Musalmāns were victorious; and the elder son of the Rāy, who had fled from Mudkal was killed by a spear thrown at him by Khān Zamān. The Hindūs fled panic-struck into the fort of Mudkal, and Fakhīr-ul-mulk Dehlavi and his brother pursuing them closely, entered the fort, were captured, and were taken before Deo Rāy. The Sultān then sent a message to the Rāy, that if these two men were killed, he would slay two lakhs of Hindūs to avenge their deaths. Deo Rāy then sent a message to the Sultān that if he would in future refrain from attacking his country, he would send an annual tribute, and return
towards the country of Bijānagar. He distributed large quantities of arms and many horses (among his soldiers); and advancing rapidly besieged the fort of Mudkal. As all appliances for the capture of the fort were prepared, and the garrison saw death before their eyes, the Rāy of Bijānagar, on account of great misery and wretchedness, sent an emissary and prayed for the pardon of his offences; and entered into an agreement, that he should send tribute every year, and ¹he should at once pay in cash whatever the Sultān should have expended on this expedition. The Sultān then drew the pen of forgiveness across his offences; and returned to his capital; and he (i.e., the Rāy) paid whatever he had agreed to pay, and thus gained safety. The Sultān arranged a great entertainment, in the vicinity of the capital, and conferred distinctions on the omīrs, bestowing on them robes of honour and other favours. He then stayed for some time at the seat of the empire.

²As Sikandar Khān Bukhārī had a great share in the rebellion of Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān; and although after that Sultān

the two prisoners uninjured, and never transgress the rules of obedience. The Sultān agreed to these proposals. Deo Rāy sent the two omīrs and the arrears of tribute of some years, and valuable presents; and the Sultān also sent presents, and then returned to his capital.

This account abridged from Firishtah contains more facts than the vague narrative in the Tabaqāt. Col. Briggs calls Faḵr-ul-mulk Mashīr-ul-mulk. Mr. Sewell also mentions the incident, but he does not give their names, but calls them two chief Muhammadan officers (page 76). He also says that the campaign must have been of short duration, since while it began in 847 A.H. (May 1st, 1443 A.D. to April 19th, 1444 A.D.), according to Firishtah, it was over before December, 1443, when "Abdur Razzāk (who came as ambassador from Persia to Calicut and Vijayanagar) left Vijayanagar". (Page 77.)

¹The words which I have translated “would pay in cash” are in the MSS. جواب گوید and جواب گوید and in the lith. ed. جواب گوید the meaning of which I am told is "to pay cash on the spot".

²Firishtah’s account of the rebellion of Sikandar Khān Bukhārī is as follows. In 857 A.H., the Sultān had an ulcer in his leg, which his physicians could not cure; and he therefore came very rarely out of the palace, and the report of his death was spread about. Upon this Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, son-in-law of Sultān Ahmad Shāh, who had jāgīrs in sarḵār Nalkonda in Tilang, believing that the Sultān was dead, took possession of a large tract of country in his neighbourhood and wanted to make his son Sikandar Khān ruler of that
Alā-ud-dīn had, after his victory, pardoned his offences he was always afraid and had suspicions of the Sultān's anger; and could not be assured in the matter of the latter's favourable disposition towards him. At last some evil-disposed persons informed him in the months of the year 960 A.H., of some words which they told him had been uttered by the Sultān. Sikandar Kḥān now, having no other alternative, resolved upon acting ungratefully; and sent a message to Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, ruler of Malwā, and persuaded him to attempt the conquest of the country of Berār. Sultān Mahmūd then advanced to Berār from Mandū; and Sikandar Kḥān advanced with one thousand

tract of country. The Kḥān Aʿazam had also at that time died, and there was no one of high rank in Tilang; and the amīrs of that province wanted to make Sikandar Kḥān the Sultān there. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, in spite of his illness began to collect troops to march against him. Upon that Jalāl Kḥān held a council and decided that he should hold that country, while Sikandar Kḥān should march to Māhur, and take possession of it, so that the attention of the Sultān should be distracted between the two rebellions. The Sultān sent a qaul-nāma (or agreement) to Sikandar Kḥān; but as he had had a large share in the rebellion of Shāhzāda Muhammad Kḥān, and had committed the present acts of hostility, he could not in any way be assured of his safety, and so he sent a message to Sultān Mahmūd Shāh Khaljī of Mālwa, to the effect that Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn had become ill and was dead, but his amīrs had for their own purposes kept the matter in concealment; and that if he would now march in that direction, Berār and Tilang would without any dispute come into his possession. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī after consulting the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr started in 960 A.H. on his march to Berār, Sikandar Kḥān advanced for a few stages and met him with a thousand horsemen. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn cancelled his expedition to Tilang, and sent Khwāja Mahmūd Gilkānī known as Gāwān against Jalāl Kḥān. He also sent the army of Berār to meet the ruler of Burhānpūr, who had advanced to support Sultān Mahmūd; and sent Qāsim Beg Saf-Shikan with the army of Daulatābād to meet Sultān Mahmūd; and himself, seated in a polkī, followed at a distance of five karōhs. Sultān Mahmūd finding that Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn was alive, and was advancing to meet him returned to his own country. He left an officer under the pretence of assisting Sikandar Kḥān, but with secret instructions to seize him with his treasures, and to bring him to Mandū, if he attempted to escape. Sikandar Kḥān however received information of this, and joined his father at Nālkonda, which Khwāja Gāwān was then besieging. Then both father and son obtained assurance of safety from the Sultān through the Khwāja; and surrendered the fort to the latter. They then came to the Sultān, and again obtained Nālkonda as their jāgīr.
horsemen, for a few stages, and joined him. They then besieged Mâhîr, and when a long time passed, and the siege was protracted, Sultân 'Ala-ud-dîn came with a large army, to help the garrison, and when he arrived in the vicinity of Mâhîr, Sultân Mahmûd marched away at night, and retired towards Mandû. Sultân 'Alâ-ud-dîn honoured the thânadâr of Mâhîr with the title of Fakhr-ul-mulk, and conferred many favours on him, and confirmed him in the government of Mâhîr, and its dependencies, in accordance with previous custom. He made arrangements for the government of that part of his kingdom; and then returned towards the capital. On the way Sikandar came before him with his head hanging down in shame, and with a shroud tied to his shoulder. The Sultân on account of the great benevolence, which was ingrained in his nature, covered his offences with the skirt of pardon, and exalted him with a special robe of honour.

They say, that Sultân 'Alâ-ud-dîn was extremely patient and forbearing; and he read the public prayer himself; and praised

---

1 This and some of the facts mentioned later have no place in Firishtah's account given in the preceding note.

2 These incidents are mentioned by Firishtah also in his appreciation of Sultân 'Alâ-ud-dîn's character and attainments. He says "People say that Sultân 'Alâ-ud-dîn was fluent and eloquent, and knew Persian well; and he had also acquired some knowledge of the sciences. Sometimes on Fridays and the two 'Id, he went to the Juma' mosjid, and ascending the pulpit he read the public prayers, and he praised himself with these titles;" (the titles agree with those in the text, but the name instead of being محمد شاه بن احمد شاه الولی ابی احمد شاه الولی بمبینی و محمد شاه الولی بمبینی ( ubdul din bin umm al-muluk ahmad shah uli bumbini and ahmad shah uli bumbini). Firishtah goes on to say, that one day an 'Arab merchant, who had sold horses for the king's use, the payment for which had been delayed by the officers of the household, being present at the foot of the pulpit, when the Sultân spoke these words, immediately stood up, and said, "By God, thou art neither just nor merciful nor patient nor liberal, but art a tyrant, and a liar, who has slaughtered the Prophet's true and holy descendants, and yet darest to speak these words on the pulpits of the Musalmâns". The Sultân, being much affected wept aloud, and immediately paid the price of the horses; and said "those who have reviled me in this world and the next as being like Yeṣīd will never escape the fire of the wrath of God. He then went to the palace, and never came out of it, till his coffin was borne out. The fact of the Sultân's owing money to the 'Arab, and ordering its immediate payment, introduces an element of bathos,
himself with the following title; viz., the just, the forbearing, the merciful, the benevolent Sultān over the worshippers of God, the great ‘Alā-ud-duniyā-wad-dīn Ahmad Shāh, son of Ahmad Shāh the Wali, son of Muhammad Shāh, Al-Bahmanī. Saiyyad Ajal, to whose great ancestors the position of the honourable naqīb of holy Mashhad had been entrusted, and who was much grieved at the slaughter of the Saiyyads at Jālna, rose on a day on which Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn recited these titles, in praise of himself, and said, "by God thou art a great liar, thou art not just, nor forbearing nor merciful but hast slaughtered the holy and pure descendants of the Prophet and thou darest to speak these words on the pulpits of the Moslems". Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn came out of the masjid; and made no protest of any kind. This story is a clear proof of his forbearance.

1In the year 862 A.H., in accordance with the Divine decree, a severe illness fell on the person of the Sultān. When he became hopeless of surviving, 2 he sent one day for Humāyūn Khān who was the most highly cultured and the eldest of his sons, and said, "Oh pupil of my eye! the time has come when I should, with an open brow, accept the summons of death; but there are some royal pearls which I have received as an inheritance from my great ancestors; and which I have treasured and kept concealed in the oyster-shell of my breast; and their beauty and elegance are such, that wisdom the appraiser of gems, who is possessed of perfection of intelligence, has to confess its ignorance in the matter of their price; and the speech of the word-stringing pen, in spite of its fluency and eloquence, has to acknowledge its impotence in describing their advantages and

into what would otherwise have been a scene of stern rebuke. This is absent from the version of the incident as told by Nizām-ud-dīn.

1 According to Firishtah, Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn had an ulcer on his leg in 857 A.H., and it was of such a serious kind that reports of his death were circulated; and the rebellion of Sikandar Khān took place; and although the Sultān was able to proceed against Sultān Mahmūd of Mālwa, he had to do so seated in a palkī. The malady appears to have gone on, and brought on the Sultān’s death in 862 A.H.

2 Firishtah does not say anything about ‘Alā-ud-dīn’s precepts and advice to Humāyūn Khān. The latter received the title of Zālim or the tyrant, so Nizām-ud-dīn’s description of him as झूठ among ‘Alā-ud-dīn’s sons, does not appear to me to be appropriate.
benefits. My paternal affection, and my great love for my good and
able son compel me that I should make heavy his ear of intelligence
with those pearls of advice, and those gems of precept.
Couplet:
I tell thee with such eloquence as I have;
Thou mayest benefit from my words, or mayest be wroth.

1 Directions and precepts.

Oh well beloved son! as the time has come, when you the light
of my eyes, and of the empire, should sit on the throne of greatness,
it is right that in matters connected with the people, you should not
pass any orders without a valid reason and clear evidence; and
should not grant a farman without deliberation and examination of
the policy, and certainty (about it); for the disadvantage of it
would be greater than the advantage. You should also keep the
affairs of rule and government pure and clean from the stains of the
words or self-interested persons; for those peoples sometimes draw
into the net of punishment, the gems of the good deeds of men, and
show, on the platform of appearance, beneficent acts and virtuous
deeds, in an ugly garb, and a sinister shape. You should always
keep wicked and dishonest men and criminals and disturbers in
subjection and misery; otherwise men would be bold in acting
dishonestly and wickedly; and justice which is the foundation of all
morality, and on which the laws of the Shara' and the rules of
government are based will be lost from amongst men. Further you
should not allow men who try to create disturbances to come near
you; and should hold the words of these men who are destined to
end in adversity to be entirely destitute of credence. You should

1 The reading in the MSS. is الإصطلاح, as I have it in the text. In
the lith. ed. it is نصبت كه سلطان علاء الدين ببشر خود همايون خان كرده آن.
2 One MS. inserts the word the word حكومته, between بيران and حكومته.
3 There are different readings. One MS. has ودبقرتايب وساسي بالفساد را ودبقر علواتما وساسي بعهد را ندهد
the other has ودبقرتايب وساسي بالفساد را ودبقر علواتما وساسي بعهد را ندهد etc., as in the other. The
lith. ed. has ودبقرساسي بالفساد بعهد را ندهد. All three appear to me to
be incorrect; but the first would be correct if وساسي is changed to ساسي.
not also, for a few words or for a suspicion, which may enter your mind, throw an innocent man into the narrow places of danger and the ravine of fear.

You should also in matters of great and small difficulties consult men of intelligence and wisdom; and in the solution of intricate matters and the discovery of difficult things recognise them as just judges and impartial Qāzīs; for wise men have said: He who consults, will never repent, as two opinions are (always) better than one; and also you should always consider justice and equity to be the two wings of greatness, and the two arms of the empire. In all matters you should not miss the path of justice and the high way of equity. You should also try to draw the hearts of your subjects and raiyyats. In demanding revenue from the raiyyats, you should not be harsh; and should not cause pain to the retainers and soldiers by unreasonable demands. You should make every endeavour for the amelioration of the condition of darwishes, and for keeping their hearts in peace and comfort. You should (in fact) so act that when the elemental body, and the limbs, which constitute it, come to extinction; and the physical form and the bodily arrangements pass away, the pages of the volumes of time remain full of descriptions of your good deeds, and praises of your acts.

Couplet:

He who after death leaves a name behind,
Be sure that in life he did great deeds.

Further you should beware (of causing) the lamentations of the oppressed, who have suffered at the hands of tyrants, and of the injured who have suffered privation and hardship; and you should know for a certainty that the 1 real favour of the great and holy God always watches over the condition of the oppressed ones”.

When the amirs and vazirs received information of these directions, 2 Malik Nizām-ul-mulk, who was entrusted with the administra-

---

1 The meaning of the words عطایت عطایت which in one MS. are written as عطایت عطایت is not clear in the context.

2 This is also mentioned by Firishtah, who explains the matter somewhat better than Nizām-ud-din. He says, that as contrary to their representation, Sultān 'Alā-ud-din made Humāyūn Shāh Zālim (tyrant), whose manners were hateful to the people, his heir, Nizām-ul-mulk Daulatābādī, who had just
tion of the kingdom, fled and went to his son, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār and was the governor of Junir and from there both of them went away together to Gujrāt. When on the 21st of Jamādī-ul-āwwal, 862 A.H., Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn took his place from the throne (takht) on the plank (takhla) of the coffin, 2 Saif Khash, Mallū Khān and other amīrs rendered homage to Hasan Khash Shāh-zāda, who was the younger brother of Humāyūn Khash and placed him on the throne, the common people plundered the palace of Humāyūn Khash and set fire to it. Humāyūn Khash determined on flight 3 with 80 horsemen. It so happened that on the way elephant drivers (filbānān) and officers of the bed-chamber and of the private apartment (parādārān) and other retainers (sāyer ahl-i-hash) saw him and hastened to join his service. Hasan Khash sitting on the throne saw Humāyūn Khash enter the palace, and fear overwhelmed him, and he could not sit firmly on that great place, and

before that, been made the vakil-us-saltanat, and who was well known for his intelligence and knowledge of affairs, fled before ‘Alā-ud-dīn’s death, and went to his son, who after the death of Qasim Beg Saf-shikan, had received the title of Malik-ut-tujjār, and was the Subahdār of Daulatabad and Junir, and from there, before even the news of the death of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn had arrived, they went away to Gujrāt.

The above is a translation from the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs does not mention Nizām-ul-mulk or his son by name, but says “Several of the nobles made their escape to Guzerat before the king’s death, to avoid the tyranny of his successor”.

1 Firishtah does not give the date of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn’s death, but the year is 862 A.H. as in the text. Mr. Sewell (page 98) says “‘Alā-ud-dīn died February 13th, A.D. 1458 (?)”. He says in a note “Firishtah says that he reigned 23 years, 9 months and 20 days which gives this date. The Burhān-i-Ma‘āsir fixes his decease at the end of Jamādī-ul-āwwal 862 A.H., which answers to April, 1458 A.D.”. As will be seen a little further down, according to Nizām-ud-dīn, Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn reigned for 23 years and 9 months and 22 days, i.e., 2 days longer than the period mentioned by Firishtah.

2 Firishtah’s account agrees, but he says that the amīrs kept the fact of the death of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn concealed; and Shāh Habīb-ul-lah, son of Khaill-ul-lah (who had come from Kirmān in Persia, on the invitation of Sultān Ahmad Shāh.—See note 1, page 55) and others also joined them.

3 The words are َعِرْضُت مُهَرَّبُت نَمْوَة جُنْكُ كَرُد, i.e., gave battle to the plunderers; and the plunderers being defeated took shelter with Hasan Khān. Humāyūn pursued them and entered the palace.
came down from it. The amirs and vazirs and all the others then kissed the ground of service; and (Humayun Khan) sat on the throne. The first order that he gave was this, that they should tie Saif Khan to the foot of an elephant; and drag him through the whole city. Malik Khan, seeing this (barbarous) punishment fled, and took shelter in a corner.

The period of his (i.e., Sultan Al-ud-din's) reign was twenty-three years, nine months and twenty-two days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTAN HUMAYUN SHAH, SON OF SULTAN 'ALI-UD-DIN.

The amirs and maliks with great unwillingness and reluctance placed their heads of loyalty and their foreheads of fealty on the ground of service. Sultan Humayun Shah although he was well known for great bravery and manliness, and distinguished for eloquence of speech and sweetness of tongue, and bravery, and courage, yet was harsh and malevolent in his temper. He showed great excess in committing sins, and great deficiency in the payment of just dues. He was sound in wisdom and policy, but barbarous and cruel in the punishment of criminals and offenders. Although he was ferocious and wrathful, the sanity of his judgment was such, that every project that he sketched out on the board of his mind, with the pen of thought, resulted according to his anticipation. When he took his place on the throne of empire, he devoted all his energy to the appointment of a perfect and wise vazir; and he laid down, that the ascent up the gradations of rule and the steps of empire is not possible, except with the help and assistance of a vazir, of whose world-adorning wisdom, the structure of the empire and the amelioration of the condition of the raiyyats would be the result; and the increase of the revenue and the administration of the army would be the fruits

---

1 The reading is the same in the MSS. and in the first ed., but the sentence appears to me to be incomplete, as it does not say before whom the amirs kissed the ground, and who sat on the throne.

2 According to Firishtah he ordered that Shah Habib-ul-lah and other should be cast into prison. Malik Khan fought his way to the frontier of the Carnatic. Col. Briggs says that Hasan Khan's eyes were put out, but I cannot find this in the first ed. of Firishtah.
of whose mature deliberations. He entrusted the duties of the vazir to Khwāja Najm-ud-din Qārān Gilānī, who was a wise and understanding man, experienced and God-fearing; and the reins of binding and loosening and the tying and untying of all matters of the government of the country were placed in the grasp of his power; and the title of Malik-ut-tujjār was conferred on him.

And in the spring time of his (i.e., Humāyūn Khān’s) rule, Sikandar Khān Bukhārī, who had formerly rebelled against Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn, and had joined Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī became ashamed and repentant, and forgetting the duties of allegiance, made the field of the government of Humāyūn Shāh dark with the dust of disturbance; and having raised the standard of rebellion, went away to Mālkonda with a large force. Humāyūn Shāh determined to march to Mālkonda, and sent Khān Jahān two stages in advance of himself. Sikandar Khān saw that Khān Jahān was weak, and attacked him with force and violence; and defeated him. On the following

1 This is the name in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is کاریان کیانی, where Najm-ud-dīn is written by mistake as سنجم الدین Sanjam-ud-dīn. Firishtah, however, says that in accordance with the late Sultān’s direction, Sultān Humayūn made Khwāja Mahmūd Gwān, the Malik-ut-tujjār, and the Vakil-ush-shāhī, and the tarafdar of Bijāpur. M. Hidayat Hosain has مسعود after قاریان in the text.

2 Nizām-ud-dīn does not explain the reason of Sikandar Khān’s new rebellion. It appears from Firishtah that Sikandar Khān, who was a companion of Sultān Humayūn, when the latter was yet shahzāda, fully expected to be made sipah-sūlār of Tilang, but when he found that Malik Shāh, who was a descendant of one of the great men among the Mughals, and according to some a descendant of the Sultāns of the family of Chengiz Khān was made Khwāja Jahān and tarafdar of Tilang; and a nephew of ‘Imād-ul-mulk Ghurī was made a commander of a thousand horse, and received jāğırs in Tilang; he was disappointed, and left the court, without asking for permission, and went to his father at Nālkonda; and the latter had no alternative, but to collect men to support his son.

3 The name is Mālkonda or Balkonda in the MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah calls it بند ignorance, Nalkanda, and Col. Briggs has Nowligeonda.

4 According to Firishtah, he was the governor of Barār, and had come to offer congratulations to the Sultān on his accession.

5 The account of the expedition, and the battle as given by Firishtah is different from and more elaborate than that given by Nizām-ud-dīn. According to him Sikandar Khān met Khān Jahān and defeated him. Then Humayūn
day, when the standards of the dawn rose over the eastern horizon, Humāyūn Shāh arrayed his army, and advanced to the field of battle and slaughter. After the two armies had met, and the flame of battle had flared up, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the standards of Humāyūn Shāh, and the enemy fled into the desert of dishonour; and a number of them were crushed under the feet of the elephant of death. Sikandar Khān also fell down from the seat of his saddle on the bed of the ground. Jalāl Khān Bukhārī fled from the battle-field and shut himself up in the fort of Mālkonda. When the Sultān arrived in the neighbourhood of that place, he obtained a safe conduct, and carried his life away to safety from the danger-zone of the (Sultān’s) wrath. The Sultān returned to his capital.

In the year 863 a.h., when the tyranny of Humāyūn Shāh became patent to all, the Rāys of Tilang placed their feet outside the circle of allegiance, and shortened their arms in the payment of the stipulated tribute. Humāyūn Shāh conferred the title of Shāh marched in person and encamped in front of Nalkonda. He waited for Jalāl Khān and Sikandar Khān to come and render him homage, when Sikandar Khān made a night attack on the Sultān’s camp and did some damage. The next morning the Sultān advanced to seize the fort; but Sikandar Khān advanced with seven thousand or eight thousand horsemen and met him. Humāyūn Shāh sent him a message, that it would not be right for him to fight with his benefactor; and offered him any pargana he might choose in Daula-tābād as his jāgir, if he would only make his submission. Sikandar Khān replied that if Humāyūn Shāh was Ahmad Shāh’s son’s son, he was his daughter’s son; if the Sultān would give him the country of Tilang well and good; otherwise he should be ready for battle. Then Humāyūn Shāh became angry, and prepared for battle; and Sikandar Khān did the same. Sikandar Khān fought bravely, and the battle continued all day, when Malik-ut-tujjar Gāwān and Khwaja Jahān Turk attacked Sikandar Khān from the right and left wing; and Humāyūn Shāh attacked him in the centre. Sikandar Khān like an infuriated tiger attacked Humāyūn Shāh, and routed his companions. As the elephant on which Humāyūn Shāh was riding was killing many warriors Sikandar Khān attacked it with his spear, when the elephant caught him by the trunk and threw him on the ground; and his own followers who were riding close behind him trampled on him and killed him. Humāyūn Shāh then sent men in pursuit of the routed enemy. Nalkonda was then besieged; and Jalāl Khān surrendered it with much treasure. His life was spared, but he was kept in imprisonment.
Khwaja Jahān on Malik Shāh, a Turkī slave, and sent him to the country of Tīlāng, and Nizām-ul-mulk Ghiyārī was sent with him; and the Sultān himself followed with twenty thousand horsemen and forty elephants. Khwaja Jahān besieged the fort of Deorkonda. The garrison prayed for help from the Rāy of Orissa, agreeing to pay him a large sum of money for it. The Rāy sent a grand army with one hundred elephants. Nizām-ul-mulk Ghiyārī said “We should go away from the foot of the fort, and station ourselves in the open field, before the Rāy of Orissa arrives”. Khwaja Jahān who had no experience, considered the opinion of Nizām-ul-mulk unreasonable, and remained where he was. The next day, when the light-giving sun rose over the eastern horizon, the Rāy of Orissa and the garrison attacked Khwaja Jahān from the two sides; and he was defeated. He fled eighty karōks and joined Humāyūn Shāh. He represented to the latter that the defeat was due to Nizām-ul-mulk’s

---

1 As we have seen, Khwaja Jahān had already been employed in the war against Sīkandar Khān. Firishtah's description of him has already been given in note 2, page 77. Firishtah says that Humāyūn Shāh attacked Deorkonda, because the Talangi zamindārs who held it had been on friendly terms with Sīkandar Khān. He sent the two officers named to attack it, and himself went to Warangal. (Warangal, however, appears to be a long way beyond Deorkonda.) The garrison made several sallies, but were defeated each time; and when they were in considerable distress, they prayed for help from the Rāy of Orissa. He sent a large body of men and also some elephants of war and sent an announcement of his own approach. Then Nizām-ul-mulk Ghiyārī and Khwaja Jahān had a conference. Nizām-ul-mulk gave the advice which is mentioned in the text. Khwaja Jahān said that if they moved away the Talingas would pursue them, and they should therefore prepare for battle where they were. Nizām-ul-mulk Ghiyārī had to remain silent. Then the battle took place, and both Nizām-ul-mulk Ghiyārī and Khān Jahān fled to Humāyūn Shāh at Warangal. Khān Jahān falsely ascribed the defeat to Nizām-ul-mulk; and Humāyūn Shāh, without any inquiry, ordered him to be put to death; and his relations and adherents went and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī. Khān Jahān was imprisoned in a fort. Humāyūn Shāh was intending to send another army to Deorkonda, when news came from Ahmadābād that Yūsuf Turk had taken Hasan Khān and Shāh Habīb-ul-lah towards the city of Bīr.

There is a curious resemblance between the language of Firishtah in some of the above sentences to that of Nizām-ud-dīn; and it appears to me that he copied from the latter; though of course in other places his accounts are more logical and accurate.
action; and Humayun Shâh's disposition turned against Nizâm-ul-mulk, and he spoke unbecoming words to the latter; who fled and joined Sultan Mahmûd Khaljî. Humayun Shâh also cast Khwaja Jahân from favour, and made him over to a jailor. And according to another statement, Nizâm-ul-mulk Ghûrî was put to death with great contumely; and his associates and tribesmen went and joined Sultan Mahmûd Khaljî.

In the year 864 A.H., Humayun Shâh again determined on the conquest of Tilang. On the way seven of the special associates of Amîrzâda ¹ Mühibb-ud-dîn Habîb-ul-lah, who on account of some

---

¹ There appears to be some confusion in the names. We know Shâh Habib-ul-lah and Shâh Mühibb-ul-lah, but not Amîrzâda Mühibb-ud-dîn. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has Shâh Habib-ul-lah. There is not much difference between Nizâm-ud-dîn's account and that of Firishtah, as to the way in which the release of Shâh Habib-ul-lah and Shâhkhâda Hasan Khan was effected. But the seven adherents of Shâh Habib-ul-lah, who are called his مريدان or disciples. Malik Yusuf Turk is called Yusuf Turk Kachâl. Then again the Drîbar Shâhî by Firishtah, and the seraglio by Col. Briggs. It appears also from Firishtah's account, that the original intention of the conspirators was to effect the release of Shâh Habib-ul-lah alone; and they released Hasan Khan and Yehayâ Khan and Jalâl Khan Bukhârî, because they begged them to do so. Firishtah also says (contrary to Nizâm-ud-dîn's account) that it was after these men had been released, that the seven thousand other prisoners were set free.

There is, up to this again, a curious similarity between the languages of Nizâm-ud-dîn, and Firishtah; and the latter, as the later author, appears to me to have copied from the former.

The subsequent movements of Hasan Khan and Shâh Habib-ul-lah, some of which are not mentioned by Nizâm-ud-dîn, are thus described by Firishtah. After leaving the city, they remained for six or seven days in the garden of Kamthânâ, which was three karâhs from Ahmadabâd Bidar. Then with three thousand horsemen and five thousand foot-soldiers they attempted to seize the citadel of Ahmadabâd Bidar, but finding this to be difficult they went towards the town of Bîr, and took possession of the country around. Yüsuf Turk was made Amîr-ul-umâr and Shâh Habib-ul-lah vazîr; and they commenced to collect troops.

Humayun Shâh now returned to Ahmadabâd Bidar, and he put the three thousand soldiers, whom he had left to guard the city, to death with much torture; and he put the kâtûlî in an iron cage and had one of his limbs cut off
heavenly catastrophe had become dispersed like the constellation of the Bear again became united like the Pleiades; and as in the time of prosperity, they had been partakers of his wealth, they spoke among themselves, that as that moon of the sky of bravery was in eclipse, what use was there in life. It was right that they should think out a plan for his release. They went to Malik Yûsuf Turk, who among the slaves of Sultân ‘Alâ-ud-din was well known for his honesty and piety and famous for his good deeds and his devotion to God, and the cup of whose hopes had always been filled with the wine of the benefaction of the Amirzâda; and lifted the veil from the face of their plan. That worthy man joined with them, and made some of the guards his confederates; and having waited for a proper opportunity, went with twelve horsemen and fifty foot-soldiers to the gate of the citadel. When the time of the afternoon prayer passed, he dismounted from his horse, and after performing the prescribed devotions, prayed to the great and holy God for success and help. About the time of sunset they went close to the gate. Most of the guards had gone away on their various businesses, and the few who remained stretched out their hands to forbid and stop them. Malik Yûsuf Turk acted with courtesy and gentleness; and showed them a farmân with a red seal, as is the custom with all farmâns in the Dakin, which he had prepared beforehand and had taken with him; and so they passed through the first gate. When they arrived at the second (i.e., the inner) gate, the guards met them with hostility and resistance, and although the forged farmân was shown to them, every day. He was compelled to eat it, and he was taken round the city till he died. After that Humâyûn Shâh sent eight thousand horsemen and an enormous number of infantry against his brother Hasan Khân. A battle took place outside the town of Bîr, in which through the exertions of Shâh Ḥabîb-ul-lah, Hasan Khân was victorious. Then Humâyûn Shâh sent more troops. His natural ferocity now blazed up, and he sent the army, which had accompanied him to Tîlâng, to Bîr, keeping the wives and children of the officers as hostages, so that they might not join Hasan Khân. Another battle was fought; and Hasan Khân was defeated, and he went away with six or seven hundred soldiers to Bîjâpîr. There Sirâj Khân Junâid ùtreacherously seized them. Shâh Ḥabîb-ul-lah suffered martyrdom, while resisting his capture; but Prince Hasan Khân and the others were sent prisoners to Aḥmadâbâd Bîdar.
they did not accept it, and said that there should be a parwāna (an order or permit) from the kotwāl. Malik Yūsuf immediately cut off the head of the chief guard with his sword, and entered the citadel. There was great tumult, and in the first instance they went to the big prison and broke down the gate. About seven thousand prisoners including Saiyids and learned and wise men and men of the middle class who were confined in that prison considered it a great boon; and each one went to his own nook and corner.

They then went from that place, and releasing Amīrzāda Habībul-lah, and the sons of the Sultāns, and Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, each one went away in a separate direction. The kotwāl (Police Superintendent) of the city seized Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, who was eighty years of age, and Yaḥya Khān, a son of Sultān ‘Alā’-ud-dīn, and put them to death with great torment and torture. Hasan Khān and Amīrzāda Habībul-lah went to the house of a barber, who had been in the service of the latter, and had their heads shaved off, in the manner of qalandars (faqīrs, mendicants). The Amīrzāda wished to retire into an obscure corner and cover his feet under the skirts of contentment; but as Hasan Khān said that the people of the city and the soldiers were on his side, on account of the tyranny and injustice of Humāyūn Shāh, and it was certain that when the falcon of his greatness should spread the wings of fortune he would be able to seize Humāyūn Shāh like a bird whose wings should have been cut, and a wild animal whose legs should have been broken, without trouble and difficulty. As the Amīrzāda always fashioned (lit. sewed) a kulāh (high cap) of this felt (i.e., had such an ambition himself), he cancelled his original intention; and making strong terms of engagement with Hasan Khān, they both went out of the city. Soldiers came to them in large numbers. Humāyūn Shāh on hearing this put his sword into friend and stranger. When he arrived in the city of Bīdar, he perpetrated such acts of cruelty, that 1 Ḥajjāj became (in comparison with him) Naushirwān, the just. His body has perished, but his bad name and the memory of his tyranny have continued in the world. One of his victims made this quatrain about it.

---

1 A cruel tyrant of Arabia.
Quatrain:
Ah tyrant! fear the sighs of the heart of sleepless men,
And fear thy bad deeds and thy evil-inciting spirit.
Look at the eyelashes, steeped in blood, of thy victim!
Fear that dagger sharp, that drips with blood!

When the news of the return of Humāyūn Shāh reached Shāh-
zāda Ḩasan Khān and Amīrzāda Ḥabīb-ul-lah, ² they found them-
selves to be without the power of withstanding him; and turned
their faces towards Bijāpūr. Sirāj Khān, who afterwards received
the title of Muʿzzam Khān behaved towards them with courtesy and
flattery; and presented much tribute; and after taking oaths took
them into the citadel. He then collected a force in the course of the
night, and attacked them. The common people became dispersed.
Ḥasan Khān and Mīr Ḥabīb-ul-lah and the seven friends, who
had brought them out of prison, were besieged in a kiosk, in which
they had been accommodated. Ḩasan Khān after receiving a safe
conduct went to the besiegers; but Amīrzāda Ḥabīb-ul-lah, in agree-
ment with his friends, said “We are all prepared for death; and the
birds of our spirit will not lower their heads into the nest of your safe
conduct.” They fought and exerted themselves to the extent of
their means, and their strength; and reached the end and object
of their hope (i.e., they heroically met their death).

³Humāyūn Shāh when he saw Ḩasan Khān, threw him in his

¹This quatrain is quoted with some variations by Firishtah also. He
says that it was written by the poet Maulāna Naẓīrī, who had, according to him,
got the title of Malik-ush-shʿarā or the king of poets, apparently in imitation of the
Malik-ut-tujjār. In the version printed in the lith. ed. of Firishtah the
second line is موطمان بین and the third line is موطمان بین.
²I think the third line as quoted by Niṣām-ud-dīn is better.
³But see note 1, page 80, from which it will appear that, according
to Firishtah, they fought two battles with Humāyūn Shāh’s army, near Bīr and
were victorious in the first. Niṣām-ud-dīn omits all mention of what happened
near Bīr.

Firishtah mentions the atrocities which were perpetrated by Humāyūn
Shāh on the companions of Ḩasan Khān, who were sent to Ahmadābād Bidar
by Sirāj Khān. It appears from Firishtah that Shāh Ḥabīb-ul-lah alone
attained to martyrdom; and the others including Yūsuf Turk, and down to
own presence before a tiger. 1 Saiyid Tahir, the poet has said the following chronogram on the date of the death of Amirzada Habib-ul-lah.

Quatrain:
In the month of Sha'bân, in India, to martyrdom attained,
Habib-ul-lah Ghâzi, may his tomb be sanctified!
The mind of Tahir, sought the date of his death;
He found it in rûh-i-pâk-i-Na'mat-ul-lah!

(the holy spirit of Na'mat-ul-lah).

Saiyid Na'mat-ul-lah was Shâh Habib-ul-lah's great ancestor. They say that Siraj Khan was afflicted with leprosy in the course of a short time.

Then, in short, in the year 865 A.H., when the tyranny of Humâyûn Shâh reached to such a pitch, that he stretched out his hands to wives and children of other men; and he became the slave of his lust. Sometimes he ordered that a bride should be seized on the road; and should be brought into his seraglio, and he after satisfying his lust, sent the woman to the house of her husband; and sometimes he put the members of the harem to death without any cause. The amirs became suspicious of him to such a degree, that whenever they went to make their salâms (homage) to him, they first of all gave directions to their sons, before placing their feet on the road.

(At last) 2 Shihab Khan who was the guardian of the seraglio even the menials such as farâshes, water-carriers and sweepers were sent to Ahmadshâd Bidar; where they were put to death with cruel tortures; and their wives and children, and others in any way connected with Hasan Khan were also put to death with unheard-of and unnameable cruelties.

1 Firishtah calls him Saiyid Tahir Astarabadi, and he also quotes the chronograms.

2 Firishtah has two versions of the circumstances of Humâyûn Shâh's death. One is that he became ill, and that when he had no hope of his surviving the illness, he made his eldest son, Nişâm Khan, his heir; and he released Khwâjah Jahân Turk from prison, and sent for the Malik-ut-tujjar from Tilang; and appointed the former to be vakil-usâh-shâhâ, and the latter to be the wazir; and he directed his son always to act under the guidance of his mother. The other version is somewhat like that given by Nişâm-ud-din; but it is said that Humâyûn Shâh had been ill, and was murdered after his recovery. The guardian of the harem is called Shihab Khan eunuch in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
associated some Habshis with him, and on the night of the 1st 27th Dhīqa'dah of the aforementioned year, one of the female Habshi slaves struck Humāyūn Shāh, when he was resting in the seraglio, on the head with a piece of wood and made him like those who had been dead a thousand years ago.

Couplet:

In this turquoise palace with calamities filled,
For evil, evil ever is the recompense sure.

The poet Nażīrī, who was the friend and companion of Amīrzāda Ḥabīb-ul-lah, and who had been delivered from captivity by the kind exertions of Malik Yūsuf Turk, wrote this verse on the date of the death of Humāyūn Shāh.

2 Verses;

Humāyūn Shāh is dead, the day has pleasant become;
God is great; oh happy and auspicious death!
The earth is full of flavour new. The date of the death,
Bring out e'en from Dhaq-i-jahān.

The word Dhaq-i-jahān (flavour of the world) becomes the date of his death.

The period of his reign was 3 three years and six months and five days.

It is also said that Humāyūn Shāh was killed when he was sleeping after drinking some intoxicating liquor. Col. Briggs gives the second version somewhat briefly, and does not give the name of the eunuch.

1 Firishtah has 28th Dhīqa'dah, 865. Col. Briggs gives September 3rd, 1461, as the corresponding date of the Christian era. Mr. Sewell also gives the 28th Dhīqa'dah, of course from Firishtah; but he has the 5th September, 1461 A.D., as the corresponding English date.

2 This verse has also been quoted by Firishtah, who, however, substitutes و روز خوش شد و رست عالم, i.e., the world has been saved, for تازه و فوامش at the end of the first line; and for تازه و فوامش.

3 Firishtah has three years six months and six days, as according to him the death took place on the 28th and not on the 27th Dhīqa'dah. See note 1, above.
THE SULTĀNS OF THE DAKIN

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF NĪZĀM SHĀH, SON OF HUMĀYŪN SHĀH.

When Nīzām Shāh in his eighth year sat in his father’s place, the establishment of the rules of government and the strengthening of the acts of administration were entrusted in the hands of 1 Makhḍūma-i-Jahān; and that 2 veiled one behind the curtain of chastity directed all her energies in furnishing the bed of equity and justice; and shortened the hand of the tyrant from the skirt of his victim. But as owing to the great oppression of Humāyūn Shāh, the hearts of men were wounded and lacerated, the work of government could not be regulated and organized.

At this time, the 3 Rāy of Orissa, having received information of

1 The widow of Humāyūn Shāh and the mother of Nīzām Shāh, whom Firisṭah describes as a عائلة or a wise woman.

2 Firisṭah describes how, every morning, the two ministers Khwājah Jahān and Malik-ut-tujjār Gāwān went to the palace and through the intervention of a woman of the name of Māh Bānū, they had a conference with the queen-mother; and then they took the young Sultān and placed him on the turquoise throne, and carried out the administration on the lines which had been determined upon in consultation with the queen-mother.

3 Firisṭah says, the Rāy of the ملك أوريسا ولاوريا in concert with zamindārs of Tīlang came to conquer the country of the Dakin, by way of Rājahmandri; and they laid waste all the country as far as Kullās. I cannot say exactly what the word after أوريا, which looks like أوريا Auriyā or Uriyā is, and whether the Rāy of Orissa and Auriyā represent one Rāy or two Rāys. Firisṭah has the two words all through his account, but Col. Briggs does not mention Auriyā, Firisṭah’s account agrees with Nīzām-ud-dīn’s as to the main incident, namely the attack of Shāh Muḥīb-ul-lah on the vanguard of the Orissa army. But before coming to that he says that, Nīzām Shāh’s advisers proceeded with great calmness to collect troops, and they got together forty thousand horsemen and marched to the camp of the Rāy of Orissa and Auriyā, taking the young Sultān with them. The Rāy intended to take possession of the territories, and then after extorting tribute to return to his own kingdom. But Nīzām Shāh’s ministers sent word to him that they intended to invade and conquer Jānjagar and Orissa and Auriyā; but that as he had now invaded the Dakin, matters had become easy for them; and unless he paid tribute, and restored whatever his men had seized, not one of the latter would be allowed to return in safety. Immediately after this Shāh Muḥīb-ul-lah, who had come to carry on a jehāp (religious war), fell on the vanguard of the Orissa army. The action is
the state of things, came forward with a large body of cavalry and infantry to plunder and ravage Bīdar; and by successive marches came within thirty korōhs of the city. The amūrs, in spite of the fact that they were unprepared, marched out for the campaign, taking the eight-year old Nizām Shāh with them. When the distance (between the two) was only eight korōhs, Amīrzāda Muḥībb-ul-lah with only one hundred and sixty brave and well-armed men separated himself from the army of Nizām Shāh, and advancing forward fell upon the vanguard of the Rāy of Orissa, which consisted of ten thousand infantry and four hundred horsemen. From morning till the time of midday they fought with courage and bravery, till in the end, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the standard of the Ghāzīs; and the vanguard of the Orissa army fled and joined the main army. The Rāy of Orissa marched away at night, and returned to his dominion. The amūrs carried out the customary thanksgiving to God, and returned at the stirrups of Nizām Shāh.

They had not yet settled down at Bīdar when Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī at the 1 instigation of Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī invaded the

---

1 This is mentioned by Firishtah, but not by Col. Briggs. Firishtah also says that Sultān Maḥmūd advanced with twenty-eight thousand horsemen and the Rāy of Orissa and Aurīyā and the Rāys of Talingāna advanced at the same time. Nizām Shāh's ministers sent the Talingāna army against the Rāy of
Deccan, and began to advance by successive marches. The amirs, taking Nizām Shāh with them, advanced to meet the army of Mandū. When there was a distance of three farsukhs (between the two armies) Nizām Shāh nominated ten thousand horsemen to the right wing and placed them in charge of Khwājah Maḥmūd Gilāni, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār. The left wing was made over to Malik Nizām-ul-mulk; and he himself took up his stand in the centre with eleven thousand horsemen; and one hundred elephants. The superintendence of the centre of the army was made over to Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk. Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī divided his twenty-eight thousand horsemen into three detachments, and advanced to the field of battle and bloodshed. After the two armies had met, Malik-ut-tujjār advancing rapidly fell upon the left wing of the Khaljī army. Mahābat Khān, the governor of Chandīrī, and Zahir-ul-mulk, the vazīr, who commanded the left wing of that army were killed on the battle-field; and a great defeat fell on the army of Mandū; so that Malik-ut-tujjār pursued it for two korōhs, and plundered the Khaljī camp.

Orissa and Aurīyā and the Rāys of Talingāna; and themselves advanced with the armies of Bijāpūr, Danlatābād and Berār, at the stirrups of Nizām Shāh against Sultān Maḥmūd. The two armies met at the neighbourhood of the fort of Qandahār. Firishtah mentions the attack by the Malik-ut-tujjār, whom, however, he calls Maḥmūd Gāwān, on the left wing of the Mandū army; and says that although Mahābat Khān and Zahir-ul-mulk fought bravely, they were at last compelled to retire and were killed. He also mentions the attack of the left wing of the Dakini army under Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, on the right wing of the Mandū army which was led by Shāhzāda Ghīyās-ud-dīn. This is not mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn. They fought bravely, but the Shāhzāda was wounded and was thrown from his horse, and was about to be killed when he was rescued. This wing of the Mandū army was thus defeated and was pursued by the Dakini army; and the camp was looted, and fifty elephants were seized. Sultān Maḥmūd seeing both wings of his army routed, determined on retiring to Mandū but one of the amirs dissuaded him. At this time Nizām Shāh wanted bravely to attack the centre of the Mālwa army. Khwājah Jahān stopped him, but after a time he advanced with ten thousand horsemen to attack the centre of Sultān Maḥmūd’s army, which consisted of twelve thousand horsemen. At this time Sultān Maḥmūd hit the forehead of an elephant, which Sikandar Khān a Turki slave of Khwājah Jahān was riding. The elephant became furious, and trampled on many men belonging to the Dakini army; and it was likely
At this time, when the men were engaged in plundering, Sultan Mahmūd appeared before Nizām Shāh's army with twelve thousand horsemen. Khwājah Jahān Turk, who was the leader of the centre of the army, turned round, and seizing the bridle of the Sultan's horse turned towards Bidar; and in spite of the fact that Malik-ut-tujjār had been victorious over the Mālwa army, the army of Nizām Shāh was defeated; and the men who were engaged in plundering were slain at the spot where they were. Malkah-i-Jahān being apprised of the treachery and deceit of Khwājah Jahān, entrusted the defence of the fort of Bidar to Mallū Khān, and took Nizām Shāh with her to Firūzābād. Sultan Mahmūd pursued the army of the Deccan as

that Nizām Shāh himself should receive some injury. Then Sikandar Khān, either through foolishness or through some enmity which he had against Khwājah Jahān, did not exhort the army to fight, but carried away Nizām Shāh, whether he liked it or not, placing him behind himself on the same elephant and they stood a short distance behind the army. The amirs not seeing the standard of the Sultan in its place turned round one after another, and taking Nizām Shāh, who was standing in a corner, with them went back to the capital.

The above is Firishtah's version of the engagement in the lith. ed. It will be seen that the account of the latter part of the battle, and of the way in which Nizām Shāh was taken away from the field, differs materially from that given by Nizām-ud-dīn.

1 According to Firishtah there was no doubt at least at that time about the good faith or behaviour of Khwājah Jahān. The only question was about the conduct of Sikandar Khān. Firishtah says that the queen-mother at first praised him for having brought her son out of danger; but when he went to see Khwājah Jahān, the latter ordered him to be imprisoned, for having brought Nizām Shāh away at such an inopportune moment. The other Turkī slaves however went to the queen-mother, and defended the conduct of Sikandar Khān. She sympathised with them, but expressed her inability to do anything just then. Khwājah Jahān hearing of this, sent Sikandar Khān to her, and he was ordered to be set at liberty.

Firishtah, however, goes on to say that the queen-mother had suspicions of the treachery and deceit of Khwājah Jahān, and knew the defeat was due to his want of firmness and courage; and therefore with the advice of Malik-ut-tujjār Mahmūd Gāwān (or Gilānī), she placed the defence of the citadel of Ahmadābād Bidar in charge of Mallū Khān. Firishtah goes on to say that Sultan Mahmūd of Mālwa took the fort of Bidar after a siege of seventeen days, and took possession of the greater part of Berār and Daulatābād; so that people thought that the power of the Bahmanis should pass to the Khaljis, when the news of the approach of the Gujrāt army came.
far as the gate of Bidar, and having devastated the country outside the fort, occupied himself with providing the necessary apparatus for its capture.

Niẓām Shāh had, at the time of starting on the campaign, written a letter in the language of sincerity, giving an account of what was happening to Sultān Maḥmūd of Gujrat. Now when he was recovering at Firūzābād; and the men who had fled had assembled again, he sent Khwājah Jahān with a large army to fight with Sultān Maḥmūd (Khaljī). About this time information came that Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī had arrived at the frontiers of the Deccan, with eighty thousand horsemen. Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, finding that he had not the strength to withstand him, started on the seventeenth day for Mandū, by way of Gōndwāra. Khwājah Jahān

---

1 The actual words are در خرداد ایاد نفس درست کرد. Firishtah whose language at this part of the narrative resembles that of Niẓām-ud-dīn has نفس راست کرد.

2 The name is in one MS., Gondwane, in the other, and Gondwar, in the lith. ed. Firishtah has Gondwane, but Col. Briggs has Gondwana. Firishtah’s account agrees with Niẓām-ud-dīn’s, almost verbatim, up to the mention of the arrival of Sultān Maḥmūd of Gujrat. After that he goes on to say that Makhdūma-i-Jahān sent Malik-ut-tujjar Maḥmūd Gāwān with five or six thousand horsemen by way of Bīr, to meet the Sultān of Gujrat. The latter sent twenty thousand horsemen, with many of his great amira to co-operate with Malik-ut-tujjar. More soldiers joined him, and then Malik-ut-tujjar advanced with forty thousand Dakinī and Gujratī horsemen towards Ahmadābād Bīdar, Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī who was engaged in the siege of the citadel, and was fighting daily with Mallū Khān, now started for Mandū in great distress. Malik-ut-tujjar sent ten thousand horsemen to Bār to stop the road; and himself with ten thousand Dakinī, and twenty thousand Gujratī horsemen, advanced to a point between Qandahār and Bīr, where the encampment of the Mālwa army was located, and prevented the importation of grain and other provisions into the camp Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī had thirty thousand horsemen ready for battle, but Malik-ut-tujjar did not meet him, and went on carrying out his own plans, till there were signs of a famine in the Mālwa camp. Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī then blinded (کور گردید, Col. Briggs has: killed) the elephants he had with him, and set fire to all his heavy baggage. He then started well-armed and in light marching order having washed his hands of his life (i.e., almost despairing of arriving safely at Mandū). He told the headman of Gōndwāra, who has with him, to take him along a good road. The
returned after pursuing him for three or four stages. At the time of his return, as the road through Göndwāra was uneven, the Gōnds harassed him at every stage, and some thousand of men and animals perished on account of scarcity of water. It is stated that at the first stage (of the journey) about six thousand men died for want of water; and the price of one kāsu (cup) of water was cheap at two tankas. In truth as the act of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī was in reality outside of rectitude and justice, the result of such unrighteous conduct could not be anything but misfortune and wretchedness.

Couplet:

Plant such a branch that it bear fortunate fruit;
Sow such seed, that a harvest thou mayst reap.

When he got out of the desert, he ordered the 1 Rājās of Göndwāra, who had performed meritorious services and were innocent, to be put to death.

2 In the year 867 A.H., Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī again advanced, with ninety thousand horsemen, to attempt the conquest of the

headman who wanted to have his revenge (it does not appear for what injury) said that there was no broad road in that part of the country along which the army might march; but there was a road along a waterless desert. The Sultān said, it was better to escape along that road than to be killed by the Dakinis and marched forward. They suffered great privation from heat and scarcity of water, and also from robbers and thieves. When they at last got out of the desert, the Sultān knowing that the crowd of robbers and the concealment of wells, had all been brought about at the instigation of the headman ordered him to be put to death. The Gōnd said he had had his revenge and he was not afraid of death, because he had sons living; and he expected to be born again, from which Firishtah infers that the Gōnds, like other Hindū kāfīrs believed in the transmigration of souls.

1 But see the later part of the preceding note for Firishtah’s version of the behaviour of the Gōnd chief or headman.

2 Firishtah’s account of this second invasion does not differ materially from that in the text. In fact Firishtah says that he was indebted for an account of this invasion to Nişām-ud-dīn Ahmad; but he apparently adds one or two touches of his own, for instance he says that on arrival in the neighbourhood of Daulatbād, Sultān Maḥmūd made some display of his grandeur (کر و فر نمود); that Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī sent a well-equipped army without delay or hesitation towards Sultānpūr; and also that the two Sultāns, i.e., those of Gujrat and the Dakin, who were bright as the sun, and beautiful as Joseph, bade adieu to
Deccan. Niẓām Shāh also advanced after making preparations for war; and asked for help from Sultan Mahmūd of Gujrat. When Sultan Mahmūd Khajī arrived on the frontier of Daulatabad, his scouts brought the news, that Sultan Mahmūd of Gujrat was approaching. The army of Mandū then left the road (to Bidar); and marched away towards Malkonda; and returned to Mandū by way of Gondwāra. 1 Niẓām Shāh sent a letter to Mahmūd Shāh (Gujratī) containing his thanks, and praised him for his help; and Sultan Mahmūd, turning back from the way, went to Ahmadabad in Gujrat. 2

3 In the month of Dhīqādah of the same year Niẓām Shāh became ill, and on account of that illness, he passed away to the vicinity of the great God.

Couplet:
Into the dust, was thrown that flower of state, which the garden of empire
With a hundred thousand caresses, in its bosom, had nourished.

The period of his reign was 4 two years.

each other from a distance, and sent gifts and presents for each other, and then went back to their respective capitals.

1 According to Firishtah, Niẓām Shāh sent besides the letter, many wonderful presents and many elephants and horses in charge of some trusted servants, and made many excuses for the trouble which he had given him.

2 The readings in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. are incorrect. One MS. has سلطان محمود از راه برگشت بپلدا احمد اباد رفت  and the other MS. has the same reading, but leaves out the name محمود. The lith. ed. omits the initial ی and also the name محمود. The first reading is correct, but I have inserted the word علمگرایی Niẓām Shāh after Ahmadabad to make the meaning quite clear.

3 Firishtah also does not say what Niẓām Shāh died of; but he says that the queen-mother arranged great festivities for the marriage of Niẓām Shāh, when suddenly at midnight, when the marriage ceremony was taking place sounds of wailing and lamentation were heard, and it was known that Niẓām Shāh was dead.

4 The period of his reign is given as one year and eleven days in one MS, and one year and eleven months and one day in the other; while the lith. ed. has two years. Firishtah says that Niẓām Shāh died on the night of the 13th Dhīqādah, 867 A.H., 29th July, 1463 A.D., and he reigned for two years and one month.
An account of the reign of Muhammad Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh.

When Muhammad Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, sat on the masnad of sovereignty, in his 2nd year, he in spite of his youth exerted himself in performing the duties of equity and justice. During the period of his rule, all the people had repose in the cradle of peace and safety.

Couplet:
To a tribe to whom God prosperity grants,
He gives a sovereign just and wise and good.

In all matters of government he had the custom of holding conferences with men of wealth. When physical greatness was combined with mental greatness, he gave himself the title of Muhammad Shāh Lashkari; and he entrusted the arrangement of all affairs and the execution of all business to his own wise opinion and his penetrating intellect. He considered that to be the best and wisest, which the inspiration of his own greatness imprinted on the page of his mind; and carried it into execution. Consequently the government of the kingdom and the greatness of the paraphernalia of power, in the period of his rule, reached to such a pitch that nothing higher than it could even be conceived. He enlisted a thousand Turkī slaves among his servants, and advanced the grandees of that tribe to high ranks and great positions. Among these he granted

---

1 This is the heading in the lith. ed. The MSS. leave out the word سلطنت. Firishtah has a rather grandiloquent heading, viz., ذكر شامي شمس الدنيا والدين ابن المؤرخ الغزلي محمد شاه باهنري لشكری, i.e., an account of the reign of Shams-ud-dunyā-wad-dīn (the sun of the world and of religion) Abul Muẓaffar Al Ghāzi Muhammad Shāh Bahmani Lashkari. The date of his accession appears to have been the 13th Dhl-qadāh, 867 A.H., July 30th, 1463 A.D.

2 Firishtah says he was the second of the three sons of Humāyūn Shāh by Makhdūma-i-Jahān. The three were Niẓām Shāh, Muhammad Shāh and Ahmad Shāh. He also says that Muhammad Shāh succeeded his brother in his ninth year.

3 The grant of these fiefs is not mentioned by Firishtah, nor does he say, like Niẓām-ud-dīn, that the government was carried on by the nine or ten years
Kāwil to 'Imād-ul-mulk and Junūr to Niẓām-ul-mulk and Māhūr to Khudāwand Khān, in jāgīr.

1 Unlike former Sultāns in the matter of the capture of forts, and the conquest of towns, he did not consider it sufficient merely to have a show of obedience and submission, and the sending of gifts and presents; but he devoted all his attention to measures by which strong forts might come into his possession. In fact the farmāns of the rule of the Bahmanī dynasty ended with his great name; and all disturbances and rebellions which had found their way into the kingdom during the reigns of Sultān Humāyūn Shāh and Niẓām Shāh were remedied by the grandeur of the personality of Muḥammad Shāh; and all weaknesses and troubles which had crept into the affairs of the kingdom and empire were cured by his attention. After the regulation of the affairs of the empire, he commenced to gratify the hearts of the pillars of the state. He had Khwājah Jahān, who in the invasion of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī had determined to undermine the foundation of the greatness of this dynasty, and had besides stretched out his hands for taking and misappropriating the government money, executed in front of the palace.

old Sultān. On the other hand, he says that Khwājah Jahān Turk had all the power in his hands. He dispossessed all the ancient amīrs of their fīds; and made them over to new men, who were his own creatures. He even stretched his hands into, and embezzeled the government funds. He kept Malik-ut-taṣārī Muhammad Gāwān constantly employed on the frontier; and did not allow him to have any share in the great affairs of state. It was the queen-mother, who impressed the dishonesty and disloyalty of Khwājah Jahān on the Sultān’s mind; and arranged for getting rid of him. It appears, moreover, that according to Fīrishtāb, Muḥammad Shāh could not even give the order for the execution of Khwājah Jahān, when everything had been previously arranged, without being specially reminded by his mother, through two old women.

1 The meaning and logical sequence of these sentences is not very clear.

2 There is some difference in the readings. I have retained in the

lieh. ed. but the MSS. have instead of بقولة or صلاح بوفر شکوک وجود محمد شاہ بقولة or صلاح پدیدہ فت

simply بقولة or صلاح پدیدہ فت

3 See the latter part of note 2, above.
The Sultan of the Dakin

1 He appointed Malik Nizām-ul-mulk the governor of Jūnīr to conquer the fort of Kehrla which now belonged to the rulers of Mandū, after giving him a special robe of honour. Malik Nizām-ul-mulk arranged his army, and then with a large body of men traversed the various stages, and encamped on the bank of the river which flows at the foot of the fort. 2 The Mandū army sallied out of the fort, and commenced the battle; but afterwards again fled into the fort. Nizām-ul-mulk’s soldiers pursued them to the gate of the fort. The garrison finding the grandeur and great strength of Nizām-ul-mulk’s army prayed for safe conduct. Nizām-ul-mulk granted it, and when they were brought out of the fort he gave pān

1 According to Firishtah this expedition did not take place till the year 872 A.H., 1467 A.D., i.e., nearly four years after Muhammad Shāh’s accession; and in the meantime, Malik-ut-tujjār Muḥammad Gāwān was made Khwājah Jahnān and amīr-ul-umrā and vakil-ul-saltānat; and when Muḥammad Shāh was fourteen years of age the queen-mother arranged for his marriage, which was celebrated with great grandeur and eclat. After this the queen-mother retired from active participation in the affairs of the state; and devoted herself to devotional duties. But even now Muḥammad Shāh did not put his hand to any important affair, till he had consulted her; and went every morning to offer his respects to her.

2 He was made the ḥāfez commander of the army of Berār; but Col. Briggs makes him the governor of that territory.

3 Firishtah’s account is different. According to him Nizām-ul-mulk defeated the army, which had come from Mandū, to aid the garrison on the last occasion, when twelve thousand Afghāns and Rājputs fought a great battle with the Dakinis in front of the fort; but were signally defeated when the garrison which had sallied out to join in the fight attempted to re-enter the fort, Nizām-ul-mulk and a small number of his soldiers pursued them, and got into the fort, and seized it. According to another version, the garrison being disheartened surrendered the fort; and were allowed to leave it in safety. At this time, some of the Dakinis abused and taunted the Mālwa soldiers. Two Rājputs who were in the garrison determined to show their courage. After the fort had been evacuated, they went near to the crowd that surrounded Nizām-ul-mulk, and said that they had never seen a great man like him; and they wanted to show their respect by kissing his feet. Nizām-ul-mulk seeing that they had no arms, allowed them to approach him, when they snatched a dagger and a sword with great activity; and each of them inflicted a wound, and slew Nizām-ul-mulk. They attacked and slew others also, and fought till they were both slain.
(betel) to each one of them with his own hand. When this was going on, a man after taking the pān, struck Niẓām-ul-mulk with his dagger, and made him a martyr. 1 Ādil Khān and Daryā Khān, who were his two accomplished sons, slew the governor of the fort and the entire garrison; and placing a man in whom they had every trust, in the fort, and taking the dead body of their father with them, went to render homage to Muḥammad Shāh. After they had had

---

1 Firishtah calls them Yūsuf Ādil Khān Sawal, who became the ancestor of the Ādil Shāhī Sultāns, and Daryā Khān Turk; and says that they were his adopted brothers, and not sons; and also says, that they believed that the Rājpūts had killed Niẓām-ul-mulk at the instigation of the commandant of the fort; and sent men in pursuit of the garrison, who had encamped one korāk from the fort, and were altogether unprepared; and every one of them, young and old, was killed.

Firishtah goes on to say that the Sultān of Mālwa sent a man of the name of Sharf-ul-mulk, with valuable presents, to represent that Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī and Sultān Hūshang had entered into an agreement, that Berār should appertain to the Bahmani kingdom, and Kehrīa and its dependencies to Mālwa, so that there might be no further disputes. Now the amirs of the Dakīn had seized on Kehrīa. If the matter be so arranged that there might be no breach of the previous agreement, there would be friendship and brotherliness between the two kingdoms. Sultān Muḥammad sent Shāh Shaiḵ Ahmad the Šadr, with Sharf-ul-mulk to Mandū; and pointed out that the Bahmani Sultān were not in need of any fort like Kehrīa, as there were many such forts in the Carnātic, which were in the possession of the kāfirs, and which they could easily conquer. Besides, the first breach of the agreement was not committed by them but by Sultān Maḥmūd himself, who had invaded the Bahmani-kingdom, when the late Sultān was a boy, and there was dissension among his principal officers. When Shāh Shaiḵ Ahmad arrived near Mandū, he was met by the principal officers of the Mandū government, who took him with all respect and honour to the Sultān. When he delivered his message the learned men of Mandū, who were present, and the Sultān himself admitted, that the first breach had been committed by Sultān Maḥmūd himself. An agreement was then concluded and attested by the learned men and the representatives of the two Sultāns, that neither party should henceforward interfere with the other’s territory, and the relations between them should be the same as had been agreed upon in the time of Sultān Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī; and that Kehrīa should be restored to Mālwa; and that for future expansion of their kingdoms, there were the territories of the kāfirs, which the contracting parties might with divine aid conquer by the sword of jehād. These transactions have not been mentioned by Niẓām-ud-dīn.
the good fortune of rendering service the rank and fiefs of their father were confirmed to them.

1 After some days, he conferred a robe of honour and a jewelled belt to the Malik-ut-tujjār; and sent him with some other amīrs to conquer the territory of the Rāy of Sonkar (Śangēsar) and Kokan. When the Malik-ut-tujjār arrived in the town of 2 Kohāpūr, As’ad Khān advanced with his own men from Jūnīr and Kishwar Khān from Gulbargah and Dābāl, and joined him. He started from that place, in concert with them, and when they arrived at the head of the 3 defile of Kaikanīa, they came to a great forest, where on account of the dense growth of the trees, it appeared to be difficult even for ants and snakes to pass through. Malik-ut-tujjār’s army cleared every day, a distance of one farsakh in breadth, and one bow shot in length. When they arrived in the vicinity of (the foot of) Kaikanīa, the height and strength of which were such that the arrow of the plan of no conqueror of forts could reach to the 4 ambition of its conquest, they encamped there. There was a great fight, and the enemy (مُمَدَّدُ) 5, i.e., the refractory people fled and

---

1 According to Firishtah this expedition was sent in the beginning of 874 A.H., 1469 A.D., for the punishment according to the lith. ed. of Firishtah 674 A.H., 1469 A.D., for the punishment according to the lith. ed. of Firishtah of Paya Sāhīb and Kītāb and to conquer other forts in the Kokan (Conkan). Col. Briggs says that the expedition was “against the Shunkur Ray of Kehīna and other refractory rajas in the Concan”. As to Sankar or Sangesar see note 2, p. 61.

2 Firishtah, lith. ed., has the jargana and not the town of Kohāpūr and Col. Briggs the district of Kohāpūr. The name of As’ad Khān is doubtful. It is so in the lith. ed.; but one MS. calls him Īstād Khān and the other omits the name altogether. Firishtah has Sa’īd Khān Gīlānī, but Col. Briggs has Assad Khān. According to Firishtah after Malik-ut-tujjār had taken possession of the ghāt or pass, seeing that the cavalry would not be of any use in that country, he sent back the troops whom he had brought from the capital; and took with him only Sa’īd Khān Gīlānī, who was of his own tribe, with the army of Jūnīr, and Khush Qadam Khān his own slave, with the army of Dābul and Kalhar.

3 I cannot find any mention of the defile of Kaikanīa in Firishtah. It may be identical with the defile mentioned there.

4 The actual words are گھاٹ کوشن which means “the ambition of its conquest” as I have translated it.
entered the fort. The army was delayed at the foot of the fort for a period of five months. As the rainy season came on, the amīrs after consulting among themselves, returned to Kolāpūr and on their arrival there, they cast the shadow of their good fortune on the capture of the fort of 2 Rangta, and seized it in a short time.

When the rainy season was over, the amīrs again directed their attention to the punishment of the Rāy of Sonkar, and when they arrived at the fort of Māchāl, they attacked it, and conquered it at the first onset, and many of the rebels were slain, and some of their leaders were seized. When the overwhelming strength and power of the Malik-ut-tujjār became known, the Rāy of Sonkar sent a body of intelligent men to him, and prayed that he would pardon his offences, and he would surrender the fort of Kaikanīa to him. The Malik-ut-tujjār pardoned his offences; and having placed the fort in charge of some trusted adherents, and made a

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have fifty days. The other MS. and Firishtah have 5, five months.

2 The name of the fort is Ramgūr in one MS. and Ṭrangānī in the other. In the lith. ed. it is Ṭrangānī. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has Ṭrangānī, and Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 484) has Ramgūr.

3 The fort is called Māchāl, Māchāl, in one MS., and probably Māchil in the other; and Māchāl, Māhāl, in the lith. ed. It does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah.

4 Firishtah's account is rather vague. He says در ابن كرت ٍتذبیر و حبلة بسیر و ٍیاکش درم و ٍینفار بیشمار قلمه ٍکبینه ٍک در هبی ٍروزگار ٍکند خسروای رفیع مقدار بکگروذا تخییریا ٍنیکندا بود مسفر ساخت which may be translated as, "This time with many plans and stratagems and the scattering of many dirams and dinārs, the fort of Khina, to the turrets to the capture of which, the lasso of the mighty emperors had not reached, in any (former) age, was taken." Col. Brigg's (vol. II, page 484) translation is less literal, but he also mentions the stratagems and gifts of money.

5 Firishtah says that after the capture of the fort Malik-ut-tujjār again left the ghāli and the fort in charge of men accustomed to the climate; and stayed for four months, as in the previous year (apparently at Kolāpūr), and then again invaded the territory of the Rāy, and took possession of it without difficulty; and having taken revenge from the sardars for the outrage committed by them on Khalf Hasan Baṣrī, the former Malik-ut-tujjār, he started towards the island of Goa.
pecuniary allowance from the revenue of the country, which might be sufficient for the subsistence of the Rāy, he without any hesitation or delay advanced towards the island of 1 Goa, which is a famous port of Bijānagar. He sent by water 120 2 ships filled with 3 war-like men and in a short time the island came into his possession. When he returned (crowned with victory), and (loaded with) plunder, to the capital, his services were considered to be meritorious, and were acceptable to the Sultān; and the reigns of binding and loosen- ing were placed in his hands of power, and the title of A‘zam Humāyūn Khwājah Jahān was conferred on him.

As the armies of Muḥammad Shāh 4 Lashkari were successful wherever they went; and it had been repeatedly heard that in the kingdom of 5 Jai Singh Rāy, proprietor of the fort of Birākar, a mine

1 Written as گو in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, the name is printed as گو. Mr. Sewell (see page 99 of his book) says that “In the middle of the year 1469, when Rājashekhar or Virūpāksha I was the king of Vijayanagar, Mahmūd Gauān, Muhammad’s minister marched towards the west, and after a fairly successful campaign attacked Goa, then in the possession of the Rāya of Vijayanagar, both by sea and land. He was completely victorious and captured the place.”

2 The reading in one MS. is یکصد و بیست جہاز 120 ships, and in the other یکصد و چہار کشتی 124 boats. The lith. ed. has یکصد و چہار کشتی 104 boats. Firishtah has the same reading as the first MS., and I have accepted it. Firishtah also says that he himself marched by land with his victorious troops and that he returned to Ahmādābād Bīdar after the conquest of the Concan and Goa after an absence of three years. The title conferred on Malik-ut-tujjār as described by Firishtah was much longer than that given by Niγān-ud-dīn. At the same time the Malik-ut-tujjār’s slave Khush Qadam had the title of Kishwar Khān conferred on him; and the forts of Goa and Banna (Briggs has Poonda) and Kondwāl and Kolāpūr were added to his former fief.

3 There is a difference in the readings here. The MSS. have مشهور از مردم جنگی نیز راہی سخت which appears to be correct; but the word نیز راہی is rather indistinct. The lith. ed. has نیز راہی instead of نیز راہی.

4 Lashkari was one of the titles of Muḥammad Shāh; and is appended to his name in the heading of the chapter about his reign, in Firishtah. See note 1, page 93.

5 The name is doubtful. It is written as جبسته راہی والی قلعہ براکر جبسته in the MSS., and جبسته راہی in the lith. ed. Firishtah also gives him this name, but Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 489) calls him Ray Beejy Sing.
of diamonds had been found; 'Ādil Khān was sent with a body of amirs, after a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt had been conferred on him. 'Ādil Khān in consultation with the other amirs besieged the fort; and active and enterprising warriors advanced the batteries day after day, and made repeated assaults. In the end Jay Singh Rāy having no more strength left asked for an assurance of safety. 'Ādil Khān having drawn the pen of forgiveness across the page of his action, brought him out of the fort, and placing it in charge of his trusted adherents returned to the capital. Muḥammad Shāh Lashkārī conferred that territory on him as his fief.  2 After

I cannot find any mention of the diamond mine in Firishtah; but he says that Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān received many honours and distinctions from Muḥammad Shāh; and was made the commander of the army of Daulatābād, and was appointed to conquer the fort of Wairākhāra (Col. Briggs has Wyragur, and says in a note, probably Woshagur, lying between Antoor and Ajunta), which appears to me to be identical with Birākar; and the recovery of the fort of Antūr, which had in the course of the troubles with Mālwa (the lith. ed. has Malikīn) but probably the last word is a mistake for come into the possession of a Marhatta. When Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān arrived at Daulatābād he nominated Qāsim Beg Šafshikān to besiege Antūr; and sent Daryā Khān, whom he had given the name of brother to Wairakharā. The Hindū who held Antūr surrendered it without any contest; but the Rāja of Wairākhāra whose name was Jainak Rāy, after fighting for five or six months, and finding himself unable to contend any longer, sent a message to Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān offering to surrender the fort with all he had in it, if he was allowed to go out with his family in safety. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān agreed and sent an order accordingly to Daryā Khān, who allowed Jainak Rāy to leave the fort in safety. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān then came there post haste, and took possession of the fort, and all the treasures in it, and conciliated the chief men of the country with assurances of his protection. He then marched to the fort of Lānhī (Col. Briggs, vol. II, page 489, has Ranjuy and says in a note, probably Ranjungam, the chief town of the district of the same name); and the rānīāda of the place also surrendered it. This is, however, not mentioned by Niẓām-ud-dīn.

1 There is a difference in the readings. The MSS. have این ولابت را بافت قوچاکک؛ but the lith. ed. has این ولابت را که بافت قوچاکک مقرر کرد؛ and the meaning is not at all clear, and the readings are doubtful. It is not clear to whom and why Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahān spoke. The
a time Malik-ut-tujjâr Khwâjah Jahân said that Birkâna Rây had placed his foot outside the path of allegiance, and having collected a very large army had advanced to the port of Goa. The Sultan advanced (against him), and besieged the fort of Birkâna. This fort was so strong that the idea of taking it had never entered the mind of any conqueror of forts. It was built from its foundation to its turrets with chiselled stone, and the breadth of each slab was three yards and its length was one yard, and the height of its wall was

readings in the MSS. are بعد از مدخت ملك التاجر خواجه جهان گفت که رأیه برتکنها قدم از جاءه اطاعت بیرون نهاده لشکر عظم بههم رسانیده متعه بنددر گروه شد و قلعه... بعد از مدخت ملك التاجر خواجه جهان گفت که رأیه برتکنها قدم از جاءه اطاعت بیرون نهاده لشکر عظم بههم رسانیده متعه بنددر گروه شد سلطان متعه شده قلعه برتکنها رأ مدعنة کرد.

I do not think that either of the readings is strictly correct. I have adopted a reading which appears to me to be the best after comparing those in the MSS., and the reading in the lith. ed. Firishthâh’s version is that in 877 a.h., 1472 A.D., برتکنها رأ قلعه للکزوال بتحرک حماری فراماه بیچگانگ عازم تسخیر جزیده کروه گردید.

Col. Briggs says “In the year 877 a.h. Birkana Ray (he says in a note ‘the Oriental Scholar will recognize in this penult the language of the southern part of the peninsula’; but not knowing the Dravidian languages, I cannot find out the meaning of this), Raja of the fortress of Belgam, at the instigation of the Ray of Beejanuggur marched to retake the island of Goa.” As regards Belgam, Col. Briggs says that it is now occupied by British troops, and is deemed one of the strongest on the plains in that part of the country. The name of the Ray as given by Nişâm-ud-dîn has some resemblance to that in Firishthâh; but Nişâm-ud-dîn does not give the name of the fort; though in one place he gives it, the same name as that of the Ray. Mr. Sewell, on page 100 of “A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar,” gives another translation of the part of Firishthâh relating to this matter. In it the Ray is called Parkna, and the fortress Bâlgson, which is nearer the Persian than the name in the translation by Col. Briggs. Mr. Sewell goes on to say that “the Burhan-i-Maśir calls the chief of Belgam “Parkatapatâh,” and Major King, the translator of the work, gives a large variety of the spellings of the name; viz.: “Birkanah,” “Parkatbatâh,” “Parkatiyâh,” “Parkitâh,” “Barkabth” (Ind. Ant., Nov. 1899, page 286, note). Briggs gives it as Birkana. It has been supposed that the real name was “Vikrama”. Mr. Sewell does not say from whom and on what authority the supposition emanated. It appears to me that the real name may be Pratâp, or some derivative from that word.
thirty yards, and the breadth of the moat forty yards. In short, Birkâna Rây bravely waited in the fort with three thousand horsemen for battle and bloodshed. Muḥammad Shâh Lashkâri built a second wall around the fort, in order to shut up all ingress and egress; and distributed the batteries (amongst his amîrs). The batteries were advanced every day, till after filling up the moat with rubbish and grass, they were taken close to the wall; and the victory became a matter of to-day or to-morrow. Birkâna now, owing to his great exhaustion and weakness sent a vakîl; and agreed to render allegiance, and pay tribute. Muḥammad Shâh having drawn the pen of pardon across his offences, gave him assurances of safety, and brought him out of the fort. He entrusted that part of the country to Khwâjah Jahân, and returned (to the capital).

In the year 880 a.h., news came that the Rây of Orissa had marched into the Deccan from his own country, with an enormous

1 Firishtah’s account differs from that in the text, inasmuch as he says that the Rây at once offered his submission, but Muḥammad Shâh refused to accept it, and carried on the siege with great vigour. The moat was filled up, and mines were blown up, and the fort was taken. There are different accounts of how the Rây appeared before the Sultân just before the fort was taken; and asked for quarter; and the Sultân “pardoned his offences”, and enlisted him in the band of his amîrs. According to Firishtah, it was after he had taken this fort, that Muhammad Shâh gave himself the title of “Lashkhari”.

2 Nirâm-ud-dîn altogether omits to mention the great famine, which depopulated the Bahlânî kingdom during the next two years. Firishtah says, that on his return journey after taking Belgium, the Sultân wanted to pass the rainy season in Bîjâpûr; but there was, during that year, want of rain in the Dakîn, and all the wells in Bîjâpûr were dried up; so the king was compelled to move to Aḥmadâbâd Bîdar. The next year also there was no rain, and town and city and village all became depopulated, and men died; and those who survived took shelter in Mîlwa and Gujrat and Jânjagar. For two years no seed was sown in Tîlang and Mîlwa and Marhat and the whole of the Bahlânî kingdom; and in the third year, when “The breezes of Divine favour blew, and there was rain, there was none left who might engage in the work of cultivation.” In his translation Col. Briggs leaves out the name of Mîlwa in the last sentence, apparently to avoid a seeming contradiction with the preceding sentence. He explains Marhatt by the word “Maharashtra,” in a note.

3 Firishtah’s account is different. He says that when the Dakîn was recovering from famine and pestilence, news came that the garrison of (Kundîr, in the lith. ed.; Condapilly in Briggs; and Kondapalle in Sewell)
force; and had plundered and devastated portions of it; and had gone back to his own country. Muḥammad Shāh sent Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk with a large army to chastise and punish the Rāy, but after some days intelligence arrived, that Niẓām-ul-mulk had

had slain the ruler, who was a vicious tyrant, and who violated the honour and the property of his subjects; and made the fort over to Hamrā (Hamrā Orfā in the lith. ed.; Bheem Raj Oorea, according to Col. Briggs), who had been a protegé of Muḥammad Shāh. Hamrā sent men to the Rāy of Orissa and incited him to invade the Dakin, and told him that there were no troops in that country on account of the famine, which had lasted for two years, and he would be easily able to conquer Tilang; and if he made it over to Hamrā, the latter would surrender the fort of Kandınr and its dependencies to him. The Rāy of Orissa was deceived, and with one thousand horsemen and six or seven thousand infantry, and taking the Rāja of Jāṅnagar with him, invaded Tilang. Niẓām-ul-mulk Basrī, the governor of Rājamandri, being unable to meet him, shut himself up in the fort; and sent a representation of the facts to the Sultān. The latter paid a year’s wages to the soldiers, and started immediately. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the enemy, the latter did not think it advisable to fight; and Hamrā shut himself up in the fort of Kandınr. The Rāy of Orissa crossed the Rājamandri river (i.e., the Godāvari), and encamped on the bank of the river on the side of his own territory. The Sultān arrived near the river, and Niẓām-ul-mulk joined him. He could not, however, at once cross the river, and when he had got the boats, etc., the Rāy marched away and went back to his capital. The Sultān, however, was highly incensed at his conduct, and left Shāhzāda Mahmūd Khān and the Khwājāh Jahān there; and himself advanced with twenty thousand horse to punish that bāfir. Towards the end of 882 A.H., he arrived at the capital of Orissa and plundered and ravaged the country. The Rāy had left the central part of his territory unprotected, and had fled to the extreme end of it; so the Sultān stayed in the capital for six months, and obtained much treasure and wealth both by peaceful means and by violence. He then wanted to summon the Shāhzāda and the Khwājāh, and to make the country over to them. The Rāy hearing this sent presents and elephants to him; and said that he would not again help the zamindārs of Tilang. The Sultān demanded twenty-five other elephants, which had belonged to the Rāy’s father, and were very valuable. The Rāy had to comply; and the Sultān then returned towards his own kingdom. On the way he besieged a fort belonging to the Rāy, because the people of the neighbourhood told him, that no one had ever before dared to attack it; but he raised the siege on the Rāy having apologized for the rudeness of those ignorant and boorish people. Then he besieged Kandınr for five or six months when Hamrā in great distress surrendered it to him.
fled from him, and had gone towards Zirbād. The spirit of the Sultan being now excited he marched out of the city, and advanced by successive marches in the direction of Rājmāndri; and when he arrived near it, he left Khwājah Jahān in attendance on the Shāhzāda; and advanced himself with twenty thousand selected horsemen and marching rapidly went to Rājmāndri. When he arrived near it, he found a wide expanse of water, the breadth of which was about one farsakh, before him. Muḥammad Shāh was compelled to draw rein there. The Rāy of Orissa had encamped on the opposite bank of the river with seven lakhs of infantry and a number of elephants. When he found that Muḥammad Shāh Lashkarī had arrived there in person, he left Rāy Mān, who was one of his principal chiefs, in the fort of Rājmāndri, and fled. The following day the Sultan nominated Daryā Khān to pursue the Rāy of Orissa; and himself encamped around the fort of Rājmāndri. He built a second wall round the fort to stop the entrances and exits of the fort; and having distributed the batteries amongst his commanders, planned the erection of covered ways. After four months, when the covered ways had been completed, and the soldiers were able to overlook the garrison, Rāy Mān seeing his own death with the eye of certainty, asked for protection, in great humility and distress, and surrendered the fort, and sent an elephant, which he had in the fort, as tribute; and enlisted himself among the servants (of Muḥammad Shāh). The latter confirmed him in the possession of the fort and its neighbourhood, and returned to his capital. He raised the men who had performed great deeds in the expedition to high ranks and noble positions. It is however mentioned in the Tabaqāt Bahāduri, that the fort of Rājmāndri was not conquered; but the Rāy of Orissa paid tribute, and turned Muḥammad Shāh Lashkarī off from all thought of him.

And the intoxication and madness of warfare had not passed from the head of the Sultan, when news was brought that the men

---

1 The name of the place is Zirbād in one MS., and Zirbad in the other and in the lith. ed.

2 This agrees with Firishtah. See note 24, pp. 151 and 152. The wide expanse of water is apparently the Godāvari.
of Orissa had come back, and had overrun some villages and parganas; and had taken the fort of 1 Bakir by fraud and deceit. Muhammad Shâh started from the vicinity of his capital, at the moment which was chosen by the astrologers, and by repeated marches proceeded to the country of Tilang. He besieged the fort of 2 Kandâr, when the thânadâr of the place after much distress and lamentation sought the Sultân’s protection, and 3 surrendered the fort. The Sultân started from there to view the sea and proceeded to the 4 ports of Narsingh Rây; and after amusing himself with a sight of the sea, he took tribute from Narsingh Rây and started for the capital. He ordered the erection in those parts of a high and strong fort, in the course of one month, for the thânadârs. At the time of his return, in the year 879 A.H., the vazîrs told him, that there was a city on the border of Tilang, which was celebrated as 5 Kanji, and which was full of gold and gems, and was one of the

---

1 The name of the fort appears to be Bakîr in the MSS. In the lith. ed., it is Gîr. In the text-edition the name of the fort is not mentioned.

2 The name is Kandar in one MS., and Kand in the other. Kandah in the lith. ed., and Kandâr in the text-edition.

3 There are some variations in the readings. I have adopted the reading which appeared to me to be the best.

4 Firishhta does not refer indefinitely to the ports of Narsingh Rây; but mentions one of them, Machhillpatan, which he says belonged to the kingdom of Narsingh Rây and which he says Muhammad Shâh conquered. As for Narsingh Rây, or Nara Simha, as he, taking the Sanskrit form of the name calls him, Mr. Sewell (p. 102) says that he "Owing to his numerous army and the extent of his dominions was the greatest and most powerful of all the rulers of Talingana and Vijayanagar" and "Had established himself in the midst of the country of Kanara and Talingana, and taken possession of most of the districts of the coasts and interior of Vijayanagar". Mr. Sewell’s account appears to have been taken from the Burhân-i-Ma’âthir.

5 This city is known in Sanskrit books as Kâncâlī or Kânchipuram, and is now known as Conjeevaram. Firishtha’s account of the way in which the existence of Kânjî came to the notice of the Sultân was that, when he arrived at Kondpârpallâ, some people of that place reported to him, that there was a temple, at a distance of ten days’ journey from there, which was called Kânjî, and the doors and walls and roofs of which were adorned with gold and jewelled ornaments, and decorated with rubies and other fine gems, and not one of the Musalmân kings had up to that time set eyes on it, and had not even heard
great places of worship of the Hindūs; and it was ten days’ journey from 1 Nilwāra. Muḥammad Lashkārī selected one thousand men and started for Kanjī by forced marches. When he arrived there, there were only forty horsemen in attendance on him. The soldiers galloped into the city, and plundered and ravaged it. The Sultan stayed there for ten days; and then returned to the capital.

In the year 886 a.H., 2 some interested persons, in Golkonda, said that the coming of the Rāy of Orissa into the Sultan’s dominion

its name. Sultan Muhammad detached six thousand horsemen adorned with daggers, and started on a rapid march to the place; and ordered Shāhzāda Mahmūd Khān to remain there; and it appears from the concurrent testimony of all the historians, that the Sultan rode so fast that not more than forty horsemen could remain with him.

1 The name is نیلواڑ, Nilwaṛa, in both MSS. and نیکویړه تیکویرا, Tikwaṛa, in the lith. ed. As will be seen from the preceding note, Kanjī was, according to Firishtah, ten days’ journey from Kondpūrūlī, which Col. Briggs calls Condapilly. Firishtah’s account of what happened at Kanjī is somewhat different. According to him there was some hand to hand encounters between the Sultan and the members of his guard, and some Hindūs of gigantic stature, who were the guardians of the temple. These went on till the Hindūs were compelled to retire into the temple; and when the rest of the Sultan’s escort arrived, the Sultan entered the temple, and looted it, and slew the men who were inside it. Mr. Sewell quoting from Firishtah says (p. 101) that “the Sultan went to Kondapalle (which he says in a note, Scott, I, p. 166, calls Ghondpore and Briggs, II, p. 500, Condapilly); and there was told that at a distance of ten days’ journey was the temple of Kunchhy, the walls and roof of which was plated with gold and ornamented with precious stones”. In a note he says, “this evidently means Kānci or Conjeeeveram, but the story is exceedingly improbable. The distance was 250 miles, and the way lay through the heart of a hostile country”. Further on quoting the Burhān-i-Ma’āthir, he says (p. 102) that “when Sultan Muhammad was at Mālūr which belonged to Narasimha, who was the greatest and most powerful of the rulers of Talingana and Vijaynagar, he was informed that at a distance of fifty farsakhās from his camp was a city called Gangī, containing temples, etc., to which he promptly marched, arriving before the place on the 13th March, a.h. 1481 (11th Muḥarram, a.h. 886). He sacked the city and returned.”

2 According to Firishtah, Malik-ut-tujzār Khwājah Jahān introduced various reforms, as regards the subdivision of the country, and the government of the forts, and the payment of the troops. They were all excellent, but they caused much discontent. The minister knew it, but he disregarded it, having great confidence in himself and his friends. The chief among the latter was Yusuf
was at the summons and incitement of Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahān. In support of their statement, they produced a letter, which bore the seal of the Khwājah, (and which they said) he had written to the Rāy of Orissa. As a matter of fact, they had given a piece of gold to the seal-bearer of the Khwājah Jahān, and had got his seal impressed on a piece of white (blank) paper. They wrote the matter on that paper, and brought it under the eye (of the Sultān). When someone went to summon the Khwājah; although his slaves told him, that as on account of his wealth, there were ten thousand horses in his stable, and there were ten thousand Turkī slaves in attendance on him, it was right and proper that he should go away to Gujrāt; the Khwājah said "I have committed no offence, why should I run away? I have every hope that the right should be separated from the wrong, and the truth from falsehood". As the hand of death brought the simple-minded Khwājah, by the nape of the neck to attend on Muḥammad Lashkari, that letter was shown to him; and without any enquiry being made in the matter, he was put to death on the

'Ādil Khān, his adopted son, and he knew that while the latter was with him his enemies would not be able to do anything against him. Then Yusuf 'Ādil Khān was sent against Narsingh Rāy; and the minister's enemies entered into a conspiracy to effect his destruction. The details of the conspiracy are the same as in the text; but the names of the conspirators and some other particulars are mentioned. The chief conspirators were Žarīf-ul-mulk Dakinī and Miftāh Ḥabshi and Malik Ḥasan Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahri. The two former and other Hindi slaves became intimate with a Ḥabshi slave of the minister, who was his seal-bearer, and bribed him with money and gems and delicate articles of food and different kinds of Arab horses, etc.; and one day in a convivial assembly, when the slave was inebriated, Žarīf-ul-mulk and Miftāh Ḥabshi produced a piece of paper which was twisted up, and said it was an account of one of their friends, to which most of the ministers or heads of departments had affixed their seals, and they asked him to affix the Khwājah's seal to it also. The slave very foolishly affixed his master's seal without unfolding and looking at the paper. A letter purporting to be written by the minister to the Rāy of Orissa was forged on this paper, and it was produced before the Sultān, and he without making any enquiry in the matter sent for the minister. What the latter said and did on receiving the summons, what his adherents suggested, and what happened after he had come to the Sultān's presence are narrated in somewhat greater detail and with more picturesque ness by Firishtah, but there is no real difference in the substance. The date of the execution is given as 5th Ṣafar, 886, by Firishtah.
3rd of Safar of that year. He lived nobly and died a martyr; may the mercy of God be on him! Khwājah Jahān Khwājah Maḥmūd Gilānī was among the most learned men of the age, and was distinguished for great perfection in literary work. He wrote an elegant book on letter-writing, and included in it the letters which he had written to the great and noble men; and named it the 1 Ṣiyāḥ-ul-inshā. He also sent presents and gifts to the men of his age in Khurāsān and 'Irāq and 'Arab and 'Ajam; more specially he sent letters to His Holiness Maulānā 'Abd-ur-Rahmān Jāmī, may his tomb be sanctified; and gave expression to his veneration and respect for him. His Holiness the saint also believing in his sincerity and faith in himself sent him epistles which are extant in his correspondence. Among the qaṣīdas in his collected poems, there is a qaṣīda, which he specially composed in the name of the Khwājah. The opening couplet of it is:

1. Couplet:

Welcome! oh messenger of the land of the heart, welcome!
Welcome, for I have devoted my life and heart to thee welcome!

He has also said in it:

2. Couplet:

To the world he is Khwājah, to faqr (poverty with contentment) he is the preface
There is the secret of faqr, but under the veils of wealth;
and in a ghazl (ode) he has said:
Jāmī! thy heart-stirring verse is an article fine;

---

1 Firishtah calls the book, the Rauḍat-ul-inshā.
2 These and the following lines are all quoted by Firishtah also; but in the second line of the first couplet is substituted for بدل نزل and in the first line of the second couplet the words أوسط are added; and in the beginning of the second line، sign or mark, is substituted for ینت. In the lines from the ghazl, which is called a qī'ah by Firishtah, the second line is ینت and in the fourth line is substituted for ینت.
Of that article, the charm is from the sweetness of the
spirit;
Send it with the caravan to India, that it may receive
The honour of the seal of acceptance of Malik-ut-tujjâr.

In short the execution of that victim the Khwâjah was not
auspicious for Muhammad Lashkari. After a few days he became
ill; and although his physician, Sharf-i-Jahân, attended on and
attended him, it was of no avail; and on the first day of Rabi‘-ul-
Awwal he passed away. The period of his reign was nineteen years
four months and fifteen days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SHIHAB-UD-DIN MAHMUD SHAH,
SON OF MUHAMMAD SHAH LASHKARI.

Sultân Shihâb-ud-dîn Maḥmûd Shâh, who was the rightful
son of Sultân Muḥammad Lashkari, ascended and sat on the throne

1 Firishtah’s account of the reign after the execution of the Malik-ut-
tujjâr is not so short as that of Niẓâm-ud-dîn. There is not much of interest
in what he says; but he mentions the fact that there were many remains of
the great minister in Aḥmadâbâd Bidar, specially a college built by him. A
note by Col. Briggs says, that a great portion of this building was demolished
by an explosion of gun-powder, which was stored in it, after Aurangzîb had
captured Biddar, but what remained still attested to its grandeur. Firishtah
gives an account of the life of the minister as given by Mulla ‘Abd-ul-kârim
Hamadânî. Col. Briggs changes Hamadânî to Sindy. Firishtah also gives an
account of the attempts made by Muḥammad Shâh to get hold of the wealth
which the minister was supposed to have left behind, but it was found that he
had left none, having spent all his revenue in charity, etc. When he became
convinced of the innocence of the minister, Muḥammad Shâh ordered that his
remains should be conveyed to Biddar for interment. Firishtah goes on to
say, that after this, the nobles all separated from Muḥammad Shâh; and the
latter, knowing that an attempt to enforce his authority would end in civil
war, refrained from doing so. He halted for three months at Firuzkâbâd,
endeavouring to beguile the time in pleasure. He proclaimed his son Shâh-zâdah
Maḥmûd to be his successor. After that he grew weak, and his illness was
increased by frequent indulgence in intoxicating liquors. He died, according
to Firishtah, on the 1st Safar, 887 A.H., 24th March, 1482, i.e., about eleven
months after the date mentioned by Niẓâm-ud-dîn; and the period of his reign
was twenty years. Mr. Sewell gives 11th Muḥarram, 886 A.H., 21st March,
1482. The Hijri date is more than a year anterior to that given by Firishtah.
of sovereignty and rule, after the death of his father. They say that in the keenness of his intellect, and the nobility of his spirit, and in other perfection, he was distinguished among the Bahmani Sultanis. When his government attained to stability, the duties of the post of vazir were allotted to 1Malik Qiyam-ul-mulk Turk, and Malik

and about twenty days anterior to that mentioned by Ni‘am-ud-din; while the English date differs from that given by Col. Briggs, by only three days.

1 He is called ملك قوام الملك by Firishtah. The latter describes the coronation ceremony in some detail. It is rather difficult to unravel the plots and intrigues which took place immediately afterwards. According to Nizam-ul-din, Nizam-ul-mulk was the villain of the piece, and Qiwham-ul-mulk a simple-minded man, who was easily duped by him. Firishtah’s account is not so simple. It appears that there was considerable play between Yusuf ‘Adil Khan on the one hand and Nizam-ul-mulk on the other. Then it was settled that Nizam-ul-mulk would become the Vakil-ul-sultanat, and his other appointments should be made over to other nobles; and for a time there was peace and amity. But after two or three months Nizam-ul-mulk and Qiwham-ul-mulk broke the engagement which they had entered into, and intended to remove Yusuf ‘Adil Khan from Bijapur, and place ‘Adil Khan Dakini, who was the deputy governor of Warangal there. They then summoned ‘Adil Khan Dakini and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imad-ul-mulk to the capital on the pretext of their coming to congratulate the Sultan; and they came with their troops, and encamped outside the city. Two or three weeks after this, Nizam-ul-mulk told the simple-minded Qiwham-ul-mulk that he would that day send for the Dakini troops, and he would remove (از عميل برداریم) Yusuf ‘Adil Khan; and they would then be freed from all apprehension from him; and they would send away all his partisans to their respective thonas. He also represented to Qiwham-ul-mulk that the Dakini amis were afraid to come out of their houses (نمی توانند) (بهر خانه اند) the meaning of which is not clear. It may mean what I have said in the text, or it may mean that they could not come to the palace), for fear of the Turkam amis. ‘If he considered it desirable, an order should be issued, that the Turkam amis should not come out of their houses that day. Qiwham-ul-mulk accepted this suggestion. The next day the young Sultan was placed on a bastion of the citadel; and a message was sent to Yusuf ‘Adil Khan and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imad-ul-mulk Dakini that they should parade their troops in front of him; and should then receive permission to go away to their fiefs. Farhad-ul-mulk, kotewal, getting information of this, intimated to Qiwham-ul-mulk that Nizam-ul-mulk had traitorous designs against him and all the Turk amis; and was merely making the destruction of Yusuf ‘Adil Khan a pretext; and it would be foolish for them to sit inert and negligent in their houses. Qiwham-ul-mulk had enmity towards ‘Adil Khan, and had perfect faith in the
Niẓām-ul-mulk; but as the Turki amirs were many in number, their party was the stronger of the two. Owing to this, the fiery furnace of the envy of Niẓām-ul-mulk and all the Indian nobles was inflamed. At last by the exertions of the great and the noble, they entered into agreements with one another, and confirmed them with strong oaths. But the perfidious Niẓām-ul-mulk, taking the thread of flattery in his hand, and having made the simple-minded Qiyām-ul-mulk careless and negligent, stated one day, that ‘Ādil Khān and Daryā Khān and Mallū Khān and certain others wanted that they should, after receiving permission, go back to their respective thanas or posts. They were, however, owing to a fear which they had in their hearts, in respect of the Turki amirs, unable to come out of their houses. It would be advisable that on the day they should receive permission to leave, the Turki amirs should remain in their houses. Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk agreed to this proposal; and on the following day

friendship of Niẓām-ul-mulk; and as his destruction was at hand, did not attend to the kowtāl’s warning. ‘Ādil Khān Dakinī and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk then came into the city with their respective troops from Tilang and Kāwīl; and were honoured by being allowed to salute the Sultān. The latter, who was a puppet in the hands of Niẓām-ul-mulk’s party, sent for the chiefs of the two troops to the top of the bastion and told them that the Turki slaves were committing excesses, and should be punished. Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk, who was on terms of sincere attachmen1 to Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān guarded him in the melā; and ‘Ādil Khān Dakinī and his troops were ordered to massacre the Turks. Qiwām-ul-mulk was first murdered and Fārḥād-ul-mulk the kowtāl was put into prison; and other Turks were killed. Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān and his followers fought their way to the city gate, and brought in Daryā Khān, who had twenty-two thousand troops according to one statement, and ten thousand according to another; and there were skirmishes in the city for twenty days between the two parties; till the learned and wise men intervened, and proposals were made for peace. Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān with his adherents went away to Bijāpūr.

It will be seen from the above, the Qiwām-ul-mulk or Qiyām-ul-mulk was not so simple-minded as Niẓām-ud-dīn makes him out to be. Firishtah also calls him simple-minded (سادات) in one place; but it appears that he had treacherous designs against Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān. Firishtah goes on to say, that after peace had been established, the whole power rested with Niẓām-ul-mulk for a period of four years, during which time, he and ‘Imād-ul-mulk acted in concert with the queen-mother. Firishtah also gives the names of the nobles on whom jāgirs and offices were conferred.
Daryā Khan and 'Adil Khan and all the Khans, having made all preparations, entered the fort with their troops. Farhād-ul-mulk Turk, the kotwal, sent information to Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk, that the amirs had come with treacherous designs; but as the latter was doomed to die, he did not listen to it. The traitorous amirs first seized Farhād-ul-mulk the kotwal, and then put Qiyām-ul-mulk to death. After that they shut up the Turki amirs in their houses; and brought them out one by one, and murdered them. After Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk had been killed Niẓām-ul-mulk and Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk took up the duties of the post of the vāzir, and attended to all affairs in concert with Malka-i-Jahān, the mother of Sultān Mahmūd. The duties of the kotwal of the capital were entrusted to Malik Barīd, who was a Turki slave of Sultān Mahmūd.

2 When some time had passed in this way, one day Dilāwar Khan Ḥabshi submitted privately to Mahmūd Shāh that Maliks Niẓām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk still considered the Sultān to be too young; and settled all matters themselves. He then obtained the permission of the Sultān to assassinate both the ministers; and waited for an opportunity. It so happened that the two vāzirs went one night to wait on the Malka-i-Jahān for the arrangement of certain matters connected with the government. When they were coming out, Dilāwar Khan with another man attacked them with swords at the gate of the palace. Niẓām-ul-mulk was wounded; but as both had great skill in swordsmanship they came out of the

---

1 The account of the attempt of Dilāwar Khan on the lives of Niẓām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk as given by Fīrishtāh is very similar to that in the text. But Fīrishtāh says that Dilāwar Khan was envious of the ministers' power. Fīrishtāh does not say where Niẓām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk went. He only says that they went out of the city; and they informed Malik Barīd, that the Sultān had designs against his life; and Malik Barīd shut up the gates of the citadel, so that no one could get any access to the Sultān. The latter in great distress repented of the orders he had passed; and sent men to apologize to the ministers, and to ask them to return. They refused to do so, unless the Sultān ordered the execution of Dilāwar Khan. The latter on hearing this fled to the country of Sīr and Burhānpūr (i.e., Khāndesh). After that Niẓām-ul-mulk and his son Malik Ahmad came back to the city; but Fath-ul-lah 'Imād-ul-mulk went away to Berār. These events have not been mentioned by Niẓām-ud-dīn.
melee with the strength of their arms. They sent for Malik Barid the same night (and informed him); that Dilawar Khan wanted also to murder him. Early the next morning, both the vazirs came out (of their houses), and bade adieu to each other; and Malik Niʿām-ul-mulk started for Junir and ʿImād-ul-mulk for Kāwīl, which were their fiefs and remained there. On hearing this news the amirs became dispersed; and great irregularity and weakness crept into the Sultan's affairs; and gradually Malik Barid kept him as if in imprisonment. His, i.e., the Sultan's, power was weakened and the men of the city made an attack on him. On the 1 night

1 The meaning of the text is not quite clear. The rebels are said to have made the elephant-keepers, etc., join them; and yet the elephant-keepers are said to have made themselves the shields or defenders of him ( Аналь ), which being in the singular would refer to the Sultan and not to the rebels. Besides, it is said that from amongst them ( نملا ), ʿAzīz Khan and four others resolved to devote their lives to save him. Firishtah's account is that from the year 890, the flames of envy and jealousy of the Mughals and Turks were burning in the hearts of the Abyssinians and the Dakins. They tried to induce the Sultan to cast them out of his favour, but it was of no avail. Then Dilpasand Khan (Col. Briggs calls him Pussund Khan) conspired with all the Dakins and Ḥabahils, that they would assassinate Maḥmūd Shāh, and would place another prince of the Bahman dynasty on the throne. With this object they got all the residents of the fort, namely, the elephant-keepers, the chamberlains or ushers, the guards, the men-in-charge of the furniture and the gate-keepers to join them. Then at nightfall on the 21st Dhiqaʿdah, 892 A.H., the same date as that given by Niʿām-ud-dīn, about a thousand of them, fully armed, some on horseback, and some on foot, entered the citadel of the fort, where the Sultan had his abode; and shut the gates of the fort from inside, for fear of the Turks and Mughals coming to help the Sultan. Then before the Sultan could guard himself, some of them came to the place, where he was reposing; but ʿAzīz Khan and four other Turks, and Ḥasan ʿAlī Khan Sabzwāri and Saiyid Mīrzā-i-Mashhādī threw themselves between the Sultan and the rebels; and offered their lives in his defence. The Sultan then got away on the terrace of the Shāhburj; and the fight continued in somewhat like the manner of Niʿām-ud-dīn's narrative, till the rebels were driven out. Firishtah in some places uses the same phraseology as Niʿām-ud-dīn; but his narrative is more consistent and logical.

Col. Briggs's translation is defective. He gives the year as 896 A.H., calls Dilpasand Khan, Pussund Khan and does not say that the men inside the fort were in conspiracy with the rebels outside, except that he mentions incidentally that the rebels were admitted by the porters who were privy to the plot.
of the 21st Dhiqa'dah in the year 892 A.H., a body of the ungrateful wretches, having united all the people in the fort, including the elephant-keepers and the 1 chamberlains or ushers, and the guards or sentries and the men in charge of the furniture (parda-dārān) with themselves, treacherously attacked their own sovereign prince. They did not know that:

Couplet:

Those whom God's protection doth guard,
No danger comes from the revolution of the skies!

At that time Maḥmūd Shāh had spread the bed of pleasure when a great tumult arose in the fort. All the men taking up their arms hastened towards the palace. The elephant-keepers started after equipping their mounts, and they made the men in charge of the furniture their confederates. 'Aziz Khān Turk and Hasan 'Ali Khān and Saiyid Mirzā-i-Mashhadi who had the title of Mallū Khān came into the field of conflict, and made themselves his shields. From amongst them, a brave young man of the name of 'Aziz Khān, who was distinguished for his great bravery and courage, offered to sacrifice his dear life, with four other Turks for the Sultān's safety. The latter taking advantage of this opportunity took shelter on the roof of the Shāhburj (bastion). The seraglio and the Shāhburj and the whole of the fort fell into the hands of the rebels, who fastened all the doors, so that the loyal and faithful adherents could not enter the fort. Some of the soldiers, however, climbed to the top of the Shāhburj from the surrounding moat by means of ropes; and drove away the rebels from its 2 neighbourhood, wounding them with their life-destroying arrows. 3 Some men set fire to things, and

---

1 The word is حاجبان in one MS., and in the lith. ed. and حاجبان in the other MS. The word in the corresponding passage of Firishtah is chamberlains or ushers. The next word in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. is كوتوال, but in Firishtah it is كوتوال. I have adopted حاجبان and حاجبان.

2 The word is حورلي in the MSS., though in one of them there is what looks like a dot near the top of the ح so that the word looks like حورلي. In the lith. ed. the word is حورلي or a house, and حورلي is neighbourhood. I think the reading in the lith. ed. is correct.

3 This is explained by Firishtah, who says that the sweepers and farrāshes (men in charge of carpets, etc.) and other menial servants (Col. Briggs groups,
the elephants fled in panic out of the fort. When the tumult and the disturbance ceased in the fort (he, i.e., I suppose, the Sultan), gave order that 1 Jahangir Khan, who was Malik Nizam-ul-mulk, should guard the gate; and Khan Jahân, leaving the fort, should guard the city and the bazar, with his own men. When half the night was over, and the moon rose, troops came from all sides, and gathered together in the courtyard of the Shâhburj. He then ordered that the Arabian horses, which were bred in the royal stables, should be distributed among the men, and they, mounted on them, should completely destroy those men of evil destiny. When the auspicious morning dawned, some of the latter threw themselves into the moat, and broke their necks; and some became food for the sword. Some concealed themselves in the rat-holes? (مَعِيشة خانًا), but after two or three days they were dragged out and got the meed of their deeds.

2 It is written in history that one day a messenger came from Adil Khan, and submitted a representation from him to the effect, that the amîrs of that  săba had, at the instigation of Dastûr-ul-mulk, raised the standard of disturbance and rebellion; and that that slave (i.e., he himself) relying on the grandeur of the good fortune of His Majesty, had with the help of Fakhr-ul-mulk dispersed them.

1 This man is called Sultan Jahângîr Khân Turk who had the title of Malik-ul-maut, in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and it is said there that he was ordered to guard the gate of the fort. Col. Briggs calls him Sooltan Jehangeer Khan Toork. He says nothing about his having any title; and says, "now took charge of the palace gates" (vol. ii, page 534).

2 I cannot find any reference to this in Firishtah; but probably what is narrated below refers to the same events, but the account is brief, and the names do not agree. I am quoting from Col. Briggs, (vol. ii, page 529), "In the year 891, Adil Khan Deccany, governor of Wurungole died, when Kowam-ool-Moolk, junior, came by forced marches from Rajmundry to that city, and established himself in Tulingana. Nizam-ool-Moolk, accompanied by the King marched towards Wurungole; on which Kowam-ool-Moolk, falling back on Rajmundry, wrote secretly to the King, warning him against the minister."
It was however, now, reported again that they had collected together; and 'Aziz-ul-mulk had joined them.

Couplet:
They have nothing in their heads except rebellious thoughts,
There is no remedy, except marching against them for war.

Immediately on receiving this intelligence, the Sultân ordered the amîrs who were on his side that they should march in concert for the punishment of that body of evil destiny; and he himself with one thousand Turki slaves (guards) marched on the wings of speed. At each stage of the journey, the amîrs came and joined them. When they arrived in the vicinity of Râjmundri, he on the next day made over the arrangement of the right and left wing to Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk; and marched to the field of battle; and the evil starred rebels also advanced to meet them; and arrayed their ranks. 'Ādil Khân, who was the commander of the right wing, fought bravely, and defeated the rebels. Dastûr-ul-mulk who was the head and leader of the rebels was seized; and the warriors pursued the enemy and cast most of those wretches on the dust of destruction. Some of the men, however, carried half a life away with great difficulty. When Maḥmûd Shâh came back to the camp, from the battle-field, with victory and triumph, he at the request of 'Ādil Khân pardoned the guilt and offence of Dastûr-ul-mulk, who had absurd thoughts in his head; and giving him back all his property, which had been escheated to the government, confirmed him in the rank, which he had formerly held. Then he arranged all the affairs of state with the advice and concurrence of the amîrs, and returned to Gulbarga.

After some days news came that a body of the men, who had fled, had shut themselves up in the fort of Sunkar. Maḥmûd Shâh, in concert with the loyal amîrs, proceeded by successive marches, and besieged the fort; and enterprising warriors at the first onset captured the lower fort (حصار اول). The garrison then betook themselves to the upper citadel; and when they saw that they had not the strength to make further resistance they prayed for safety and surrendered the fort. Maḥmûd Shâh left one of his trusted men in the fort, and returned to the city of Bidar. According to the custom of former Sultâns, he made the different ranks of the great and noble men fortunate by the granting of rewards.
In the year 896 A.H., 1 Bahādur Gilānī, who was one of the servants of Khwājah Maḥmūd Khwājah Jahān, and was also in charge of the thāna, had raised the dust of rebellion, and had taken forcible possession of certain parganas, and also of the port of Dābul. He had equipped some ships, and had stretched hands of oppression and tyranny over the ports of Gujrat, so that the passage over the sea was closed. It so happened also that some ships belonging to Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrāṭī had fallen into his hands; and he had plundered everything that was contained in them; and had cast Sultān Maḥmūd’s men into prison. Another version of the incident is that as merchants and the servants of merchants complained of Bahādur Gilānī’s acts, Sultān Maḥmūd sent Kamāl Khān and Sańdar Khān with some troops, some of whom were to go by water and some to march by land (with order), that they should cast the boat of his (i.e., Bahādur’s) life in the whirlpool of destruction. As Kamāl Khān and Sańdar Khān went on horses that travelled on the wind (i.e., ships), the bridle of (their) power fell into the wind (i.e., I suppose they were caught in a storm); and contrary winds carried their ships to a great distance from one another. Bahādur sent a man to express his allegiance. When Kamāl Khān and Sańdar Khān came and joined him with a small body of men, he at once meditated treachery towards them; and there was a great battle. So much blood and water got mixed together that the water took the colour of a bright ruby. In the end Kamāl Khān and Sańdar Khān received wounds and fell into Bahādur’s hands; and he sent them to Dābul.

When this news reached Sultān Maḥmūd, he appointed Qiwām-ul-mulk with fifty thousand horsemen to attack Bahādur. When

---

1 Firishtah gives the following account of the antecedents of Bahādur Gilānī: he was a servant of Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Maḥmūd Gilānī. After the latter’s martyrdom, he became a servant of Najm-ud-dīn Gilānī; and when the latter was in charge of the port of Goa, he became the kotwāl of that town, and became known for his bravery and courage. When Najm-ud-dīn died, the thought of hostility (مغافر), or more correctly rebellion, entered his mind; and in the year 889, he took possession of Goa and the entire fief of Kishwar Khān; and in a short time he seized Dābul and Chaul and Kalhar and Panāla and Kolāpūr and Sarvāla and Nilgawān and Mirich.
Qiwām-ul-mulk arrived at Mahīm, he made enquiries about the different roads. It was at last found out that it would be difficult to reach their destination unless they marched over a part of the Deccan. So after attacking certain villages, he came alone to the court, marching with great rapidity, so that he might represent the true state of things, and obtain permission to trespass into the Dakinī kingdom.

Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh Gujratī, owing to his innate kindness, sent a letter to Maḥmūd Shāh (Bahmani), to the purport that it was a life-time, since the chain of friendship and attachment between the two parties had been strengthened; and this noble alliance between them had come to them in the form of an inheritance and from this side (i.e., from himself) there had been no default in the discharge of the rights of friendship. "When," he went on to say, "Sultān Maḥmūd Khilji had seized the Deccan from the late Sultān Nizām Shāh, if I had not helped the latter with my army he would have lost his kingdom. At this time, it has come to my knowledge that Bahādur Gilānī, the governor of the port of Dābul, had plundered twenty vessels belonging to my government and to merchants which were filled with valuables and pearls and various rich stuffs, and had sent two hundred ships to Mahīm, and had invaded and ravaged that country, and had burnt down mosques and other places of worship. As I had and have regard for our old friendship, it appears, under the orders of the judge of wisdom, that I should bring the circumstances to your knowledge. If the light of sovereignty (i.e.,

---

1 The meaning is not at all clear. If Qiwām-ul-mulk was sent by Sultān Maḥmūd Bahmanī, as the context would indicate, there would be no objection to his marching over a part of the Deccan, which was in the Bahmani kingdom. In Firishtah's account, it appears that Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī wrote to Sultān Maḥmūd Bahmanī complaining of the depredations committed by Bahādur Gilānī, and pointed out, that the army of Gujrat could not march to attack him by the land route, unless a part of the Dakinī kingdom was laid waste and trodden under foot (and ruined) by his soldiers. It would appear that Nizām-ud-dīn has mixed up things a little. In fact, it appears from Firishtah that Kamāl Khān and Saṭdar Khān came with a brave army by sea, under the orders of the Sultān of Gujrat; and that Bahādur had fought with them and seized them and kept them in imprisonment. This is, however, not mentioned in Col. Briggs's translation.
you yourself) should not advance to crush him, I would give him such punishment, that it would be a warning to him." Maḥmūd Shāh gave assurances to the ambassador, and summoned the amirs who were in agreement with him, and told them that "The return of the rights of benefits is incumbent on all, and more specially on Sulṭāns. Besides, Sulṭān Maḥmūd Gujrātī is a sovereign possessing much power; and it is conceivable that injury may be caused by him to this country; and as discourteous and wrongful acts have been committed by Bahādur Gilānī, it is right and proper that the amirs should collect their armies, and turn their attention to his discomfiture and destruction." Then according to the advice of the amirs a farmān was sent to Bahādur; and he was informed of the purport of Sulṭān Maḥmūd’s letter. He was also directed to send to the court all that he had taken from the ships and to send the ships also by way of the sea; and also to send Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān and every one connected with them to his presence. He was also informed of the purport of these couplets:

Couplets:

Why dost not thou to thy own good attend?  
Make not the face of thy fortune black.  
Place not thy foot outside the measure right,  
For thou wilt headlong fall into the well of danger dire.

When Bahādur heard that a servant of Maḥmūd Shāh was bringing the farmān, he wrote to his guards of the road, that they should not let him pass beyond the fort of Mirich. He loosened his audacious tongue to give expression to boasting and bragging, and wrote an improper reply, and forwarded it. When (the news of) the temerity and audacity of Bahādur, and of his preposterous reply reached Maḥmūd Shāh, 1 he, with the advice and concurrence

---

1 Firishtah’s account of the expedition agrees mainly with that in the text; but he says in addition that Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān sent five thousand horsemen under his Sar Naubat (Sar or rather Meer Nobut, according to Briggs, p. 527, means Commander of the bodyguard) Kamāl Khān Dakīnī; and Malik Aḥmad Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahri, the same number under Mubāriz Khān (Col. Briggs calls him Moetibar Khan); son of Khwājah Jahan Turk, and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk also sent a small body of horsemen under one of his trusted servants, to reinforce him, Bahādur Gilānī had had fights with the first two, and
of the amirs, advanced against him by successive marches; and after traversing many stages arrived in front of the 1 fort, which Bahādur had been engaged for a long time in strengthening; and in which he had collected an immense number of cavalry and infantry. The garrison on seeing the number and grandeur of the Sultān’s army, turned their ill-starred faces towards flight. The Sultān remained there for three days, in order to arrange the affairs of the place; and then advanced towards 2 Börkal, where Bahādur had fortified himself. Before, however, the (royal) troops arrived there, Bahādur abandoned the fort and fled. The Rāy or zamīndār of the place came to attend on the Sultān, and enlisted himself among his loyal adherents. When Bahādur fled from Börkal, the commander of his army took up his position in the fort of Mirich. The amirs then decided on the capture of Mirich, and taking Maḥmūd Shāh with them, they advanced against it. When they arrived there (they found), that the governor of the neighbourhood had come to the help of Bahādur’s men, and had strengthened the fort. They came forward to meet, and fight with, the invading army. The latter surrounded the fort from all sides, and attacked Bahādur’s men. When most of those who had sallied out of the fort with the desire of fighting were mixed with the dust of destruction; and the

they had not been able to defeat him; and they therefore considered it fortunate that the Sultān should undertake his chastisement. When they arrived at the fort of Jāmkhandi (which, it appears, Bahādur had by his good policy, (حمس تنبير) wrested from the possession of Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān), Qutb-ul-mulk Dakini, who was the pārafār of Tilang, was ordered to attack it; but he was killed by an arrow shot from the fort. The Sultān conferred the title of Qutb-ul-mulk on Sultān Qull Khawāṣ Hamadānī with certain territories in Talingāna as his jāgīr. This man later became the founder of the Qutb Shāhī dynasty. When Jāmkhandi was taken, it was made over to the servants of Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān. The Sultān then marched towards Manklīr (in the lith. ed.—Mangalore (?), but Col. Briggs has Sunkeswar) where Bahādur had taken up his residence. Before, however, the Sultān’s troops arrived there, Bahādur fled from that place. It was taken in the course of three days, after which the Sultān marched towards Mirich. The garrison came out and gave battle; but most of them were slain, and the survivors retired into the fort.

1 The name of the fort is not given in the text, but probably Jāmkhandi is referred to. See the preceding note.

2 Börkal does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah.
governor of that country, who was the head and leader of the rebels, was killed; the remainder fled, and like snakes got into holes, Maḩmūd Shāh and the amīrs considered it advisable that they should distribute the batteries (among the leaders of the army), and dig mines on various sides of the fort, so that the water in the fort might flow into the moat, and the garrison might be in great straits for want of water. It was also decided that opposite to each bastion, a bastion should be erected outside the fort.

When the commandant of the fort saw that the path of flight was closed, he came in great humility, and prayed for quarter Maḩmūd Shāh, with the consent of the amīrs, gave him promise of protection; and notified to the soldiers of Bahādur, that to such of them as might wish to enter his service, the men in charge of his treasury would give subsistence allowance and jāqīrā; and as regards such of them as might wish to go to Bahādur the guards of the roads would not prevent them taking away with them their horses and equipment. After his mind had been set at rest about the fort of Mirich, the Sultān turned his attention towards the forts of Kalhar and Dābul. When he arrived at the village or place called 1 Mālwa a son was born to him on the 27th Rajab in the year 899 A.H. In gratitude for this great gift, he opened his hand for giving benefactions and largesses; and placing the crown of Aḩmad Shāh on the head of that light of his eyes, gave him the name of Aḩmad Shāh.

When Bahādur heard of the conquest of the fort of Mirich, and of the advance of the Sultān towards Kalhar and Dābul, he fell into the chasm of amazement and the gulf of bewilderment. He knew that with meagre plannings, he had attempted a great feat. On whatever side he looked, he found the door of flight closed. Then in distress and humility he sent Khwājah Naʿamat-ul-lah Tabrizī to wait on the amīrs; and to ask for pardon of his offences. Sultān

---

1 The name is Mālwa in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah the name cannot be made out; the sentence being لازمر قوضحبدا پیاده زنی where the word پیاده زنی appears to be a mistake for the name of the place, but it will be seen from note 2, p.122, Firishtah has Piāda as the name for a place, Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 541) calls the place Walwa. The birth of the son is mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but I cannot find any reference to it in Col. Briggs’s History.
Maḥmūd Shāh, in accordance with the prayers of the amīrs, drew the pen of forgiveness across the offences of Bahādur Gilānī, and pardoned all his faults. He ordered that if Bahādur would hasten to render homage to him, and would send two elephants, and the tribute, which had been fixed, to the treasury, the forts and towns, which have been taken out of his possession, would again be restored to him. Khwājah Naʿmat-ul-lah wrote to Bahādur that his prayers had been accepted, and he should come with all haste. When the Khwājah's letter reached Bahādur, ¹ the crow of pride again laid the egg of conceit and exultation in his head. He cast down the honour which he would have acquired by his (forth-coming) engagements and promises into the dust of wretchedness. The amīrs, taking Maḥmūd Shāh with them, advanced in the direction of the fort of Ḷājkīr. When they arrived on the bank of the river of Kalhar, they distributed the batteries (among themselves), and besieged the fort. When the morning raised the veil of darkness from the cheek of the sky, the whole army at once galloped into the battle-field, and whoever came out of the fort to give them battle, became at once food for their swords. When the greatness and grandeur of Maḥmūd Shāh's army were impressed on the minds of the enemy, and night came on, they gave up all idea of fighting, and took to flight; and owing to their evil destiny ² the town of Kalhar was sacked.

On hearing this news, Malik Shams-ud-dīn Tārmī, thānādār of Muṣṭafābād, came with the residents of that city to see the Sultān. The latter after waiting for two or three days in the town of Kalhar, and arranging the affairs of that territory, advanced towards Ḫāḷāpūr

¹ This agrees generally with Firishtah; but he adds that Bahādur boasted that he would have the Ḧuḥāba (public prayers) read in his own name, that same year, in Aḥmadābād Bidar, and the next year in Aḥmadābād Gujrāt. Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 511) says that Bahādur "made an attack on the King's baggage", but I cannot find any mention of this in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

² The name is Ḫājkīr in the MSS. and Ḫājkīr in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not mention the place, but says that the Sultān on hearing Bahādur's bragging, came from Ḡyāda to Kalhar.

³ Firishtah also says the town was sacked, but Col. Briggs does not mention the fact.

⁴ The town is called Ḫāḷāpūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Ḫāḷānūr in the other MS.; but evidently both names are incorrect; the correct name is Kāḷāpūr, and is used later on.
When he arrived in the village of 1 Salāla, news was brought that Bahādūr having come out of the fort of 2 Panāla had marched towards Kolāpūr; and had with a mistaken idea got a body of men to join him, and was preparing for strife and bloodshed. After receiving this news, when (the Sultān) by successive marches arrived in the vicinity of Kolāpūr, most of Bahādūr’s troops separated from him, and joined the service of Maḥmūd Shāh. Bahādūr then fled, and betook himself to a corner. Maḥmūd Shāh, with the advice of the amīrs, sent Malik 3 Fakhr-ul-mulk and ‘Ain-ul-mulk to take charge of the fort of Panāla and its neighbourhood; and decided that he would spend the rainy season in Kolāpūr, till the bushes of the enmity and tree of the rebellion of Bahādūr should be totally uprooted. When Bahādūr received information of this, his eye of hope became blind, and he fell from the zenith of pride down to the nadir of humility. He then again sent a petition by the hand of Khwājah Na’mat-ul-lah Tabrūzī, and prayed that an agreement

1 Apparently not mentioned by Firishtah.

2 It was according to Firishtah the strongest fort in that part of the country; and Bahādūr had taken shelter in it, when he was frightened on hearing the news of the capture of the forts of Mirīch and Kalhar. He now came out, because the Sultān did not at once proceed to besiege it; but went to view the sea, and the port of Dābul. Firishtah says that when Maḥmūd Shāh went to see the sea and the port of Dābul, Bahādūr came rapidly to Kolāpūr with the intention of blocking the road and giving battle; but when he saw the pomp and grandeur of Maḥmūd Shāh’s army, he again became frightened and fled. Bahādūr’s belief that the Sultān was too weak to engage him is apparently referred to by Niẓām-ud-dīn by the use of the words بنصر بیاصل.


4 Firishtah says that the qaulnāma was to bear the sacred seal (i.e., of the Sultān) and also the seals of Malik Qāsim Barīd Turk, and other chief men. It may be mentioned that throughout the narrative of the expedition against Bahādūr Gīlānī, and in fact of the whole reign, both in the accounts of Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah, there are indications of Maḥmūd Shāh being a puppet in the hands of Qāsim Barīd and other nobles. There are attempts made to show that he had great power and grandeur, but it appears also that he could do nothing without the concurrence of Qāsim Barīd and his associates
(qaulnāma) might be sent to him by the hand of the vazīrs, so that he might, with assurance of safety, come and attend on His Majesty; and for the remainder of his life never transgress the path of obedience. Mahmūd Shāh accepted the prayer in order to put down the flames of disturbance; and sent the qaulnāma. Khwājah Naʿmat-ul-lah again represented that if Sharif-ul-ʿUlamā Ṣadr Jahān and Qāḍī Zain-ud-dīn Hasan should also go with the learned men, it would be the cause of greater faith in the wild (وحشي) Bahādur. (The Sultān) ordered that these revered men should accompany the vazīrs. When the vazīrs and noble men arrived near Bahādur (they found) a deep river (in front of them). First of all Khwājah Naʿmat-ul-lah and Khwājah Majd-ud-dīn crossed the river, and described the graciousness of the Sultān, and the coming of the vazīrs.

Bahādur’s resolution was again changed, and his evil destiny did not permit that he should keep his feet of grace straight in the path of goodness. The two Khwājahs came back, and stated to the vazīrs how the matter stood. Khadam Khān who had the reins of the affairs in his grasp of authority, and Qutb-ul-mulk then crossed the river, and went to Bahādur; and they did everything that was possible in the way of advice. Bahādur welcomed the arrival of the Khāns with all honour and respect, but as his mind had become darkened, it did not at all become clear by the polishing of

---

1 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has از راه اطمنان بافتاق وزرا. The other has از راه اطمنان عازم حضور گردد. The lith. ed. has از راه اطمنان بافتاق وزرا عازم حضور گردد. The first appears to be the best, and I have accepted it.

2 He is called شرف العمل in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; but in the other MS. he is called اشرف العمل or شرف العمل. Firishtah calls him وزرا.

3 Both MSS. have اعلم but the lith. ed. has علازم. The MSS. have با وزرا مرام بروند وزرا و شرفنا جوی تربیت بهادر رسیدند but the lith. ed. has با وزرا و شرفنا بروند جوی وزرا تربیت بهادر رسیدند.

4 According to Firishtah he had come with Khwājah Naʿmat-ul-lah, bearing Bahādur’s petitions.

5 This name is doubtful. It is خدمت خان (apparently a mistake for خدمت خان) in one MS., and خدمت خان in the other. It is خدمت خان in the lith. ed., and خدمت خان in Firishtah.
their precepts. When they returned Ḍā'ī Makhdūm A'zam, Ṣadr Jahān and Qāḍī Zain-ul-dīn Ḥasan also went, and did not refrain from giving him advice. But as he had fallen a hundred farsakhs away from the path of truth, good fortune did not come to his aid; and wishing only to waste time, he said that if Maḥmūd Shāh should march towards the fort of Mirich, this slave (that is he himself) would come there and render him homage.

After the vazirs had returned, the Sultān summoned Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk from the fort of Panāla, and having, with the consent of the amirs conferred on him a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt, sent him to effect the destruction of Bahādur. Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk proceeded by successive marches; and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of Bahādur, he on the following day marched forward with his army arrayed for battle. Bahādur met him with great pride and self-confidence, and began to act with great gallantry. But suddenly an arrow, discharged from the bow-string of destiny struck him on the side; and Zain Khān with the blood-letting blade of his lance, hurled him from the saddle to the ground; and cut off his head which had been filled with so much pride, and sent it to the Sultān. This victory was the result of the skilful work of Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk and Zain Khān; and it gave much pleasure and happiness to all

1 He is called مجدوم اعظم صدر جهان in one MS., and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. he is called, apparently by mistake, only اعظم صدر جهان. He was called something else before; see note 2, page 124. Firishtah, however, calls him منصرف العمل in both places.

2 Firishtah's account agrees generally, but he says that Maḥmūd Shāh, i.e., having no other alternative, or being unable to induce Bahādur to submit) sent for Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk. He also says that Qutb-ul-mulk and others accompanied Fakhr-ul-mulk from Panāla; but Maḥmūd Shāh sent Qutb-ul-mulk back to go on with the siege of Panāla, for fear that Bahādur might advance in that direction and the trouble might be prolonged. Firishtah also says that Bahādur had two thousand horsemen, most of whom were Gilānīs and Maṣandarānīs, and 'Īrāqīs, and Khurāsānīs, and fifteen thousand infantry, and many cannon and muskets.

3 Firishtah says he died در گکشت on being struck by the arrow, but somewhat inconsistently adds, that Zain Khān, brother of Fakhr-ul-mulk, and according to another statement Main Khān cast him down from his saddle by striking him with his lance.
classes, high and low. At the time of the return of Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk, the Sultaän sent the amirs and the troops and all the retainers to welcome him; and conferred on him the title of Khwâjah Jahân; and in the same majlis, a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt and an 'Arab horse and an elephant were bestowed on him; and the horses and weapons which Bahâdur had brought as tribute were conferred on Zain Khân.

Two or three days after the victory (the Sultaän) entered the fort of Panâla and sent Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk from there to the island (of Goa), so that he might take possession of it by transfer from Bahâdur; and send all Bahâdur's property and equipage; and bring Malik Sa'id his brother to the court, after giving him assurance of royal favour. After some days, 'Ain-ul-mulk came back, bringing Malik Sa'id with him. He also passed before the eyes of the Sultaän fifty elephants and three hundred 'Arab horses and much money and other things belonging to Bahâdur. As marks of loyalty were patent on the forehead of Malik Sa'id he received the title of Bahâdur Malik in the same majlis (i.e., in the majlis in which he was presented before the Sultaän). The properties and territories of Bahâdur were, with the advice and concurrence of the vazîrs, entrusted to 'Ain-ul-mulk; and the Sultaän returned towards the capital. When he arrived in the town of Bijâpur, he halted in a garden house which had been built by Khwâjah Jahân Fakhr-ul-mulk; and spent two or three days there in pleasure and enjoyment. The Khwâjah offered as tribute handsome and valuable things and 'Arab horses,

1 Both Nişâm-ud-dîn and Firishta had been giving him the title of Khwâjah Jahân from a time anterior to this. Firishta does not say that the title of Khwâjah Jahân was conferred on him after this victory, but the word Maţdûm, which appears to be an entirely Dakini honorific, was added to his title.

2 He is called Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk Kan'âni in the lith. ed. of Firishta. Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 543) calls him Mullik Ein-oool-Moolk Geelany. He is said to have been sent to the port of Goa.

3 Firishta says the garden was called Kâlâbâgh, and it had been planted by Malik-ut-tujjâr Maţmûd Gâwân Khwâjah Jahân, and not by Fakhr-ul-mulk Khwâjah Jahân, as stated by Nişâm-ud-dîn. He also says that the Sultaän visited it at the invitation of Yusuf 'Adil Khân, after sending the camp on to the capital; and the tribute was offered by Yusuf 'Adil Khân.
more than can be contained in the desire of anybody, and was exalted by the gift of a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt.

On his arrival at the capital, the Sultan on the advice of the amirs showed favour to the ambassadors of Sultan Mahmūd Gujrāti, and bestowed 'Arab horses on them. He also conferred on them double of what was the customary (remuneration) of ambassadors. He also made over to the vakils five maunds of pearls of the weight of Delhi, and five elephants and one jewelled dagger as presents (to Sultan Mahmūd Gujrāti). He sent for Kamāl Khān and Šafdar Khān and all the adherents of Sultan Mahmūd, whom Bahādur had kept in imprisonment, to his presence, and granted favours and benefactions to them, and gave them permission to go back to Gujrat. He also ordered that the twenty ships belonging to Sultan Mahmūd, which Bahādur had looted should be made over to the Sultan’s servants, so that the chain of inherited friendship and alliance might be strengthened.

1 It has been narrated before, that in the early days of the Sultan’s reign, all freshness and beauty had departed from the trees

1 Firishtah also mentions these presents.
2 It appears from Firishtah, that the defeat and death of Bahādur Gilānī, and the events connected with them, took place on or before 901 A.H., 1495 A.D.; and Niẓām-ud-dīn says that Sultan Mahmūd died in 927 A.H., while Firishtah says that he died in 928 A.H. Col. Briggs has 924 A.H., 1518 A.D., so that there was a period of 23 or 26 years between these events. Niẓām-ud-dīn passes over the account of what happened in the course of these years in about fifteen lines of the lith. ed. Firishtah gives a more detailed account. According to him, Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī, who became the founder of the Qutb Shāhī dynasty was made jārafdār of Warangal, and got Ḥasanābād Gulbarga and Ṣafārī with their dependencies as his fief. At the same time the Sultan was informed that the mansabdārs were the cause of the strength of the great amirs, and of the latter rising in rebellion; and therefore except the mansabdār amirs, all other mansabdārs were taken away from Dastūr Dīnār and were joined to the royal army. It may be mentioned, in explanation, that all commanders of less than five hundred were mansabdārs; and those of five hundred and more were amirs. Dastūr Dīnār was aggrieved at the mansabdārs being taken away from him, and raised the standard of revolt, and took forcible possession of a part of Tilang, which was contiguous to Gulbarga. The Sultan demanded help from Yūsuf Adil Khān, and he came and joined the Sultan and Qāsim Barīd; and they fought with Dastūr Dīnār and 'Azīz-ul-mulk and all the Ḥabahīs and Dakinīs who had joined him, near the town of Mahindrī.
of the garden of Sultan Mahmud Shah, owing to the assassination of Qiyam-ul-mulk Turk, and the flight of Nizam-ul-mulk and 'Imad-ul-

(Col. Briggs calls the place Myndurgy; and says, in a note, that it is situated near Akulkote); and Dastur Dinur was defeated, chiefly by the manly exertions of Yusuf 'Adil Khan. He was taken prisoner, and was ordered by the Sultan to be put to death; but he was not only pardoned, but restored in his government, at the intercession of Yusuf 'Adil Khan. Some of the rebels took shelter in the fort of Saghir, but it was seized, and made over to Yusuf 'Adil Khan.

In 902 A.H., Yusuf Ghulam Dakini and Tughrish Khan Dakini and Mirza Shams-ud-din (the first two are called Yoosoff Deccany and Yoorish Khan by Col. Briggs) entered into a conspiracy to destroy Qasim Barid; but the latter coming to know of it put them all to death. The Sultan also helped to extinguish the flames of slaughter and pillage; but he was so angry with Qasim Barid and the other Turks, that he would not, for one month, take their salams; and at last, at the intercession of Shah Mubib-ul-lah, he was induced with great reluctance to pardon them. After this the Sultan sank again into drunkenness and debauchery, so that his greatness and grandeur completely passed away from the minds of the people.

In 903 A.H., Mahmud Shah asked the daughter of Yusuf 'Adil Khan, Bibi Satl, by name, who was one year old for his son Ahmad who was four years of age. This was child marriage in excelsis. Col. Briggs does not give the age of the bride, but calls her "the infant daughter of Yoosoff Adil Khan". The age of the bridegroom, he says, was fourteen years. The marriage, it was arranged, would take place at Hasanabad Gulbarha; and it was arranged that when the bride would attain the age of ten years she should be sent to the Shahzada. While the marriage festivities were still in progress, Dastur Dinur and Yusuf 'Adil Khan had a dispute about the fief of Gulbarha, the former arguing that Bijapur up to the bank of the Bithura (Bima) should belong to Yusuf 'Adil Khan, and Gulbarha and Annatigir as far as the boundary of Tilang should belong to him (Col. Briggs has Koolburgha, Sagur and Etgeber); and the latter that Hasanabad, Gulbarha, Aland, Ganjiati and Kaliyan should belong to him, so that his territory should abut on that of the Sultan. A battle was fought between the two contestants, and their partisans, in the neighbourhood of Ganjiati. Yusuf 'Adil Khan was victorious, and became very powerful, so that even the Sultan could not sit on the throne in his presence. Then the nobles retired to their fiefs; and Qasim Barid returned, and became vakil as before; and now his power became so great that the Sultan without his permission could not get even a drink of water when he was thirsty.

In 904 A.H., Yusuf 'Adil Khan led an army against Dastur Dinur; and the latter fled from Hasanabad Gulbarha; and at the suggestion of Qasim Barid went to Malik Ahmad Nizam-ul-mulk, who rendered him much help. Yusuf 'Adil Khan being unable to withstand them hastened to Ahmadabad Bidar. The Sultan wrote to Malik Ahmad Nizam-ul-mulk and directed him not to assist
Dastūr Dīnār. Malik Aḥmad Niẓām-ul-mulk complied with this, but prayed that the Sultān would direct Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān not to molest Dastūr Dīnār. Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān, at a hint from the Sultān forbore from causing further molestation to Dastūr Dīnār.

In 910 A.H., Qāsim Barīd died; and his son Amir Barīd dispossessed the Sultān of the little power which he still possessed. In the same year Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān fought a battle with Dastūr Dīnār; and defeated him, and put him to death. He then took possession of all his fiefs, and had the Khutba read in his own name, according to the tenets of the Shī’a faith in Bijāpūr. This made him very unpopular with all the people of the Dakin; and Maḥmūd Shāh wrote letters through Amir Barīd to Malik Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and Khudawand Khān Ḥabshi, about Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān’s rebellion, and his acceptance of the tenets of the Ṭa’fṣīz (Shī’as); and asked them to come immediately to help to destroy Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān. Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī came with all the amīrs of Tilang; but the others sent excuses. The Sultān and Amir Barīd wrote in some anxiety to Ahmad Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahrī, and asked for his help. He and Malik Faqhrul-mulk Dakinī Khwājāh Jahān came very quickly with a large army. Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān did not think it advisable to meet them. He made Sāghir Ḥasanābād and Aland over to Daryā Khān and Faqhr-ul-mulk Turk; and sent his infant son Ismā’īl with Kamāl Khān and other trustworthy nobles, with elephants and treasures to Bijāpūr so that they might govern the country from that fort. He himself with five thousand horsemen started for Berār. The Sultān and Amir Barīd, with those who had come to their assistance pursued him, till Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān reached Kāwlī, where Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk was encamped. The latter said that it would not be advisable to fight with the Sultān; and advised Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān to go for a time to Burhānpūr, till he could arrange matters. Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān accepted this advice, and went to Burhānpūr. Then Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk wrote to Ahmad Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahrī, etc., that Amir Barīd wanted to destroy Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān, and if he succeeded in doing this, he having the Sultān with him would become very powerful and would crush them all. They should therefore go away to their own territories. They accepted this advice and started. The next day Fathul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk submitted a representation to the Sultān and advised him to pardon Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān, and to go back to the capital. The Sultān at the instigation of Amir Barīd did not accept this advice, but wanted to march with Amir Barīd to Bijāpūr. Yūsuf Āḍīl Khān, hearing all that had happened, came with lightning speed and joined Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk. They then marched against the Sultān’s camp. Amīr Barīd, seeing that he would not be able to withstand them, returned with the Sultān to Ahmadābād Bidar.
in Bidar, and the sardars went to their respective places, even the little power and the small grandeur which had been left passed away.

In 912 A.H., Yūsuf Ḥādī Khān and Fath-ul-lah Ḥamādūl-mulk and Fakhr-ul-mulk Dakinī Khwājah Jahān died and their sons succeeded them. Amīr Barīd tried to seize Bījāpūr but all his efforts were unsuccessful.

In 918 A.H., Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī declared his independence, and removed the name of the Sultān from the Khuṭba, but he secretly sent five thousand kāns every month to the Sultān.

In 920 A.H., Amīr Barīd raised a large army with the royal treasures, and taking the Sultān with him, marched to Gulbarga, and took it from the possession of Ismā'īl Ḥādī Khān; and made it over to the adopted son of Dastūr Dīnār, who had the name of Jahāngīr Khān and whom he gave the title of Dastūr-ul-mulk. The latter collected an army, and recovered all the forts on his side of the Pithāra (or the Bima river), from Sāghir to Naldurg which had been in the possession of his father. Amīr Barīd then crossed the river with reinforcements from Malik Aḥmad Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī and Qutb-ul-mulk, and marched to Bījāpūr. Ismā'īl Ḥādī Khān gave him battle near Bījāpūr; and completely defeated him, so that he fled from the battlefield. The Sultān fell from his horse, and remained helpless on the battlefield with his son, Aḥmad Khān. Ismā'īl Ḥādī Khān, however, treated him with great respect, and wanted to take him to Bījāpūr; but he remained in the town of Aland, where he was treated for his wounds. After a short time he went with Ismā'īl Ḥādī Khān to Hāsanābād Gulbarga, the latter made over his sister, who had already been betrothed to him, to Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān. The Sultān then marched with three or four thousand Mughal horsemen, whom he obtained from Ismā'īl Ḥādī Khān, to Aḥmadābād Bidar. Amīr Barīd evacuated the capital, and retired to the fort of Urisa (Col. Briggs has Oussa). But soon after that, the officers of Ismā'īl Ḥādī Khān heard that Amīr Barīd had combined with Būhrān Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī, and was advancing with a great army; and they returned to Bījāpūr in all haste. Amīr Barīd then came back to the capital; and treated the Sultān with even greater strictness and harshness than before, on account of his alliance with Ismā'īl Ḥādī Khān. The Sultān being unable to bear this treatment fled to 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk at Kāwili (Col. Briggs says he went to Gavul in Berar). 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk received him with respect, and marched with him to crush Amīr Barīd. The latter took shelter in the fort; and sent men to Būhrān Nizām-ul-mulk, who sent Khwājah Jahān to assist him. Amīr Barīd then sallied out to give battle; and 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk met him, but the Sultān was bathing at the time. 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk sent one of his principal men to summon the Sultān; and the latter told the Sultān that a man who engages himself in bathing at such a time becomes a subject of ridicule to his people. The Sultān became very angry at this rebuke, and galloped off to Amīr Barīd's army. 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk then retired to his own country; and Amīr Barīd re-entered the capital
Malik Barīd became so powerful, that he left no one before (بیش از) him, (i.e., probably to attend on him); and having strengthened the entrances and exits, did not permit that he should come out of his harem. He took the management of affairs into his own hand; and left Maḥmūd Shāh nothing but the name of Sultān. Maḥmūd Shāh wrote something about this to Imād-ul-mulk. The letter sent a reply to the effect that if His Majesty would come to Kāwil, this slave (i.e., he himself) would perform the duties of service, and would give a fresh splendour and currency to the affairs of the sultānat. Maḥmūd Shāh then, with such pretexts as he could think of, fled to Kāwil. Malik Imād-ul-mulk welcomed his arrival, with respect and honour; and advanced with a large following to crush Malik Barīd. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city of Bīdar, Malik Barīd, having equipped his army came forward to meet him. At the time when the armies were facing each other, the slave, who was the head of ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s tribesmen sent a message to the Sultān, that His Majesty should now mount, as the time of the battle had come. It so happened that at that time Maḥmūd Shāh was engaged in washing his head. ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s slave said that when the Sultān was so negligent at the time of the battle, there was no doubt that it was a sign of misfortune.

with the Sultān, and placed the latter in such strict confinement that it was impossible for him again to attempt to escape. Firishtah is rather inconsistent in describing the last days of Maḥmūd Shāh. He says first that he نه درمیان صردها نه درمیان زندگی محصول بود, i.e., he was not counted among the dead or among the living; but later on he says that he and his son, who were both weak in intellect and indolent, were contented with شراب و شاد و ساقی و نانگه و قصر, i.e., with wine and mistresses and cup bearers and their throne and palace. Firishtah places the death of Maḥmūd Shāh on the 4th Dhil Hijjah, 924 A.H., (Col. Briggs has 928 A.H., October 21, 1518), and says that he reigned for 37 years and 20 days.

This is a very long note; but I have thought it necessary to give some account of the last years of the reign.

1 Both the MSS. have ملك بروید. The lith. ed. has بدون, without any prefix. It appears however from Firishtah that Malik Qāsim Barīd died in 910 A.H., and was succeeded by his son, Amr Barīd.

2 This is mentioned by Firishtah among the incidents of the year 920 A.H.
Couplet:

Whoe'er doth ignorance and indolence adopt,
His foot from the ground will fall, and his work from his hand.

These words appeared to be insolent to the Sultan. He then mounted his horse, and rode over to the army of Malik Barid; and made a complaint about the slave of 'Imād-ul-mulk. 'Imād-ul-mulk seeing what had happened returned to Kāwīl. After this, life became so miserable to the Sultan, that the maid-servants of Malik Barid carried his water and food to him, till in the year 927 A.H., he departed from this difficult lower world. The period of his reign was forty years and two months and three days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF AḤMAD SHĀH, SON OF MAḤMŪD SHĀH.

1 In the year 927 A.H., Malik Barid placed Sultan Aḥmad Shāh, son of Maḥmūd Shāh, on the throne, in the city of Bīdar, with the concurrence and advice of the amīrs and khāns; but he left only the name of bādshāh to him; and kept him (confined) in his house. The amīrs all took up their residences in their jāgīrs; and were all independent of one another. The name of bādshāh was given to

1 Firishtah says that Amīr Barid placed Aḥmad Shāh on the throne, because he had only a small territory and only three or four thousand horsemen; and he was afraid that otherwise the rulers of the neighbouring countries would be tempted to seize Aḥmadābād Bīdar. He also says that the Sultan, like his father, was satisfied with sensual pleasures. As the stipend given to him by Amīr Barid did not suffice for his expenses, he broke up the jewelled crown of the Bāhanās, which was valued at four hundred thousand hūns (Col. Briggs says in a note £1,60,000); and sold the gems secretly. When Amīr Barid became aware of this, he put many musicians and others, who were in the palace, to death; and tried to get back the jewels; but was unsuccessful, as the men who had bought them, had fled to Bījānagar and other places.

The Sultan sent men secretly to Ismā'īl 'Ādil Khān, and complained of the hardships he suffered at the hands of Amīr Barid. Ismā'īl 'Ādil Khān sent an ambassador with presents, and sent some verbal messages, but the Sultan died before the ambassador could arrive.

Firishtah says that Aḥmad Shāh died in 927 A.H., after a reign of two years and one month. Col. Briggs (vol. II., page 554) has the same year, but he reduces the duration of the reign to two years only.
poor oppressed Ahmad Shah for a period of two years and one month. He died in the year 929 A.H.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTAN 'ALĀ-UD-DIN,¹ SON OF MAHMUD SHAH.

When the poor and helpless Ahmad Shah died, Malik Barid, with the concurrence of the amirs took 'Ala-ud-din, the brother of Ahmad Shah by the hand; and made him the badshah. He kept him (confined) in the house as he had kept his brother. The nobility of the nature and the high spirit of the prince, however, incited him to collect men round him, and to give fresh life to the ancient customs and rules; and like his great ancestors to conquer fresh territory. Malik Barid coming to know of this in concert with Nizam-ul-mulk, son of Malik Nizam-ul-mulk and 'Imad-ul-mulk, son of 'Imad-ul-mulk and 'Adil Khan, son of 'Adil Khan Sawai, took away the name of saltanat from him. He in truth released him from bondage and confinement; and raised his brother in his place. The period of his reign, which was passed in confinement and imprisonment, was one year and eleven months.

¹ He is called the son of Mahmud Shah in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. In the heading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, he is described as the son of Ahmad Shah Bahmani. There is nothing said about his parentage in the account of his reign. In Col. Briggs's translation there is no mention of King Alla-ood-Deen's father. It appears however that Mahmud had three sons, Ahmad Shah, 'Ala-ud-din and Wali-ul-lah, and they were raised to the throne one after the other, but none of them had any real power.

According to Firishtah Amir Barid kept the throne unoccupied for fourteen days; but after that, for the same reason as before, he did not himself mount it, but placed 'Ala-ud-din on it. The latter, who was brave and intelligent and knew that his predecessors had ruined themselves by indulgence in wine and sensual pleasures, abstained from them; and exerted himself to effect the destruction of Amir Barid and the others, who had seized his ancestral dominion. With this object he flattered and conciliated Amir Barid. At the same time he collected a body of men for the assassination of Amir Barid; and kept them concealed in the palace. They were to seize Amir Barid and his associates when they came to offer their salutations on the morning of the first day of the month. When they came near the Sultan's apartment, one of the men who was hiding happened to sneeze. The plot was discovered. The conspirators were tortured and put to death; and the Sultan was imprisoned and soon after put to death. His reign extended to two years and three months.
THE SULTANS OF THE DAKIN

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN WALI-UL-LAH,
SON OF MAHMD ShĀH.

When 1 Malik Barid, son of Barid, gave Sultān 'Alā-ud-din freedom from the imprisonment of sovereignty, he brought his brother, who had the name of Wali-ul-lah, and appended the name of Sultān to him. He however without hesitation entered the Sultān's harem, and no one had the power to forbid him. Going there he conceived a passion for the Sultān's wife; and his evil passion led him to administer poison to Wali-ul-lah; and to take the latter's wife to himself. The period of his (i.e., Wali-ul-lah's) imprisonment did not reach a year.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF Kalim-ul-lah,
SON OF MAHMUD ShĀH.

After Sultān Wali-ul-lah had drunk the sharbat of martyrdom from the hand of 4 Malik Barid; and after this nefarious deed had been perpetrated, the helpless Kalim-ul-lah was made Sultān; and he was kept under guard like his brother in the city of Bīdar.

1 Both MSS. leave out the word Malik before the second Barid. Of course the father was Qasim Barid, and the son Amir Barid.
2 According to Firishtah Wali-ul-lah reigned as a puppet in Amir Barid's hand for three years. He also like his brother tried to secure freedom. After this, Amir Barid confined him in his harem. The latter then conceived a passion for the Sultān's wife; and effected his death; and then took his wife to himself.
3 Firishtah also in the heading of his account of Sultān Kalim-ul-lah's reign calls the latter the son of Sultān Mahmud Bahmani; but at the end of his account of the reign of Sultān Wali-ul-lah, calls Sultān Kalim-ul-lah, daughter's son of Yusuf 'Adil Shāh. This is incorrect, because it was Almud Shāh the eldest son of Mahmud Shāh, and not Mahmud Shāh himself, who married the daughter of Yusuf 'Adil Shāh. Col. Briggs makes the same mistake at the commencement of the account of Kuleem Oolla Shah Bahmuni where he describes the latter as "The son of Ahmad Shah by the daughter of Yoosooef Adil Shah". It will be seen from the account of the events of the year 903 a.h. in footnote, page 128, and also from Col. Briggs's History (vol. II, page 558) that it was Ahmad Shah who was married to the daughter of Yoosooef Adil Shah.
4 Both MSS. have Az Desht Malik Barid, without any reference to Malik Barid's parentage; but the lith. ed. has Az Desht Malik Barid Bin Barid.
1 When the curtain of agreement was raised from the face of the affairs of the amirs, 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwili went to the aid of Muhāmmad Khān son of 'Ādil Khān the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, and, after fighting with Niẓām-ul-mulk and Malik Barīd and Khudāwand Khān and all the amirs of the Deccan ran away. Three hundred elephants and a hundred horses and a large quantity of arms fell into the hands of the Dakini armies, 'Imād-ul-mulk fled to Asir and Burhānpūr. But in the end, with the help of Sūltān Bahādur (of Gujrat), he regained possession of his dominions. In the year 935 A.H., he read the Khutba in the name of Sūltān Bahādur in the towns and parganas of his territories. Again at the invitation of 'Imād-ul-mulk, Sūltān Bahādur invaded the Deccan. As Niẓām-ul-mulk and Malik Barīd and the other amirs were not strong enough to withstand him, they in their helplessness, read the Khutba in the name of Sūltān Bahādur in Ahmadnagar and all the provinces of the Deccan. The provinces of the Deccan then came into the possession of four amirs; viz., Niẓām-ul-mulk, 'Ādil Khān, Qutb-ul-mulk and

1 Firishtah does not mention these conflicts among the amirs at all. His account of the reign of Sūltān Kahīm-ul-lah is entirely different from that of Niẓām-ud-dīn. He says that in 932 A.H. Bābar came from Kābul; and took possession of Delhi. Ismāʾil 'Ādil Shāh, Burhan Niẓām Shāh Bahīrī and Qull Qutb Shāh all sent petitions to him expressing their attachment to him. Sūltān Kahīm-ul-lah on hearing this also sent an ambassador in disguise to Bābar, offering the territory of Bārā and Daulatābād to him if he would free him from the bondage in which he was kept. Bābar was too busy elsewhere, and could not pay any heed to this petition. When the news of his having sent the petition became known, Sūltān Kahīm-ul-lah, considering it necessary for his safety, fled in 934 A.H. to Ismāʾil 'Ādil Shāh, who at that place is described as his Khālī (maternal uncle), at Bijāpūr. The latter, according to the lith. ed., attempted to seize him. (Col. Briggs, however, says that he was received honourably.) He then escaped with eighteen horsemen to Burhān Niẓām Shāh Bahīr at Ahmadnagar. Burhān Niẓām Shāh received and treated him with royal honours, till Shāh Ṭāhir (on whom be the mercy of God) forbade him to do so; and explained that such conduct was highly impolitic for him. After that Burhān Niẓām Shāh discontinued receiving Sūltān Kahīm-ul-lah, who after that died at Ahmadnagar, either by poison being given to him, or by a natural death.

2 Firishtah mentions five dynasties instead of Niẓām-ud-dīn's four; viz., 'Ādil Shāhī, Niẓām Shāhī, Qutb Shāhī, 'Imād Shāhī and Barīd Shāhī. Mr. Sewell (page 106) also mentions five dynasties, viz., the "'Ādil Shāhs of Bijāpūr . . . ; the Barīd Shāhs of Bidr or Ahmadabad; the Imād Shāhs of Bīrār; the Niẓām Shāhs of Ahmadnagar and the Qutb Shāhs of Golkonda".
Malik Barid; and up to this day which is in the year 1002 A.H., the rule of the Deccan is vested in these four dynasties. And something of their conditions will now be narrated.

SECTION II. 1 THE NIZĀM-UL-MULKĪ LINE OR DYNASTY.

AN ACCOUNT OF NIZĀM-UL-MULK BĀHRI.

He was a slave of Brahman descent. His name had been Ḍheeru (Bhareu); and by change of letters, he was called Bahri. His son Aḥmad, who had in his head an ambition to rule, commenced hostilities, the vazīrs of Sūltān Kālīm-ul-lah made Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri a prisoner, and drawing a pencil across his eyes, ulti-

1 Firishtah begins with an account of the ‘Āḍil Shāhī line, and then goes on with the Nizām Shāhīs. The title of the section is not given in the text-edition.
2 Bhareu may be a corruption of Bhairo, which again is a corruption of Sanskrit Bhairava (lit. terrible) one of the names of the god Siva. Firishtah (lith. ed.) says that Malik Nāyib Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri’s name was तिमाहदत and his father’s name was धीरु Bheru. Col Briggs (vol. III, p. 189) says his name was Timapa, son of Bhairoo. It is not clear to me why he was called Bhareu or Bahri which was his father’s name, and not Timābhat which was his own name. According to Firishtah, Timābhat and Bhareu were taken prisoners by the Musalmāns in Bjiṅagar in the reign of Ahmad Shāh Bahmani; and Bhareu’s name was changed to Hasan when he was enlisted among the Sultan’s slaves or guards. He was very intelligent, and so was sent to school with the prince who later became Muhammad Shāh. In a short time he became well-known as Malik Hasan Bhareu; but Muhammad Shāh in his boyhood being unable to pronounce Bhareu changed it to Bahri; and he became known as Malik Hasan Bahri. When Muhammad became the Sultan, he made Malik Hasan Bahri a commander of one thousand horse; and the latter gradually rose to be Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri; and by the favour of Khwājah Jahān Gāwān was made taraḍār of Tilang. In the text-edition it is धीरु.
3 This is a very brief and incomplete and confused account. Firishtah’s account of the Nizām Shāhī dynasty begins with the reign of Aḥmad Nizām Shāh. The murder of Nizām-ul-mulk is only incidentally mentioned in it, where it is said that Aḥmad Nizām Shāh, after capturing a number of forts such as Jaund and Lahagar and Tangi, etc., was engaged in the siege of the fort of Dandi Rājpūrī, that he heard of the murder of his father. As this happened before 895 A.H., it could not have been the act of the vazīrs of Sūltān Kālīm-ul-lah, as stated erroneously in the text; but must have occurred in the reign of Maḥmūd Shāh which extended from 887 A.H. to 924, 927 or 928 A.H., according to different accounts.
mately put him to death. His rule had no stability, and has been narrated in the history of the Bahmanls.

1 An account of Ahmad, son of Nizam-ul-mulk Bahri.

After the death of his father, Nizam-ul-mulk, he declared his independence, and having taken possession of the whole of the country of Junir, he laid the foundation of a grand city in the middle of it; and called it Ahmadnagar. He died after having ruled for forty years. As no comprehensive work containing particulars of the conditions of this dynasty, has come before my eyes, I am confining myself to this much.

2 An account of Burhan Nizam-ul-mulk, son of Ahmad.

When Burhan sat in his father's place, Shah Tahir who was one of the wisest men of the age, came from Sulthaniya in 'Iraq to the

1 Nizam-ud-din very frankly acknowledges that he did not come across any comprehensive history of the Nizam Shahi dynasty; and he has, therefore, made a very brief statement about Ahmad Nizam-ul-mulk. The latter, however, ruled for forty years and an account of his reign extends over about ten pages of the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and about twenty-one pages of Col. Briggs's translation. It would be impossible for me to add much to Nizam-ud-din's account without unduly increasing the volume of this work. I may say, however, that Ahmad Nizam-ul-mulk died in 914 A.H., 1518 A.D., leaving his son Burhan, a boy seven years of age, as his successor.

2 The words بعده است نظم الملک پدر خود are in one MS. only, but not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have, however, inserted them in the text.

3 Nizam-ud-din's account of the reign of Burhan Nizam-ul-mulk or Burhan Nizam Shahi, as Firishtah calls him, is very brief and incomplete. The reign extended, according to Nizam-ud-din, to forty-eight years; and yet his narrative is confined to about nine lines of the lith. ed. Firishtah's account extends over eighteen pages of the lith. ed., and Col. Briggs's translation to about twenty-five pages. It is impossible for me to give even a brief summary of the events which occurred during this long period. I have, however, given a fairly comprehensive translation of the narrative in the lith. ed. of Firishtah (in the next note) of the conversion of Burhan Shah and most of his subjects to the Shi'a form of the religion which appears to have taken place in 944 A.H., 1539 A.D.; as this is mentioned in the Tabaqat. The translation in Col. Briggs, vol. III, page 228, is rather short and does not mention many very curious and interesting particulars.

4 Firishtah begins with a long and detailed account of the previous history of Shah Tahir. According to that Shah Tahir established himself in 926 A.H.
Deccan; and became a companion and courtier of Burhān; and making him adopt the *Imāmīa* religion became his guide in religious matters.

at Sultāniya as a religious teacher. Shāh Ismā'īl Šafvi, however, ordered him to be put to death. He then left Sultāniya in all haste; and arrived at the port of Goa. From there, he went to Ismā'īl 'Adil Shāh at Bijāpur; but that ruler had no use for anyone except swordsmen and warriors; and so he did not show him any favour. Shāh Tāhir then started for the port of Chaul, in order to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca and Madīna. On the way he halted at the fort of Parinda, where Maḥdūm Khwājah Jahān Dakini received him with great honour and respect. It so happened that at this time Burhān Niẓām Shāh had sent his teacher Maulūna Pīr Muḥammad Shīrwānī, on an embassy to Khwājah Jahān; and he remained there for about a year as a pupil of Shāh Tāhir. By this time the fame of Shāh Tāhir's learning had spread all over the Deccan; and when Pīr Muḥammad came back to Aḥmadnagar, and explained the reason of his long stay at Parinda, and diluted on Shāh Tāhir's learning and wisdom Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk, who was fond of the society of learned men, invited Shāh Tāhir to come to Aḥmadnagar. He came, and was received with great honour, and began to give lessons to the learned men of the capital. Soon after this Shāhāzāda 'Abd-ul-qādir, eldest son of Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk fell ill, and all the physicians were unable to effect his cure. Then Shāh Tāhir suggested that he would be able to cure the prince, if Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk would make offerings to the twelve Imāms. Burhān agreed to do so, but Shāh Tāhir said that he did not suggest the making of offerings alone. He had something else in his mind, but he would disclose it only if Burhān would promise, that in the event of his suggestion not meeting with Burhān's approval, he would allow him and his sons to depart to Mecca. Burhān at once agreed, and bound himself by solemn oaths. Then Shāh Tāhir inquired that if the prince was cured that night, would Burhān agree to read the Khuṭba in the name of the twelve Imāms, and endeavour to give currency to the Shi'a form of religion. Burhān agreed. That night Burhān sat by the side of the bed of 'Abd-ul-qādir; and fell asleep, placing his head on the edge of the bed. Then he saw Muḥammad and the twelve Imāms in a dream; and the next morning 'Abd-ul-qādir was cured. After that 'Abd-ul-qādir and his mother, A'mīna Bībī, and all the members of the royal family accepted the Shi'a faith. Burhān wanted that the names of the twelve Imāms should be inserted at once in the Khuṭba; but Shāh Tāhir suggested that it would be better if he should convene an assembly, when the merits of the four religious sects of Iṣlām could be discussed. The discussion continued for six months without much effect. Burhān Shāh spoke to Shāh Tāhir; and said, he was unable to ascertain the superiority of any of the religious sects discussed. After further discussions, Burhān Shāh described his dream at the time of prince 'Abd-ul-qādir's illness. Then most of the members of the royal family and the great officers, etc., accepted the Shi'a
In the year 945 A.H., Sultân Bâhâdur Gujrâtî advanced to conquer the Deccan; and having arrived in the neighbourhood of Aâmâd-nâgâr, encamped at a place, which is known as Kâlâchâbûtra. Burhân came forward in the way of sincerity and service; and did homage to him. The latter showed him favour; and gave him an umbrella, and other insignia of royalty. They say that Sultân Bâhâdur said to Shâh Tâhir, “Do not you accompany Burhân when he comes to me, so that there may be no derogation to your honour, for whenever Burhân comes to wait on me, he has to remain standing; and as you are connected with him, you have also to follow his example, and remain standing”. Sultân Bâhâdur held Shâh Tâhir in great respect.

As Burhân Nizâm-ul-mulk received strength and support from Sultân Bâhâdur, he had the public prayer read, and coins struck in his own name. He ruled for forty-eight years.

form of religion. Mullâ Pîr Muhammed and other learned men were angry and left the assembly. They then had a conference at Mullâ Pîr Muhammed’s house, where some one suggested that Shâh Tâhir should be seized and put to death; but Mullâ Pîr Muhammed said that as long as Burhân Shâh should be alive, they would not be able to effect their purpose. He suggested that Burhân Shâh should be deposed; and prince ‘Abd-ul-qâdir placed on the throne; after which Shâh Tâhir could be executed. Then they surrounded the fort, in which the palace was located. Burhân Shâh took measures for defending it; but at the same time went to Shâh Tâhir, and explained the state of things. Shâh Tâhir who was versed in divination told Burhân Shâh to march out of the fort, when the rebels would at once submit. Burhân Shâh did so. Then Shâh Tâhir read a verse of the Qurân over a handful of earth; and threw it in the direction of the enemy; and told the heralds to go close to the latter, and call out that all loyal subjects should immediately come under the shadow of the royal umbrella; and those who were disloyal (harâmâdâwâr) should follow Mullâ Pîr Muhammed. Immediately the amîrs and the commanders of the army and the soldiers came over to Burhân Shâh; while Mullâ Pîr Muhammed with a small number of soldiers went to his own house. He was seized by men who were sent by Burhân Shâh, and the latter ordered his execution; but, at the intercession of Shâh Tâhir, the order of execution was cancelled, and he was kept in imprisonment in a fort for four years, after which, again at the intercession of Shâh Tâhir, he was restored to favour.

This is a long note, but I have inserted it, as it is very interesting in many ways. Col. Briggs has left the matter of the conversion of Burhân Shâh and his subjects entirely out of his translation.
AN ACCOUNT OF Husain Niżām-ul-mulk, son of Burhān.

After his father he sat in the latter’s place. It is related traditionally that Burhān Niżām-ul-mulk became enamoured of a prostitute, and married her. One day he asked her in private, what persons she had liked best, and pleased most, among the men who had visited her during the time that she had lived in her former way. She named four persons. He had all four of them seized, and gave orders for those helpless persons being put to death. That prostitute was called Āmnā and Husain Niżām-ul-mulk was born of her.

1 According to Firishtah the succession was not without a contest. Husain Shāh, who was thirty years of age (Col. Briggs says incorrectly that he was in his thirteenth year), succeeded Burhān Niżām Shāh as being his eldest son, but Shāhzāda ‘Abd-ul-qādir, who had much honour in the sight of his father, did not agree to Husain Shāh’s succession. He and the other princes left the palace, and two factions were formed, the foreigners and the Hābešis joined Husain Niżām Shāh; and the Dākinis, Hindūs and Musalmāns, were on the side of the other princes. There was every likelihood of a civil war; but Qāsim Beg Ḥakīm succeeded in detaching four hundred or five hundred silahdārs and haušālādārs from ‘Abd-ul-qādir’s party. Others joined Husain Niżām Shāh; and ‘Abd-ul-qādir with some of his partisans fled to ‘Imād-ul-mulk in Berār. He died there. The other princes fled to Bijāpūr; and ‘Ādil Shāh espousing the cause of one of them, Shāh Ḥaidar, who was the son-in-law of Khwājah Jahān ruler of Parinda marched to recover Sholāpūr; but Husain Niżām Shāh attacked and captured the fort of Parinda.

Afterwards ‘Ādil Shāh espoused the cause of Mirān Shāh ‘Alī who was his cousin (‘ammāzāda); but Husain Niżām Shāh advanced with seven thousand horsemen, whom he obtained from Daryā ‘Imād-ul-mulk, to Sholāpūr, which ‘Ādil Shāh was then besieging, and after a severe battle the Bijāpūr army was defeated.

2 She is called a فارسی girl by Niżām-ud-dīn. She is منه تام مولی in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and in Col. Briggs’s History (vol. III, p. 215), “Ameena a dancing girl”. Firishtah says, Burhān made her the chief of his harem; and from her he learned to drink intoxicating liquors; and, owing to this, Mukammāl Khān who was his vazīr and qādī during his minority, and had worked with zeal and ability, resigned his office. It is also mentioned by Firishtah that when in 931 a.h. Burhān Shāh married Bībī Mariam, the sister of Ismā‘īl ‘Ādil Shāh, Bībī Āmīna did not treat her well; and she complained to her brother; and there was a war between Burhān Niżām-ul-mulk and his allies. Amīr Barī, and ‘Alī-ud-dīn ‘Imād-ul-mulk on the one hand and Ismā‘īl ‘Ādil Shāh on the other in which ‘Imād-ul-mulk was defeated and retired in precipitance to Kāwīl; and Burhān Niżām-ul-mulk became unconscious, through heat and thirst; and was carried away in a pālki to Aḥmadnagar.
At that time 1 Rām Rāj of Bijānagar, which in the Hindi language is known as 2 Bedbānagar, had acquired much strength and power. Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk with ‘Ādil Khān and Quṭb-ul-mulk and Malik Barid attacked him. 3 Rām Rāj advanced to meet them with

---

1 It appears from Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar," p. 109, that Rām Rāj or Rāma Rāya, as Mr. Sewell calls him, was not the titular Rāja of Vijayanagar. Sādasiva, who succeeded Achyuta in 1542 A.D., was the Rāja de jure, but he "was virtually a prisoner in the hands of Rāma Rāya, the eldest of three brothers, at first nominally his minister, but afterwards independent".

2 "These three men held the government of the kingdom till 1565, when the empire was utterly overthrown by a confederation of the five Muhammadan kings of the Dakhan, already mentioned, at the battle of Talikota—so-called—and the magnificent capital was almost wiped out of existence." It appears also from Mr. Sewell's History, p. 184, note 1, that Rāma Rāya was married to a daughter of Krishna Deva, who was king of Vijayanagar from 1509 to 1530, A.D.

3 The name is بید ناگر and بید مالکر in the MSS. and بید ناگر in the lith. ed. In text بید ناگر.

3 This is a very brief and incorrect account of the relations between the Nizām Shāhī rulers and those of Bijānagar and the final defeat and death of Rām Rāj. It appears from Firishtah, that the relations between Burhān Nizām Shāh and Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh were strained ; and in 950, Burhān Shāh sent Shāh Tāhir to congratulate Jamāḥīd Quṭb Shāh on his accession ; and on that occasion he instigated Rām Rāj and Quṭb Shāh to invade and conquer a part of the ‘Ādil Shāhī dominion. ‘Ādil Shāh, however, conciliated both Nizām Shāhī and Rām Rāj. Some time after that, Burhān Shāh at the instigation of Rām Rāy advanced to Gulbarga. ‘Ādil Shāh went forward to meet Rām Rāy and a great battle ensued in which Burhān Shāh was at first victorious; but in the end he was attacked by ‘Ādil Shāh, when his troops were engaged in plundering; and was signally defeated, and fled behind his royal umbrella and standards and elephants and artillery.

After various other operations and after the death of Shāh Tāhir, Burhān Nizām Shāh again resolved to attack the Bijāpur territory and sent ambassadors to Rām Rāj. The latter was put to great straits by the Marhatta cavalry under Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh. Burhān Nizām Shāh attacked ‘Ādil Shāh's camp, when he and his nobles and soldiers were engaged in celebrating the 'Id, and slew many of them and compelled the rest to run away in all haste. After this Kāliān was surrendered by the garrison. In the mean time, ‘Ādil Shāh marched into the Nizām Shāhī territory, and devastated Bir and other parganas ; and laid siege to Parinda and captured it. After that ‘Ādil Shāh went back to Bijāpur and Burhān Nizām Shāh marched towards Parinda. The thānasār
one hundred thousand horsemen and two thousand elephants, and
arranged them in order of battle; and it was likely that the four
being panic struck left the place and Nizām Shāh recaptured it, and made
it over to Khwājah Jahān, and returned to Ahmādngār.
He again opened negotiations with Rām Rāj; and passing through the
Bijāpūr territory, met him in the neighbourhood of Rāichūr; and they settled
that Rāichūr and Mudkal should be seized, and should belong to Rām Rāj;
and Sholāpūr and Gulbarga to Būrhān Shāh. They accordingly seized these
forts. In 960, Būrhān Shāh and Rām Rāj again invaded the Bijāpūr territory,
and settled that they should besiege the fort of Saghūr and Etgar, and should
seize the whole of the neighbouring territory up to the river Bīmā; and then
seize Bījāpūr and Gulbarga. In 961 when they advanced towards Bījāpūr,
‘Adil Shāh being unable to meet them retired to Panāla. Būrhān Shāh was
engaged in the siege of Bījāpūr and was about to seize it, when he fell ill and
went back to Ahmādngār died there. Firāshtah points out that Māhmūd
Shāh of Gujarāt and Sāfīm Shāh Sūr died in the same year.
After the accession of Ḥussain Nīzām Shāh and the death of Ibrāhīm ‘Adil
Shāh the former sent ambassadors to Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shāh; and they marched
from their respective capitals, and met at Gulbarga, and laid siege to it; and
were about to capture it, when Muṣṭafā Khān Ardīstānī, the minister of
Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shāh persuaded the latter to detach himself from Ḥussain Nīzām
Shāh; and the latter had to return to his capital without attaining his object.
‘Ali ‘Adil Shāh who had succeeded Ibrāhīm ‘Adil Shāh now entered into an
alliance with Rām Rāj and Quṭb Shāh, in order to retaliate the injury done
to him. Ḥussain Nīzām Shāh sent Mūllā ‘Ali Mazandarānī to Daryā ‘Imād-ul-
mulk of Bārār; and the emissary succeeded in bringing about an interview
between his master and ‘Imād-ul-mulk near Sūnpat (the lith. ed. of Firāshtah
says on the bank of the Ganges, but Col. Briggs says, more correctly, on the
bank of the Godāvarī); and a marriage was arranged and celebrated with
great splendour between the daughter of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and Ḥussain Nīzām
Shāh.
Sometime after, in the year 967 a.h., ‘Ali ‘Adil Shāh with Rām Rāj and
Quṭb Shāh advanced towards Ahmādngār. Ḥussain Nīzām Shāh’s minister
suggested that he should surrender the fort of Kālīn to ‘Adil Shāh and make
peace with the latter. Ḥussain Nīzām Shāh did not agree, and said that it
would be a matter of discredit to him, if he would surrender a fort which his
father had conquered with the sword. The allies arrived at Ahmādngār with
one lakh of horsemen and two lakhs of foot-soldiers. Ḥussain Nīzām Shāh
left Ahmādngār in charge of his officers, and retired towards Pattan, so that
he might get Daryā ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and Mīrān Mubārak Shāh Fārūqī and ‘Ali
Barīd to unite with him. It so happened, however, that Khān Jahān, brother
of Aμūr Barīd, who was in charge of ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s affairs, not only dissuaded
the latter from helping Ḥussain Nīzām Shāh, but proceeded himself with five
rulers should meet with a defeat, when by an act of fate, a cannon ball, shot from the army of Niẓām-ul-mulk, hit Rām Rāj and killed thousand horsemen and foot-soldiers to devastate Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh’s territories. He was, however, defeated by Shāh Muḥammad Naṣṣābūrī, whom Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh sent against him. In the meantime the allied sovereigns laid siege to Ahmāndagar; but Qutb Shāh thinking that it would be unwise, that ‘Ādīl Shāh would have too great a power over Husain Niẓām Shāh, allowed free passage for provisions and emissaries of Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh to enter the fort, through his lines. ‘Ādīl Shāh and Rām Rāj, coming to know this, demanded an explanation from Qutb Shāh, who without giving it, left in the night and went back to Golkonda. Rām Rāj and ‘Ādīl Shāh finding it difficult to maintain their position retired to the town of Āśhtī; and there planned that they should first seize the fort of Parinda, and afterwards return and capture Ahmāndagar. Husain Niẓām Shāh then made overtures to Rām Rāj for peace. Rām Rāj agreed on three conditions, all of which Husain Niẓām Shāh found it necessary to accept, Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh made over the keys of Kālān to Rām Rāj in fulfilment of one of the latter’s conditions; and he sent them to ‘Ali ‘Ādīl Shāh.

In the beginning of 970 A.H., Husain Niẓām Shāh and Qutb Shāh met in the neighbourhood of Kālān, and proceeded to lay siege to it, and were about to capture it, when Rām Rāj and ‘Ādīl Shāh arrived in that neighbourhood, with a large army. Burhān ‘Imād-ul-mulk, who had succeeded his father, and ‘Ali Barīd joined ‘Ādīl Shāh. Husain Niẓām Shāh then raised the siege and sent away his heavy luggage and his son and other members of his family towards the fort of Aūsā; and he himself intending to give battle to the enemy encamped at a distance of six karōhs from them. The next day Husain Niẓām Shāh advanced to carry on a jiṭhād against Rām Rāj; and Qutb Shāh also marched forward, with such men as he had, against ‘Ali ‘Ādīl Shāh and his Mūsāmān allies. It so happened, that although it was not the rainy season, there was heavy rain that day; and Husain Niẓām Shāh’s guns, etc., were rendered useless. Rām Rāj and ‘Ali ‘Ādīl Shāh, becoming aware of this, attacked Qutb Shāh’s camp, and he fled without making a struggle, and took up a position behind Husain Niẓām Shāh’s camp. Husain Niẓām Shāh now saw that it was impossible for him to do anything, and retired towards his capital. He was pursued, but he showed such dauntless courage, that the pursuers, after a time, turned back. He then came to Ahmāndagar via Āūsā. ‘Ali ‘Ādīl Shāh, Rām Rāj and their allies marched towards Ahmāndagar, when Husain Niẓām Shāh leaving the capital in charge of his officers, retired to Jūnīr. The Hindūs of Rām Rāj’s army destroyed mosques and palaces, and committed outrages on the women. ‘Ali ‘Ādīl Shāh was shocked at this, but could not prevent it. He, however, advised Rām Rāj to raise the siege, and to go in pursuit of Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh. Rām Rāj agreed, and they went after Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh. The latter retired to the hilly country, after
him. His army was routed; and much booty fell into the hands of the amirs of the Deccan. Husain Nizám-ul-mulk ruled for thirteen years. He left two sons Murtada and Burhan.

directing some of his officers to hover round the hostile army, and to carry on a guerilla warfare. They did so with much success, and as the rains were approaching, Ram Raja encamped near the river Sen. There was heavy rain and the river was flooded, and about twenty thousand men and three hundred elephants and innumerable cattle were swept away, and drowned. On account of this catastrophe Ram Raja started for his own country; and 'Adil Shah proceeded to Naldurg and repaired the fort. Ram Raja under the pretext of foregoing devastated portions of the Bijapur and Golkunda territories, eventually obtained the cession of parts of those territories, before retiring to his own country.

After this in 972 A.H., Husain Nizam Shah and 'Ali 'Adil Shah entered into matrimonial and political alliances; and they also secured the alliance of the other Mulsamans sovereigns, except Burhan 'Imad-ul-mulk, for the destruction of Ram Raja. Nizam Shah and Qutb Shah and 'Adil Shah and 'Ali Barid advanced with their armies, and crossed the Krishna, and encamped at a distance of six karbs from it. Ram Raja advanced with a formidable army to meet them; and they thinking that it would be impossible to withstand him, made overtures for peace. Ram Raja refused to listen to them. There was a great battle, in which the Hindus were defeated, mainly owing to the attacks by Husain Nizam Shah's artillery. Ram Raja was taken prisoner, when the sinhason or throne on which he was riding was thrown down by the bearers, when they were charged by some of Husain Nizam Shah's elephants. He was recognised, and taken to Husain Nizam Shah, who ordered him immediately to be beheaded. This battle is known as the battle of Talikota, though according to Mr. Sewell, see note 2, page 199 of his book, it did not take place there. Talikota is a small fortress and town near the Krishna. 'The battle took place ten miles from Rama Raya's camp south of the river, wherever that might have been.' Mr. Sewell thinks it probable that it took place near the celebrated fort of Mudkal. 'The ford crossed by the allies would appear to be that at the bend of the river at Ingali and the decisive battle seems to have been fought in the plain about the little village of Bapupur to Bhogapur, on the road leading directly from Ingali to Mudkal.' Col. Briggs has also pointed out that the battle 'has been called the battle of Talikote by the Mahomedans because the head-quarters of the several sovereigns were near that village. The battle was fought on the south bank of the Krishna, nearly twenty rulers off.' (See footnote, page 126, vol. III of his History.)

This again is a very long note, but I have considered it necessary to insert it so that there might be a correct narrative of the events, as far as that can be ascertained by a reference to Firishtah.
By the order and testamentary direction of his father, he succeeded the latter. He was benevolent and friendly to the poor. 1 Khwājah Mīrak Harvīl (of Herāt) was his minister in the beginning of

1 According to Frishtah, Murtadā's mother Khunza Humāyūn (called Khoonza Sooltana by Col. Briggs) carried on the government for six years, with Mullā 'Ināyat-ul-lah as the pāshād, and in accordance with the advice of Qasim Bég Ḥakím. She raised her three brothers to the highest rank of nobility and sat daily with Mullā 'Ināyat-ul-lah to transact public business from behind the parda. At this time, 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh advanced against the Hinduš of Bijānagar. Venkatādri, the brother of Rām Rāj applied to Khunza Humāyūn for help. She led an army into the Bijāpūr territory, and compelled 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh to retire. Peace was, however, soon made between the two Musalmān princes; and they entered into an alliance against Tufāl Khān, the prime minister of Burhān 'Imād Shāh, who had seized his master's dominions, and who had not joined them in their invasion of Bijānagar. They plundered the country; and on the approach of the rains, Tufāl Khān propitiated 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh; and the 'Ādil Shāhī and Niẓām Shāhī armies returned to their respective territories.

In 976 A.H., 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh invaded the Ahmadnagar territory. Khunza Humāyūn sent some amirs against the 'Ādil Shāhī army which was under Kishwar Khān; but the latter defeated them; and they retired to Ahmadnagar. After this some of the courtiers of Murtadā Niẓām Shāh told the latter that on account of Khunza Humāyūn's partiality to her brothers and other favourites, the army was in a wretched condition. They suggested that she should be seized, and after some delay Murtadā Niẓām agreed. They were preparing to enter the harem, when Khunza Humāyūn sent for Murtadā Niẓām; and the latter, thinking that his mother had discovered the plot, made a clean breast of it, in order to exculpate himself. She put one of the conspirators under arrest, and the others escaped. Some of them went to Bijāpūr and some to Gujrat. Khunza Humāyūn gave them assurances of safety, and asked them to return.

Then in 977 A.H., she started with her son against Kishwar Khān the Bijāpūr general. In the course of the month, Murtadā Niẓām Shāh determined to take the government into his own hands; and sent a message to that effect to his mother. She came out on horseback ready armed, but she was soon seized, and her attendants fled. Murtadā Niẓām Shāh now returned to Ahmadnagar; and levying additional forces attacked the fort of Dārūr; and seized it in a very dramatic manner, after Kishwar Khān had been slain by an arrow, which hit him on his breast. Murtadā Niẓām Shāh then invaded Bijāpūr; but shortly after that a treaty was concluded between him and 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh.
his reign; and had the title of Changiz Khan conferred on him. He conquered the country of Berar from 1 Tufal Khan; and annexed it to the territories of Murtaza Ni zam-ul-mulk. After the 2 death of Changiz Khan, it so happened, that a relationship of passion (نسب نوریغری) was produced between Ni zam-ul-mulk and the son of a bird-seller. He conferred on him the title of Musahib Khan; and made 3 him his vakil. That wretch having stretched his hands for plunder and ravage, went into people's houses; and stretched his hands over their families and children. He also endeavoured to put to death such of the amirs, as he believed to be unlikely to obey

It was sometime after this, that Khwajah Mirak had the title of Changiz Khan conferred on him, and was appointed as the vakil.  

1 The name is 'Adil Khan instead of Tufal Khan in the text-edition.  
2 Ni zam-ud-din does not mention the circumstances under which the death of Changiz Khan took place. According to Firishtah Shah Mirza Isfahani, who was hujjub or chamberlain of Quab Shah learned that Ni zam Shah's army would march against Bidar. He first of all offered a large bribe to Changiz Khan so that he might give up the idea of the invasion. Changiz Khan indignantly refused the bribe, upon which Shah Mirza Isfahani bribed Sahib Khan, whom Firishtah describes as a favourite minion of the king; and told him to report to Nizam Shah that Changiz Khan wanted to make himself the ruler of Berar. Murtaza Nizam Shah at first did not believe the report; but Sahib Khan persisted in the accusation, and referred Nizam Shah to Shah Mirza Isfahani. The Sultan sent for him, and Shah Mirza of course corroborated Sahib Khan's statement. Murtaza Nizam Shah then gave some credence to the accusation; but to make assurance doubly sure, he told Changiz Khan, that he was tired with the long stay in the camp, and wanted to go back to Ahmadnagar. Changiz Khan told him that he should remain there for sometime longer. This confirmed the Shah's suspicions, and his demeanour towards Changiz Khan changed. The latter perceived this, and for some days, on the pretext of illness, he did not go and wait on Murtaza Shah. This confirmed the latter's belief and he sent a hakim to Changiz Khan, with a poisoned draught, which he was to represent as a medicine. Changiz Khan at first refused to drink it; but in the end remembering Murtaza Shah's kindnesses to him, drank it off, after writing a petition to the latter.

It will be seen from the above that Sahib Khan was already a minion of the Sultan, before the death of Changiz Khan.  

3 This does not agree with Firishtah's account. According to him, Murtaza Nizam Shah first made Hakim Muhammed Mihr his vakil, but after six months dismissed him and appointed Qadi Beg Yazdi to that post. But Firishtah also mentions the outrages committed by Sahib Khan on the people, and even on the amirs.
his behests. After a time he marched to attack the amirs of Berār, among whom were Mīr Murtaḍa and Khusdāwand Khān, and others. As the latter knew his intention they forestalled him, and slew him.

Murtaḍa Niẓām Shāh grieved much, and saw no remedy except in madness. At this time the derangement of his brain became violent; and he secluded himself in Bāgh-i-Bihisht (the garden of paradise); and never came out of it. He also did not allow any one to go near him; and it was only rarely, that any one was received in audience. At all times the vazīrs were engaged in the affairs of the state, and maintained the stability of the government. If a matter of importance had to be dealt with, they submitted a written report to him; and he wrote a reply to it.

When six years had passed in this way, His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhi sent Pishrau Khān, who was one of the old servants of the threshold to the Deccan, so that he might acquaint himself with the state of things in that country, and submit a report about them.

1 The manner in which he was killed is described by Firishtah. It would appear, that he left the court in anger. Murtaḍa Niẓām Shāh sent some men to call him back; and they put him to death, and represented to Murtaḍa Niẓām Shāh that he fell when resisting their endeavours to take him back.

2 The meaning of this is not clear. It would appear from Firishtah’s account that he was in his senses; but he became convinced that he could not administer justice to his subjects; and so freed himself from all responsibilities; and left everything in charge of his minister; and himself went into retirement.

3 According to Firishtah, he first retired to an apartment inside the fort of Ahmadnagar, which was called Bāghhād; and later to a garden house called Hasht Bihisht. Col. Briggs says that the garden and the palace in it were still to be seen in Ahmadnagar, in his time. It was then known as the Behishty Bogh (vol. III, page 261).

4 Firishtah does not appear to mention the mission of Pishrau Khān; but he says that in 984 A.H., Akbar came to the frontiers of Mālwa, hunting. On receiving information of this, Murtaḍa Niẓām Shāh at once started for Daulatābād in a pālki with only about one hundred followers. The amirs submitted to him that it would be unwise to advance with such a small force. He waited for sometime till six thousand or seven thousand of his special troops had assembled. His generals again represented that it would be better to wait for his artillery. He did not agree to this; but the scouts brought information, at this time, that Akbar had gone back to his capital. Murtaḍa Niẓām Shāh then returned to Ahmadnagar and again secluded himself in Hasht Bihisht.
When Pishrau Khan arrived at Ahmadnagar, Asad Khan Rumí, who was at that time the vakil of Murtaza Nizam Shah, and who, communicated with the latter when from time to time he felt somewhat better and was in his right mind, brought him out; and he had an interview with Pishrau Khan. Murtaza Nizam Shah then expressed his sincerity and faithful service to the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilahi. Pishrau Khan said "His Majesty has ordered me that I should ascertain the cause of your secluding yourself". He replied "There are many men round me, and the revenues of my kingdom are not sufficient for the payment of their expenses. I come out rarely on account of my being ashamed of men". He sent back Pishrau Khan with much tribute and elephants of immense size.

It so happened that Burhan brother of Murtaza Nizam-ul-mulk escaped from prison, and rose in revolt. The amirs brought out Murtaza, and defeated Burhan. The latter fled, and went as a supplicant to the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilahi, and received imperial favours. Murtaza again secluded himself in that garden. No one went near him. This happened in the year 996 A.H. A period of three years passed in this way. There was war several times between the armies of Nizam-ul-mulk and Adil Khan, and peace was each time made. A Circassian (Karji) slave of Shah Tahmasp of the name of Salabat Khan acquired an ascendancy in the service of Nizam-ul-mulk; and became his minister pleni-potentiary. Mir Murtaza and Khudawand Khan and the other jagirdar amirs of Berar had enmity with Salabat Khan. They came with a large force, and attacked Ahmadnagar. Salabat Khan fought with them and defeated them. The Berar amirs then fled, and went for protection to the threshold of the Khalifa-i-Ilahi, which was the asylum of the world. They obtained reinforcements there, and again came back to Berar. An account of these events has already been given in its place.

1 According to Firishtah the revolt of Burhan took place before the death of Suhib Khan. Burhan escaped from the fort of Junir; and was defeated by Salabat Khan, and fled to Bijapur. He returned again, when some disaffected amirs conspired to place him on the throne; but the plot was discovered by Salabat Khan; and he had again to make his escape. After that he sought an asylum in Akbar's Court.
In his old days, Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk became enamoured of a prostitute of the name of Fattū. On account of the fact that a Saïyid named Mîr Bihishtî had this woman in his house for sometime; and he had a son of the name of Ismā’îl by another woman, Fattū used to describe Ismā’îl as her brother. Ismā’îl became the vâkil of Nizām Shâh; and put Šâlabat Kâhân in prison. They say that he showed a writing with a ص derived from Nizām-ul-mulk to the effect that Šâlabat Kâhân should remain in a fortress (or prison). Šâlabat Kâhân sent for a 3 litter; and getting into it 4 went to the fortress. Although the men in charge of the fort said that Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk was not in his right senses, and did not know anything about the order; and loyalty and faithfulness to the salt required that he should

---

1 She is called تنوّت نامه نتخت شاه لری in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls her نتخت شاه لری; and Col. Briggs has “Futteh Shah a dancer”; and he described her apparently as a man, and not as a woman (vol. III, page 264).

2 One MS. has نوشته با مداد از مرزنوی نظام الملك; while the lith. ed. has نوشته با مداد ص (correct) and is equivalent to a signature.

3 Both MSS. have دلی, but the lith. ed. has پالکی.

4 Firishtah also says that Šâlabat Kâhân, in a quixotic spirit of loyalty, immured himself in the fort of Dandrâjpûr. He gives a detailed account of the causes of Murtada Nizām Shâh’s displeasure with him. First of all, there was some trouble about some very curious and valuable necklaces which Fattū demanded. Šâlabat Kâhân, in consultation with the other ministers, had two copies of the necklaces made, and made them over to her. She found out that the necklaces given to her were copies, and complained to Murtada Nizām Shâh. Another cause was, that Murtada Nizām Shâh took it into his head, at the suggestion of the women about him, that his son Mîrân Husain wanted to dethrone him, and attempted to put him to death. Šâlabat Kâhân refused to make the Shâhzâda over to him; and put the matter off. At this time Ibrâhîm ‘Ādî Shâh invaded the Nizâm Shâhî dominions, and demanded that the marriage of his sister with Shâhzâda Mîrân Husain should be celebrated; or the bride should be sent back to Bîjâpûr. Šâlabat Kâhân refused compliance with the demand, unless Shâlâpûr should be first ceded to Nizâm Shâh. Ibrâhîm ‘Ādî Shâh, becoming angry at this, besieged Aûsa. Murtada Nizâm Shâh was enraged with Šâlabat Kâhân; and after reproaching him said, “I am tired of your disobedience, but I have no power to put you into prison”. Šâlabat Kâhân said, “Name a fortress, and I shall put myself in chains, and go and shut myself up there”. Murtada Nizâm Shâh named the fort of Dandrâjpûr; and Šâlabat Kâhân at once went and shut himself up there.
attend to the welfare of his master, he did not accept this argument; and said "I have nothing to do with these contentions. I have no alternative except obedience."

When Şalâbat Khân ceased to be in the way 1İsmā‘īl became the vakîl muftlaq (minister with absolute power); and he and the woman Fattû acquired complete power and authority. İsmā‘īl committed various acts of tyranny and oppression. As he had made 2 Hasan ‘Ali, son of Sulṭān Husain Sabazwârî his nāyîb, and had conferred the title of Mirzâ Khân on him, the latter when the tyranny and violence (of İsmā‘īl) went beyond all bounds, got most of the amîrs to join him, and made himself the vakîl of Murtaḍâ Niţâm-ul-mulk. When he found the field unoccupied, the ambition to rule got into his head; and he released (Mîrân) Husain, the son of Murtaḍâ Niţâm-ul-mulk, who had nearly attained his majority, and was imprisoned in a fort, and made him the ruler of the country.  3 They

1 Firishtah, however, says that Murtaḍâ Niţâm Shâh made Qâsim Bêg Ḥâkîm his vakîl, and Mirzâ Muḥammad Taqî Nâzîrî his vazîr.

2 According to Firishtah, however, it was Sulṭān Husain Sabazwârî himself, and not his son who was made regent with the title of Nâzîr Khân, by Murtaḍâ Niţâm Shâh, because the other minister did not agree to the latter’s proposal to effect the destruction of Shâhzâda Mîrân Husain.

3 Niţâm-ud-dîn’s account of the way in which Murtaḍâ Niţâm Shâh was killed is correct but incomplete. He has omitted all mention of an attempt by Murtaḍâ Niţâm Shâh to burn his son Mîrân Husain to death. He told his ministers, Qâsim Bêg Ḥâkîm and Mirzâ Muḥammad Taqî Nâzîrî that he had great longing to see his son. They were very thankful to God for this change in their master’s disposition, and sent the Shâhzâda into the fort. Murtaḍâ at first showed much affection towards the prince; and put him in a chamber near Bâghdâd (see page 147, note 3). Then he set fire to the bed clothes, and shut the doors from the outside. When Mîrân Shâh woke up he ran to the door, and called out for help. Fatahî Shâh, it must be said to her credit, opened the door; and sent the prince to the ministers. There was not, therefore, very much to choose between the father and the son; but it may be said that the former was, or affected to be mad. But evidently there was much method in his madness.

It may be mentioned here, that Firishtah’s account of the events in Murtaḍâ Niţâm Shâh’s reign is that of a contemporary, who took part in some of the events, which he has recorded. According to his account, he was employed by Murtaḍâ Niţâm Shâh to watch Nâzîr Khân, when the latter turned against him, and took up the cause of Shâhzâda Mîrân Shâh.
threw Murtaḍa Niẓām-ul-mulk into a hot (Turkish) bath, and shut all the doors; and the poor man died of the heat. The rule of Murtaḍa Niẓām-ul-mulk extended to twenty-six years and some months.

**AN ACCOUNT OF ḤUSAIN NIẒĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF MURTAḌA NIẒĀM-UL-MULK, WHO WAS CALLED MĪRĀN ḤUSAIN.**

Mīrzā Khān kept him as a figurehead and himself carried on the government. 1 The prince on account of his youth was occupied during the whole of his time in pleasure and dissipation, and in cock fights and in wandering about in the baḍār. He roamed about during most of the time in the lanes and baḍārs in a drunken state in the company of women of the town, and committed harsh and offensive acts. 2 As the strength and power of Mīrzā Khān went beyond all bounds, the old amīrs of the Deccan became jealous and envious of him; and induced the young and inexperienced Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk to get rid of him. Accordingly 3 a feast was arranged in the house of

---

1 The character of Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk as given by Firishtah does not quite agree with that given by Niẓām-ud-dīn. Firishtah also says that he was a young man of dissolute character; but he was also of a cruel and savage disposition. When he went about in a drunken state in the city, he killed men whom he met and who were guilty of no crime whatever, with arrows and musket shots and the sword.

2 Before this however, according to Firishtah, some of his associates informed Ḥusain Shāh, that Mīrzā Khān had brought Ḥusain Shāh's uncle from the fort of Asrār (the lith. ed. has اسیر, and Col. Briggs, vol. III, p. 268, Joonere); and was keeping him concealed in his house, with the object of placing him on the throne, after deposing Ḥusain Shāh. The latter ordered Mīrzā Khān to be placed in imprisonment; but when the accusation was found to be false, he reinstated him, and increased his honours. Mīrzā Khān suggested, that in order to prevent future accusations of this kind, all the surviving male members of the royal family should be put to death; and fifteen persons, namely, his uncles and their male offsprings, were put to death in one day.

3 The account of this feast in the text agrees severely with that given by Firishtah. The name of the man who gave the feast is also Ankas Khān in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs, vol. III, p. 271, Bungush Khan. The man who became ill, or according to Firishtah, feigned to be ill as previously arranged, with Mīrzā Khān was, according to Firishtah Aḵā Mir Sharwānī, and the date of the feast was Thursday, the 12th Jamād-al-awwal, 997 A.H. Col. Briggs gives the 10th Jumād-ool-awul 997 A.H., March 15th, 1588 A.D., as the date.
Ankas Kháñ, who was a foster-brother (a son of the wet-nurse) of Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk, and was of the same age as he; and Mirzā Kháñ was invited to it. He, however, got information of the intention (of his enemies); and did not attend the feast, sending excuses for his absence. It so happened that after the feast Saiyid Murtaḍa Sharwānī, a friend of Mirzā Kháñ, who was among those who had come to the feast, got up vomiting and cried out and complained that they had given him poison. Mirzā Kháñ went and saw Saiyid Murtaḍa; and after having arranged matters went to wait on Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk, he told the latter, "Saiyid Murtaḍa is a 1 man highly esteemed, and is lying on the bed of death; and air and water (climate or atmosphere) inside the fort are salubrious. He might, if you so order, be there for some days." 2 After obtaining permission he sent the man to the fort. 3 On the following day, he again waited on Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk; and took him to enquire about the health of Saiyid Murtaḍa; and then imprisoned him, (i.e., Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk), in an apartment there.

Couplet:

Place not thy foot on the path of deceit and fraud,
For in the end, in the net of danger thou must be caught.

---

1 The actual words are میراث میر از امیران بهروز. Firishtah has بکی از امیران بهروز است، i.e., one of your great amirs. شماست.

2 The account given by Niẓām-ud-din of the way, in which the incarceration of Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk was effected, is consistent. That given by Firishtah is somewhat different, and is rather confused. He says that Mirzā Kháñ reported to Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk, that Aqā Mir Sharwānī should be sent outside the fort; and should be allowed to live in a part of his (i.e., the Sultān's) own palace. Afterwards Mirzā Kháñ went and reported that Aqā Mir's condition was serious; and suggested that it would be a great kindness on his part, if he would go, and enquire after his health. Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk then rode into the fort, with two or three companions, and was at once placed in confinement.

3 The way in which the revolution was affected, as given by Firishtah, agrees mainly with that in the text. Firishtah however says, that two sons of Burhān, namely Ibrāhīm and Ismā'īl, were brought from the fort of Lāhagar, where they had been imprisoned, so that one of them might be selected and placed on the throne; and eventually Ismā'īl, the younger of the two, who was only twelve years of age was chosen to be the puppet Sultān.
The doors were then shut and placed in charge of his (Mirzā Khān's) men. Saiyid Murtaḍa in complete health and strength, sat at the gate of the fort, and supervised everything. Mirzā Khān had Ankas Khān also seized, and put him into prison. He sent Mir Tāhir, son-in-law of Amin-ul-mulk to the fort, and brought Ismā'īl son of Burhān who was the nephew of Murtaḍa Niẓām-ul-mulk out of prison; and he was brought to Ahmadnagar.

When the news of the imprisonment of Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk was bruited about, 1 Jamāl Khān Gujrātī, who was the commander of the silāḥdārs, and the slave Yāqūt who had the title of Khudāwānd Khān united together, and having secured the union of the soldiers and other men with themselves, came in a crowd to the gate of the fort, and commenced to fire cannon. Mirzā Khān came to the gate; and a great fight took place. Kishwar Khān, the uncle-in-law (khāl) of Mirzā Khān and 'Ali Khān were slain. Mirzā Khān and Saiyid Murtaḍa and Jamshīd Khān and Amin-ul-mulk and Bhā’ī Khān and

---

1 The account of the way in which Jamāl Khān came to support Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk, and the latter was murdered by Mirzā Khān and his partisans, as given in the text, agrees with that given by Firishtah. According to the latter, however, Jamāl Khān was the leader of the Dakinis and Ḥabshis, and Mirzā Khān of the foreigners, other than the Ḥabshis. He also says that Mirzā Khān did nothing when Jamāl Khān had five or six thousand horsemen and many men on foot, including the people of the bāzār; but later when twenty-five thousand horsemen came to Jamāl Khān, who was Mahdawi, he encouraged the men in the fort, by giving each, one kamīān of red gold; and sent out hundred and fifty Gharibzādas seven Gharibs and twenty Dakinis and one elephant (بخت), which had the name of Ghulām 'Ali. (the meaning is not at all clear) under his Khālu Muhammad Sa’īd and Kishwar Khān (it is again not clear whether the men were both maternal uncles of Mirzā Khān or only one of them, or whether Muḥammad Sa’īd was the uncle’s name, and Kishwar Khān his title). Col. Briggs does not help in this matter, as he does not mention that Mirzā Khān sent anybody from the fort to fight with Jamāl Khān’s men. Kishwar Khān knew that it was impossible for him to do anything against such terrible odds. Still he came out, and made brave onsets; and he and most of the men perished. It was after this, that Mirzā Khān ordered the head of Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk to be cut off, and fixed on a lance at the top of a bastion. After this some of the Dakinis wanted to go back to their own houses; but Jamāl Khān strenuously objected; and he was selected as their leader; and the gate of the fort was set on fire.
Khan Khanan and other men then decided to cut off the head of Husain, and to throw it outside the fort, under a mistaken idea, that their doing so would put an end to the disturbance. They also brought Isma'il the son of Burhan and placed him on the top of a bastion and raised the royal umbrella over his head. They also proclaimed, that "as Husain was unfit to rule, he had met with his deserts, and Isma'il Nizam-ul-mulk is now your ruler".

Jamal Khan and the other amirs seeing Husain's head fought with greater energy; and set fire to the gate of the fort. Although Mirza Khan knocked on the door of peace, it had no effect. In the end Mirza Khan and his partisans came out of the fort, and took the path of flight. Mirza Khan escaped, but Jamshid Khan and Bhai Khan and Amin-ul-mulk and Saiyid Murtaqa and other leaders were seized and put to death. As Mirza Khan was going away towards Junir, some people recognised him, and seizing him brought him back. By the order of Jamal Khan, he was torn limb from limb and was put in a cannon, and fired off. The hand of destruction was then raised and of the 'Iraqis and Khorasanis and Mawar-an-nahris every one that was seized was slain.

Couplets:
With my own eyes I saw, that on the path,
A small bird struck on the life of an ant;
But yet its beak had not finished the prey;
Another bird came and devoured it up.

The women and children were carried away to captivity; and whole families were destroyed. About four thousand innocent persons, who had no connection whatever with the affairs, were murdered. On the whole wherever a man with a white skin was seen, he was killed.

The period of the rule of Husain Nizam-ul-mulk was about two months.

1 The account of the flight of Mirza Khan and his partisans and of the massacre which followed, as given in the text, agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah. There are some differences, but it is not necessary to mention them.

2 Firishtah makes it two months and three days. So ten months in the text-edition.
AN ACCOUNT OF 1 Ismā'īl Niẓām-ul-mulk, SON OF BURHĀN.

When they 2 desisted from the general massacre, Jamāl Khān raised Ismā'īl Niẓām-ul-mulk, to the seat of power; and kept him as a puppet or figurehead; and himself carried on the government. Ismā'īl in spite of the fact of his 3 youth, perpetrated harsh and cruel acts. They say that he was passing one day through the būzār, and his eye fell on a group of Kashmiri. As he saw that they had white skins, he enquired why they also had not been slain.

In short, Jamāl Khān having acquired complete ascendancy the duty of carrying on the Niẓām-ul-mulkī government devolved on him. On account of a dispute which cropped up between the Niẓām-ul-mulkī and the 'Ādil Shāhī governments on the border of the two territories, 4 he invaded the 'Ādil Shāhī country, and fought a battle, and was victorious; and three hundred elephants were taken by him as part of the plunder.

---

1 According to Firishtah, Ibrāhīm the elder brother of Ismā'īl was born of a Ḥabshi mother, and had a dark complexion and an unprepossessing appearance. Ismā'īl was a son of a daughter of one of the Nawābats of the Kōhān (Cōncan), and possessed both good qualities and looks. The fact mentioned by Niẓām-ud-dīn, about his remark about the Kashmiri, does not show that he possessed the former. According to Firishtah, Jamāl Khān was a Mahdawi; and he initiated Ismā'īl in the doctrines of that sect. After this, Ṣalābat Khān, who was imprisoned in the fort of Kehrla on the borders of Berār, hearing of the murder of Mirān Ḥusain, and being aggrieved at the power of the Mahdawis rose in revolt; but Jamāl Khān defeated him in the neighbourhood of Pattan, and made him retire towards Burhānpūr. He then marched to meet the 'Ādil Shāhī forces, and the two armies met near Aṣhti. They confronted each other for fifteen days, after which peace was concluded, on an agreement that Jamāl Khān should send back the pālki of the mother Mirān Husain Shāh, with seventy thousand hūns as Na'lībāha. This is what is mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs says, that the agreement was, that "Chand Beeby, the widow of Ally Adil Shah, and aunt to the present King of Ahmadnuggur, should be sent to the Bheejaopoor Camp, and the Nizam Shaby Government should pay two hundred and seventy thousand hoons (Nalbaha)" (vol. III, p. 278).

2 The word is پرداختند in one MS. It is پرداختند in the other and in the lith. ed.

3 The lith. ed. has صغر سن which has been adopted in the text-edition.

4 This invasion and victory took place according to Firishtah at a somewhat later period.
At this time, 1 Burhān, brother of Murtada Niẓām-ul-mulk, who had entered the service of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, having heard of the disturbances in the Deccan, came there in the year 997 A.H., in accordance with a farmān of the threshold, which was the asylum of all people; and with its help and assistance, he came to

1 According to Firishtah, Akbar, on hearing of the accession of Ismā‘īl Niẓām-ul-mulk, sent for Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk from Bangash, where he had a fief; and offered to send him to the Deccan with an army, so that he might take possession of his ancestral dominions. Burhān said “people would be averse to join me, if I go with a Mughal army; let me go alone to conciliate the people, and bring them over to my side”. Akbar agreed to this; and gave him pargana Hândia as a jagir; and also sent a farmān to Rāja ‘Ali Khan to help him. Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk sent qaulānāmas to the zamīīndārs of the country of Ahmadnagar. They expressed their willingness to join him. He then marched with a small force by way of Gōndwāna into Berār; but Jahāngīr Khān Ḥabshi, who had agreed to join him, now turned against him, and met him in battle. Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk was defeated and retired to Hândia. After this, he obtained the help of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh, and Rāja ‘Ali Khān, and came to Burhānpūr; and began to collect troops. Jamāl Khān then consulted with other Mahdawīs; and Saiyid Amjad-ul-mulk Mahdawi was made commander of the Berār forces to meet Rāja ‘Ali Khān and Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk; and Jamāl Khān himself advanced to meet Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh. He met Dilāwar Khān Ḥabshi, the leader of the ‘Ādil Shāhī army at Darsang; and defeated him and seized three hundred elephants. Jamāl Khān was still there, when he heard that the amīrs of Berār had submitted to Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk. He then with great pomp and splendour advanced to meet the latter. Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk on the advice of ‘Ādil Shāh and Rāja ‘Ali Khān, ordered the Marhatta horse to hover about Jamāl Khān’s camp and to cut off their supply of grain and fodder. Owing to this, many deserted Jamāl Khān and joined Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk. When Jamāl Khān reached the Rōhangīr Ghāt, he found that Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk’s men had blocked it. He attempted to get through by another way, which was very difficult; and his army suffered much from heat and thirst. When they came near a place, where they had hoped to get some water, they found that Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk had already occupied it. At last they found a place where there was a little water; and Jamāl Khān and his partisans resolved to fight at once, after quenching their thirst a little. The battle was fought on the 13th of Rajab 999 A.H.; and Jamāl Khān was about to gain a victory, when he was struck on the forehead by a bullet from a musket, and killed. His partisans fled; but some of them and Ismā‘īl Niẓām-ul-mulk were seized. Ismā‘īl was sent to attend his father Burhān. Col. Briggs says he was confined by his father; and deprived of his throne (vol. III, page 281)
the country of Berār, and with the help of Rāja ʿAlī Khān, ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr, took possession of it. At this time Jamāl Khān advanced rapidly with much pride and haughtiness to attack Burhān-ul-mulk; and fought with him and was killed. The country of Aḥmadnagar and Berār then came into the possession of Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk; and up to this day, which is in the year 1002 a.h., he occupies the place of his ancestors.

The period of the rule of Ismāʿīl was about two years.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF BURHĀN NIZĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF HUSAIN, SON OF BURHĀN, WHO IS THE BROTHER OF MURTADA.

For a long time he was kept in imprisonment by order of his brother. By chance he escaped; and went to Bijāpūr and was in the court of ʿĀdil Khān. From there, he was summoned by some of the amīrs, and came to Aḥmadnagar. As Murtada was alive, and Šalābat Khān was the peshwā, he was unable to do anything. He then fled to Gujrāt; and went to Quṭb-ud-dīn Muḥammad Khān Ghaznavī, who was one of the great amīrs of his Majesty the Khalifā-i-Ilāhī. After that, he was honoured by being allowed to kiss the noble threshold. He was then made an amīr of three hundred, and a jāgīr was conferred on him. After some time he was made a commander of a thousand horse and sent to Mālwa. An army was then sent with Aʿzām Khān (with orders), that he should free the Deccan from those intemperate and vulgar people; and make it over to Burhān who was one of the servants of the threshold. Aʿzām Khān arrived at Elichpūr which was the capital of Berār; but nothing was done towards the conquest of the Deccan, and he suddenly elected to return instead of standing firm. Burhān being disappointed again went to the threshold, which was the asylum of the people. These matters have already been mentioned in their proper places.

After that he was appointed to attack the Afghāns in concert with Šādiq Muḥammad Khān. When the news of the disturbances

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ʿĀdil Khān; the other has ʿĀdil.  
2 The actual word in one of the MSS. and in the lith. ed. is بگشتهایه, in the other it is خاک بگشتهایه. In the text-edition M. Hidāyat Hosain has rightly adopted خاک بگشتهایه.
in the Deccan again reached the noble ears, His Majesty summoned Burhân from the country of Bangash; and with much attention and great favour sent him (to the Deccan). A farmân to be obeyed by all the world was then issued to all the amîrs of the şûba of Mâlwa, and to all zamîndârs and more specially to Râja 'Ali Khân, son of Mubârak Khân, the ruler of Asir and Burhânpur, that they should take such measures that Burhân, who had come for protection to the threshold, should be placed in the seat of his brother. A noble farmân was also sent to Nazr Bê Uzbek and his sons who had jâgîrs in Mâlwa. Nazr Bê and his sons joined Burhân. Râja 'Ali Khân, considering the service a means of increase in his position and dignity, advanced (to support Burhân). When Jamâl Khân who had gone to Bijâpûr, and defeated 'Âdil Khân and seized the large number of elephants, heard that Râja 'Ali Khân was advancing, and intended to bring forward Burhân, he marched rapidly from Bijâpûr and arrived with some troops. Râja 'Ali Khân, who had detached most of the useful of Jamâl Khân's men from him, by means of letters and messages, fought a battle. Men began to desert from Jamâl Khân's army one by one; and the artillery men leaving the guns, etc., unattended, to, fled. Jamâl Khân thoroughly amazed at this, exerted himself in spite of the great confusion. At this time one of the musketeers, one of whose relations Jamâl Khân had put to death, 'fired at the latter, and he fell dead on the battle-field. Râja 'Ali Khân sent Burhân with great honour and respect to Aḩmadnagar. This event happened in the month of Rajab 999 A.H. He (Burhân) is on the throne of government up to this date.

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have the word; the other MS. substitutes the other.  
2 The word cannot be made out. It is and in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. The correct word is adopted in the text-edition.  
3 There are some variations in the readings. One MS. has The other changes to and then says. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MSS., but substitutes for  
4 I have translated the sentence as it is in the MSS. The lith. ed. has  
5 This is the end of the history of the Nizâm Shâhî dynasty in one of the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but the other MS. takes the history onward to the
SECTION III. THE DYNASTY OF 'ADIL KHĀN.

2 'Adil Khān, who was the founder of the dynasty, was a Circassian slave, whom Khwājah Maḥmūd Garjistānī had sold to Maḥmūd Shāh Bahmani. Garjistān is a dependency of Gilān. 'Adil Khān became possessed of the country of Shōlāpūr, as far as the river 3 Krishnā, in breadth and length from Dābul to Gulparga; and proclaimed year 1042 A.H., which was long after the death of Nizām-ud-dīn. As this is clearly an interpolation by some subsequent scribe, I have not thought it fit to translate it. It may be mentioned, however, that it contains the account of the rules of Ibrāhīm son of Burhān, of Bahādur son of Ibrāhīm, and Ḥusain son of Bahādur. According to Firishtah Ibrāhīm succeeded Burhān. Then Aḥmad, son of Shāh Tāhir was set up, but his title was disputed. After that the Mughals stormed Aḥmadnagar. Chānd Bibi defended it with courage and intrepidity. The Mughals were repulsed, but Berār was ceded to them. Then Bahādur Shāh’s claim was established; and Chānd Bibi became the regent. After three years, Aḥmadnagar was annexed to Akbar’s dominion; and Bahādur was sent to Gwālar as a prisoner. After that Murtada Nizām Shāh II, was set up as king with Parinda as his capital; but the whole of the power was in the hands of Malik Aḥmad.

1 This is the heading in one MS. In the other it is ایشان بوسف عادل خان است. The heading in the lith. ed. does not mention the dynasty, but simply has ذکر.

2 The words عالمی چرکس برد are taken from the lith. ed. The MSS. omit them. Firishtah gives a long and romantic account of the birth of 'Adil Khān, from which it appears that he was a son of Aghā Murād (Amurath II), Sultan of Rūm (Constantinople). His elder brother, Muḥammad, on his accession ordered him to be strangled to death, but his mother smuggled him away; and he was taken to the town of Sawā, where he received a good education. His birth being afterwards divulged, he had to leave Sawā, and ultimately came to India.

Nizām-ud-dīn does not give any account of the events of his reign. Firishtah’s account extends over about 13 pages of the lith. ed. and Col. Briggs’s translation over about 31 pages. According to Firishtah his rule began in the year 895 A.H. (1489 A.D.) ; and according to another account in 896 A.H.; and he died in 915 A.H. (1510 A.D.) having ruled for twenty years and two months according to the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and to twenty-one years according to Col. Briggs’s translation. So that what little Nizām-ud-dīn says is incorrect. Mr. Sewell also says that 'Adil Shāh proclaimed his independence in 1489 (page 106 of his book); and he died in 1510 A.D. (page 115).
his independence. And in the end he acquired possession of Bijapur also, he ruled for seven years from the beginning of the year 906 to the year 913 A.H.

AN ACCOUNT OF ISMĀ'IL 'ĀDIL KHĀN, SON OF YŪSUF.

1 (He) sat in his father’s place. He was a brave and liberal man. He seized Ankar and Sākar and Naṣratābād and the territory of Ancha; and obtained the title of ‘Ādil Khān Sawā’i. As he had a territory equal to one quarter more than that of any of the other rulers of the Deccan, he got the title of Sawā’i. He had twelve thousand selected

1 According to Firishtah Yūsuf ‘Ādil Shāh appointed on his death-bed Kamāl Khān Dakini to be the regent; Ismā‘il his son being still a minor. The regent gradually usurped all the power; and it was decided at a conference of his creatures, held on the 1st Šafar 917 A.H., April 29th, 1511, that on the 1st Rabī‘-ul-awwal Ismā‘il would be deposed; and Kamāl Khān should have the Khufta read in his own name. The queen mother then had the regent assassinated by Yūsuf Turk, the foster-father of Ismā‘il. After this, Kamāl Khān’s mother concealed her son’s death, and directed his son Ṣafdar Khān to storm that part of the fort, in which Ismā‘il and his family lived. They were panic struck; but Dilshād Aghā, aunt of Ismā‘il, who had come recently from Persia incited Ismā‘il’s attendants to oppose Ṣafdar. Both parties fought bravely, but in the end Ṣafdar, who had been wounded in the eye by an arrow, was killed by a stone being rolled upon him by Ismā‘il, from the terrace on which he stood above him. Both Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān being dead, Ismā‘il ascended the throne.

2 These names are differently written in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. The first appears to be Ṣafdar, and the second and third are the same in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The fourth is Ye, and the fifth is Ye, and the sixth is Ye, in the MSS., and Ye in the lith. ed. The first three places are Ṣafdar, and the last two are Yūsuf, in the MSS., and Yūsuf, in the lith. ed. The word ‘Adil Shāh, that is, Amīr Barīd during the lifetime of and in collusion with Kamāl Khān, and were recovered by Mīrāja Jahāngīr. Col. Briggs (vol. III, p. 46) calls them Etgeer, Sagar and Noosratabad. Ṣafdar in the text-edition.

3 Sawā in Hindūstani means one and one quarter. I cannot find any reference to the title in Firishtah. It may be that the title had reference to Yūsuf ‘Ādil Shāh having come from Sawā. See note 2, page 159. The word Sawā’i is not in the heading in the MSS., but is in it in the lith. ed. Niẓām-ud-dīn does not give any real account of the reign of Ismā‘il ‘Ādil Shāh. Firishtah’s account extends over about thirteen pages of the lith. ed. and Col. Briggs’s translation to about forty pages; but I do not think it necessary to
and well-armed and well-equipped horsemen, most of whom were Mughals, in his service, and he looked after them with care. Every year he sent ships to Hurmuz (Ormuz); and summoned men from Irak and Khurásan. They say that one day he was a guest in the house of Imād-ul-mulk Kāwēli. ‘Imād-ul-mulk placed some dishes filled with gems and made a great show of offering them to his guests. When ‘Imād-ul-mulk became a guest of Ismā‘īl Adil Khān, the latter brought his army fully arrayed before his guest’s eyes; and said “This is all that I have acquired; I shall offer to you any one of my servants, whom you may ask for”. He carried on three wars with Nizām-ul-mulk; and was victorious each time. He ruled for a period of twenty-five years, and then passed away.

An Account of Ibrahim Adil Khān, Son of Ismā‘īl Khān.

Through the exertions of the amirs, he sat in his father’s place. Mallū Khān, who was the elder brother applied to Asa‘d Khān who refer to any part of these, as it is not necessary to elucidate any of the statements made by Nizām-ud-din.

1 The MSS. have ترابيت ميكود, but the lith. ed. has ترابيت سمي كورد.

2 This anecdote is to be found in Firishtah also. The horsemen are described there as dō-aspa, i.e., having two horses, riding one and leading the other.

3 One MS. inserts حكوات before the name. Firishtah has a short section giving an account of the history of Mallū ‘Adil Shāh. It appears that Ismā‘īl ‘Adil Shāh died on the 16th Safar 941 A.H. (6th September, 1534 A.D.), while he was besieging Nālkonda on the border of the Tilang country. Col. Briggs calls the fort Kowlondea. Mr. Sewell does not give the name of the fort, but describes it as a fortress belonging to the Quṭb Shāhs, see page 166. Ismā‘īl ‘Adil Shāh’s sons immediately began to contend with each other for the succession but Asa‘d Khān Lārī, knowing that it would be dangerous for them to fall out in a hostile country, told them that the time was inauspicious for the succession; and that they should return to Gulbarga; and after asking for inspiration from the spirit of Saiyid Muḥammad Gēsū Darāz, select a Sultan. The princes agreed. Asa‘d Khān was himself in favour of Ibrahim’s succession; but as Mallū was the elder brother, and Ismā‘īl had directed that he should be the successor, Mallū was placed on the throne; and Ibrahim was imprisoned in the fortress of Mirich.

Mallū was however utterly unworthy to rule. He was extremely vicious and dissolute; and was deposed after six months, both he and his younger brother Allū Khān being blinded by order of their grandmother.
was the Amir-ul-umarâ. Asa'd Khân raised him to the seat of authority; and he ruled for half a day (یک تکمیل روز, ۱ which may mean either half a day or a day and half). But Asa'd Khân afterwards repented of what he had done; and went away to ۲ Malkapur, which was his jâgîr. Mallu Khân was then taken prisoner by Ibrâhîm 'Ādil Khân; and he and his younger brother, Ulugh Khân, were blinded by having the pencil drawn across their eyes. They say that he fought nine times with Burhân Nizâm-ul-mulk, and was sometimes victorious and was sometimes defeated. He ruled for five and twenty years; and then passed away.

AN ACCOUNT OF 'Ali 'Ādil Khân, son of Ibrâhîm.

In accordance with ۳ the directions of his father, he sat in the latter's place. He had two brothers Tahmâsp and Ismâ'îl. He,

Nizâm-ud-din says very little about the events of Ibrâhîm 'Ādil Shâh's reign, except that he had nine campaigns against Burhân Nizâm-ul-mulk. His account is mainly connected with the disputed succession. As regards this also, there are some discrepancies between his account and that of Firishtah. The man whom he called سعید خان Asa'd Khân, is called سعید خان Sa'id Khân by Firishtah. He says nothing about the disputes about the succession having taken place while the rival claims were in a hostile country, Golkonda; and the statement that Mallû Khân ruled for half a day is of course incorrect. The younger brother of Mallû Khân, who is called الغ خان, Ulugh Khân in the MSS. of the Tabaqât is called الف خان, Aluf Khân in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Alloo Khan by Col. Briggs (vol. III, p. 77).

Firishtah's account of Ibrâhîm 'Ādil Shâh's reign extends to about eight pages of the lith. ed. and to about thirty-three pages of Col. Briggs's translation.

۱ In the text-edition بک و نم ردز .

۲ In the text-edition بلکم نو Balkanu, in place of Malkapur.

۳ This is not correct. Ibrâhîm, who had contrary to the example of his father and grandfather adopted the Sunâî doctrines was displeased with 'Ali, who had shown his preference for the Shi'a faith; and kept him confined in the fort of Mirich; and wanted to make his son Tahmâsp his successor; but he found that the latter had also become a Shi'a and he confined him in another fortress. He left the question of his successor to be decided by God. Muhammad Kishwar Khân wrote to the Superintendent of Mirich that the death of Ibrâhîm was close at hand; and he (Kishwar Khân) was proceeding to Mirich to support Shâhzâda 'Ali. As the partisans of Tahmâsp were likely to create a disturbance he should raise the umbrella of rule over the head of
also following 1 the example of his father, had the pencil drawn across the eyes of both of them. He was a man of (good) morals and prepossessing manners, and had the qualities of liberality and patience and generosity. Every year he gave five or six lakhs of 2 huns in charity to faqirs and the needy, and travellers from foreign lands. He brought that most learned man of the age, Amir Fatough-ul-lah Shirazi from Persia, having sent him a large sum of money (to induce him to come to India) ; and made him his vakil. A large number of the wise men of the age were members of his court. He was a man with the nature of a darvish, and was a friend of faqirs. He had a great knowledge of the language of the sufis. The greater part of his time was spent in the society and company of wise men. He was also obsessed with outward appearance; and having collected many amirs round him, kept them arrayed in grand dresses. 3 This had a great effect on his affairs. He took possession of the districts of 4 Bäikalä and Baslär and Bälkör; and his rule extended beyond that of his ancestors. He waged war three times with Hüsain Nizam-ul-mulk, and was sometimes victorious and was sometimes vanquished.

He had relations of sincere attachment to the world-protecting threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa'-i-Ilaahi. He always made himself mentioned in the sanctified court, by sending petitions and highly befitting tribute. Hâkim 'Ain-ul-mulk came once and Hâkim 'Ali came a second time on embassy to him from the threshold which was the asylum of all the people. He went forward twelve karohs

1 The readings are slightly different. The MSS. appear to have بسم الله یرئ نسبت ; and the lith. ed. has بسم الله نسبت. I cannot find any mention of the two brothers being blinded in Firishtah.
2 rupees in text.
3 The meaning of this is not quite clear.
4 I have not been able to identify these territories. In the text-edition

باوکلا و باسلر و بالکور.
to meet them; and performed the ceremony of submission and allegiance. He inserted the great name of His Majesty the Khalifa'-Ilâhi in the public prayers, and the coins of his realm. He was inclined to the Imâmîa religion; and abandoned the custom of his ancestors.

He heard by accident, that Malik Barîd the ruler of Bîdar had a very handsome eunuch. He sent letters and demanded the eunuch. Malik Barîd evaded (sending him) by pretexts and objections. At last Murtaḍa Nizâm-ul-mulk sent an army to attack Barîd. The latter shut himself up; and made an appeal for help to 'Ali 'Ādil Shâh. He sent ten thousand horsemen to reinforce Amir Barîd's army; and freed the latter from the siege. This time Malik Barîd being helpless and having no other alternatives sent the eunuch. 'Ali 'Ādil Shâh owing to his great passion went out to meet the eunuch, and took him to his palace. At night he took him to a private place and attempted to have intercourse with him. The eunuch drew out a dagger from (şanq shank of) his sock, and stabbed him with it in his chest, and slew him. This strange affair took place in the year 988 A.H.

The period of his rule was twenty-five years. It is a strange coincidence that three 'Ādil Khâns in succession each ruled for twenty-five years.

---

1 Col. Briggs says (see note, page 142, vol. III, of his history) that "The cause of the King's death is most disgusting and offensive, and it is by no means attempted to be palliated by Ferishta, when he mentions it. A modern author of the history of Beejapoor, however, has set forth reasons in defence of Ally Adil Shah's conduct, and endeavoured to prove that Ferishta has traduced his memory." I have not been able to ascertain the name of the author referred to.

2 The word is مشوق (lust) in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and مشوقتی (curiosity, affection) in the other. In the text-edition مشوقتی.

3 The word is شانق in both MSS., مشوق in the lith. ed. and مشوق in the text-edition.

4 This does not appear to be quite correct. Nizâm-ud-dîn of course mentions 25 years as the periods of the reigns of Ismâ'il 'Ādil Shâh, Ibrâhîm 'Ādil Shâh and 'Ali 'Ādil Shâh; but according to Firishtah Ismâ'il reigned from 915 A.H. to 941 A.H., about twenty six years. Then Mallû reigned for six months, after which Ibrâhîm reigned from 941-965 A.H., which according to Firishtah was a period of twenty-four years and six months; and 'Ali 'Ādil
THE DYNASTY OF 'ĀDIL KHĀN

AN ACCOUNT OF IBRĀHĪM 'ĀDIL KHĀN (SON OF TAHMĀSP),
WHO WAS A NEPHEW OF 'ĀLI 'ĀDIL KHĀN.

1 Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān was placed on the seat of government at the age of nine years, by the exertions of Kāmil Khān. Kishwar Khān who

Shāh from 965 to 987 A.H., which only gives twenty-two years; but if the correct date of his death was 988, then he reigned for twenty-three years. Mr. Sewell's table has Ismā'īl from 1534 A.D. Malik or Malū as he calls him from August, 1534 to February, 1535, Ibrāhīm from 1535-1537 A.D. and 'Ali from 1537 to April 11th, 1580 (page 408).

1 The account of the rise and fall of different ministers or regents agrees generally with that given by Firishtah. According to him Kāmil Khān at first acted with moderation, but after two months he became intoxicated with power, and showed some disrespect to Chānd Bibī; who got Ḥāji Kishwar Khān to effect his destruction. Ḥāji Kishwar Khān in his turn tried to grasp the whole power of the state. At this time Bahzād-ul-mulk āranaubat of Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh advanced with fifteen thousand horsemen, to conquer some of the districts of Bījāpūr lying near the border. Ḥāji Kishwar Khān sent an army to meet him; and he was signally defeated. There were great rejoicings; and valuable presents were made to the amīrs; but later they were directed to return the elephants which had been given to them to the royal ūlūkhāna. This order, which was passed without consulting Chānd Bibī or Chānd Sulṭān as Firishtah calls her, gave much displeasure; and a conspiracy was made to effect the destruction of Ḥāji Kishwar Khān; and to raise Muṣṭafā Khān to power. Ḥāji Kishwar Khān hearing of this got Mīrzā Nār-ud-dīn Muhammad, who had received many favours from Muṣṭafā Khān treacherously to assassinate him. Chānd Bibī was highly incensed at this; but Ḥāji Kishwar Khān got an order from the king for imprisoning her in the fort of Satārā; and she was forced out of the harem with much indignity, and sent to Satārā. After this Ḥāji Kishwar Khān became very unpopular, and went away to Aḥmadnagar; but he found that the court there could not protect him; so he went away towards Golkonda, where he was assassinated soon after by a relative of Muṣṭafā Khān.

After this, according to Firishtah Ikbūsid Khān became the regent; and Chānd Bibī was brought back from Satārā. He, however, being suspicious that Afḍal Khān Shīrāzī and Rāsu Pandit, who were associated with him in the government, would prove hostile to him had them put to death. He banished other great amīrs; and in conjunction with Ḩamīd Khān and Dilāwar Khān carried on the government according to his own wishes. He then invited 'Ain-ul-mulk from his jāgīr; and he and Ḩamīd Khān and Dilāwar Khān went out of the city to meet him. 'Ain-ul-mulk treacherously seized them, put fetters on them and brought them back to the city. On his arrival near the fort he found the gates closed and being panic-struck he went back to his jāgīr
was one of the great amirs slew Kāmil Khān, and became himself the vakil. He and Muṣṭafā Khān and the latter’s children were then put to death; and the vakālat fell to Dilāwar Khān Ḥabsīl. He, i.e., Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Khān abolished the Imāmī form of the religion; and established the religion of the sunnat and jama‘at. Dilāwar ran the government with great power and strength for nine years. Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Khān with the help of the other amirs then attacked leaving Ikhlāṣ Khān, Ḥamīd Khān and Dilāwar Khān behind, who then resumed their authority.

Owing to these disorders, the other rulers of the Deccan, viz., Muḥammad Qūṭb Shāh, who had succeeded his father and Bahzād-ul-mulk, with Saiyid Murtada the Amīr-ul-umrā of Berār invaded Bījāpūr; and laid siege to Shāhdur. They were unable to take it, as it was strenuously defended by the thānmādar Muḥammad Ağā; and then advanced to Bījāpūr plundering and ravaging the country through which they passed. Ikhlāṣ Khān and the Ḥabshis attempted to defend Bījāpūr; but being unable to do so, and knowing that their rule was not acceptable to the amirs, represented the fact to Chānd Bībī. She thereupon made Shāh Abūl Hasan, son of Shāh Tāhir the amir jumla. The latter reconciled the nobles; and the enemies finding it difficult to seize the city, retired to their own countries; the Niẓām Shāhīs going back to Ahmādānig; and Muḥammad Quli Qūṭb Shāh to Gōlkonda; but the latter left Amīr Saiyid Zain-ul Astarābādī on whom he conferred the title of Muṣṭafā Khān, to plunder the country. Upon this Ikhlāṣ Khān sent Dilāwar Khān to attack him; and he defeated him signally; and obtained much plunder. From the hour of his victory, the idea of becoming the regent entered the mind of Dilāwar Khān. He returned towards Bījāpūr; and encamped at the town of Alāpūr. He flattered and deceived Ikhlāṣ Khān and then marching rapidly took possession of the citadel. Ikhlāṣ Khān tried to storm it, but was defeated; and his partisans were killed by the cannon fired from the citadel; and he had to retire in the evening. He then nominated Da‘lī Khān to besiege the citadel, and he continued the siege for four months; after which he went over to Dilāwar Khān. Ikhlāṣ Khān disdaining to escape was seized in his house; and was blinded and imprisoned.

Dilāwar Khān continued to be the regent till 998 A.H.; when Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh succeeded in wresting the power from him. He effected his escape to Ahmādānig. He was induced by Burhān Niẓām Shāh to march towards Bījāpūr. After this Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh invited Dilāwar Khān to come back; and the latter did so after receiving an assurance, that he would not be injured in life and property. He was, however, after his arrival, blinded, and was imprisoned in the fortress of Sātāra.

This again is a long note but I have thought it proper to write it in order to clear up the accounts of the changes in the regency.
Dilāwar Ḳhān; and the latter fled to Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk at Ạhmādnagar. He instigated the latter to march towards Bījāpūr and attack ‘Ādil Ḳhān; but he was unable to do anything; and went back. Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Ḳhān then sent qaʿūl (probably an agreement of safe conduct) and summoned Dilāwar Ḳhān; and made him blind by drawing the pencil across his eyes. Up to this day which is in the year 1002 A.H., and which amounts to a period of fourteen years, he (Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Ḳhān) is ruling his 1 kingdom.

SECTION IV. 2 THE QUṬB-UL-MULKĪYA LINE OR DYNASTY.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QULĪ QUṬB-UL-MULK 3 HAMADĀNĪ.

He is from the tribe of 4 Mir ‘Ali Shakr Āq Quyunlu. He was one of the five vazīrs of the Bahmanī Sultāns. As Sultān Māhmūd

1 This is the end of the history of the ‘Ādil Shāhī dynasty in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; but in the other MS. there is a short interpolation, which says, that Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh reigned altogether for forty-eight years and a few months; and died on the 11th Muharram 1037 A.H.; and that after his death, Sultān Muḥammad ‘Ādil Shāh ascended the throne. Firishtah’s history of the ‘Ādil Shāhī dynasty ends somewhat abruptly with the year 1005 A.H. Col. Briggs in a note on page 188 of vol. III of his history says, “Firishtah continued to write his history as late as 1612, sixteen years after this period, and probably intended to finish that of Beejapore last, which can alone account for his leaving off so abruptly”.

It may be mentioned that Firishtah’s account of this reign is very prolix, and extends over forty-four pages of the lith. ed. It is in more high-flown language than is usual even with him.

2 This heading occurs in both MSS., but is not to be found in the lith. ed.

3 The word َاست in both MSS., but is not in the lith. ed. I do not think it necessary to insert it.

4 The name is doubtful. It is شکر ان in one MS. and شکر اف in the other. In the lith. ed. it is مبرع على شکر اف. Firishtah however says that a detailed history of the Qutb Shāhī line was written by a man of the name of Shāh Khur Shāh; but he (Firishtah) was unable to get hold of a copy of it. Col. Briggs says that he was able, some years ago, to procure a work entitled the “History of Mahomed Kooly Koott Shah”, written about the time that Firishtah lived. From Col. Briggs’s translation of that work the name of the tribe
showed great favour to his slaves, Sultan Quli sold himself to him, and became one of his slaves. He took possessions of the country of Golkonda and ruled for twenty-four years and passed away.

1 An account of Jamshid Qutb-ul-Mulk, son of Sultan Quli.

After his father, he sat in the latter's place; and ruled for seven years.

appears to be Ak Kooinlo; so that the correct name of the tribe may be اک کوینلو. It appears however from the quotation of Sultan Quli Qutb's own words in Col. Briggs's work, vol. III, page 340 et seq that the Sultan belonged to the Kurra Kooinlo tribe, who were subjugated by the Ak Kooinlo tribe; and he fled in his childhood, with his uncle Ameer Alla Koolly; and came to the Deccan. He returned however to Hamadan with his uncle, as he was then too young to remain alone in the country. He came back however later again with his uncle; but the uncle went away; and he remained under the special protection of Sultan Mahmud Bahmani. He defended the latter with great gallantry, when he was attacked in the fort of Ahmadabad Bidar, and after the campaign against Malik Dinâr Habash he was made governor of Talingana. Later he fought bravely in Mahmood Shah's campaign against the rebel Bahadur Gillsi. After the death of Mahmood Shah Bahmani on the 24th Dhi-lijja, 912 A.H., May 12th, 1507 A.D., he with the five other Deccan chiefs, threw off the small portion of allegiance, which they had up to that time owed to the Bahmanl Sultan. He was killed by Mir Mahmood Hamadani, governor of Golkonda, when he was sitting down at prayer, at the instigation of his third son Jamashid Qutb Shah on the 2nd Jamadi-us-sani 940 A.H., 4th September, 1543. These latter facts are taken from Col. Briggs's account. According to Firishtah he was killed by a Turki slave in 950 A.H., when he was looking at some jewels. The slave had been instigated by Jamshid Qutb Shah with the promise of being made a great amir; but he was slain by Jamashid, immediately after he had slain Sultan Quli Qutb Shah, so that he might not divulge his complicity in the crime. It is difficult to say exactly how long Quli Qutb Shah ruled as an independent prince. According to Mr. Sewell's table (p. 410) he reigned for thirty-one years from 1512 to 1543 A.D.

1 It is difficult to find the correct history of this reign. Nizâm-ud-din gives no account at all; and the histories given by Firishtah, and Col. Briggs differ. The former says Shah Tahir was sent by Burhan Nizâm-ul-mulk to congratulate Jamashid on his accession. Shah Tahir incited him to join Burhan Nizâm Shah to attack Ibrahim 'Adil Shah. He accordingly invaded the latter's territory, and built a fort in parjana Kâkni; and then advanced to attack the fort of Atgar. In the meantime 'Adil Shah made peace with Nizâm Shah.
An account of Ibrāhīm Qutb-ul-mulk, son of Sulṭān Qulī.

After his brother, Ibrāhīm became the ruler of Golkonda. He was a man of affairs and of wisdom. But anger and wrath obsessed him.

and Rām Rāj; and Niẓām Shāh went back to Ahmadnagar. ‘Ādil Shāh then sent Asa’d Khān Lārī to attack Jamshid Qutb Shāh. Asa’d Khān Lārī first seized the fort of Kākni and compelled Jamshid Qutb Shāh to raise the siege of Atgar. After that Jamshid Qutb Shāh had several campaigns with Asa’d Khān Lārī, in each of which he was defeated; and in the last of these in a hand to hand fight with Asa’d Khān Lārī, one side of his face was severed off by a blow of his opponent’s sword. After that he made peace with ‘Ādil Shāh; and conquered some parts of Kachitī. Then he was ill for two years; and now became very savage; and ordered people to be put to death or imprisoned for slight offences. A conspiracy was then formed to depose him, and place one of his brothers on the throne. He received information of this plot; and imprisoned his brothers, Haider and Ibrāhīm. The former died soon after and the latter went away to Bijānagar. Jamshid died of a high fever in 957 A.H.

Col. Briggs’s account, which is probably derived from the work he got hold of (see note 1, p. 167) is entirely different, except that he agrees in saying that Jamshid Qutb Shāh died in 957 A.H. I do not, however, consider it necessary to give a summary of his account, as it can be referred to by anybody who is interested in the history.

1 Niẓām-ud-dīn gives no account of the reign of Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh. He only mentions a few of the traits of his character. As far as this goes he agrees with Firishtah; who mentions the same traits, with some more details; for instance Firishtah says that the nails which had been shown to him were the nails of the toes of his victims, which were severed by being beaten with sticks (tūziyāna). As regards his servants eating at his table, he says that it was the special servants (naukarān khaṣa), who had this privilege. Firishtah also says that he freed Talingāna from highway robbers; so that merchants and wealthy people could travel from place to place in safety.

As regards the history of his reign, Firishtah says that he sought an asylum with Rām Rāj during the reign of Jamshid Qutb Shāh. After the latter’s death, the ministers placed his son, who was an infant of two years of age on the throne; but the Dakinis attacked the palace. Then the ministers determined to send for Ibrāhīm Qutb-ul-mulk; and to place him on the throne. They obtained permission from Rām Rāj for bringing him to Golkonda; and when he came to the border of Bijānagar. Muṣṭafā hastened to receive him; and he was made amīr jumla or Prime Minister.

After this, he in concert with Husain Niẓām Shāh, invaded Bijāpūr in 965 A.H.; and laid siege to Gulbarga. But he was afraid of increasing the power of Husain Niẓām Shāh; and went back to Golkonda; and Husain Niẓām Shāh
For a very small offence he inflicted strange punishments on the servants of God. He ordered that the nails of his victims should be severed from their fingers; and should be brought before him in a vessel. Much food was brought, every day, to his table; and it had been so determined that all his servants should eat at his table. He indulged in much ceremony in his meals.

He reigned for five and thirty years.

being unable to carry on the siege alone, retired to Ahmadnagar. Afterwards 'Adil Shâh and Râm Râj invaded the Nižâm Shâhi territory; and at their request, and somewhat against his will Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh joined them; and they laid siege to Ahmadnagar. They were about to take it, when Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh left at midnight; and retired in precipitation to Gôlkonda; and Râm Râj and 'Adil Shâh had also to raise the siege.

After that Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh asked for the hand of Hûsain Nižâm Shâh's daughter; and at the latter's request he agreed in concert with him to lay siege to Kaliân. There the marriage feast was celebrated and the siege was begun. Then 'Adil Shâh and Râm Râj and Tufâl Khân and Amîr Barîd advanced against them, when Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh retired to Gôlkonda, and Hûsain Nižâm Shâh to Ahmadnagar, hotly pursued by 'Adil Shâh and Râm Râj. They laid waste both the Ahmadnagar and the Gôlkonda territories; but peace was at last concluded; and Râm Râj and 'Adil Shâh retired to their own territories. Afterwards Murtaḍâ Nižâm Shâh summoned Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh to come and aid him in besieging the fort of Dârûr, belonging to 'Adil Shâh; but before he could arrive the fort was taken. He however joined Murtaḍâ Nižâm Shâh in the invasion of Bûjâpûr. 'Adil Shâh now sent to Murtaḍâ Nižâm Shâh a letter, which Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh had written to him, about acting in concert with him. Nižâm Shâh became suspicious of Qutb Shâh's fidelity; and Qutb Shâh retiring in all haste to Gôlkonda, Nižâm Shâh looted his camp; and pursued his army, and took much booty and slew large numbers of his men. 'Abd-ul-qâdir, the eldest son of Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh then represented to his father, that if he received permission to do so, he would at once attack the Nižâm Shâhi army and defeat it. Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh became suspicious of his son's motives; and imprisoned him in a fort, and afterwards caused his death, by giving him a poisoned drink. Ibrâhîm Qutb Shâh died in the year 989 A.H. He had ruled for thirty-two years.

Col. Briggs's account (vol. III, p. 39) is slightly different. He has a separate section for Soobhan Kooly Kooth Shah, the infant son of Jamshedd, who, he says, was seven years of age, when he was elevated to the throne. Then as regards Ibrahim Kootb Shah, he says that in the latter part of his reign he conquered some territories in Orissa. According to Col. Briggs, Ibrahim Kootb Shah died on the 21st Rubbee-oos-Sany 988 A.H., 2nd June, 1580. Mr. Sewell (p. 410) has 1581.
1 An account of Muḥammad Quli Qutb-ul-Mulk, son of Ibrāhīm.

Muḥammad Quli succeeded his father. He became the lover of a prostitute of the name of Bhāgmatī; and having laid the foundation of a city, called it Bhāgnagar. He had one thousand horsemen, as the retainers of that woman; and they always attended at her stirrups. He is ruling the country up to the present day which is in the year 1002 a.h., and in the 38th year of the Ilāhī era; i.e., for a period of nine years.

1 Niẓām-ud-dīn does not give any account of the events of the reign; and merely refers to a scandalous matter of a more or less personal nature. According to Firishtah Muhammad Qutb Shāh was the eldest and best of the three surviving sons of Jamshīd Qutb Shāh. He succeeded the latter in his twelfth year. He married a daughter of Shāh Mīrzā Ispahānī.

He entered into a treaty with Niẓām Shāh, and invaded the Bijāpūr territory, and besieged Shāh Drūg; but being unable to take it, went to Bijāpūr and laid siege to it. They were however unable to take it also, and Muḥammad Qutb Shāh was about to retire to Gōlkonda, when the commander of the Niẓām Shāhī army, becoming aware of his intention suggested that he should go himself towards Aḥmādnagar, laying waste the ‘Ādil Shāhī country through which he would pass; and Muḥammad Qutb Shāh should proceed to besiege Hasanābād Gulbarga. They accordingly did so; but when Muḥammad Qutb Shāh arrived near Hasanābād Gulbarga, he left seven thousand horsemen; and many elephants, under Muṣṭafā Khān, to carry on the siege; and himself hastened back to his capital. Muṣṭafā Khān laid waste the country round Hasanābād Gulbarga; but Dilāwār Khān was sent with a large army from Bijāpūr, and he defeated Muṣṭafā Khān who retired in great haste to the borders of Tilang.

After this Firishtah refers to Bhāgmatī, and he also refers to the building of the new city; but he says that it was necessary to do so because Gōlkonda had become extremely unhealthy. He afterwards changed the name of the new city of Ḥaidarābād.

Muḥammad Qutb Shāh resolved after this to conquer Dang, by which Firishtah means the country lying between Tilang and Bang or Bengal, i.e., Orissa. He conquered a great part of the country; and the ruler of it, who was called Bābā Balandar died in great distress to the furthest part of the country.

The above is the history down to 1017 a.h. It is not necessary to go any further, especially as Firishtah says nothing further about the history; but indulges in a description of certain matters connected with the Sulṭān.

2 One MS. calls her a Ṣanāʾī ʿAlī ʿAlī, the other simply Ṣanāʾ, while the text-ed. has only 逯年代 in the text-edition the name is
SECTION V. ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF GUJRĀT.

From the beginning of the year 783 to the year 970 A.H., when (Gujrāṭ) came into the possession of the officers of His Majesty the Khalīfa'-i-Ilāhī, which is a period of 187 years, fifteen persons ruled over the country. (These are the) particulars (of them).

Sultān Muḥammad, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, two months and a few days;
Sultān Muẓaffar 1 Shāh, three years and eight months and twenty days;
Sultān 2 Aḥmad, thirty-two years and six months and twenty days;
Sultān Muḥammad, son of Aḥmad, seven years and four months;
Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh, seven years and six 3 months and thirteen days;
Dāūd Shāh, seven days;
Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, fifty-five years and eleven months and 4 two days;
Sultān Muẓaffar, son of Maḥmūd, fourteen years and nine months;
Sultān Sikandar, two months and sixteen days;
Sultān Maḥmūd, four months;
Sultān Bahādur, eleven years and eleven months;
Sultān Muḥammad Shāh one and half month;
Sultān Maḥmūd, son of 5 Latīf Khān, eighteen years and a few days;

1 The word Shāh is in one MS. and in the lith. ed. but not in the other MS. The period is 3 years 8 months and 20 days in one MS., but is 3 years and 8 months and 8 days, in the lith. ed. It may be either 8 or 20 days in the other MS.
2 One MS. inserts اپनے after the name.
3 The words و سبز روز which occur in both MSS. are omitted from the lith. ed. I have inserted them.
4 The words دو روز which occur in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are not to be found in the other MS.
5 He is called Latīf Khān in both MSS., but Latif Shāh in the lith. ed. The period is 18 years in both MSS. and 16 years in the lith. ed. I have adopted the reading in the MSS.
Sultān Aḥmad, three years and a few months; and
Sultān Muẓaffar, son of 1 Maḥmud, sixteen years and some
months.

(AN ACCOUNT OF) ĀẓAM HUMĀYŪN ZAFAR KHĀN.

It is written in books of history, that when the (accounts of the)
tyranny of Niẓām Muṭarrāḥ, who bore the title of 2 Āshṭī Khān,
and who had the government of Gujrāt in his hands under Sultān
Muḥammad, son of Sultān Firūz Shāh, spread over the regions of
the world; and the oppressed who had suffered from his tyranny,
and the victims of his cruelty arrived in the capital city of Dehli
from the country of Gujrāt with their complaints; and narrated
tales of his tyranny and oppression before Sultān Muḥammad Shāh;
and spoke the truth of his violence and insubordination, the Sultān
after much consideration and great deliberation, conferred the fief
of Gujrāt on Āʿẓam Humāyūn Zafar Khān, son of Wajih-ul-mulk,
who was one of the great amirs, after bestowing many royal favours
on him. On the 3rd Rabīʿ-ul-awwal in the year 783 A.H., he conferred
on him a (royal) umbrella, and a red pavilion, which are specially
reserved for bādshāhs, and granted him permission to go to Gujrāt.
Zafar Khān started from the city the same day, and encamped at
the royal reservoir (hausd-i-khas). On the 4th of the month, Sultān
Muḥammad hastened to Zafar Khān’s camp; and made his ears heavy
with the pearls of advice; and after again conferring on him a special
robe of honour retired to the city.

They say that when the vazirs wrote the order of his appoint-
ment, they under the orders of the Sultān left the place where the

1 One MS. has Shāh after Maḥmūd, but neither the other MS. nor the
lith. ed. has it.

2 Firishtah does not give him the title of Āshṭī Khān, but calls him
Farḥat-ul-mulk otherwise called Niẓām Muṭarrāḥ. Firishtah does not speak
much of his tyranny, but he says that he had the intention of hostility (to the
emperor), and therefore treated the zamindārs and the infidels of the country
well, and in order to flatter them, gave currency to the customs of heathenism
and idolatry. Therefore the learned and erudite men of Gujrāt sent the letter
in which they spoke of Niẓām Muṭarrāḥ’s misdeeds, and prayed the Sultān
to take necessary steps for remedying them.
titles (of the new Governor) should have been written, blank; and he (i.e., the Sultân) wrote the titles with his own hand and they were as follows. 1 "My brother, Majlis 'Allî (the noble courtier), the honoured Khân, learned, just, generous, energetic, the most fortunate of the faith and religion, the defender of Islam and Musalmâns, the binder of the sultânât, the supporter of the faith,

1 It is rather difficult to understand these lofty titles and to find equivalents for the high flown epithets. Firishtah who in many places copies the Tabaqât almost verbatim gives them as برادرم مجلسی علی خان معظم عادل باذل مجدید سعید الملة والدین غزیر الإسلام و المسلمين عضد السلطان بهين الملت قام بلكهرة و المشرکین قلّة الفجرة و المغردون قطب سماه العالي نجم نلق ذلك الإعالي صدر روز وعا تيمتی قلّته كشا كشٌرگید آصف تدبیر ضبی اسیر ناظم مصالح جمیع - ذي الیاسی و السعادات صاحب الرؤى و التفابات ناصر العدل و الحسن دستور صاحبقران الف قلّق اعظم The antecedents of Zafar Khân are rather curious. It appears from Bayley's History of Gujarât, p. 68, et seq that Firoz, who was a great hunter, went out in pursuit of deer one day, and became separated from his attendants. He came to a village which was one of the dependencies of Thânêsar. Outside the village he found a party of land-holders seated, and dismounting from his horse, asked one of them to pull off his boots. This man was a master of the science of interpreting signs and appearances. He found on the sole of the Sultân's foot, marks of royalty and the signs of imperial power. The chief men of the village were two brothers Sâdhî and Sadhâran. For their caste and genealogy see pp. 67-68. They entertained the guest, and gave their sister, who 'was peerless in beauty and loveliness' in nikâh to the Sultân. They shortly afterwards became Musalmâns and Sadhâran received the title of Wajih-ul-Mulk. He was the father of Zafar Khân. The Sultân was a disciple of Qâbir-ul-aqtâb Ḥaṣrat Mahâyâm-i-Jahânîn. Sâdhî and Sadhâran and Zafar Khân also became his disciples. Zafar Khân did some service to the saint, and the latter in return gave him the country of Gujarât. When he went back to his family, and told them what had happened they said "You are well-stricken in years and if the country of Gujarât falls to thee, what life wilt thou have left to enjoy it?". He went back to the saint, and made offerings of perfumes, etc. The saint accepted them, and taking a handful of dates, from a plate which was before him, said "Thy seed like unto these in number shall reign over Gujarât". Some say there were twelve, some say thirteen dates and other say eleven.

When Firoz Khân became the Sultân, he appointed Zafar Khân and his brother Shams Khân to the high position of sharîbdâr. Owing to this they have been described as kbalâs or distillers.
the exterminator of kufr and heresy, the destroyer of the false and the rebellious, the Pole-star of the sky of spirituality, the star of the high heaven, the breaker of the ranks in the day of battle, a fort conquering Rustam, the conqueror of kingdoms, an Asaf in policy, the regulator of affairs, the director of the rule of people, the master of success and good fortune, the man of wisdom and success, the distributor of justice and beneficence, the vazir of the lord of conjunction Ulugh Qutlug A’zam Humayun Zafar Khan.”

In short (he) travelled towards Gujrat by successive marches. On the way news came to him that a son had been born to Tatar Khan, his son, who was the vazir of Sultan Muhammad Shah; and he had received the name of Ahmad Khan. Zafar Khan was greatly delighted on hearing this joyful news. He arranged a grand entertainment, and conferred honours and robes on many of the soldiers. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Nagor, the men of Kanbaya came to petition against Nizam Mufarrakah, praying for justice. Zafar Khan gave them hopes, and advanced towards Nahrawala. When he arrived there, which is commonly known as Pattan, he wrote and sent a letter to Malik Nizam Mufarrakah (in which he said) that it had been mentioned in the august presence of Muhammad Shah that Malik Nizam Mufarrakah had spent the revenue of a number of years of the khalsa lands of the Sultan, for his own needs and purposes, and had not remitted one dinar to the treasury. It had likewise (been reported), that he had stretched out his hands for tyranny and oppression, and had greatly harassed the common people living in these places; so that men had repeatedly come to Delhi with supplications and complaints. (He went on to say) that as the reins of binding and loosening of all state affairs of the neighbourhood had been placed in his hands, the better way would be, that whatever might still be left of the revenue of the khalsa lands for those years should be sent with all promptitude, before he went himself; and after comforting and cheering the oppressed, he should himself proceed to the metropolis of Delhi.

1 Firishtah does not say that Zafar Khan wrote to Nizam Mufarrakah after arriving at Naharwala Pattan.
Malik Nizām Mufarrakah sent a reply to this effect. "You have come a long way, you should remain where you are and should not take the trouble (to advance further). I shall go there and render an account, but on this condition that you will not make me over to custodians." When this reply came and the fact of his rebellion and violence became certain, Āzam Humāyūn Zafar Khān began to arrange his army. After a few days news came that Malik Nizām Mufarrakah had turned towards that country with a large force, and was advancing by successive marches. Āzam Humāyūn sallied out of the city of Pattan with his well-equipped army, with the intention to give battle. A great battle was fought on the 7th of Safar in the year 794, in the village of Kānthū which is twelve karōhs from Pattan. Malik Nizām Mufarrakah went about searching for Zafar Khān accompanied by a select body of troops; and he ran about in all directions, like an ordinance of heaven (?). At this time a man belonging to Zafar Khān's army having vanquished him (apparently in single combat) inflicted on him a severe wound, and he fell off from his horse on to the ground. The man immediately cut off his head, and brought it to Zafar Khān.

Couplets:

When Death into his blood plunged his hand,
Fate his clear seeing eyes did close.
When the key of victory is not in one's hand,
He cannot with his arm, the door of victory break.

On seeing what had happened, defeat fell on the army of Nizām Mufarrakah. Large numbers of men were slain; and much booty fell into the hands (of the victorious army). Zafar Khān went in pursuit

1 Firishtah also says that the tenor of the reply was what it is described in the text.
3 Firishtah's account of the engagement is different. It is figurative and vague. He says that بعد از استعمال ائته حرب و فریاد آتش النصر و جریزی از اتاق بخت ارجمان ظفر خان ظلّهغ نظیرہ نظام مفرج نیوزج تفصیل بنوراله قریبخت. It does not mention what happened to Nizām Mufarrakah after he had fled.
4 The first couplet is not in the lith. ed., but it is in both the MSS.
for some distance, and then returned to the neighbourhood of Pattan; and sent his agents to all the parganas. In the year 795 A.H., he advanced with the object of punishing the rebels, who had raised the dust of disturbance in the neighbourhood of 1 Kanbāyat. He cleansed that country from the weeds and thorns of the insurgents. He laid the ointment of his kindness and favour on the hearts which had been wounded by the dagger of the tyranny of Nizām Mufarrah. He then advanced towards 2 Asāwal. He remained there for some days; and having pleased the common people, and all the inhabitants, earned their gratitude and came back to the neighbourhood of Pattan.

In the year 796 A.H., news came that Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, son of Sultān Firūz, had accepted the summons of the just God, in the metropolitan city of Dehli, and the affairs of the empire had fallen into confusion; and most of the zamīndārs had taken up an attitude of insurrection; more specially, 3 the Rāja of Īdar, who had placed his foot outside the circle of obedience and fealty. Zafar Khān equipped an army, and advanced by rapid marches with a large force and elephants of the size of mountains to punish the Rāja. As he came with great quickness and proceeded to lay siege 4 the Rāja had no time whatever to arrange for his defence. He was, therefore, compelled to shut himself up, and the victorious troops, having overrun the country of Īdar stretched their hands for plunder and rapine. They raised to the ground every temple which they found. In a very short time there was such scarcity and famine in the fort, that the 5 Rāja of Īdar, sent his vakils in great humility.

---

1 One MS. has ۱۲۰۱۲۳۴۵۶ but the other and the lith. ed. have ۱۲۳۴۵۶.
2 Firishtah says with reference to Asāwal, ۱۲۳۴۵۶, i.e., that at present Ahmādābād is situated in its place. It will be seen from the accounts of the reign of Ahmād Shāh that he built the city of Ahmādābād near Asāwal.
3 According to Firishtah he had formerly borne allegiance to the rulers of Gujrāt but had now laid the foundation of shamelessness, and had withdrawn his head from the yoke of dependence.
4 Firishtah says that there were several severe battles, and Zafar Khān was victorious each time.
5 According to Firishtah the Rāja sent his eldest son with some others to sue for quarter.
and piteousness, and prayed for forgiveness of his offences. Zafar Khan took such tributes from him as he wanted; and advanced towards Somnath.

At this time intelligence came that 1 Malik Nasir Raja celebrated as 'Adil Khan, the ruler of Asir, had stretched his foot of pride beyond the blanket of his status, and had harassed some of the villages of Nadarbār. Aẓam Humāyūn, knowing that the protection of his own territory was more incumbent on him than the capture of the temple of Somnath advanced towards Nadarbār by rapid marches. 'Adil Khan hearing this news returned to his own country. Zafar Khan also returned to his headquarters at Pattan, after showing kindness to the inhabitants of the country.

In the year 797 A.H., he again mustered his troops, and determined to invade 2 Jar and Tar which are situated to the west of Pattan, and after overrunning some places and getting tributes from the headman of that locality, advanced from there, with the purpose of destroying the temple of Somnath. On the way he made the Rājpūts food for his merciless sword; and wherever a temple appeared before his eyes, he raised and destroyed it.

When he arrived at Somnath he burnt the temple down and broke up the idol. He slew the kāfirs, and plundered the city. He planned the erection of a Jāma' masjid, and having appointed the right men as directed by the shara', and leaving a thāna (military post) there, retraced his steps towards Pattan.

In the year 799, news came to Aẓam Humāyūn that the Rājpūts of 3 Mandalgarh had acquired such power, that the Musalmāns there were abandoning their country and leaving their homes, on account of the injuries caused to them. Zafar Khan collected the

---

1 Firishtah describes him as the ancestor of the Faruqī the rulers of Burhanpur.
2 The names are written as جرجر in one MS. but the جرجر may be a mistake for جرجر which is required having been omitted by mistake. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. the names are جرجر and the ruler of جرجر. Firishtah calls the place جرجر. In the text-edition it is جرجر. 1 It is Mandalgarh in the MSS. and Karnāl in the lith. ed. Karnāl or Garmāl or Girnār is the same as جنگر جنگر جنگر Jūnāgarh. Firishtah also has مندل جنگر جنگر جنگر.
army of Gujrat, and by successive rapid marches traversed the forests and deserts of that country. The Raja of the place, being proud of the strength of his fortification, occupied himself in defending it. The victorious troops surrounded the hill and the fort, like the centre of a circle, and placed manjanis (battering ram or catapults) on all sides; and every day a number of Rajputs were slain. But as the fort was so strong, that they were unable to accomplish their object, by the help of the catapults, Zafar Khan ordered that sabaids (covered ways) should be planned and completed with all speed. But in spite of these the fort could not be taken. In the end after the siege had lasted for a year and some months, the Rajputs in great humility asked for quarter; and men and women came with bared heads and prayed for safety. They agreed to pay tributes; and promised that it should be sent every year to Pattan without any demand being made for it. They also agreed, that henceforward they would not cause any kind of injury to the Musalmans.

A' zam Humayun owing to his innate kindliness and natural generosity accepted their excuses, and gave them quarter. He took tribute from them, and having fixed the amounts of the annual tribute, and having assured himself about the safety of that territory he hastened to perform a pilgrimage to the holy tomb of the Shaikh of the path of the Faith, Khwajah Mu'in-ud-din Hasan Sanjari. He pillaged and plundered the towns in that country and left no trace of cultivation and habitation. After finishing this invasion, he moved to the country known as Dandwana and having plundered Dilwara and Jalwara took a large number of prisoners and much booty. He returned to Pattan on the 17th of Ramaḍān in the year 800 A.H. As these campaigns had extended over three years, A' zam Humayun issued an order that all his troops and soldiery

1 Of Ajmir.

2 Dilwara and Jalwara in one MS. and Dilwara and Jalwara in the other and Danduna in the lith. ed. Firishtah has Dilwara and Jalwara. He does not mention Dandwana at all.

3 Firishtah says that it appears from the Tarikh-i-Alfi that at this time Zafar Khan had the Khufta read in his own name, and assumed the title of Mu'azzar Shâh.
should be exempted from all service and work of all kinds for the period of one year.

Towards the end of the year 800 a.h., Tātār Khān, Zafar Khān’s son, who held the office of vażīr of Sultān Muḥammad bin Firūz fled from Dehlī owing to the dominance and violence of Mallū Khān, and came to Gujrat to his father as has been mentioned in the section about Dehlī. In short Tātār Khān came in a state of great humility with a prayer to his father that he should be allowed to take the latter’s army with him, and have his revenge over Mallū Khān. A’zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān was thinking of collecting troops. But as Mirzā Pir Muḥammad Khān, grandson of His Majesty, the Lord of the auspicious conjunction, Amīr Ṭājmūr Gurgān had taken possession of Mūltān and had seized Sārang Khān, A’zam Humāyūn deferred the carrying out of this determination and the accomplishment of this deed; inasmuch as he had learned by his acumen that Mirzā Pir Muḥammad was the vanguard of His Majesty, the Lord of the auspicious conjunction. It so happened that after a short time, in the year 801 a.h., news came that Amīr Ṭājmūr had arrived in the neighbourhood of Dehlī with a large army. Zafar Khān comforted his son, and postponed the march to Dehlī for a suitable opportunity.

At this time they (i.e., Zafar Khān and Tātār Khān) advanced together towards Īdar. They arrived by rapid marches and besieged the fort. They sent detachments every day in different directions, and left no stone unturned in plundering and ravaging the country. The Rāja of Īdar in great humility and weakness sent emissaries, and agreed to pay tribute. As the empire of Dehlī was at this time full of disturbances and rebellion, Zafar Khān remained satisfied.

---

1 Firishtah briefly describes the conflicts between Mallū or Iqbāl Khān and Tātār Khān.

2 He is called بلو اقبال خان in one MS., بلو اقبال خان in the other, while the lith. ed. has only بلو اقبال حلاق. Firishtah does not say that Tātār Khān prayed for the help of his father’s army to revenge himself on Mallū or Iqbāl Khān; but he incited his father, Muṣaffar Shāh, to march to Dehlī, with the object of making himself the bāḏshāh. Muṣaffar Shāh agreed, and began to collect troops; but the news came of the advance of Mirzā Pir Muḥammad Khān, grandson of Amīr Ṭājmūr; and upset all their plans.
with the engagement to pay tribute, and returned to Pattan in Ramadān of that year. About this time an immense number of people fleeing from Dehli from the visitation of Amir Ta'Imūr arrived in Pattan. A'zam Humāyūn took pity on their condition, according to their different predicaments, and showed each one of them such kindness as his condition merited. After sometime Sulṭān Maḥmūd, son of Sulṭān Muḥammad, son of Sulṭān Fīrūz Shāh also fled from the Lord of the happy conjunction; and came to Gujrat. Zafar Khān did not accord to him the treatment and respect that was due to him, and he becoming hopeless and heart-broken, went away towards Mālwa, as is mentioned in the proper place.

In the year 803 A.H., A'zam Humāyūn disbursed a year’s pay to his soldiers, and with a large force advanced to conquer Īdar. When his victorious army surrounded the fort on all sides, and fought battles in succession for some days, the Rāja evacuated the fort, one night, and fled towards Bijānagar. Early the next morning Zafar Khān entered the fort, offered thanks to God, demolished the temples, left a thāna (military post) in the fort, and divided the country of Īdar among his nobles. After the accomplishment of the necessary work in that country he returned to Pattan. In the year 804 A.H. (they) sent (the news) to Zafar Khān that the Hindūs and 1kāfīrīs had collected round the temple of Sōmnāth and were exerting themselves to the utmost in reviving their ancient customs. A'zam Humāyūn turned his attention in that direction, and sent an army in advance of himself. When the inhabitants of Sōmnāth received information of this, they advanced to meet him by way of the sea, and began a battle. A'zam Humāyūn arrived there on wings of speed, and routed and destroyed them. Those who escaped the sword fled, and took shelter in the citadel of the port of Dip. After a few days the gates of the citadel were opened and the garrison were made food for the sword. He had the chief

---

1 The reading is obscure; the MSS. have هندو ع کافران; and the lith. ed. has هندو ع کانتران. The word هندو appears to be incorrect; if it was هندو, then the meaning would be some Hindūs and infidels. بھوپ in the lith. ed. is of course incorrect. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has کانتران سومنات i.e., the kafīrs of Sōmnāth. He also says that they had overpowered the military post left there by A'zam Humāyūn.
men of that body thrown under the feet of elephants. He demolished the temples, and laid the foundation of Jâmi‘ mosque. He appointed qâdis and muftis and other officers directed by the shara‘; and leaving a military post returned to Pattan, his capital.

In the year 806 A.H., Tātār Khān informed his father A‘zam Humāyūn, that Mallū Khān had seized Dehlī; and in spite of the fact that Sultān Maḥmūd had rested content with Qanouj, he would not leave him in that condition. He went on to say “If an army be sent with this slave (i.e., he himself) he would advance to Dehlī, wrest the city from his possession, and having revenged himself again restore his dominion to Sultān Maḥmūd.” A‘zam Humāyūn said in reply, “At present there is no one among the descendants of Firūz Shāh, who is capable of carrying on the duties of the empire. Mallū Iqbāl Khān is at present in possession of Dehlī, and the learned in the doctrines of the religion do not approve of dissensions and warfare leading to bloodshed among the followers of Islām.” Tātār Khān was not satisfied with these words, and said, I have such power now that I can attain to the empire of Dehlī. Kingship and empire are not the inheritance of any one; and recited the following couplet:

Couplet:

None can a kingdom and throne acquire,

That does not seize the sword with both his hands.

When A‘zam Humāyūn saw that he (Tātār Khān) was bent on this idea, he relinquished the work of the empire, and made over to him all the army and the paraphernalia of sovereignty.

1 An account of the accession of Tātār Khān, son of A‘zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān.

When Zafar Khān 2 voluntarily gave up the duties of the sovereignty, Tātār Khān arranged on the 1st of Jamādl-ul-ākhir 806 A.H.,

1 The heading is given differently in the MSS, and in the lith. ed. It is what I have in the text in one MS. In the other MS., it is the same, but the word جلوس (accession) is omitted. In the lith. ed. it is ذكر. Firishtah has no separate heading.

2 According to Firishtah Zafar Khān who had assumed the title of Muṣaffar Shāh had acquired such power by the conquest of Idar and Sōmnāth,
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a grand entertainment in the town of Asāwal and sat on the throne of empire. He raised the umbrella over his head, and assumed the title of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh. He conferred robes of honour on the amīrs and the chiefs and leaders of the country. He distributed the gold that had been scattered as thanks-offering on the umbrella of sovereignty among wise and meritorious men. He conferred the office of vazir on Shams Khān Dandānī who was the younger brother of Aʿzam Humāyūn. He ordered that in the heading (Tughrā) of the fārmān the following words should be written. 1st. Al-Muaffaq wal Waḥiq bi-tāʿid-ur-Rahmān, iftikhār-ud-dunya-wad-din Abul Ghāzi Muḥammad Shāh bin Muṣaffar Shāh."

After arranging the affairs of the country, he collected a large army, and on the 1st of Shaʿbān of the afore-mentioned year, he moved out of the town of Asāwal with the object of conquering Dehli. He was informed while on the march, that the Rāja of Nādōt

that he formed the idea of seizing Dehli; and making his son Tātār Khān the emperor, with the title of Ghiaṣ-ud-daula-wad-din Sultān Muḥammad Shāh. With this object they were marching along, when at Sānūr Muḥammad Shāh suddenly died.

Firištah goes on to say that the real facts are, that Tātār Khān rebelled against his father who had become old and weak, at Asāwal; and kept him imprisoned in the fort there. He made his uncle Shams Khān, the vakil-ud-saltanat, and gave himself the title of Nāṣir-ud-din Muḥammad Shāh; and then having collected troops advanced to conquer Dehli. Sultān Muṣaffar sent one of his trusted men, and insisted on his brother's arranging for his release, and for the assassination of Muḥammad Shāh. Shams Khān attempted to dissuade him, having no other alternative killed Muḥammad Shāh by giving him poison. Bayley (pages 81, 82) says "It is commonly believed, among the best-informed of the people of Gujrat,......that Tātār Khān conspired with certain discontented men, his friends outwardly, his enemies in reality, and placed his father in confinement. He then seated himself on the throne, with the title of Muḥammad Shāh and won over all the officials and army. Afterwards he waged war against the infidels of Nādōt, and subdued them. Then he directed his course towards Dehli, but drank the draught of death, and went to the city of non-existence. The cause of his death was this. In his ambition for the things of this life he threw aside the respect due to a father, a respect which is a lasting blessing to him who pays it; and God Almighty then sowed the seed of vengeance in the heart of his father. Whereupon some of those who were in attendance upon Tātār Khān, but who were personally inclined to Zafar Khān gave him poison."
had placed his feet of pride outside the bounds of obedience and allegiance. He turned his bridle of might from the road, advanced full gallop into the country of Nādōt, and sacked and ravaged villages and towns. He then halted in the town of Sānūr. At this time which was the spring tide of his greatness he suddenly passed away owing to excessive drinking.

Couplet:

To the dust was cast, that flower of greatness, that the
garden of empire,
With a hundred thousand caresses had in its bosom
nourished.

The period of his reign was two years and two months and some
days. When the dreadful news reached Aẓam Humāyūn in the
country of Bahrūj he grieved sorely. He arrived very quickly
at the camp, and sent Muḥammad Shāh’s body to Pattan; and had
his title recognised in the fārmān as Ḵhūdā-i-gān Shahid (the martyred
Lord). He showed favour to Shams Khān Dandānī, and transferring
Malik Jalāl Kōkhar, made over to him the government and defence
of the territory of Nāgūr. Then as there was no help for it he, with
a heart broken into a hundred pieces and dazed and stunned mind,
occupied himself with the affairs of state. He laid aside the royal
umbrella and the throne; and did not assume any of the insignia
of greatness. At last, however, acceding to the prayer of the nobles,
and of the pillars of state he again sat on the throne of empire in
the year 810 A.H. It has, however, come to (my) notice in various
histories that Shams Khān Dandānī gave poison to Muḥammad
Shāh in his wine.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF ZAFAR KHĀN WHO HAD THE
TITLE OF MUẒAFFAR SHĀH.

When the period of disturbance as regards the imperial power
in the country of Gujrat, which had extended over a period of three

1 The name is Sānūr in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; and also in the lith.
ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs calls the place Suntpoor. The invasion of
Nādōt and the name of the place where the death took place are not mentioned
by Bayley. According to him, Muḥammad Shāh died on the march to Dehli.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ʿUmām anḏawānāk Shāh; but the other MS.
omits the word ʿUmām.
years and four months was ended, A'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān in accordance with the prayer of the nobles and the suggestion of the great and the wise sat on the jewelled throne, in the manner of Sultāns, in the town of 1 Birpūr, at the moment which was selected by the astrologers who knew all the stars; and assumed the title of Sultān Mużaffar Shāh. He was described in the Khutba and farman as Almāthiq bālla-al-mannān Shams-ud-dunīā-wad-dīn Abul Mujāhid Mużaffar Shāh. The gold that was showered in thanks-offering over his umbrella was distributed among meritorious persons. He conferred robes of honour on nobles, and men possessing the knowledge of God and the heads of various groups. He then advanced by successive marches to the country of Mālwa. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Dhār, Sultān Hūshang advanced to give battle, but as he had not the strength to withstand the onset of Mużaffar Shāh's (army), 2 he fled, and took shelter in the fort of Dhār (but) in the end he came out and saw the Sultān. It had however come to the knowledge of Mużaffar Shāh that Sultān 3 Hūshang had given poison to his father Dilāwar Khān. As there

1 The name is Birpūr in the MSS., and in Bayley. In the lith. ed. it is بیرپور, Purnūr. It does not appear to be mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah or in Col. Briggs.

2 Firishtah however says that a great battle was fought between the armies of Gujrat and Mālwa, of which the Rustams and heroes of the world have spoken with the tongue of praise; but the army of Mālwa being defeated Sultān Hūshang was taken prisoner. Col. Briggs also says that Sultān Hūshang was taken prisoner "after a severe action". According to Bayley (page 84) "the brave warriors of Mużaffar Shāh soon scattered his ranks, as a whirlwind scatters clouds, and he was obliged to fly into the fortress of Dhār".

3 Bayley quotes the Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī as given in "Muhammadan Historians", vol. IV, p. 36, which agrees mainly with the text; and then says that Firishtah's version (which is probably impartial) is one of "Not proven". I have examined the passages about the death of Dilāwar Khān in Firishtah in both the Gujrat and Mālwa sections, but I do not find anything that justifies the statement that Firishtah's version or verdict is one of not proven. In the section about Gujrat Firishtah says و چوئین داکیور خان والی مالوّہ فوت شدہ بود هوشنگ شاہ قابل مقام اور گردد و شہر یافته کو موسلاج بطم مالک بدر را جمہ ہادا بکشت In the section about Mālwa he says منہبین خبر اوردد کہ بشاہ مظفر گجرائی جنین خبر رسید کہ اپنہ خان پدر خود داکیور خان غوری را پروسطہ حظام دلیوی زمرہ ہادا خود را
had been affection and fraternal feeling between Dilāwar Khān and Muẓaffar Shāh, (when they were both) in the service of Sultān Muhammad Firūz Shāh, Muẓaffar Shāh put Sultān Hūshang and some of his adherents into prison; and installed his brother ¹ Naṣrat Khān in the government of Mālwa.

Intelligence came at this time, that Sultān Ibrāhīm Shārqi had come out of Jaumpūr with the idea of seizing Dehli. On hearing this Muẓaffar Shāh started towards Dehli. When Sultān Ibrāhīm knew that Sultān Muẓaffar was coming with the intention of giving battle, he turned back from the way and returned to Jaumpūr; as the pen has narrated in the section about Jaumpūr. Sultān Muẓaffar on hearing this returned from the way and came back to Gujrat.

He took ² Sultān Hūshang with him in a state of captivity. (But) after a time the ra’iyyats and soldiers of Mālwa (aggrieved)

---

¹ He had been previously called Shams Khān Dandānī. Bayley appears to me to be unnecessarily puzzled about the identity of Naṣrat Khān. According to the Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī, Žafar Khān had only one brother, who was called Shams Khān, till the time when he was left as the governor of Mālwa; but at that time he was called Naṣrat Khān without any explanation of the change in his name. Firishtah says the same. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 10) identifies the two names as belonging to one person, where he says “Shums Khan, entitled Noosrut Khan”.

² Firishtah says that Muẓaffar Shāh made over Sultān Hūshang to the custody of his grandson Ahmad Shāh, with the order to keep him imprisoned in a fort. Sultān Hūshang wrote a very humble supplication which Ahmad Shāh showed to his grandfather with a suggestion that Hūshang might be released. As at this time there was a disturbance in Mālwa, Sultān Hūshang was released and after a time the territory of Mālwa with the insignia of royalty was given to him and he was sent with Ahmad Shāh so that the latter might reinstate him in the government. Bayley's version is slightly different. According to him, Alp Khān sent his petition direct to Sultān Muẓaffar and told him that Musa Khān who had been his lieutenant at Mandū had recovered a portion of Mālwah; but if he was released and sent there he would remain his obedient servant all his life. Sultan Muẓaffar then sent him with Ahmad Khan and a large army to expel Musa Khān from Mandū. Musa Khān fled and Sultān Hūshang was then installed in Mandū (p. 85).
at the harsh treatment (accorded to them) by Nasrat Shāh rebelled against the latter. The 1 Khuwajahdār rescued him from Dhār, and sent him to Gujrāt. Such of his adherents, as were left behind, were treated with harshness and suffered hardship. The people of Mālwa for fear of offending Sultān Muẓaffar made Mūṣa Khān, who was a relation of Sultān Hūshang their leader and they selected the fort of Mandū for their residence. Sultān Muẓaffar on receiving this news released Sultān Hūshang from imprisonment and sent Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, that he might recover possession of Mālwa, and deliver it over to him. Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān arrived at Dhār, and taking possession of the country, made it over to Sultān Hūshang; and returned by way of 2 Dahūr to Gujrāt; as the pen forming letters black and fragrant as musk has narrated this clearly and explicitly in the section about Mālwa.

In short, in the year 812, intelligence came to Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh, that the 3 Rājpūts of Kuhnakōt, one of the dependencies of Kach, had raised the dust of rebellion. Immediately on hearing this news, he detached a large force for their punishment. It is said, that he sent Khudāwānd Khān to attend on Shaikh Muḥammad Qāsim Budhū, (asking the latter) to pray that the army of Islām might return with victory and triumph. His reverence the Shaikh on examining the muster roll of the men who had been sent as

---

1 I do not know the exact meaning of Khuwajadār which is in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. He might have been some kind of a palace official. Neither Bayley nor Firishtah gives any help, for although the former refers to the Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī in this connection, neither says anything as to the way in which Naṣrat Khān retired from Dhār. Khuwajahwār in the text-edition.

2 The name may be دهور or دهور in one MS., and دهور in the other and in the lith. ed. The place is not mentioned by Firishtah or Bayley.

3 The name of the place is کھنکوٹ Kuhnakōt in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and کھنکوٹ Kunthakōt in the other MS. I cannot find any mention of the expedition in Firishtah or in Col. Briggs. It is mentioned in Bayley’s History, which is based on the Mirāt-i-İskandarī, but he places it in 810 A.H., the same year as the expedition to Mālwa; and he calls the place Kambh-kōt, which is very likely the correct name, but he adds a note that the Tārīkh-i-Allī calls the place Kanth-kōt; and he says that Khudāwānd Khān was sent in command of the expedition (p. 86).
members of the army, drew his pen across certain names. It so happened that when the army returned under the wing of triumph and victory, every person across whose names the Shaikh had drawn his pen was found to have attained to martyrdom.

In the year 1 S 813 A.H., Sultan Mu'azzar became ill in the city of Nahrwala Pattan. He placed Shahnaza Ahmad Khan on the throne of the empire in the presence of the nobles and chief men of the country; and conferred on him the title of Nasir-ud-din Ahmad Shah. According to his orders, the Khuftba was read in the prince's name on the pulpits of Islam. Three years and eight months and sixteen days had elapsed on that day since the commencement of his rule. Five months and thirteen days after the accession of Sultan Ahmad Shah, he redeemed the pledge of life; and in the month of Safar 814 A.H., he passed from the old caravansarai of the world, to the happy land of a future life. He is buried in the country of Pattan, and he has been styled Khudai-qa'an Kabir.

1 Bayley (pp. 86, 87) says that according to the Mirat-i-Ahmad, Sultan Mu'azzar reigned for eighteen years, eight months and fourteen days. He also quotes the Tabaqat-i-Akbari about the period of his reign and the date of his death; and also quotes the Tarikhi-Alfi, in explanation of the statement made in the Tabaqat-i-Akbari, though an explanation was scarcely necessary. He also quotes a story from the Tarikhi-Bahadur Shahi according to which Ahmad Khan imprisoned Sultan Mu'azzar and gave poison to him, after obtaining an opinion from some learned men, that a son would be justified in killing a man who had killed his father. Sultan Mu'azzar asked him why he was in such a hurry. Ahmad Khan answered him in words of the Kur'an, "All men have their times appointed, and when the hour is come, they cannot delay or advance it a moment". Bayley after considering the facts given in the Tabaqat-i-Akbari and the Tarikhi-Alfi, says that although the story told by the Tarikhi-Bahadur Shahi is not absolutely irreconcilable with them, they are at least prima facie in conflict with it, and at any rate seem to dispose of the alleged motive of the crime. This is correct, if the haste to grasp the sovereignty be considered to be the motive, but not correct if the desire was to avenge his father's death.

Finishtah says nothing about these things. He says that Sultan Mu'azzar became ill at the end of Safar 814 A.H., and died on the 8th of Rabii-ul-akbar, i.e., after a month and a few days, and he appointed Ahmad Khan to be his successor, as he considered him to be abler than his own surviving son. He was 71 years of age at the time of his death.

2 Since his second accession, after the death of Muhammad Shah.
AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÂN AHMAD SHÂH, SON OF SULTÂN MUHAMMAD, SON OF SULTÂN MUZAFFAR.

When Sultân Ahmad Shâh inclined on the pillow on the throne of empire and the seat of greatness, he conferred honours on the nobles and the chief men of the kingdom, the great men of the city and the chiefs of various groups; and gave a share of his gifts to all sections of the people. He kept the officers and writers charged with matters connected with the revenue in their former positions; and made great exertions in the matter of increasing the cultivation, and in the building up of the country and the administration of justice.

When the news of the accession of Sultân Aḥmad Shâh reached 1 Firûz Khân, son of Sultân Muẓaffar Shâh in the town of Barōda, he owing to his envy and jealousy, raised the standard of revolt and hostility. He conferred the position of vazîr on Jivan Dâs Khattr, Amîr Maḥmûd 2 Barî, who was the governor of Kanbâyat also joined Firûz Khân. Other amîrs, who were wicked by nature, considering Firûz Khân to be a source of profit and success for themselves united with him. They took Firûz Khân to Kanbâyat; and in that town Haibat Khân, son of Sultân Muẓaffar had an interview with him. After a few days Saʿādat Khân and Shâr Khân, sons of Sultân Muẓaffar, came and united with them. Firûz Khân gained strength and power from the union of his brothers, and advanced towards the town of Bahūrj. From that place they wrote a letter to Sultân Hūshang Ghûrî and requested him that he should help them with his spirit and courage; and agreed to pay him a certain number of

---

1 According to Bayley (p. 88) it was Mōdûd, the son of Firûz Khân, who was governor of Barodah, who raised the rebellion. Firishtah like Niẓām-ud-dîn says that it was Firûz Khân himself. Bayley says in a note that the Tabaqāt and Firishtah have Firûz, but the Muntakhab-ut-Tawârîkh has Muʿīd-ud-dîn; and this confirms the Mīrāt-i-Sikandari. Among the rebel's adherents Firishtah has حاکم الملک و ملک شیرو و ملک کوئن خسرو و جبوند و بایگندس کنوری. Col. Briggs has two names Jeevundas and Vinaikdas Kauhtry, while Bayley has Jiwan Dās and Payāq Dās. The name is جبونداس کنوری in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.

2 Firishtah calls him Amîr Maḥmûd Turk. Barî seems to be incorrect, though it is found in several places further on, but Turk is also found in a few places.
lakhs of tankás at each stage, as contribution to his expenses. They also sent to every zamīndār that was in the country of Gujrāt, a horse and a robe of honour, to induce him to join them.

When this news reached Aḥmad Shāh, he collected his troops, and advanced rapidly towards Bahroj. When he arrived there, he, in order to extinguish the flames of the disturbance, sent an emissary to the amirs, with the following message:—

Couplet:

"Whom God had exalted, fate will not see abased,
Who to Him is dear, the world will not see him lowered.
As Ḵhudā-i-gān Kabīr (the great Lord), Muẓaffar Shāh took me by the hand, and placed me on the throne of empire, and the foundation of the high mansion, and the strong palace of my empire has been strengthened by the allegiance of the amirs and the well-known men of the country, and of all sections of the people, it is right and proper that you should not place your foot outside the line of loyalty and obedience; for the result of rebellion is destruction. Each one should be contented with the fiefs, which Ḵhudā-i-gān Kabīr Muẓaffar Shāh allotted to him, and should hope for other favours." When the emissary delivered this message, the amirs consulted among themselves, and sent Haibat Khān who was the uncle of Aḥmad Shāh, with him. As Aḥmad Shāh lavished great favours on Haibat Khān, Fīrūz Khān and the other Khāns, becoming assured of safety and favour, hastened to attend on him. The latter cheered each one of them with fresh favours and tried to draw their hearts towards him. He confirmed their old jāgīrs; and after arranging the affairs of that part of the country in the best possible way, arranged to return towards Pattan. At this time news was brought to him that Sultān Hüshang was advancing in that direction from Dhār, with the object of helping Fīrūz Khān.

Sultān Aḥmad immediately on hearing this news left the fort of Bahroj, and advanced by successive marches to the village of

1 Wantaj. At that place 2 Bhīkan Ādam Khān Afghān who during

---

1 The name is ܢ͡ investigación  and 🔎 in the two MSS., and 🔎 in the lith. ed. I have not been able to find the name in Firishtah, in Bayley or in the Rās Mālā.

2 According to the Mirāṭ-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, page 88), the rebels headed by Mūdūd (or Fīrūz Khān) "defeated Bhīkan and Ādam Afghān, the king's men".
the reign of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh was the feudatory of Barōda, and at present on account of his hostility (to Sultān Aḥmad), was wandering about, came and attended on Aḥmad Shāh and was received with favour by the latter. As he had now completely settled the matter connected with Firūz Kḥān, he with perfect calmness, physical and mental, turned to the conflict and warfare with Sultān Hūshang, and sent ‘Imād-ul-mulk in advance of himself to engage him. Hūshang in shame and humiliation returned to his own country. ‘Imād-ul-mulk pursued him for several stages; and seizing the zamindārs who had joined him brought them with himself to attend on the Sultān.

When Sultān Aḥmad Shāh at the time of his return arrived at the town of Asāwal and the air (climate) of that place appeared to be congenial to him, he after consulting the omens, and taking the advice of the asylum of all truth, Shaikh Aḥmad Kanbū, may his tomb be sanctified! laid on the ground the first brick for building the great city of Aḥmadābād, which has no equal among the cities of Hindūstān, on the bank of the Sābarmati, in the month of Ḍhīqa’dah 813 A.H. He laid the foundation of a fort and a Jāma’ mosque and many markets; and he built 360 pūras outside the fortifications, each of which contained a mosque and a bāzār and was surrounded by a wall. If, during the time when Aḥmadābād was in a most flourishing condition, some one had said that there was no other city in the whole world which was so grand, and which was so beautifully arranged and decorated, he would not have been guilty of any exaggeration.

Bayley (p. 88) says in a note, "the Tab.-i-Akbarī makes these the name of one man, but the probabilities are in favour of the text. Bikan Afgān escaped and rejoined the Sultān". According to the context of the Ṭabaqāt the name appears to be that of one man.

In the lith. ed. of Firishtah Ādam Bhankar is said to have been ordered to fight the rebels, and to have been defeated by them, but this is not mentioned by Col. Briggs.

1 two forts in the text-edition appears to be a mistake.
Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān again revolted in the year 840 A.H., at the instigation of 1 Malik Badr ‘Alā’, who was a very near 2 relation of Mużaffar Shāh, and again took the path of violence and rebellion; and leaving the central part of the kingdom, took shelter in the hills of Īdar. Sultan Āḥmad Shāh on hearing this news advanced to destroy them; and when he arrived in the town of Wantaj, he sent Fath Khān, son of Sultan Mużaffar in advance of himself. (But) he also at the instigation of 3 Saiyid Ibrāhīm Nizām the feudatory of the town of Mahrāsa joined his brothers. Sultan Āḥmad on hearing this advanced towards Mahrāsa. Malik Badr ‘Alā and Saiyid Ibrāhīm entitled Rukn Khān had a ditch dug around the fort of Mahrāsa; and began to make the necessary arrangements for defending it. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān summoned Ra‘īmal, the Rāja of Īdar, to help them; and they brought him to a place called Ankhōr, which is five karōhs from the town of Mahrāsā.

When Sultan Āḥmad arrived in the vicinity of the town, he first of all sent a body of learned men to Badr ‘Alā and Rukn Khān, that they might remove the veil of neglect from before their eyes, and might reveal to them what was right. When the emissaries did not receive such a reply as they had wished for, they came back. The Sultan out of his great mercy sent some other men and by their mouths sent the following messages: “I am giving you assurances of safety, you may go wherever you like.” Malik Badr ‘Alā and Rukn Khān sent the following reply: “If Nizām-ul-mulk, who is the

1 Col. Briggs calls him Mullik Dear, but he does not say that he instigated the revolt. It is not clear how he was related to Mużaffar Shāh. He is described as puzzle-headed in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī. Bayley (p. 93, footnote 1) speculates about his relationship with Mużaffar Shāh but cannot say anything definite about it.

2 See note 1 above.

3 Firishtah calls him Saiyid Ibrāhīm, who bore the title of Rukn Khān, and was the jāgīrdār of Mahrāsa. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 15) says as regards the name of the place, that Firishtah always spells it همپر, and so he has also called it Mahrāsa, but the correct name is Mowrasa. The name is spelled موراس in the MSS. of the Tabaqāt, but the lith. ed. has لاس مو. Bayley has Mūrasah. As regards the double name Ibrāhīm Nizām it appears from Bayley, p. 93, that it really means Ibrāhīm the son of Nizām. He was the jāgīrdār of Mūrāsah under Sultan Ahmad, but was induced to join the rebels.
nā'ib ṭasīr, and Malik Aḥmad ʿAzīz who is the kārguzār (superintendent) and nā'ib vakīldar (the deputy vakīl in attendance), and Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk, and Saif Ḵhwājah are sent to us, to take us with them, we would be assured of our safety, and come and attend on you." Sultān Aḥmad gave orders that the noblemen named should go to the gate of the fort, but they should be very careful of the deceit and treachery of Badr ʿUlā, and they should not go into the fort. The above-named amīrs then proceeded to the gate of the fort of Mahrāsa. Malik Badr ʿUlā and Rūkn Ḵẖān kept a body of men in ambush; and themselves received the noblemen with courtesy and respect. They then separated Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk from the other amīrs, and engaged them in talk and conversation. At this time the men who were in ambush came out and seized Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk, and carried them into the fort. Nizām-ul-mulk said in a loud voice, "Go and tell the Sultān that he should not allow any delay in seizing the fort. Whatever fate was allotted to us has overtaken us." Malik Badr ʿUlā put chains round the feet of both of them, and kept them guarded in a dark dungeon. The real reason for such conduct on their part was this, that Malik Badr ʿUlā knew that as long as these amīrs should remain in confinement, no injury of any kind would reach the fort.

When Sultān Aḥmad heard what had happened, he gave orders that batteries should be allotted to the different commanders and the fort should be attacked from every side. On the 5th Jamāḍī-ul-āwwal in the year 814 A.H. (1411 A.D.) the Sultān (in person) attacked the gate of the fort. The brave amīrs seeing this jumped into the ditch, and clambered to the fort and in the twinkling of an eye they mounted on the wall; and commenced to take measures for liberating Malik Nizām-ul-mulk. As the moment of the death of those two beloved noblemen had not yet come, they were both brought out, and the rebels were completely routed and destroyed. Malik Badr ʿUlā and Rūkn Ḵẖān, who were the leaders of the traitors and chiefs of the rebels, were executed. ¹ Firūz Ṭẖān and the Rāja

¹ There was apparently two Firūz Ṭẖāns, (1) Firūz Ṭẖān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, and (2) Firūz Ṭẖān, son of Shams Ṭẖān. The former led the revolt against Aḥmad Shāh, and fought with him. Finally however, the Rāja of Idar
of Ídār on hearing of the victory fled and took shelter in the hills of Ídar.

After some days, Ranmal, the Rāja of Ídar, wishing to redress and remedy what had happened behaved treacherously towards Firūz Ḳhān, and having seized his treasures and elephants sent them for the service of Sulṭān Aḥmad. He also commenced with great humility and submissiveness to send tribute. The Sulṭān then returned to Aḥmadābād under the wings of triumph and victory. Firūz Ḳhān fled with his brothers, and went to the country of Nāgōr. On the day on which Rāna Mūkul fought with Firūz Ḳhān, the son of Shams Ḳhān Dandānī, Firūz Ḳhān the Shāhzāda attained martyrdom.

In the year 816, ¹ Malik Aḥmad Sarkējī, Malik Shāh Malik and Malik Aḥmad son of Shēr Malik, Bhīkan Ādām Ḳhān Afghān and Malik īṣa Sālār again wakened up the disturbance which had fallen asleep, and they united some of the turbulent zamīndārs with them, and overran a part of the country; and every wretched man that was there came and joined them. About this time the Rāja of ² Mandal, the Rāja of Nādōt and Badhūl behaved treacherously towards him, and he fled to the other Firūz Ḳhān, who had succeeded his father at Nāgōr. Here he was killed according to the Taḥṣīq in the course of the fight between the other Firūz Ḳhān and Rāna Mūkul. Nīzām-ud-dīn calls him Shāhzāda, to distinguish him from his namesake, when mentioning his death. According to Firishtah he went to Nāgōr, and was killed by the ḥākim of that place, i.e., either by his namesake, or by some officer of his. As regards Firūz Ḳhān No. 2, it will be remembered, that his father Shams Ḳhān, after being expelled from Dhār, went to Nāgōr, and became the ruler there. This Firūz Ḳhān was alive long after the death of the other which took place apparently in 815; for it appears that as late as 820 A.H., he sent a message to Sulṭān Aḥmad, to exculpate himself from all complicity with Sulṭān Hūshang and his partisans.

Col. Briggs is inclined to think that there was only Feroz Khan, and he was the son of his uncle Shams Khan. See footnote 2, page 19 of vol. IV of his work. According to Bayley it was Mōdūḍ who fled to Nāgōr, and was killed in a battle between Rānā Mokal, Rāja of Chītōr and Shams Ḳhān Dindānī.

¹ According to Firishtah, Sulṭān Aḥmad invaded Jalwāra in 816 A.H. and it was during his absence that Malik Aḥmad Sarkīgijvangi and Shāh Malik, son of Shaikh Malik and Ādām Bhānkār raised the revolt. Col. Briggs (p. 17) has Kutchey instead of Sarkīgijvangi and he calls Ādām Bhānkār of the lith. ed. Adam of Bhukkur. Bayley (p. 95) calls 'Usmān Ahmad Sarkhejī.

² Possibly Mandalgarh.
sent petitions to Sultân Hûshang, and incited and tempted him to come and conquer Gujràt. Owing to his foolishness, he put his trust on the help of these rebels and advanced towards Gujràt. Sultân Aḩmad saw that the dust of disturbance had risen from both sides, sent his own brother Laţif 1 Khân, son of Muhammad Shâh, with Malik Nizâm-ul-mulk the na‘îb vazîr to punish Malik Shâh Malik, and the other amîrs. He himself with a well-equipped army advanced to crush Sultân Hûshang. When he arrived at 2 Bândhû which is in the neighbourhood of Châmpânîr, he sent Malik ʻImâd-ul-mulk Samarqandî with a large force, in advance of himself. When Sultân Hûshang heard that a slave of Sultân Aḩmad was coming to give him battle, he considered his grandeur higher than that; and returned to his own country. ʻImâd-ul-mulk seized a number of the men who were the prime movers and the cause of the disturbance, and brought them before the Sultân. It can, however, be well understood by intelligent men, who know the niceties of things, that Sultân Hûshang was only seeking a pretext for a retreat. It was quite possible for him to send one of his slaves to meet ʻImâd-ul-mulk; and he might also have advanced in person, when Sultân Aḩmad advanced to reinforce his own army.

About the time when the news of the retreat of Sultân Hûshang came, fast-moving couriers brought the news that Malik Shâh Malik and the other amîrs finding that they had not the strength to meet (the Sultân’s army) had fled without waiting to fight. Shâhzâda Laţif Khân took up a position after pursuing them for some distance. Shâh Malik in consultation with the other disturbers of the peace, who had combined with him, made a sudden attack in the darkness of the night on the Shâhzâda’s camp; but as the soldiers were all present and alert, they could not effect anything. They left a large number dead, and fled and took shelter with the zamindâr of Karnâl. The Sultân on receiving this news performed the rites of thanking God, and made the people of Aḩmadâbâd happy, by his gifts and favours.

1 According to Bayley (p. 96) Prince Latîf Khân had orders to bring Kânhâ to account; and the latter was driven into the country of Sûrath.

2 Bândhû is called Pândrû in Bayley, p. 96, and its situation is described as in purqana Sânouli, ten miles from the hill of Châmpânîr.
As the Rāja of ¹Karnāl had given shelter in his territory to Shāh Malik and the other rebels, the Sultān, in the year 817 A.H., determined on punishing him and teaching him a lesson. When he arrived at Karnāl, which is celebrated as Jūnagarh, the Rāja came out, and engaged him in a battle, but in the end he fled and retired into the citadel of Karnāl, and most of his best men fell, and departed to the city of eternity at the time of the flight. Sultān Aḥmad besieged the fort; and sent detachments every day for plundering and ravaging the country of ²Sōrāth. After a few days, in the month of Rajab of that year, he seized the fort by an attack in great force. The Rāja, with the others who were concerned in creating disturbance, fled to the top of the hill of Karnāl. Then in great humility and weakness, they came down, and begged for quarter; and again began to pay tribute according to the old custom. Sultān Aḥmad left Shāh Abūl ³Khair and Saiyid Qāsim in order to collect the tribute, and returned to Aḥmadābād, his capital.

In the year 821, news came that Naṣīr, son of ʿĀdil Khān the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr, feeling very proud of his power and greatness had overrun some parts of Sultānpur and Nadarbār. Immediately on hearing this, (Sultān Aḥmad) marched rapidly towards Nadarbār. At the same time he sent a detachment to seize the fort of ⁴Tambōl,

¹ According to Firishtah Sultān Aḥmad invaded Karnāl or Garnāl or Girmār because he had heard a great deal in praise of the place, and because the Rāja had never submitted to any Musalmān prince. When he was returning from Karnāl, he demolished a temple at a place called Saiyidpūr, (it is curious that the place should have such a name) which was adorned with various gems and pictures. It appears however from a quotation from a Muhammadan historian, apparently Firishtah, in Forbes’s Rās Mālī, vol. I, page 329 (1856), that the name of the place where the temple was situated was Somāpoor.

Firishtah also says that Sultān Ahmad sent Malik Tuhfā, on whom he conferred the title of Tāj-ul-mulk on a jehār all over Gujrāt; and the latter slew many, and laid the burden of the jizya and kharjāj on others, and converted many to Islam. In 819 Sultān Aḥmad himself went on a similar expedition.

Firishtah mentions one Ḥaḍrat Khān Wali of Dehī coming to Gujrāt, but it does not appear who he was.

² مصوب in the text-edition.

³ Firishtah calls them two brothers, Saiyid Abul Khair and Saiyid Abul Qāsim.

⁴ According to Col. Briggs (p. 19), “Tumbole, a small hill fort in the district of Baglana. The district from its local position naturally belongs to Kandehā, but it had from a very early period rajas independent of that province.”
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which is situated on the boundary of the Deccan. When he arrived at Nadarbār, 1 Ādil Khān fled to Asīr. The forces that had been sent to the fort of Tambōl, took possession of it by giving assurances of safety to the commandant. As it was the rainy season, and the chārwād (beasts of burden?) suffered great hardship in the open plains, Sultān Aḥmad Shāh wanted to return to Aḥmadābād; but very swift couriers brought the news that the Rājas of Īdar and Chāmpānir and Mandal and Nādōt had sent repeated representations to Sultān Hūshang; and had brought him into Gujrāt; and that he had arrived at the town of Mahrāsa.

At this time a man riding a camel who had come from the country of Nāgōr in the course of nine days arrived at Nadarbār, and brought a petition from 2 Fīrūz Khān, son of Shams Khān Dandānī, the purport of which was that Sultān Hūshang was coming to conquer Gujrāt; and as he had come to know from the letters of Jahān Khān that this faqīr (i.e., he himself) was not honest and pure in his intentions towards Sultān Aḥmad, he had written to the faqīr that the zamindārs of Gujrāt had sent repeated petitions to him, and had begged him to invade Gujrāt, and he was accordingly starting for that country. It would be right and proper that he also should make himself ready quickly and should come; (in which case) after the conquest of Gujrāt the country of Nahrwāla would be conferred on him. As His Majesty is his lord and master, he has thought it right and proper that he should send him notice of this.

Sultān Aḥmad, in spite of the rains, marched rapidly and crossing the Narbada, encamped on the bank of the Mahindri; and when, in the course of a week, he arrived in the vicinity of the town of Mahrāsa, Sultān Hūshang’s spies took the news to him, and he sent for and reproached the zamindārs, and after scratching the back of his head, returned to his own country. As Sultān Aḥmad had come with only a small retinue, he halted there for a few days for collecting his troops. At this time news came that owing to the disturbances the Rāja of Sūrath had again neglected to pay his tribute; and

1 It was “Naṣīr son of Ādil Khān a few lines above but it is Ādil Khān here. The correct name however is Naṣīr, son of Ādil Khān” (see p. 196).
2 See note 1, pp. 193, 194.
Naṣīr, son of ‘Ādil Khān the ruler of Asīr, had in concert with Ghaznīn Khān, son of Sultān Hūshang, besieged the fort of ¹ Thālnīr ; and had by fraud and deceit taken possession of it ; and with the advice and concurrence of the Rāja of Nādōt had invaded the country of Sultānpūr ; and had retired after plundering and ravaging it. Sultān Aḥmad immediately on hearing this nominated Mahmūd Khān with a large

¹ As regards Thālnīr or Thālnīr it appears from a note in page 101 of Bayley’s Gujarāt that “Thālnīr had been assigned to Iftikhār-ul-mulk (who was Naṣīr Khān’s younger brother), by their father, Malik Rāja, the first of the Fārūqī rulers of Khāndāsh, and with it certain territories, as his inheritance. Naṣīr Khān, who seems to have been restless, ambitious, and unscrupulous, seized the fort from Iftikhār-ul-mulk”. Firishtah says it was taken by force, but the Ṭabaqāt Akbār says by stratagem; any way, he got it, and was assisted in doing so, by Ghaznīn Khān, who was his wife’s nephew whether their object at first was merely to seize Thālnīr, and the attack on Sultānpūr an after-thought, or whether this was designed from the beginning, the fact was that the two confederates renewed their attempt on these provinces, and, aided by the Rāja of Nādōt (Ṭabaqāt Akbār), for a time carried all before them. On the whole it seems likely that the attack by Sultān Hūshang, the rising in Sōrath, and the second adventure of Naṣīr Khān in Sultānpūr, were concerted movements, and intended to be simultaneous; and, if it had not been for Sultān Aḥmad’s prompt march to meet Sultān Hūshang, and the precipitate flight of that irresolute and treacherous prince, Sultān Aḥmad would have had a very serious task on his hand.

This is also confirmed by the Cambridge History of India, pp. 296, 297, where however Malik Rāja is called Raja Ahmad, and Iftikhār-ul-mulk is called Hasan. Malik Rāja divided his dominion giving the eastern portion to Naṣīr, and the western to Hasan. Naṣīr founded the city of Būrānāpūr in 1400 A.D. and captured the strong fort of Asīr from a Hindū chieftain; while Hasan established himself at Thālnīr. In 1417 Naṣīr with the help of Hūshang, who had married his sister, captured Thālnīr, and imprisoned Hasan. Then Sultān Aḥmad sent an army which compelled Naṣīr to retire to Asīr, where he was besieged. Peace was made, Naṣīr swearing fealty to Ahmad and the latter recognising Naṣīr’s title of Khān. Hasan retired to Gujarāt, where he and his descendant found a home and intermarried with the royal house.

From the treaty between Sultān Aḥmad and Naṣīr, an estrangement took place between Khāndāsh and Mālwa. Naṣīr resented Hūshang’s failure to support him adequately against Sultān Aḥmad. In 1429 in spite of the former enmity between his family and the Bahmanis, he gave his daughter in marriage to ¹Alā’-ud-dīn Aḥmad, son of Aḥmad Shāh, the 9th Bahmani King; but this union engendered strife, and Khāndāsh after a disastrous war with the Bahmanis, was at length driven into the arms of Gujarāt.
force to proceed to the country of Sóraith; and he went there and recovered tribute from the zamindárs. The Súltán also sent Malik Mahmúd Barkí, and Múkhlís-ul-mulk to go and punish Nasír the son of ‘Ádil Khán and to teach him a lesson. Malik Mahmúd and Mukhlís-ul-mulk in the first instance raided Nádot and a part of that country. The Rája being too weak to withstand them, paid the tribute which had been agreed upon. Then when they arrived in the vicinity of Sultánípur Ghaznín Khán retired to his own country. Nasír Khán, son of ‘Ádil Khán, retired to the fort of Tálnir, and prepared to defend himself there. After the siege had been protracted for a length of time, he prayed for the pardon of his offences, through the intervention of Malik Mahmúd Barkí. Súltán Áhmád drew the pen of forgiveness across his offences, and conferred distinction on him, by giving him a robe of honour and the title of Nasír Khán.

As Súltán Húshang had repeatedly invaded Gujrát, and had soiled and tarnished the brightness of Súltán Áhmád’s heart, which was the seat of peace and happiness, with the dust of pain, the latter in the month Safar of the afore-mentioned year advanced to conquer the kingdom of Málwa. On the way the representatives of the Rája of Ídar and Chámpánír and Nádot and other zamindárs came and did homage to him; and prayed for the pardon of their (master’s) offences. They also engaged that they would remit double the annual tribute. Súltán Áhmád shut his eyes to the offences of these men; and accepted their excuses. As the Rája of Mandal continued in his pride and rebellion, and did not try to discontinue his offences, Súltán Áhmád left Malik Nízám-ul-mulk to be the regent of the kingdom during his absence, and left the work of punishing the Rája in his charge; and in spite of the weather, and the narrowness of the road, himself advanced into Málwa. When by successive marches he arrived in the neighbourhood of the village of ¹Kálliádah, Súltán Húshang selected some broken land near it, and strengthened his position by having the river of Kálliádah on one side; and having cut down large trees made a khárband (a sort of zariba made of trunks and branches of trees) in front of him. Súltán Áhmád stood mounted

¹The name looks like Kálliáwa ग़लीवा in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs has Kaliada. According to Bayley (p. 103) Kálliádah is the name of the river on which Ujain is situated.
on an extensive plain. He directed that 1 Amîr Maḥmûd Barkî should command the right wing, and Malik Farîd 'Imâd-ul-mulk the left, while Naṣîr-ud-dîn 'Aḍâd-ud-daula would be in the centre. It so happened that while seated on his horse he examined the battlefield, his attention fell on the circle fixed for Farîd; and seated there on his horse, he sent a servant to summon him, so that he might confer his father's title, which was 'Imâd-ul-mulk, on him. The messenger came back (and said) that the Malik had rubbed oil on his body, and he would arrive after a moment. The Sultân said "This is the day of battle. Farîd will find sorrow and shame on account of this delay"; and without waiting any longer advanced to the battlefield.

When the two bâdshâhs stood in front of each other, and the two armies met in great excitement and clamour, an elephant belonging to Sultân Ahmad's army rushed on Sultân Hûshang's troops, and caused much havoc; and scattered the horsemen in all directions. Ghâzîn K̲hān, son of Sultân Hûshang, coming within bow shot, shot many arrows on the forehead of the animal and wounded and killed it. From all sides warriors thirsting for battle rushed and fell on Sultân Ahmad's army; and there was great distress among the men of Gujûrât. At this time Malik Farîd mounted on his horse and followed by his men came towards the battlefield, but although he tried, 2 he could not find his way into it. At last a man told him, "I know a path by which you can get behind the enemy's army, and can launch an attack on it". Malik Farîd knowing the finding

1 Amîr Maḥmûd appears here to be called in one MS. as تيٍُ. Turk, and not as in previous passages بركي Barkî. Firishtah all along calls him Amîr Maḥmûd Turk. Bayley, however, on page 102 calls him Malik Maḥmûd Bargî. As regards Farîd, although he has been called Malik Farîd 'Imâd-ul-mulk, he was the son of 'Imad-ul-mulk, but that title had not yet been conferred on him; and the Sultân wanted to confer it on him there and then, as appears from the next sentence.

2 According to the Mirât-i-Sikandarî (Bayley, p. 103) Farîd "came to the side of a river, where there was a difficult ford". After a little while a man pointed out a way to him which led to the rear of Sultân Hûshang's army.

The battle is mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, as a fiercely contested one, but the name of the place where it took place is not mentioned and no details are given.
of the pathway to be a piece of unhoped for good fortune, advanced along it. At this time when the two armies were contending with each other, the detachment of Malik Farid appeared before Sultān Hūshang’s army; and he at once, and without hesitation fell on it, and there was a great battle. Although Sultān Hūshang was personally 1 bold and courageous, yet 2 not being victorious in the battle he took the road of flight; and fled galloping to the fort of Mandū. Much booty fell into the hands of Sultān Āḥmad, and his soldiers; and they went in pursuit till within one karōh of Mandū. Sultān Āḥmad also sent detachments in different directions, so that they plundered and ravaged the country, and cut down trees, both those that bore fruit and others that did not, in the vicinity of Mandū. As the rainy season had now arrived, they turned back and returned to Gujrāt. They trampled down (the crops, etc.) in the countries of Chāmpānīr and Nādōt, which lay on their way. After arriving at Āḥmadābād Sultān Āḥmad held many entertainments and festivities in the course of some months; and everyone, who had exerted himself even a little was distinguished by favours and kindnesses and had title conferred on him.

At the beginning of Dhīqā’dah in the year 821 A.H. (the Sultān) determined to punish 3 the Rāja of Chāmpānīr; and advancing by successive marches, besieged the hill of Chāmpānīr, which is three 4 karōhs in height, and seven karōhs in circumference. He shut up all entrances and exits, and waited for the blowing of the breezes of victory and conquest. After some days, the Rāja in great humility and distress sent a vakīl, and submitted that 4 This slave (i.e., he

1 in the lith. ed., but شجاع and مردانه in the MS. I think the former is the better reading.
2 The readings are doubtful. One MS. and the lith. ed. have اما دروز جنگ نیوہ. The other has اما دروز خان درگر نبرد. The former reading is probably correct. The latter certainly is not. دروز جنگ نیوہ in the text-edition.
3 He is called Tirbang Dās in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 104. Tirbang is a variant of Triabhanga, lit. broken in three; a name given to Krishnā, as indicating the posture in which he is shown as standing, in the ordinary pictures.
4 This is absurd, but I cannot get the correct altitude of the hill anywhere. Probably the path to the fort was three karōhs in length.
himself) has all along been a slave of that threshold, and has always caused himself to be written down as a dependant of Ahmad Shah. If owing to his innate generosity he would accept the excuses for the offences of this humble one, the latter would send all his expenses for one year into the treasury, and would pay the annual tribute.". As Sultan Ahmad had at this time another achievement in his mind, he accepted the Raja's excuses and took the tribute.

In the beginning of Safar of 822 A.H. (1419 A.D.) he advanced towards the town of Sönkara; and having plundered and ravaged a part of the country round it, he encamped on the 22nd Safar nearer the town; and ordered the erection of a Jama' Mosque there, and appointed the necessary officers directed by the Shara'. He marched from that place on the 11th Rabi'-ul-āwwal of that year and encamped at Manki, and ordered that a strong fort should be built there as a military post. On the 12th Rabi'-ul-āwwal, he started towards Mandu, and having punished the inhabitants and infidels of the hill of Kantū, he proceeded along the way by rapid marches. On the way Maulānā Mūsā and 'Ali Hāmid came as emissaries from Sultan

---

1 The word is Sönkédass in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. I suppose it means a dependant or protégé; or is it only a variant of his name Tirbang Dās.

2 The name is Sönkara in the MSS., and Sōngar in the lith. ed. Bayley (p. 104) calls it Sōnkherah Bahādurpūr. Firishtah's account differs from that in the text. He says at the end of that year (821 A.H.) Ahmad Shah caused the fort of Sönkara (or Sōngar) to be repaired and built a mosque there; and then marching towards Andarun (Idar ?), and gave orders for plundering and ravaging Mālwa. Col. Briggs's (p. 22) account is similar, but he does not mention the building of the mosque; and he says that Ahmud Shah proceeded in person to Idur, and then sent a detachment into Malwa to lay waste that country. The place is called Songar, in the Cambridge History of India, page 298; and is said in a note to be at 20°, 11° North and 73°, 36° East.

3 The name is Mānktī in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. According to Bayley (p. 105) the name of the village is Māknl and it is a dependency of Sōnkherah. It is not mentioned by Firishtah. In the text-edition it is Mānkī.

4 They are called the infidels of the hill of Kantur in Bayley; and are referred to in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, as the "infidels, of the Sātpūrasa".

5 The name is Jamadār in one MS., and Jamādīr in the other. It is 'Ali Jāmādar in the lith. ed. Firishtah
Hūshang, and prayed, through the intervention of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk the nā'īb vazīr and Malik Maḥmūd Turk and Malik Ḥisām-ud-din with great submission and humility, that it was not right that a būdshāh professing the Islāmic faith should cause injury to the Musalmāns and the helpless people of Mālwa. The Sultān, noble spirited and generous of heart accepted their prayers; and wrote an affectionate letter to Sultān Hūshang. He then turned back, and encamped in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānīr on the 7th Rabī‘-ut-thanī. He levelled to the ground, wherever there was an idol temple; and then went back to Aḥmadābād.

2 In the year 823 a.h., he moved out with the intention of building some forts. First of all he laid the foundations of a strong fort in Jīnūr on the bank of the Mahindrī. After that, he built a line of fortifications round the town of Dhāmōd, and tried to increase its population and cultivation. After that when he arrived in the town of Kāritha he ordered that the old fort which had been

does not give the name, but describes them as the ambassadors of Sultān Hūshang. According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 105, the correct name is ‘Ali Jāmdār; and Jāmdār means treasurer.

1 One MS. has بسح 7th, but the other and the lith. ed. have حَنْم 7th.
2 Fiištah does not mention the building of these forts; but I find the following in Rūs Mālā, vol. I, page 348. The passage is within inverted commas, but the work from which it is quoted is not mentioned. "Having also founded forts in such places, he left garrisons in them, among which may be mentioned the fort at the town of Jinoor in the Pergunnah of Bareah, and that of Shivpoor. After this he established the market town of Dahmod, among the mountains, where he erected a fortification. After this the fort of Kārieh (Kaira or Kurree?) built in a.d. 1304 by order of Alp Khān who governed the country for Allah-ood-deen Khiljiy, was repaired, and named Sultanabad." It would be seen that the statements made in the quotation agree closely with those in the text. There are differences in the spelling of the names of the places where the forts were built in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but I do not consider it necessary to mention them. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 105, the first fort is said to have been built at Janūr in the pargana of Bārā Sanwāl. After that the Sultān built the town of Dhāmōod, in the hills, and he erected a fort there. He repaired the fort at Kāreth which was founded in the time of Sultān 'Alā-ud-din by Alp Khān Sanjar, in 704 a.h. (1304 a.d.), but had fallen into decay, and he gave it the name of Sultānābād.
erected in the year 1 704 A.H. by Alp Khan Sanjar, the Deputy of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din Khalji should be entirely re-built; and having endeavoured to increase the cultivation and the population of the district, gave it the name of Sultanabad. He again marched in the direction of Champanir at the end of the year 824 A.H., 1421 A.D. He besieged it and extorted tribute; and on the 19th of Safar, 825, he advanced towards Sonkhera. He arrived there on the 22nd Safar, and laid the foundation of another Jama' Masjid.

At this time, news came that sometime ago 2 Sultan Hushang had left Malwa, and had gone away elsewhere; and had completely

---

1 The dates vary in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but as the year of the Christian era in the passage quoted in the preceding note is 1304 A.D., 704 appears to be the correct A.H. year.

2 As to Sultan Hushang's disappearance Firista'h's account is, that as he knew that the fort of Mandu was so strong that Sultan Ahmad would not be able to capture it, and he wanted to achieve a feat that people would remember for a long time, he left it in charge of one of his chief officers, and went out himself with six thousand selected horsemen and left it by the Nagor gate, while Sultan Ahmad was encamped in front of the Sarangpore gate with the object of capturing some fine mast elephants in Jajnagar; and coming back with them. According to Firista'h Sultan Ahmad did not know anything about Sultan Hushang's departure, or his return, till he heard joy drums beaten, and saw flags hung out from the turrets of the fort of Mandu after he had returned. Apparently the siege was not at all a close one. Firista'h also gives another version from the Tarkh-i-Alfi. According to this, Sultan Hushang assumed the dress of a horse merchant, and went to Jajnagar in order to procure elephants. Ahmad Shah of Gujrat, having heard that he had left his kingdom, and that his officers had divided it among themselves invaded Malwa. In the first place he reduced the fort of Maheswar and then marched to Mandu. I do not consider it necessary to give this version at greater length but I may point out that it agrees generally with the text.

The names of the jagirs, and of the amirs on whom they were conferred, are not mentioned in the quotation from the Tabaqat-i-Akbari, but the collection of the kharif revenue is. According to Bayley, page 106, Sultan Hoshang is said to have gone to Jajnagar elephant hunting; and the people in the fort of Maheswar having no hope of relief surrendered the keys to Sultan Ahmad.

Bayley discusses at some little length, in a note on page 106, the reason and motives of Sultan Ahmad's attack on Mandu. He thinks that Sultan Ahmad is not likely to have been induced to attack Mandu, a Musalmân country, merely by the absence of Hoshang, with whom he was at peace. He comes to the conclusion that Sultan Ahmad might have been led to believe that Sultan
disappeared. The amirs and the chiefs of the different sections of the people had taken possession of the country, and had divided it among themselves. On hearing this news, the Sultan marched towards Mandu, and advancing by successive marches he laid siege to Mahisra. The thanadar prayed for quarter, and entered the service of Ahmad Shah. The latter encamped on the 12th Rab-ul-akhir at the foot of the fort of Mandu; and sent many detachments to ravage the country. Then when the rainy season approached, he marched from the fort towards Ujjain. He divided the country among his amirs, giving Dipalpur Banharla in fief to Malik Mukhlas-ul-mulk, and Kanthha to Malik Farid 'Imad-ul-mulk, and Mahindpur which is now celebrated as Muhammadpur to Malik Iftikhar-ul-mulk. The amirs sent their officers to the parganas; and realised the instalment of the kharif (rainy season crops) revenue.

Sultan Hushang returned at this time from his journey to Jajnagar, where he had gone to buy elephants, a detailed account of this matter is given in the section about Malwa, and entered the fort of Mandu. After the end of the rains, Sultan Ahmad went from Hoshang had by some means come to an untimely end; and he himself was as much entitled to the vacant throne as anyone else.

In the Cambridge History of India, page 298, Sultan Hushang's expedition is called his famous (?) raid into Orissa. I do not think it was a famous raid in any way. It is clear from the account of the expedition given in Firishta that merchants frequently took their goods to Jajnagar from Malwa, and the neighbouring country for the merchants of that country apparently knew what colour of horses the Raja had a partiality for, and what merchandise his subjects were likely to buy. It was a whimsical raid certainly, to be undertaken by the ruler of a country which was exposed to attacks by a powerful neighbour.

1 The name is in one MS., and in the lith. ed., but كسر in the other MS. Firishta calls it the fort of مهار. In the quotation from the Tarih-i-Alfi it is called Maheswar. It is called Chola Maheswar in Bayley, page 106. In the text-edition it is مهار.

2 كسر in the text-edition.

3 Col. Briggs (p. 22) says that Jajnagar "is a city situated on the Mahanuda river which empties itself into the sea in the province of Orissa. The forests of which have always been famous for wild elephants." There is no city of the name of Jajnagar at present in Orissa; there is a town called Jajpur, but it is not on the Mahanadi. Probably the name of Jajnagar was given to the province of Orissa. According to Riga'atu-Saldatin (1902), p. 15, Northern Orissa was known as Jajnagar.
Ujjain to Mandū on the 20th Ramadān; and sat down in front of the Dehlī gate. He distributed the batteries and laid siege to the hill. He sent a farmān to Aḥmadābād, to summon Malik Aḥmad Āyāz; so that he might bring with him treasure and some appliances. The Malik came on the 12th of Shawwāl; and waited on the Sultān. The latter conferred a robe of honour on him, and made over to him the duty of working the Tārāpūr battery. As on the return of Hūshang, Sultān Aḥmad’s troops, which had taken possession of the country of Mālwa, and were engaged in managing the parganas had again collected together, Sultān Aḥmad thought it advisable that he should take up a position in the centre of the country and should send the amīrs to the towns and parganas. According to this decision he marched away from the foot of the fort, and advanced to Sārangpūr. Sultān Hūshang also betook himself to Sārangpūr by a different route. When the Gujrat army arrived in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, Sultān Hūshang sent an emissary, and behaving with great humility and submissiveness agreed to pay tribute. When Sultān Aḥmad saw the humility and the weakness of the emissary, he became sure of his safety, and neglected to dig the ditch and to erect the zarība round his camp.

The same night, which was the 12th Muḥarram in the year 826 A.H., Sultān Hūshang made a night attack on the camp. As the men were negligent a large number was slain; among them Sāmat Rāy, Rāja of the country of Dandwāna, who was killed with five

---

1 It is کوه, hill, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Probably the entire hill on which Mandū was built was besieged.

2 He is called Muqarrab in the Tārikh-i-Alfi. He brought battering rams and engines with him; and he was detached to secure the passage by the Tārāpūr gate, which according to a note by Col. Briggs (p. 24) was the southern entrance.

3 According to Finishtah the emissaries spoke with such flattery and urgency that Aḥmad Shāh neglected not only to dig the ditch and make the thorn fence, but kept no night sentries.

4 He does not appear to be mentioned by Finishtah. Sāmat Rāy may be a corrupt form of Sāmant Rāy. He is called Sāmant Rājpūt Grāsia of the district of Dandāh who held the advanced post, in Bayley, page 108. The night attack is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, but may be one of the “desultory and inconclusive hostilities” mentioned on page 298. In the text-edition the name is سامت رائے راجہ ولایت دندوا.
hundred Rājpūts around him. When Sultān Aḥmad woke up he did not find a single person in his pavilion. There were two post horses there. He mounted Malik Jūnā, his rikābdār (stirrup holder) on one, and himself mounted the other. Coming out of his suite of tents, he saw the whole camp being destroyed; and not knowing what to do, went away towards the open country. After a little time, he sent Malik Jūnā back to the camp, so that he might make enquiry. When Malik Jūnā again got into the camp, he found that Malik Muqarrab Aḥmad Ayāz, and Malik Farīd had got their men together, and were going towards the royal pavilion. They asked him news of the Sultān. Malik Jūnā after ascertaining the real state of things, took the other two with him and went and waited on the Sultān. As the Sultān was “naked” (i.e., probably he had only some kind of night-dress on him), Malik Muqarrab taking off his own arms put them on him. He also asked for leave to attack the enemy. The Sultān ordered “Wait a little while, so that the light of the morning may appear”. Malik Jūnā was again sent to the camp, so that he might make further enquiry, and ascertain where Sultān Hūshang was, and how he was occupied.

Malik Jūnā returned, and said, that Sultān Hūshang’s troops were busy plundering the camp, and he himself was standing with a few others, with all the royal horses and elephants collected round them. Sultān Aḥmad advanced with the thousand horsemen, who had come with Malik Muqarrab and Malik Farīd, at the approach of the dawn, which indeed was a dawn of good fortune, to effect the destruction of Hūshang. When the two forces met face to face, the Sultān with his followers attacked the enemy; and doing all that was demanded of him in the way of activity and bravery, inflicted wounds on Hūshang, and also received a wound himself. Sultān Hūshang also in spite of the wound exerted himself with great bravery. About this time the fīlbāns attached to the Gujrāt army, recognised Sultān

---

1 He is said to have been awakened by Malik Munir in Bayley, page 108; but we hear nothing more of this man.

2 The name of the rikābdār is transliterated as Malik Jaunān in Bayley, page 108.

3 According to Firishtah they were seated on their elephants, which had been seized by Sultān Hūshang.
Ahmad; and drove Sultan Hushang before them; and although the latter tried to maintain his position, he was unable to do so, and in the end had to flee towards Sarangpur. The tables were turned now, and the men who had been engaged in looting the Gujrât camp, became food for the sword; and all the elephants and horses and camels and war material that had been seized were recovered; and 1 seven famous elephants, out of those brought from Jâhnagar, which Sultan Hushang had acquired with such great hardship and trouble were obtained as booty. Sultan Ahmad then with victory and triumph betook himself to his pavilion, and bound up his wound. He then arranged a great public audience; and did everything to please and encourage the amirs and the heads of groups, and the brave warriors. On the next day, he sent Iftikhär-ul-mult and Malik Safdar Khan Sultânî, with a well-equipped detachment into the adjoining country, that they might guard the animals belonging to the camp which had been sent out to collect fodder. It so happened that a detachment of the enemy's army had come out of their camp to attack and harass the men who were collecting fodder. The two bodies met and attacked each other, and did everything to slay and be slain. In the end, Sultan Hushang's detachment fled and retired to Sarangpûr and Malik Iftikhär-ul-mult and Safdar Khan Sultânî returned crowned with success and victory, and received favours from the Sultan.

Sultan Ahmad for reasons of state now started for Gujrât on the 24th of Rabî'-ul-âkhir of that year. Sultan Hushang immediately sallied out of the fort of Sarangpûr, and started in pursuit. Sultan Ahmad turned back, and stood his ground; and the flames of battle blazed up between the two armies. Sultan Ahmad exerted himself with great gallantry. After much fighting and great struggle, Sultan Hushang turned his back on the field of battle, and fled, and entered the fort. On this occasion also some of the Jâhnagar elephants fell into the hands of the Gujrât army. Sultan Ahmad halted that day at that place, and on the next day he again advanced in the direction of Ahmadábâd. He arrived there on the 4th Jamâdi-ul-

1 One MS. has سلسلة, chain, after هفت, seven; but the other and the lith. ed. do not have it. Ordinarily an elephant is described as پک زنجبار فیل. I suppose پک سلسلة فیل also means an elephant.
ākhir of that year; and held great festive assemblies; ¹ and conferred distinctions on the amirs and the soldiers in the form of reward and robes of honour and increase of emoluments; and as during this expedition the troops had lost much of their accoutrements, he directed that they should not move for three years. The Sultan took up his residence in Aḥmadābād; ² and spent most of his time, in inquiring into the cases of seekers of justice, and regulating the administration of the kingdom and increasing the cultivation.

While he was so engaged the vazīrs represented to him that ² Pūnjā, son of Ranmal, the Rāja of Īdar, had shortened his hand (i.e., had delayed) in remitting the tribute, during the time when the Sultan was engaged in waging war in Mālwa; and having sent petitions to Sultan Hūshang had tried to combine with him. Accordingly in the year 829 A.H., Sultan Aḥmad sent a well-equipped army to attack Pūnjā. When the army arrived in the country of Īdar, and began to plunder and ravage it, Pūnjā met it with hostility, and placed the shield of resistance before himself. When the struggle was protracted, the Sultan advanced into Īdar in person, and planning the building of the city of Aḥmadnagar, on the bank of the river ³ Hāṭmatī, at a distance of ten karōhs from Īdar, laid the foundation

¹ There are different readings here. The reading in one MS. which I have accepted is امرَا و سِبَاهمِيَا رَا بِسِبارِي، و خَلَعَت و ضِادَّني عَلَيْهِ امْتَازِ بِعَشْدِرَمَمْ و جَوِرَ. The other MS. has درَيْن بِسِبارِي سِبَاهمِيَا بِسِبارِي سِلْمِيَا شَهَدُ بِودَنَدْ رَأَ كِدْسِبارِي سِبارُي شَهَدُ بِودَنَدْ خَلَعَ و انْعَمَات كَلِيِّ دَاد. The reading in the lith. ed. is manifestly incorrect; it has امرَا و سِبَاهمِيَا رَا كِدْسِبارِي سِبارُي شَهَدُ بِودَنَدْ.

² The name is written in the MSS. as پونجا واد رنمال, and in the lith. ed. as پونجا بن رئو مانل. He is called Row Poonjā in Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 349. It is difficult to ascertain the derivation or correct Sanskrit form of Pūnjā. It may be Pujya the worshipped, the honoured. Ranmal appears to be Rānā Malla an athlete in war.

³ The name of the river is Sābarmati in the MSS., in the lith. ed. of Fīrisṭah and in the text-edition; but it is Hāṭmatī in the lith. ed. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 26) says, “Ferishta writes Hatmutty; it should evidently be Saburmutty, the same river that flows to Ahmudabad”. In the map before me Aḥmadnagar is not on the Sābarmati, but on a stream which flows into it some distance to the south near a place which is called Cairah in the map. So I have retained Hāṭmatī.
of a fort there. He made very great exertions in completing the building of it. He sent out detachments from Aḥmadnagar, in different directions, all round Īdar; so that they might burn tar o khushk or wet and dry, i.e., growing crops, houses, etc.; and slay all that fell into their hands. Pūnjā, although he saw all this, was determined to carry on the war. He sometimes appeared suddenly from a distance before a detachment which went to escort the men who went for fodder; and in the meantime, whenever he accidentally got a chance, he launched an attack.

In the end, when he found that he could effect nothing, and could not endure any longer the onslaughts of Aḥmad Shāh’s armies, he sent representatives, and with sincerity offered to pay a large tribute. But as he had (before this) several times broken his engagements, the Sultān did not accept his offer. He advanced in person against Īdar, and on the first day he seized three forts. Pūnjā fled and took shelter in the hills of 1Visālnagar. The next day the Sultān sacked the city of Īdar and returned to Aḥmadnagar. As the construction of Aḥmadnagar was now completed, the Sultān in the following year, namely 830 A.H., again turned the bridle of his spirit to the conquest of the territory of Īdar, and sent his troops in all directions, so that they might plunder and ravage the country; and he himself also gave his attention to the work. Pūnjā in a state of great humility and distress sent emissaries and knocked at the door of peace; and agreed to pay a heavy tribute. As the Sultān had now formed a kingly determination to destroy him completely, he showed no favour to the words of the emissaries. Pūnjā, now utterly despondent, hovered moth-like round his territory; and wherever he could, made an onslaught. On a Thursday 2 in the month of Jamādi-ul-ākhir in the year 831 A.H., he came upon a detachment, which had gone to the jungle to escort a body of men who had gone to bring grass. After exerting himself a great deal against them, he fled; but when

1 It is Bijānagar in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but the correct name appears to me to be Visālnagar, but I find that the Mirāt-i-Sikandari also calls it Bijānagar. The reading in the MSS. is followed in the text-edition.

2 So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firsištah who has copied the sentence from the text verbītān has 5th, instead of 5th, Thursday, and this is apparently correct.
he was galloping away, an elephant which had become separated from the detachment came into his view. He immediately turned round, and wounding the animal with his spear, drove it before him. As some brave men pursued him, he betook himself into some uneven ground where there were caverns and ravines; and by an accident, his horse shied at the elephant and threw him into a cavern. Aḥmad Shāh’s soldiers came up and turned the elephant back; but they did not know that Pūnjā had been thrown by his horse. About this time a poor man entered the cavern in order to collect fire-wood. He saw a well-dressed man lying dead; and from his appearance concluded that it must be the corpse of a great man. He cut off his head and waited with it upon the Sultān; and many people recognised it to be the head of Pūnjā. They say that a man at that time saluted the head and showed great respect towards it. When people asked him the reason of this, he said, “I served him for a long time”. Sultān Aḥmad was pleased with the man’s good manners, and rewarded him.

Couplet:

Neglect not good manners, and their results great;
For in the end, they will your fortune make.

The next day the Sultān advanced to Īdar, and sending troops gave them orders to devastate Īdar and Viṣālnagar. 2 Har Rāy, the son of Pūnjā, having through the intervention of 3 Khān Jahān Sultānī begged for the pardon of his offences; and engaged to pay an annual tribute of three lakhs of silver tankas. Sultān Aḥmad, on account of his great generosity and humanity, drew the pen of

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have استادخت, but the other MS. has اندادخت. I have accepted the latter reading, for it does not appear that the dead horse was found near Pūnjā’s corpse. The circumstances under which Pūnjā was killed are given somewhat differently by Firishtah. Col. Briggs does not say anything about the manner of his death. According to Rās Mālā, vol. I, p. 349, Pūnjā fell under his horse and was killed.

2 So in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah (lith. ed.) has پیراو, Pirāū. Col. Briggs does not give his name; while the Rās Mālā has Naron Das. Bayley (p. 112) calls him Bīr Rāi; but says he is called Har Rāo in some MSS. He is called Hari Rāi in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, and is said to have been reduced to vassalage by Sultān Ahmad in 1428.

3 One MS. has Khān Jahān Sultānī, and this is followed.
forgiveness across his offences; and took him into the circle of his loyal adherents. He conferred the title of Şafdar-ul-mulk on Malik Hasan and left him with a large body of troops in charge of the military post of Ahmadnagar. He then trampled over and plundered the country of 1 Kilwâra, and went to Ahmadabad. He made the citizens fortunate with rewards and favours. After some days, Malik Muqarrab gave letters, addressed to Har Rây, to some of his personal adherents, for the payment of their wages. When these men arrived at Ídar Har Rây made delays in the payment of the money and passed the time making evasions. He then got the news that the Sultan had come out of the city, and was engaged in collecting troops. In great fear he fled and took shelter in an out-of-the-way place. When this news reached the Sultan he 2 advanced on the wings of speed on the 4th Safar, 832 A.H.; and on the 6th Safar, he took up his residence in the fort, and after performing the rites of offering thanks to God, planned the erection of a jâma' masjid, and leaving a large force there went to Ahmadnagar.

3 In 833 A.H., when 4 Râja Kânhâ, the Râja of Jhâlâwâr, knew that Sultan Ahmad had nearly finished the matter of Ídar; and that

1 So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah (lith. ed.) has 2 Kankwâra. Col. Briggs has Gilwara and Râs Mâlâ has Gudwâra.

2 Instead of the peaceful march to, and entry into Ídar, described in the text, Firishtah says 1 بِكَي اَرْقَامٌ مَعْتَدٌ آدَم مَفْتُوحٌ سَاحِقَةٌ بَيْلَةٌ دَرَأَمٌ, and Râs Mâlâ, vol. 1, p. 350, follows him and says "he carried by storm one of the principal forts in that province, wherein he built a magnificent mosque".

3 Bayley says (page 114), that for some reason, the Mirât-i-Sikandari gives only a brief summary of the latter years of Sultan Ahmad’s reign; and he has supplied the deficiency by extracts from the Tabakât-i-Akbari. As regards the war between Sultan Ahmad of Gujarât and Sultan Ahmad Bahmaní no additional information can be obtained from the Mirât-i-Sikandari.

4 So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith ed. of Firishtah he is changed to two Râjas 1 Râja Kânhâ and 2 Râja of Jâlâwârah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 26) has Kanhâ Ray, the Râja of Jhalode. According to the Mirât-i-Sikandari his proper name was Kânhâ Sâtsârâl, Râja of Jhâlâwâr. He had joined the rebellion of 1413 and had therefore good reason for being afraid of Sultan Ahmad’s displeasure towards him. The rebellion of Kânhâ is also mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, page 296, where it is said that it called “Ahmad into Kâthlâwâr”.
as soon as he would be free, he would attack other zamindars, he considered that it would be most advantageous for him to leave his own country; and he accordingly fled. The force, which was deputed to punish him, went in pursuit of him into the territory of Asir and Burhanpur. Nasir Khan, the ruler of Asir, on account of the fact that Kathah had presented 1 two worn-out elephants as tribute to him, and 2 exchanging the rights for benefits conferred, for injuries, gave him a place (i.e., an asylum) in his kingdom. After some days, Kathah went to Gulbarga 3 and brought a force from Sultan Ahmad Bahmani to assist and help him; after which he plundered and ravaged parts of Nadarbahr.

When this news reached Sultan Ahmad, he appointed his eldest son, Shahzada Muhammad Khan to inquire into and redress this matter; and sent great sardars, such as Saiyid Abul Khair, and Saiyid Qasim, son of Saiyid 'Alam, and Malik Muqarrab Ahmad Ayaz, and Malik Iftikhar-ul-mulk with him. Shahzada Muhammad Khan fought a battle with the Dakin troops, and gained the victory; and a large number of the Dakinis were slain, and others were taken prisoners. The remainder who escaped the sword fled to Daulatabad. When this intelligence reached Sultan Ahmad Bahmani, he sent his eldest son, Sultan 'Allud-din, and his second son, Khan Jahans, to carry on the war with Shahzada Muhammad. He also entrusted the

1 One MS. has, the other has . The lith. ed. has . Firishtah has . Col. Briggs says (vol. IV, pp. 26, 27) Kanha presented two elephants which he had succeeded in bringing with him, when he escaped from a detachment, which was sent in pursuit of him. Bayley (p. 116) in his translation of the Tabakat has two large elephants, but says in a note, some MSS. have “one”.

2 The sentence in the text is obscure and cryptic. Firishtah is more intelligible. He says or by establishing a strong hold, i.e., and he (i.e., Nasir Khan) relying on the strength (he felt) from the fact of his relationship with the badshahs of the Dakin, exchanged the rights, which the Sultan of Gujrat had on him for benefits he had conferred, for injuries.

3 Firishtah says specially that it was a small detachment.

4 The names are somewhat different in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Saiyid Qasim is called Saiyid Abul Qasim. Saiyid 'Alam is not mentioned as the father of Saiyid Qasim, but as a separate chief.
affairs of the army to the judgment of Qadr Khān, who was one of the great amirs of the Deccan. Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din, in consultation with Qadr Khān, arrived by successive marches at Daulatābād; and took up his residence there. At this station, Naṣīr Khān, the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, and Kānhā Rāja of Jhālāwār also joined the camp of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din; and he was much strengthened by them. Muḥammad Khān also advanced towards Daulatābād with the intention of giving battle. When the two armies approached each other closely, Muḥammad Khān arrayed his ranks, and the fire of battle flamed up from both sides. At this juncture Malik Muqarrab Aḥmad Āyāz and Qadr Khān, both of whom were commanders, fought hand to hand. Qadr Khān fell from the back of his horse on the dust of destruction. Malik Iftīkhār-ul-mulk seized a large elephant as booty. Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din fled and took shelter in the fort of Daulatābād. Naṣīr Khān, the ruler of Asir, also fled, and went to the hills of Kaland, which are situated in the country of Asir. Muḥammad Khān carried out the customs of offering thanks to God, and as he knew that it would be impossible to capture the fort of Daulatābād, he returned from there; and having trampled down a part of the territory of Asir and Burhānpūr, took up his quarters in the town of Nadarbār. From that place he notified the true state of things to his father. Sultān Aḥmad wrote in reply that he should continue for a few days longer at Nadarbār, in order to arrange and regulate the affairs of that quarter.

In the year 834 A.H. Qūṭb, the officer-in-charge of the island of Mahāim, and other sufferers (mehnat zadḥā) sent a petition to

---

1 This battle is said, in the Cambridge History of India, page 299, to have taken place at Mānikpunj about 38 miles N.-W. of Daulatābād.
2 One MS. has Golkund, which is clearly a mistake. The other has Kaland, Kaland. The lith. ed. has Kalid, Kalid. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has Kaland. Col. Briggs simplifies matters by saying (vol. II, p. 28) “took refuge in the hills of Kandeish”.
3 He is called Qutb without any addition, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs, however, calls him Kootb Khan. Firishtah’s account, however, differs from that in the text inasmuch as he says that it was after the death of Qutb, that Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanl, who was always thinking of retaliating for his previous defeat, sent the Malik-ut-tujjār, and the latter took possession of the island. In the Tārīkh-i-Alfi Qūṭb is called Rāl
Sultān Aḥmad that Malik ۱ Ḥasan, who had the title of Malik-ut-tuṣjār and was one of the amīrs of Sultān Aḥmad Bahmani, had come from the country of the Deccan, and had seized the island of Mahāim, and neighbouring country with great violence and ferocity; and had ravaged a Musalmān country, and had carried Musalmāns away in bondage. Sultān Aḥmad sent Shāhzāda Zafar Khaṅ to destroy Malik-ut-tuṣjār; and he appointed some great amīrs, who had previously done (great) deeds to serve under him. He also wrote to Mukhliṣ-ul-mulk, the kotwīl of Dīb (Dīū), that he should get the ships belonging to the different ports, and should proceed to attend on Zafar Khaṅ. Malik Mukhliṣ-ul-mulk fitted out ۲ seven hundred ships, large and small, from the town of Pattan, and ۳ the Port of Dīb and the district of ۴ Kambayat. He came and waited upon Zafar Khaṅ in the neighbourhood of the country of Mahāim. It was decided in consultation with the amīrs, ۵ that the ships should be sent to the country of Thāna and he should himself remain with Zafar Khaṅ.

When they arrived near Thāna, Zafar Khaṅ sent Iftikhar-ul-mulk and Malik Suhrāb Sultānī, in advance, to surround that country. At the same time, the ships filled with armed men arrived by sea; and closed the approach (by sea). When Zafar Khaṅ began to conquer that district, the governor of Thāna sallied out of the fort, and fought with bravery. He was, however, unable to withstand the onslaughts of the Gujrat army, and fled. The Shāhzāda, with the advice of the amīrs, left a body of troops there, and advanced on Mahāim. Malik-

Quṭb, and Bayley thinks that “He was the Rāi of Mahāim, whose daughter Prince Fath Khaṅ is said, in the sequel, to have married”. He was probably one of the petty local princes. It is said in Rās Mālā, page 350, vol. I, that he was “a tributary Hindu prince with the title of Rāee, who afterwards gave a daughter to the hareem of the son of Shah Ahmed”.

۱ For an account of him, see the history of the reign of Ahmad Shāh Bahmani, p. 49 onwards.
۲ According to Firishtah and Col. Briggs and Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 352) there were only seventeen ships.
۳ One MS. has Bandar Ghogah instead of Bandar Dip; but Bayley, p. 117, has both Dīū, and the port of Ghōgah.
۴ Kambayat in the text-edition.
۵ Col. Briggs's translation is slightly different. It is that the ships with part of the army should go to Tanna, and the remainder should go by land.
ut-tujjār had cut down large trees, and had built a barricade with the branches along the shore of Mahām. When the Gujrāt army came up, Malik-ut-tujjār came outside the barricade and fought with gallantry. From the approach of the light of dawn to the setting of the sun, the brave men of the two armies showed no deficiency in courage and hardihood. But in the end, Malik-ut-tujjār fled and got within the barricade. When the ships arrived, and the Gujrāt army had the command both by sea and land, Malik-ut-tujjār sent a petition to Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī and prayed for help. The Sultān sent ten thousand horsemen, and 1 sixty and odd mast elephants with two of his sons from Daulatābād, and sent his vazīr Khān Jahān with them, so that they might act according to his advice and counsel. When the Deccan army arrived near Mahām, Malik-ut-tujjār being assured of the safety of the island and of the barricades of trees, had the honour of waiting on the two Shāhzādas. After much discussion, it was decided, that they should in the first instance endeavour to recover possession of the district of Thāna; and they started in the direction of that place.

Shāhzāda Zafar Khān also made necessary preparations, and started to re-inforce the men at Thāna. After the two armies had met (near Thāna), they fought with each other from morning till sun-set; and in the end, defeat fell on the Deccan army. Malik-ut-tujjār fled to 2 Jālna; and his troops, for fear of their lives, abandoned the island of Mahām. Zafar Khān crowned with success and victory landed there; and sent out ships, and seized some of the officers of Malik-ut-tujjār, who had fled by way of the sea. He despatched some boats after 3 filling them with various kinds of rich fabrics and

1 Both MSS. have شمط و جند, sixty and odd. The lith. ed. has شمط و جند, sixty. Bayley, p. 117, has sixty odd, but Firishtah has شمط و جند sixty and odd, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 29) has sixty.
2 The MSS., the lith. ed. have جالنه. Bayley, p. 118, has Jālnah. Firishtah has جالنه, (which does not differ very much from جالنه) but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 30) says, he fled to Chakun.
3 The passage is somewhat obscure. The MSS. and the lith. ed. have از اقسام اقمیش و ثَنهایی که بار چندن کشته پرکرده. Bayley, p. 118, has translated the passage, "Several ships were loaded with stuffs and clothes and precious stones". Firishtah has رشت و ز رطرخ. Col. Briggs has "Some beautiful gold and silver-embroidered muslins". Rās Mālā has the words as Col. Briggs, and puts them
tankas, as offerings to Sulṭān Aḥmad. He took possession of the entire district of Mahām and divided it among the amirs, and the heads of different groups of people.

When all these facts reached the ear of Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmani, he was extremely depressed; and equipped his army in order to revenge himself; and marched against the country of Baglāna, which is near the port of Surat. Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān, who was in the country of Nadarbār and Sultānpūr sent a representation to his father to the effect, that he had been deprived of the honour of serving His Majesty for a period of four years and some months; and on account of this long residence of his in a distant land, the retainers of the amirs and khāns had gone away to their own countries; and a large force had not been left there. He also said that he had heard that Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmani had marched into the country of Baglāna; and intended to advance in the direction of Nadarbār.

When this representation reached the Sulṭān, he postponed the siege of Chāmpānir to some other time; and advanced towards Nādōt, and after plundering and ravaging that country, advanced by successive marches, and encamped in the vicinity of the town of Nadarbār. Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān and the amirs who were with him had the honour of offering their services; and each one of them received a special favour in accordance with his rank and position. The spies brought the news at that station in the year 835 A.H., that Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmani, on receiving the information of the arrival of the Sulṭān (Aḥmad Gujrātī), had left a detachment on the boundary of his kingdom, and had gone back to Gulbarga. The Sulṭān was pleased and delighted on hearing this news, and turned back towards Aḥmadābād. He had crossed the 2 Tīptī after successive marches, when

between inverted commas, which shows that they have been taken from Col. Briggs's History. The difficulty in the passage lies in the words تنثهیا, which I am inclined to translate as tankas but which Bayley has translated as precious stones. The word does not occur in Firishtah, so he can be left out of account. As between tankas and precious stones, I have never seen the latter called سنک. They are always called جوهر. Firishtah's red gold may mean gold and red tankas.

1 تنثلئ in the text-edition.
2 تنثلئ Patni in the text-edition.
news arrived that Sultān Aḥmad Bahmani had again besieged the fort of Tambōl; and Malik Saʿādat Sultānī was leaving nothing undone in bravely defending it. Immediately on receipt of this news, he turned back, and advanced on wings of speed towards Tambōl. When Sultān Aḥmad Bahmani became aware of this fact, he cheered and encouraged a body of pāiks, with robes of honour and great rewards; and told them, "Reinforcements are coming to the garrison. If to-night you will play a great game, so that the hand of my hope should reach the skirts of success, I shall give you such rewards, that you will never again be in want". When a part of the night had passed, the pāiks went to the foot of the fort, and slowly and silently under the shelter of the rocks, climbed to the top of the rampart and dropped into the fort. They wanted to open the gates; but Malik Saʿādat Sultānī, being on the alert, fell upon them; and slew most of them. Those who escaped the sword threw themselves from the ramparts and perished. Malik Saʿādat Sultānī did not consider this sufficient; but opening the gate, he made a sudden attack on a battery which was in front of it. The men in the battery, who were asleep, were most of them wounded.

At this time the Sultān of Gujrāt approached near; and Sultān Aḥmad Bahmani leaving the foot of the fort, advanced to meet him. He summoned his amirs and the commanders of his army and told them, "The armies of Gujrāt have several times defeated the armies of the Deccan; and they have also taken possession of Mahām. If this time also, I show inactivity and am defeated, I shall lose the Deccan altogether". He then arrayed the ranks of his army, and took up a position on the battlefield. Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī also came, and met him with his armies arranged for battle; and there was a

1 Called Batnol in the Cambridge History of India, page 299.
2 The words are somewhat obscure. The MSS. have نشئى يأختيد، and the lith. ed. has نشئى يأختيد. The lith. ed. of Firishtah in the corresponding passage also has نشئى يأختيد. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 31) calls the pāiks "Naigs", but he does not translate the Shah's words to them. Bayley has pāiks, and he says immediate action is necessary; but it is not clear what meaning he has given to the words in question. I have adopted نشئى يأختيد, while the text-edition has نشئى يأختيد.
terrible conflict. 1 Dāūd Kūhān, who was one of the great amirs of the Deccan, having challenged the Gujratī amirs, was taken prisoner by 'Aḍḍ-ul-mulk. The two armies fought together and showed great gallantry. When evening came, both sounded the drum of return, and turned back to their respective encamping grounds. As large numbers of the Dakini army had been slain, Sultaān Aḥmad Bahmani, in great distress, took the path of flight.

The next day Sultaān Aḥmad entered the fort of Tambōl, and showed great favour to Malik Saʿādat Sultaānī, and leaving a detachment to reinforce him started towards 2 Tālnīr; and having rebuilt the fort there, 3 plundered and ravaged the towns and villages. He conferred the title of Muʿīn-ul-mulk on Malik Tāj-ud-dīn and 4 directed that he should remain there. He then returned to Aḥmadābād by Sultaānpūr and Nadarbār. After a few days, he brought the daughter of the Rāy of Mahāim into the bond of wedlock with Shāhzāda Fath Kūhān.

(It appears in my mind) that in the Tārikh-i-Bahmani the 5 story of the siege of the fort of Tambōl has been narrated in a different way, from what my double-tongued pen has described, in the section about the Dakin. (It may be said here) in brief that as the period of the siege was protracted to two years Sultaān Aḥmad Shāh Gujratī,

---

1 The name is Dāūd in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in Bayley's translation; but Firishtah says that it was Azharār Kūhān, who challenged the Gujratī amirs, and Col. Briggs calls him "Ajdur Khan, a young Deccany nobleman" (vol. IV, p. 31).

2 تالنیر instead of تالنیر in the text-edition.

3 The MSS. have بلاد و دهات را ناخت و تاراج کرده but the lith. ed. has دهات آن بلاد را تاراج کرده. Firishtah who copies the Tabaqāt frequently word for word has in the corresponding passage نادوت و امانت و تاراج نموده. This last version appears to me to be the best, but I have retained the words of the MSS. بلاد دهات را without conjunction in the text-edition.

4 The reading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. which is ملك تلگ الدين را معبني المملك خطاب داد انجا مانند appears to me to be incomplete. I would insert some words like Kūr kūr or Kūr kūr kūr kūr kūr, kūr kūr kūr kūr kūr kūr between and and.

5 The word is قصد and في صند in the two MSS., and قصد in the lith. ed. Firishtah has قصد in the corresponding passage and this is followed in the text-edition.
in the way of kindness and friendship, sent an ambassador to wait upon Sulṭān Ahmad Bahmani; and made a request through him, that this fort might be left in his possession. Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmani did not accept this proposal. In the end, Sulṭān Aḥmad Gujrātī marched straight from the boundary of his kingdom and invaded the Deccan, in order to have his revenge; and commenced to plunder and ravage it; and Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmani had no further opportunity for besieging it. It appears to my mind, that the author of the Tārīkh-i Bahmani has not narrated the facts in a plain, straightforward manner; and what is narrated in the history of Gujrāt is nearer the truth.

In the month of Rajab in the year 836 A.H. (1432 A.D.), the Sulṭān advanced to conquer the countries of 1 Mewār and Nāgōr; and when he arrived in the town of 2 Harpur, he sent his troops and plundered and ravaged the towns and villages; and he levelled to the dust any temple that came anywhere into his view. After some days, he encamped in the town of Dūngarpūr; and 3 Ganēsā, the Rāja of the place fled; but later feeling ashamed and repentant, came and waited on the Sulṭān; and becoming enlisted in the band of his defendants, paid a suitable tribute. Sulṭān Aḥmad Shāh then trampled down and ravaged the country of Kīlwaṛa; and then invaded Dīlwāṛa, and having rased to the dark ground the palaces and other structures of 4 Rānā Mūkul, the Rāja of Dīlwāṛa, which had lifted up their

---

1 In the translation of this part of the Tabakāt, given in Bayley, p. 120, the name of Kōlwārah is inserted after Mewār and Nāgōr. Firīštah in the lith. ed. has مبوات و ناقور; and Col. Briggs also has towards Nagoor and Mewat. Mēwāt seems to be a mistake for Māwār. Rās Mālā says, he marched into Rajpootana.

2 The MSS. have بارپ و هارپ Barpūr and Harpur; the lith. ed. has سبز پیر بزریب Sabzpūr; and Bayley, p. 120, has Sīlpūr. Firīštah does not mention the place, and at once takes Sulṭān Aḥmad to Dūngarpūr.

3 The name is كشیسا in the MSS., and كشیسا in the lith. ed. Bayley has Ganesā. Firīštah does not mention any name, but says the Sulṭān extorted tribute from the zamāndār of the place. Col. Briggs has Raja, and Rās Mālā has Rāwul. كشیسا in the text-edition.

4 With reference to Rānā Mūkul the lith. ed. of Firīštah has ولايت بیلورہ و دیلوارہ کہ تعلق برنا مروکل داشت. Col. Briggs paraphrases Kīlwaṛa and Dīlwāṛa as the country of the Kolies and Bheels. Rās Mālā has "the country of the Bheels."
heads to the sky (with pride), demolished the temples and destroyed the idols. He also had some turbulent men who had fallen into his hands, executed, by throwing them under the feet of elephants. He left Malik Mir Sultānī in those places for the purpose of collecting khirāj (tribute); and turned to the country of the Rāthōrs. The Rāthōr chiefs offered him allegiance, and paid tribute, and behaved with loyalty. Firūz Khān, the son of Shams Khān Dundānī, and the nephew of Sultān Muẓaffar, who was the ruler of Nagōr came and waited upon the Sultān, and brought some lakhs of tankas as tribute. Sultān Aḥmad gave back the tribute; and leaving a body of troops in certain mahāls of Mawās, in the way of a military outpost, returned to Aḥmadābād. As on every occasion when the Sultān returned from journeys and wars, he held grand festive assemblies, and conferred distinctions on each of the amirs and other soldiers, who had performed commendable services, by the grant of rewards and favours and increase in their stipends and promotions in their ranks, and also granted kingly favours on all the inhabitants of the country of Gujrat, both great and small, and Shaikhs and deserving persons, on this occasion also he arranged a similar festive assembly; and conferred new favours on every deserving person.

In the year 839 a.h., news came from the country of Mālwa, that Mahmūd Khān, the son of Malik Maghīth, who had been the ezzīr of Sultān Hūshang, had murdered Ghaznī Khān, the Shāhzāda, who had, after the death of Sultān Hūshang, succeeded him, by giving poison to him; and having raised the standard of his own rule had taken the name

---

1 I do not exactly understand the words which I have translated by throwing them, etc. They are in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah has no corresponding passage.

2 Instead of Rāthōr chiefs, Firishtah in the lith. ed. has: "جؤین بولاپت معیمات و لقبة و باز باپاچ و لاسی رفت و از ما رابن باج و خواج مرفت." Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p.32) has "the rays of Kota, Boondi and Nowlaya", and Rās Mālā (p. 351) has the Raws of Kotah Boondi and Nudoolaye.

3 This is also mentioned by Firishtah and also by Col. Briggs; but neither of them says anything about the leaving of the military outpost in certain Mahāls of Mawās.

4 The Cambridge History of India, page 299, mentions the question of an indemnity from Firūz Khān, but does not say that it was given back to him.
of Sultan Mahmud. At the same time, Masa'ud Khan, the Shahzada of Malwa, fled from his own country, and came (to Sultan Ahmad) for protection. The Sultan advanced with a well-equipped army, and took possession of the greater part of the country of Malwa; and intended to place Shahzada Masa'ud Khan on the throne of his great ancestors. At this time, by a strange mischance, a great pestilence made its appearance in Sultan Ahmad's army, so that people had no time for placing the dead into shrouds, and for burying them. In the course of two days some thousands of people died; and the Sultan himself having been attacked, had against his wishes to return to Gujrat. He gave hopes of being able to help Masa'ud Khan in the course of the next year. The particulars of this brief statement have been narrated in greater detail in the section about Malwa.

Fate did not give a further lease of life to Sultan Ahmad; and he passed away on the 24th of Rabii-ul-akhir in the year 846 A.H. (4th July 1443 A.D.). He was born in the metropolitan city of Dehli on the night of Friday the 19th of Dhi-hijjah in the year 793 A.H.; and this has been referred to on a preceding page. They say that from the time of his attaining to majority, till the time of his death, he had never omitted to perform the prescribed religious duties. He

1 Firishtah narrates the different operations of the campaign, and it appears from what he says that Sultan Ahmad was not so successful as Nizam-ud-din wants to make out. In fact according to Firishtah, Sultan Mahmud (the usurper) was well able to withstand the Gujrat forces, as well as those raised by 'Umar Khan, a son of Sultan Husang. It appears from Firishtah that there was famine in the Gujrat camp before the plague broke out, while Sultan Mahmud was well provided with food and ammunition. As to the plague (व्या का मा हे हड्डोस्तैय किन्नर बांड़) Col. Briggs has a note about this (p. 34, vol. IV), the meaning of which is not quite clear to me. The Cambridge History of India, page 299, calls Mahmud Khalji a cousin of Ghazi Khan.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 300, gives August 16th, 1442, as the date of his death.

3 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. has after هرگز طریقه بادشا بسنودیہ اطوار و مائئل بطاعت بود اور قضا نشند مدعی کشت بود. The other MS. omits the sentence from بادشا بسنودیہ و نیک کردار بود. I have adopted the reading of the first MS.
was a bāḏshāh of agreeable manners, just and god-fearing. He attained to sovereignty in his 22nd year and he ruled his kingdom for 32 years and six months and twenty days. He was buried in the centre of Aḥmadābād. After his death he has been mentioned in letters and farmāns, as Khudāyīn Maghfīr (the pardoned Lord).

AN ACCOUNT OF GHIYAS-UD-DUNIYĀ-WAD-DIN MUḤAMMAD ṢHĀḤ, SON OF AḤMAD ṢHĀḤ.

When 1 two or three days' mourning was over, the amirs and the vazirs, and the great men of the city, and the well-known men of the kingdom placed Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān on the throne of the empire 2 on the 7th of Rabi‘-ul-Ākhir, in the year 846 A.H. (7th July 1443 A.D.); and gave him the title of Ghiyās-ud-duniyā-wad-din Muḥammad Shāh. The ceremonies of offering presents and thank offerings were carried out. The gold that was showered over the royal umbrella was distributed among the meritorious people. The Sultān conferred distinctions on the amirs, and the great men of the kingdom, by conferring titles and high appointments on them. From the time of his accession the kingdom gained a new grandeur and greater splendour. He opened his hands with such liberality, that the common people gave him the name of Muḥammad Shāh 3 Zar-bakhsh, i.e., the giver of gold. On the 20th Ramaḍān, in the year 849 A.H., Muḥammad Shāh had a son born to him, and the prince

---

1 In the text-edition یژ: ۱ three days only is adopted.
2 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 125) gives 845 A.H., as the year of the accession of Muhammad Shāh; but his coin (see Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Dehli, page 353) gives the name and title as it is given in the text; and the date of the accession as the 3rd Rabi‘-ul-Ākhir, 846. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 129) gives him credit for his liberality, but says he gave himself up to pleasure and ease, but the capacity of his understanding did not attain to the lofty heights of the concerns of the state.
3 There is a very great difference between the accounts of this reign as given by Nizām-ud-din and by Firuzshah respectively. According to the latter, it was in the year of the accession, and not after three years, that Muhammad Shāh invaded Ḩḍar, and espoused the Rāy’s daughter. According to Bayley (p. 129) the version in the Tabakāt is probably correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 300, says, Muhammad Shāh was surnamed karīm or the Generous. This is scarcely correct. He was popularly called Zarbakhsh, and after his death he was called Khudāyīn Karīm.
received the name of Maḥmūd Khān. The Sultān gave grand entertainments, and conferred rewards and favours on the amirs and the great men of the kingdom.

After the time of the entertainments was over, in the same year he advanced to the country of İdar, in order to devastate it; and he did not omit a single minūlia in the practices of plunder and rapine. 1 Rāy Har, son of Pūnjā, Rājā of İdar, came forward in great distress, and brought his daughter in the shape of tribute. That lady owing to her great beauty kept Muḥammad Shāh bound to her by her personal charm. After some days she prayed that the fort of İdar might be bestowed on her father. The Sultān gave the fort of İdar to Har Rāy; and advanced towards the country of 2 Bākur; and Ganūsā, the Rāja of Dūngarpūr, fled and concealed himself in the caverns in the 3 hilly country. When he saw that the country was suffering from the ravages of calamities, he came out; and through the intervention of 4 Malik Mīr Sultānī, who had the title of Khān Jahān did homage to the Sultān, and having paid tribute kept his kingdom in safety. From that place Sultān Muḥammad Shāh returned to Ahmadābād. 5 He advanced in the year 853 A.H., (1449 A.D.), to

1 The Cambridge History of India here calls the son of Pūnjā, Raja Bīr, though on page 298 it had called him Hari Rāī. Earlier, Har Rāy (vide p. 211).
2 It is written as باغار in the MSS., and is so printed in the lith. ed. Firishta does not mention the place. Bayley (p. 130) has Bāgar. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 300, "Muḥammad next attacked at Bāgor, Rānā Kūmblā of Mewār, who fled and took refuge with the Rāwal of Dūngarpur, the chief of his house, but afterwards appeared before the invader, and purchased peace with a heavy indemnity". This does not agree with the text, according to which it was Ganūsā of Dūngarpūr, (and not Kūmbhā of Mewār) who paid the tribute. In the text-edition the name of the King is كنیا.
3 One MS. inserts و جنگلل after كوهستان in the text-edition.
4 I have already noted that there is considerable difference between the accounts of this reign as given by Niẓām-ud-dīn and by Firishta. According to the latter the expedition to Chāmpānīr took place in 954 A.H. and not in 953 A.H. The Rāja of Chāmpānīr is called Kangdās in the lith. ed. of Firishta and Gangadas by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 35). The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls him Gangdās, but the name can only be transliterated as Kangdās, Kangdās, or Gangdās and not as Gangdās. He is said after the
conquer the fort of Chāmpānīr; and when by successive marches he arrived in its neighbourhood, Rāy Kank Dās, the Rāja, sallied out of the fort with his men; and fought bravely; but in the end, he fled and re-entered the fort. Sūltān Muḥammad blockaded the fort from all sides; and employed all his energy in capturing it. Rāy Kank Dās sought the intervention of Sūltān Maḥmūd Khaḷjī and asking him to his aid, agreed to pay a *lakh* of *tankas*, at every stage, as a contribution towards his expenses. Sūltān Maḥmūd Khaḷjī being tempted by the money, advanced to help and support him. When he arrived in the town of Dahūd Sūltān Muḥammad, rising from the foot of the fort battle to have been driven into the hill fortress of Pavagarh (?). Pavangar, the fort of the winds. Then as regards the invasion of Sūltān Maḥmūd Khaḷjī, Firishtah says that as soon as Sūltān Muḥammad heard of it, he set fire to his surplus tents and other equipages, because many of the beasts of burden in his camp had perished on account of hard work; and there was also a certain amount of faint-heartedness; and commenced to retire. And although his *amīrs* incited him to carry on the war, he did not agree, and retired with precipitation towards Ahmadābād. Then when the Sūltān of Mālwa again advanced with a hundred thousand men to conquer Gujrāt, Sūltān Muḥammad could not be induced by his *amīrs* to fight against him; and in fact wanted to flee to Dip. Then the *amīrs* went to his wife, and asked her whether she wanted that her husband should live or that Gujrāt should be lost to the dynasty. The queen had to agree; and the *amīrs* gave him poison in his food; and he was killed on the 7th of Muḥarram 855 A.H.

His reign, according to Firishtah extended to eight years and nine months, and fourteen days. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 36) reduces the period of his reign by ten days; and says in a note that according to the Moontukhib-oot-Towareekh, be died on the 10th Muḥarram A.H. 855, 12th February, 1451.

Bayley (p. 132) says that the Sūltān asked the advice of a *bakāl* or grain dealer; and the latter advised him to place his treasures and family on board ships; and amuse himself with fishing. The Sūltān accepted this advice and commenced secretly to make his preparations; but Sādūd 'Alā-ul-lah, one of the great nobles came to know of this, and asked the *bakāl* why he gave such advice. The man replied that as the Sūltān did not ask the advice of the *amīrs*, but of a man like him, he gave him such advice as he considered best. Then Sādūd 'Alā-ul-lah told the King's son, what his father intended to do; and asked him what he would do if he was in his father's place. The prince said, he would fight for his kingdom and if necessary die on the battlefield. Then poison was given to Sūltān Muḥammad (pp. 133, 134).

The Cambridge History of India, page 301, says nothing about poison being given to the Sūltān; and says he died on the 10th February 1451.
retired towards Aḥmadābad. He halted in the village of Kothrah, and busied himself with the mustering of troops, and the collection of materials of war and of the arms and weapons of offence. Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji also stopped at the place where he had arrived, and did not advance any further.

In the month of Muḥarram 855 A.H., Sultān Muḥammad Shāh accepted the summons of the just God. After his death in formal matters people have written of him as Khudāiqān Karim (the merciful Lord). The period of his rule was seven years and nine months and four days.

2 An account of the reign of Sultān Qutb-ud-din Aḥmad Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Aḥmad Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Muẓaffar Shāh.

The amīrs and the great men carried out the rites of mourning for three days; and then on the 4th day, which was the 3rd of Muḥarram in the year 855 A.H., they placed the eldest son of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, who was in his twentieth year, on the throne of empire; and they gave him the title of Sultān Qutb-ud-din Aḥmad Shāh. His name is Aḥmad but he is celebrated by his title. At the time of his accession, they carried out the rite of Nīthar, wave offering; and they distributed the gold to the deserving men of the country of Gujrat, and made them happy and contented. He made the amīrs and the great men of the kingdom happy by royal gifts, and titles and high appointments.

1 The place is called Godhra in the Cambridge History of India, page 301; and it is said there, that Muhammad in spite of his illness advanced as far as Godhra to meet Sultan Maḥmūd Khālji and the latter on hearing this retired to Mandū.

2 The headings in the MSS., and in the lith. ed., all give the whole genealogy. Firishtah has a shorter heading ذكر سلطان قطب الدين بن محمد شاه.

3 Firishtah does not mention the date of the accession, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 37) says indirectly that he was born on the 8th of Jumad-ūl-Sani, 855 A.H.; and he ascended the throne in the 49th year of his age. As a matter of fact he was born on the 12th Jamād-ūl-Ṣāḥīr, 835 A.H. and ascended the throne in his 20th year.
It so happened that when Sultan Muhammad Shāh died, and Sultan Qutb-ud-din took his place. Sultan Mahmud Khalji, who had come to aid the Rāy of Chāmpānīr, and was still on the boundary of Gujrat, thinking that (the conquest of the country) would be within his power advanced into the country with great rapidity. On the day on which he arrived in the neighbourhood of Baroda, a mast elephant belonging to his army entered the village of Barnāma. The zunnārdārs (Brahmans) of Barnāma killed the elephant and the driver. The Sultan was amazed at the boldness of the ra‘iyats; and ordered, that in revenge the town of Barnāma should be destroyed.

As it was yet the beginning of the reign of Qutb-ud-din, and Sultan Mahmud had invaded the country with great strength and violence, Sultan Qutb-ud-din consulted with a baqāl (grain dealer), who held a position of great proximity (to his person) in his service. The baqāl said, “The best course would be that the Sultan should withdraw into the country of Sūrath. When Sultan Mahmud should go back to his own country, after leaving an army in Gujrat, the Sultan would be able to drive away those troops with ease.” Sultan Qutb-ud-din made inquiries of the truth of this, and wanted to act accordingly. The amirs, however, did not allow him to do so, but took him along to carry on the war. When they gained the victory,

---

1 Contrary to what is stated in the text, the Cambridge History of India, page 301, says Sultan Mahmud Khalji advanced from Mandū with an army of one hundred thousand horse and five hundred elephants.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have %Bārōda, while the other MS. has %Bārōda. I have adopted Baroda, which is the name by which the place is known; though I have heard that Baroda is the correct ancient name.

3 The story of the baqāl is mentioned by Firdishtah in much the same language as in the text. Col. Briggs gives a slightly different version, in which he says that the Sultan “was advised by some of his courtiers to retreat to Sorut (in a note, Western Guzerat called also Kattywar) and allow the king of Mālwa to occupy for the present the eastern provinces”, etc. It will be remembered (see note, page 225) that in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, a bakāl is said to have given somewhat similar advice to Sultan Muhammad the father of Sultan Kutb-ud-din. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not say that Sultan Qutb-ud-din sought the advice of the baqāl; but apparently a baqāl was consulted either by the father, or by the son.
they were angry with the bāqūl; and questioned him. He said, "If the Sultān had the wish to fight, he would have consulted you. As he wanted to flee he asked me."

In short Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn met Sultān Maḥmūd in the village of 1 Kaparbanj which is twenty karōhs from Aḥmadābād. At this place 2 Malik 'Alā'-ud-dīn Suhrāb, who was the thānadār of Sultānpūr, and who had been compelled to join Sultān Maḥmūd, fled from him, and waited on Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn. He was honoured by having seven robes of honour conferred on him in the course of a day, and received the title of 'Alā'-ul-mulk. As there was now a distance of three karōhs between the two armies, Sultān Maḥmūd wrote this couplet, and sent it to Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn.

---

1 The name is and in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The correct name appears to be Kaparbanj. The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls it Kapadvanj.

2 Bayley (p. 135) quoting from the Tārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhī says that 'Alā-ud-dīn "shut the gate of the fort (of Sultānpūr) in his face and opened fire both with guns and musketry. Maḥmūd Khilji besieged the place for seven days. After that through the mediation of Mubārak Khān, son of Ahmad Shāh and uncle of Kutb-ud-dīn, who had gone to Sultān Maḥmūd at Mandū during the previous reign, and had joined his court", he surrendered the fort, and joined Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī's service. When asked to swear allegiance to the latter, he swore it in an evasive language. The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls the fort Nandarbār (or Nandurbār and not Sultānpūr); and says that 'Alā-ud-dīn Suhrāb made no attempt to hold it, but surrendered it at once; and sought his own safety by swearing allegiance to the invader, and entering his service. It goes on to say that after this, Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī marched on Broach, and summoned Marjān, the governor to surrender it. Marjān refused; and Maḥmūd was about to besiege the town when, by the advice of 'Alā-ud-dīn Suhrāb, he decided, instead to attack the capital at once, and marched to Baroda, where he was joined by Gangādās of Chāmpāner and other chiefs. Crossing the Māhī river he advanced to Kapadvanj, where 'Alā-ud-dīn deserted him and joined his old master. Nothing of this appears in the Ṭabaqāt or in Fīrishtah. The Mirāt-i-Sikandārī has a long account of Kuth-ud-dīn's going to a faqir or saint to intercede for him. At last we come to the fact that 'Alā-ud-dīn returned to his old master, and was received with favour. He told Kuth-ud-dīn, that Sultān Maḥmūd was advancing by Kaparbanj, and advised him to proceed thither (p. 143).
Couplet:
1 I hear you play the ball without a chaugān, in your house,
   If you wish to challenge, come; this is the ball, and this the field.

Sūlṭān Ḥāfiz-ud-dīn ordered Ṣadr Jahān to write a reply to the couplet. Ṣadr Jahān wrote in reply.

Couplet:
If a chaugān I take in my hand, thy head like a ball shall I hurl;
   But I am ashamed to torment my prisoner in this way.

In this couplet there is a hint to the fact, that Sūlṭān Hūshang, who was the master and patron of Sūlṭān Māḥmūd, had been captured and had been kept as a prisoner by Sūlṭān Muẓaffar Shāh, who had, however, afterwards treated him with favour and had given back to him the kingdom of Mālwa; as the pen has conveyed this meaning in the account of the reign of Muẓaffar Shāh. After this, after some days on the night of the 2 3rd Šafar, Sūlṭān Māḥmūd mounted with the intention of making a surprise night attack; but being defeated went away to Mālwa, as has been described in detail in the section about Mālwa. On the way the Kōlis and Bhils greatly harassed (Sūlṭān Māḥmūd’s army). Sūlṭān Ḥāfiz-ud-dīn returned to Aḥmādābād, his capital, crowned with victory and triumph.

After a time the vāzīrs said that 4 Firūz Khān, son of Shams Khān Dandānī, who was the ruler of Nāgūr, had died. His brother Mujāhid Khān took possession of Nāgūr; and Shams Khān, his son, for fear of his uncle had fled, and sought the protection of Rānā Kūmbhā, son

---

1 There are some verbal differences in the couplet as given in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have adopted the version which appeared to me to be the best.

2 Firishtah has در سلسلة مسفر “towards the end of Šafar”; and the Cambridge History of India, page 301, says that the abortive night attack was made on the night of the 1st April, 1451.

3 Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India, page 301, give somewhat detailed account of the abortive night attack, and the battle which took place on the following morning.

4 Firūz Khān died in 860 A.H., 1453 A.D.

5 Both MSS., and the lith. ed. have برادر، brother, which is of course incorrect. Firishtah has برادر in the text-edition.
of Rānā Mūkul. Rānā Kūmbhā determined that he would recover Nāgūr from the possession of Mujāhid Khān, and make it over to Shams Khān, but on the condition that the latter would demolish three of the turrets of the citadel of Nāgūr. His reason for this was that before this Rānā Mūkul had fled in great distress and disgrace from Firūz Khān, and in that battle three thousand Rājpūts had been slain; and if now his son demolished three of the bastions of the fort, the people of the world would say that, although Rānā Mūkul had fled, yet he having acquired power over the fort had had his revenge. Shams Khān, who was helpless, accepted this condition in his great distress. After some days Rānā Kūmbhā having collected troops marched against Nāgūr; and Mujāhid Khān being unable to meet him, went and begged for help from Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji. Shams Khān then went and took possession of the fort of Nāgūr. Rānā Kūmbhā sent him a message, that he should now carry out his promise. Shams Khān summoned the amirs and the heads of the clans and brought up the matter for discussion. Some of them said that it was a matter of pity that Firūz Khān had not begotten a daughter, so that she might have saved the honour of the family. Shams Khān replied in a spirit of shame and self depreciation and anger and said that it was not possible that any part of the fort should be demolished, till many heads should have been cut off. Rānā Kūmbhā on hearing this news went back to his own country, and having collected a large army again advanced on Nāgūr. Shams Khān having repaired the ruined parts of the fort, left all his army and the heads of the clans in it, and himself went on wings of speed to Aḥmadābād to seek for help. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh conferred many favours on him, and married his daughter in the nikāḥ form. After the marriage festivities were finished, he sent 1 Rāy Rām Chand Nāik, and Malik Gadalī and some other amirs to re-inforce the men of Nāgūr; and kept Shams Khān in attendance on himself till the day, when it was reported to him, that Rānā Kūmbhā had fought with the men of Nāgūr, and had slain a large number of them; and had devastated wherever there was any cultivation and people outside the fort.

1 in the text-edition.
On hearing this news, the spirit of anger and daring of Sultan Quṭb-ud-din was excited, and he advanced against the fort of Kūm-bhalmir in the year 860 A.H. When he arrived in the vicinity of the fort of Ābū, Gitā Déōrah, the Rāja of the fort came out and did homage, and represented that Rānā Kūmbhā had taken the fort from him by force, and had left his own thanadār there. Sultan Quṭb-ud-din appointed Malik Sha'bān Sulṭānī, who had the title of Imād-ul-mulk in charge of the fort of Ābū, and himself advanced towards his original destination. Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk, who was inexperienced, immediately commenced a battle, and had a large number of his men slain. When this news reached the Sulṭān, he declared, that he would, at the time of his return capture the fort of Ābū, and make it over to Gitā Déōrah. He sent a messenger to summon 'Imād-ul-mulk; and himself advanced to seize the fort of Sirōhi. When he arrived in its neighbourhood, the Rāja engaged him in a battle and was defeated.

From that place, the Sulṭān invaded the country of Rānā Kūmbhā; and sent troops in all directions, so that they might ravage the country, and destroy the temples. When he arrived at the fort of Kūm-bhalmir, Rānā Kūmbhā sallied out of the fort, set the fire of warfare ablaze; and having had a large number of his followers slain,

1 Called Kumbhalgarh in the Cambridge History of India, page 302. Bayley, page 149, calls it Kōmbhalmir and says in a note, quoting Tod's Rājasthān, Chapter VIII, that it was one of the 32 fortresses erected by Rānā Kūmbhā. In Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 352) it is called Komulmer and it is said to be the greatest of the 32 fortresses attributed to Koombho. Altogether there are 34 fortresses erected for the defence of Mewār. The correct name of Rānā Koombho appears, according to an inscription in a temple, which stands at the village called Rānpoor, about five miles from the town of Sādee or Sāduree in Mewār, to have been Rānā Shree Koombh Kurn, or according to correct transliteration Rānā Sri Kumbhakarna (note on page 353).

2 The Cambridge History of India makes no mention of the incidents, which took place at the fort of Ābū. Firishtah does, but he says nothing about the Rāja rendering homage to the Sulṭān. The name of the Rāja of Ābū is given in the MSS. as کینا دیریا and in the lith. ed. as کینا دیری. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 149) he is called Khatiā Déōrah, Rājah of Sirōhl. This can scarcely be correct, as the Rāja of Sirōhl appears to have fought with Quṭb-ud-din, and to have been defeated by him.
again retired into the fort. He, however, sent out parties every day; and fought battles; and each time defeat fell on him. In the end, Kūnbhā came forward in distress and humility, and offered suitable tribute. The Sultān then returned to Aḥmadābād.

1 At the end of the year, Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī sent 2 Tāj Khān who was one of his great amirs, to the boundary of Gujrāt, to knock at the door of peace. The amirs and the chief men of Gujrāt induced Sultān Qutb-ud-din for the benefit of the people, to agree to the treaty. 3 Shaikh Niẓām-ud-din and the prince of the learned men Ṣadr Jahan came to Chāmpānīr from the side of Sultān Maḥmūd, and Qāḍī Hisām-ud-din and some others went from Aḥmadābād. They drew up the treaty in this way, that the armies of Sultān Qutb-ud-din should plunder and ravage such parts of the territories of Rānā Kūnbhā as were contiguous to Gujrāt; and Sultān Maḥmūd should seize 4 the country of Māwār and Amhar, and the neighbouring country. (It was also agreed that) whenever necessary they should not fail to give help and assistance to each other. Letters of peace

1 According to the Cambridge History of India, page 302, Ghiyās-ud-din, son of Maḥmūd Khaljī, led a raid into his dominions as far as Sūrat, but retired hurriedly on hearing of Qutb-ud-din’s return; and it was after this that Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī sent the mission to propose a treaty of peace. The raid led by Ghiyās-ud-din is not mentioned in the text or in Firishtah or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari or in Rās Mālā.

2 Firishtah says Tāj Khān was the Ṣawīr, minister in-charge of all departments of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī. Neither the Mirāt-i-Sikandari nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the ambassador.

3 The names of the men sent to draft the treaty do not appear to be mentioned in any other history.

4 The lith. ed. of Firishtah has باد و ترايني ميرات و امیر, and Col. Briggs the districts of Mewar and Aheerwara. The other histories do not give the names of the districts which were to be ravaged respectively by the Gujrāt and Mālwa armies. The Cambridge History of India, page 302, says, that the western part of the Rānā’s dominion were allotted to Gujrāt, and the eastern parts to Mālwa. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 150) is less definite. According to it, Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī would assail the Rānā from one side and Sultān Qutb-ud-din from the other. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 333) says that the treaty was to the effect that Rānā Koombhō’s dominion should be partitioned “between the two Mouhammadan powers”.
containing these terms were written, and made over to the great men of the age.

In the year 861 A.H. (1451 A.D.) Sultān Quṭb-ud-din again marched to invade Kūmbhalmīr, and on the way he took the fortress of Ābū, and according to his promise, delivered it over to Gītā Dēōrah. From Ābū he advanced towards Kūmbhalmīr; and Rānā Kūmbhā left that place and retired to the fort of Chitōr. On the way he saw an uneven and difficult place, and halted there. After the two armies had met, the fire of war blazed up; but when night came, they retired to their respective places. On the next day, the battle began again, and Sultān Quṭb-ud-din himself fought like Rustam. Rānā Kūmbhā then hid himself in the hills; and sent emissaries, and begged for pardon. He sent 1 four maunds of gold and some elephants, and other tribute, and entered into an engagement, that he would after that never again cause any injury to the country of Nāgōr. Sultān Quṭb-ud-din returned with victory and triumph, and went back to Aḥmadābād.

But three months had not yet elapsed, when news came that Rānā Kūmbhā was again attempting, with an army of fifty thousand horsemen, to devastate Nāgōr. The same day that the news came, 2 the Sultān came out of Aḥmadābād, and halted for a month outside the city, for the purpose of mustering his troops. Rānā Kūmbhā, hearing the news of the Sultān’s preparations, retired to his own station and took up his position there. Sultān Quṭb-ud-din also on hearing the news returned, and entered the city, and spent his time in pleasure and enjoyment.

1 Firishtah makes it fourteen mana of gold and two large elephants and other fine things. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 42) says that 14 maunds of solid gold and two elephants which carried it were paid to Kootb Shah; and a seasonable donation was also made to Sooltan Mahmood Khilji; but that was after the latter had advanced on Chitor.

2 Firishtah is more explicit about the Sultān’s promptitude in starting. He says that the messenger bearing the report came to Aḥmadābād at night, when the Sultān, being in his study, asked the azīr, who went the same night to the Sultān, but found him drunk and senseless. He could not wait, but put the Sultān in a mihaffah (a litter), and took him one stage the next day; and then they halted for one month for the استعداد لشكر or mustering of the troops.
In the beginning of the year 1 862 A.H., the Sultan made a strong resolution to punish the zamindârs; and marched to Sirõhî. The 2 Râja who was a relation of Râna Kûmbhâ fled to the hills, and took shelter there; and for the third time Sirõhî was burnt down; and the other towns were RAIDED and ravaged. Then (the Sultan) sent detachments to ravage the dominions of Râna Kûmbhâ; and himself advanced to the fort of Kûmbhalmîr. At this time intelligence came that Sultan Mahmûd Kâhiljî had advanced towards the fort of Chitôr, by way of Mandsûr; and seized all the parganas near the last-named place. Sultan Qûb-ud-din now besieged the Râna in the fort of Kûmbhalî risk with a firm determination; but as a considerable time elapsed, and he knew that it would be difficult to seize it, he gave up the siege, and advanced towards the fortress of Chitôr; and after plundering and ravaging the country around it, 3 went back to Aḩmadâbâd.

To everyone of the soldiers whose horses had become disabled during the campaigns, the Sultan gave the price of one from the treasury; and thought it proper, in this way, to show kindness to them. Râna Kûmbhâ sent ambassadors after the Sultan and in great humility and distress prayed to be excused for his offences; and the Sultan again drew the pen of forgiveness across his guilt; and sent back the ambassadors, pleased and happy.

And again in the year 863 A.H., the Sultan wanted to march with his army; but he happened to fall ill. He then went one day to see Saiyîd Muḥammad, who was celebrated as Qûb-i-Ālâm, who lived in peace and contentment in the town of Bâtûh; and resolved in his mind, how nice it were if the holy and high God should bestow on him a

---

1 The year is 862 in both MSS., (one of which also gives it in figures, 872), and in the lith. ed., but this is incorrect; the correct year being 862 A.H. or perhaps 861 A.H. Firishtah has 861; Col. Briggs 861 A.H., 1457 A.D., and the Cambridge History of India, 1456 as the year of the destruction of Sirõhî. The Mirât-i-Sikandarî (Bayley) has 862 A.H., 1456 as the year. It will be seen that later on the MSS. and the lith. ed. give the correct year 863 A.H.

2 He is called Sains Mal in the Cambridge History of India, page 302. I cannot find his name anywhere else.

3 Firishtah says that Sultan Qûb-ud-din returned to his capital with plundert that could not be conceived; but contrary to that Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 42) says that the Rana gave fourteen maunds of solid gold and two elephants. See note 1, page 233.
worthy son. His Holiness the Saiyid, the beloved of God, may God sanctify his tomb! knew what was in the Sultan's mind by his spiritual illumination; and said "Your younger brother, who is like your son will keep the dynasty of Muṣṭaffar Shāh alive". The Sultan rose in correspondence; and day by day his illness increased. He died on the 23rd Rajab of the afore-mentioned year, and was buried in the enclosure of Sultan Muḥammad Shāh's tomb. In proclamations and farmāns they styled him Sultan Ghāzī. The period of his reign was seven years and six months and thirteen days. He was a bāḍshāḥ noted for his bravery and high spirits; but at the times when the fire of his wrath flamed up, and specially when he was intoxicated with wine, he did many evil deeds and was greedy and reckless in killing and shedding blood.

When Sultan Qūṭb-ud-dīn died, his amīrs put Shams Khān son of Firūz Khān to death, on the suspicion that his daughter, who was a nikāḥ wife of the Sultan, had given him poison; and the mother of the Sultan made her over to the slave girls, who tore her to pieces, and thus killed her with torment.

An account of Sultan Dād Shāh, son of Ahmad Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Muṣṭaffar Shāh.

When the amīrs, and the pillars of the state, and the great men of the kingdom had carried out the ceremonies of mourning for

1 Col. Briggs gives the 25th May, 1459, as the date of his death whereas the Cambridge History of India, page 303, has May 18th, 1458. Neither the Mirāt-i-Sikandari nor Rās Mālā gives the date of his death or the period of his reign; but the former has some curious stories about his wounding himself in the knee; but (Bayley, p. 158) quoting the Tārikh-i-Bahādar-Shāhī says that Shams Khān's daughter gave him poison at the instigation of her father. FIRISHTAH's account of the way in which Shams Khān and his daughter were murdered is somewhat different as regards the particulars. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, says "Qūṭb-ud-dīn's officers at Nāgaur put Shams Khān to death", which cannot be correct if it implies that he was put to death at Nāgōr. As regards his daughter it says, that she was made over to her jealous co-wives. FIRISHTAH does say that she was made over to

2 FIRISHTAH has seven years and seven months.

3 There are slight differences in the heading. I have translated it as it is in one MS. The other MS. omits the word Sultan; and the lith. ed. substitutes Sultan for Sultan.
Sultān Qutb-ud-din, they placed Shāhzāda Dāūd Khān, son of Aḥmad Shāh, who was the uncle of the deceased Sultān on the throne of empire. As the recorder of destiny and fate had not written the order of sultānāt against his name, he began to commit unworthy deeds and to perpetrate wicked acts. Some acts, which bore the suspicion of meanness of spirit were perpetrated by him from time to time and became the cause of the abhorrence of the people. ¹ For instance, he made the promise of conferring the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk on a ²farrāsh who was his neighbour at the time when he was a Shāhzāda; and the amīrs and great men seeing such ³ill-regulated acts of his, became annoyed with him; and they directed, that he should be excused from the work of government. They sent Malik ⁴'Alā-ul-

¹ There is a difference in the readings. Both the MSS. have از انجماد فرشاتان؛ but the lith. ed. has از انجماد فرشاتان.

² The man was a farrāsh. A farrah is a kind of cotton cloth which is spread on the ground for people to sit upon; and the farrāsh, strictly speaking, is a man who spreads such cloth and keeps it in his charge; and generally, a man who keeps the house, and the furniture in it, swept and garnished. He is, however, different from an ordinary sweeper; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 43) is wrong in calling him "one of the common sweepers of the household". Bayley (p. 150) calls him more correctly a carpet-spreader; and unlike Firishtah, who says that Sultān Dāūd conferred the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk on the man, and made him one of the great amīrs, agrees with Niẓām-ul-din, and says he only held out the hope of granting the title to him. The Cambridge History of India is indefinite, and says that the new Sultān conferred high honours on unworthy favourites. Sultān Dāūd's act was unconventional, and must have given umbrage to the amīrs as a body, but it did not, I think, involve any moral turpitude.

³ One MS. and the lith. ed. have نا منظم، but the other MS. نا منظم. I have adopted the former.

⁴ Malik 'Alā-ul-mulk in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk in the other MS. There is a good deal of confusion about this. Firishtah lith. ed., says nothing about anybody being sent to the mother of Sultān Qutb-ud-din; but says that by the advice of 'Imād-ul-mulk, they raised Mahmūd Khān, the younger brother of Sultān Qutb-ud-din, who was in his fourteenth year to the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, says that the amīrs raised his (which would mean Dāūd's, which is certainly incorrect) younger brother Abu-'l-Fath Mahmūd on the throne. Bayley (p. 160) says that the amīrs deputed 'Alā-ul-Mulk bin Suhrāb to the mother of Fateh Khān. I have adopted 'Alā-ul-mulk.
mulk bin Suhrāb to the palace of Makhdūma-i-Jahān, the widow of Sultān Muḥammad, who was a 1 daughter of one of the Sultāns of Hind, so that he might bring Shāhzāda Fath Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh; and all of them combined together to place him on the throne. Makhduma-i-Jahān said in reply, "Please keep your hands off my 2 son; for he has not the strength to bear this heavy burden." It so happened, however, that Malik 'Alā-ul-mulk went privately to wait on Shāhzāda Fath Khān, and made him mount a horse, and took him to the royal palace. The other amirs hastened to wait on him; and carried out the ceremony of congratulating him; and on that very day, which was Sunday, the first of Sha'bān of that year placed him on the throne of empire; and gave him the title of Sultān Maḥmūd.

The period of the reign of Dāūd Shāh was 3 seven days.

4 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH.

When Sultān Maḥmūd ascended the throne of Gujrat on Sunday, the 5 first day of Sha'bān 863 A.H., according to the advice and counsel

---

1 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 160, she was Bibi Moghali, who appears to have been a daughter of one of the Jāms of Sind.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have فرزندان sons; but the other MS. has فرزند son.

3 The period of the reign of Dāūd Shāh is not mentioned by Firishtah or by Col. Briggs. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley (p. 160), agrees with Niẓām-ud-din, and has seven days. Rās Mālāy says indefinitely, only a few days; but the Cambridge History of India, page 303, gives him a reign of "no more than 27 days". This is incorrect; and is contradicted by the fact that the date of the death of Qutb-ud-din is said in the same page to have been May 18th, 1458, and that of the accession of Sultān Maḥmūd, also in the same page, May 25th. Unlike others Dāūd Shāh does not appear to have come at once to a violent end. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley (p. 160), says "Sultān Dāūd got out of a window facing the river Sābar, and went in to hiding. He reigned only seven days. It is related, that he entered as an inquirer into the monastery of Shēkh Adhan Rūmī, and became one of his attendants; in a short time he obtained advancement (in spiritual rank). He soon afterwards died."

4 That is the heading in both MSS. The lith. ed. has ذكر سلطنت فتح خانān. The text is مخاطب معصوم شاہ بن معمر شاہ بن احمد شاہ.

5 Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs gives the date of the accession. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari gives the same day and date as in the text; and the corresponding A.D. date as 18th June, 1459. Rās Mālāy does not give the date.
of the amīra, and sat in the place of his father, he made the various sections of the people happy by his universal benefactions in accordance with their respective ranks. They say, that on that day, in addition to Arab, 'Iraqī and Turkī horses, and valuable robes of honour, and jewelled-belts and swords, and daggers embossed with gold, a kurār of tankas was given away.

When six months had passed, 1Malik Kabīr Sultānī, who had the title of 'Aḍl-ul-mulk, Maulānā Khīḍr, who had that of Ṣafī-ul-mulk, Piārah Ismā‘īl, who bore that of Burhān-ul-mulk, and Jhajū Muḥammad, who had that of Ḥiṣām-ul-mulk, from the wickedness of their natures and the refractoriness of their dispositions, prepared to create turmoil and disturbance. They resolved amongst themselves, that they would cause Malik Sha'bān 2Imād-ul-mulk, in whose grasp of power the reins of the vaṣārat were, to be removed (from his office), so that this wicked intention and dishonest determination of theirs might gain currency and success. In order to carry out this resolution, they represented (to the Sultān) in private, that Imād-ul-mulk wanted to place 3his own son, Shahāb-ud-dīn, on the throne; and like Malik Mughīth Khaljī has determined that the rule of the empire should be

The Cambridge History of India, page 303, does not give the A.H. date but gives an A.D. date different from that given by Bayley, viz., May 25th, 1458.

1 The names and titles of the conspirators are the same in the MSS. and the lith. ed., except that the last name which is Ḥiṣām-ul-Mulk. Jhajū Muḥammad in the MSS. appears to be Ḥiṣām-ul-Mulk. Manjhū Muḥammad in the lith. ed.


2 This Imād-ul-Mulk appears to be the same person who is designated earlier on. See note 4 on p. 236.

3 Firishtah and Col. Briggs and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley) all agree that the conspirators accused Imād-ul-mulk with the intention of raising his own son Shahāb-ud-dīn, on the throne; and Nizām-ud-dīn’s reference to Malik Mughīth Khaljī confirms this; but the Cambridge History of India, page 303, says quite incorrectly, that the conspirators accused Imād-ul-mulk of the determination of placing Sultan Mahmūd’s own son, whom it gives the name of Shihāb-ud-dīn, and describes as an infant, on the throne, so that he might be able to govern the country as regent.
transferred to his own family. Maḥmūd Shāh told them, that he had also inferred the same thing from ʿImād-ul-mulk’s behaviour. He gave orders for the latter being arrested, and placed in confinement. He was kept under guard on the upper floor of the gate of Aḥmadābād. The Sultān placed five hundred of the men whom he trusted to guard him. ʿAḍd-ul-mulk and the other conspirators, (thinking that they were quite) successful, went to their own houses.

It so happened, however, that Malik ʿAbd-ul-lah, the superinten-
dent of the elephants, who was one of the men, in whom the Sultān reposed confidence, asked for a private audience, and having reported the deceit and treachery of that deceitful crew, stated that they had taken ¹ Shāhzāda Ḥasan Khān to the house of one of themselves, and having made asseverations and taking oaths, had made the imprison-
ment of ʿImād-ul-mulk, a means for attaining their own objects. Sultān Maḥmūd made enquiries, and having impressed the true state of things on his mind, and keeping some of his old and faithful adherents, such as ² Ḥājī and Malik Bahā-ud-din and Malik Kālū and Malik ʿĀfn-ud-dīn with him, said to Malik ʿAbd-ul-lah, that he should get all the ele-
phants ready and bring them to the darbār, so that he might throw ʿImād-ul-mulk under the feet of an elephant. He also ordered Malik Sharf-ul-mulk, that he should bring the wicked and ungrateful Shaʿbān to the darbār, so that the superintendent of the elephants may throw him under the feet of an elephant. When Malik Sharf-ul-
mulk went to bring ʿImād-ul-mulk, the guards said, that they could not hand him over without the permission of Malik ʿAḍd-ul-mulk. He came back, and reported what the guards had said, to the Sultān. Sultān Maḥmūd then ascended to the top of the bastion, and said in

---
¹ Firishtah also says that the conspirators wanted to raise prince Ḥasan Khān on the throne, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 46) has changed the name to Hoosein. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 164), however, says that the conspirators wanted to raise Habīb Khān on the masnad; and Bayley says in a note, that according to Firishtah and the Tārīkh-i-Alfī, the accession of Habīb Khān was the real object of the plot. The statement as far as Firishtah is concerned appears to me to be incorrect. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, agrees with Nizām-ud-din and Firishtah, that it was Ḥasan Khān, whom the conspirators wanted to place on the throne.
² The name is Ḥājī without any prefix or suffix in the MSS, as well as in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari both call him Malik Ḥājī.
a loud voice; "Bring Sha'bán quickly, and throw him under the feet of an elephant". When the men heard these words from the Sultán himself, a large number of people went and brought him. When the Sultán's eye fell on him, he ordered "bring that wicked man here, so that I may ask him some questions". When they brought him up, (the Sultán was evidently standing on a platform), he ordered that the chain should be removed from the hands and neck of this faithful servant, so that he might inquire into the conduct of, and punish the wicked wretches. Some of the connected amírs (i.e., apparently those who were connected with the conspirators), who were occupied with the duty of guarding him, on seeing this threw themselves down from the top (of the bastion, or some platform some way up), and some of them raised a cry of mercy.

When this news reached 'Aḍd-ul-mulk and the other conspirators, they were amazed at the result of their action, and commenced to collect their retainers. At the approach of the true dawn, Sultán Mahmúd came to the window of the darbār-hall, and saluted the people. He placed the fly-whisk in the hand of 'Imád-ul-mulk, so that he might drive away the flies. Malik 'Abd-ul-lah, the superintendent, had all the elephants there. About three hundred (thirty hundred ?), men including both free men and slaves attended to perform the kúrnish (royal salute). At this time, the rebel amír came towards

---

1 The Sultán who was up to this time calling 'Imád-ul-mulk a harám khwár (lit. one who eats forbidden foods, a wicked wretch) now calls him according to the MSS. hadíl khwár (lit. one who eats unforbidden food, an honest man). The behaviour of the Sultán is somewhat enigmatical. If as Firishta says he had understood the deceit of the conspirators from the beginning, he acted with a good deal of dissimulation and astuteness for a lad of fifteen; and there is no other explanation. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 47) says, "He had sufficient discretion to see the matter in its true light and at the same time too much prudence openly to avow his sentiments." Rās Málā (vol. I, p. 355) says, that though only fourteen years of age he evinced a determination to protect a faithful minister against his enemies. On the other hand, the Cambridge History of India, page 303, says that new to political intrigues, he believed the conspirators, but later on after consulting his mother and a few of his immediate attendants he determined on a course of action.

2 Somewhat contrary to this, Firishta on the authority of Háji Muhammad Qandahári, says that the rebels came with thirty thousand horse and foot ready for battle; and that at that time there were not more than thirty
the *darbār-ball* attended by the riff-raff of the city, and their own retainers. When they came near 'Imād-ul-mulk and Malik Ḥājī and the other *sardārs*, with the immediate servants (of the Sultān) placed the elephants before them, and made an attack on the rebels; and 'Aḍḍ-ul-mulk and the other traitors fled. Their soldiers threw away their arms in the lanes of the city, and hid themselves. Out of the rebel *amīrs*, Ḥīṣām-ud-din went to his brother, Rukn-ud-din, who was the *kōtwāl* of Pattan; and from that place they both went away to Mālwa; 'Aḍḍ-ul-mulk, with a single retainer went among the *grāssias*; and as his retainers had slain some of the *grāssias* of that neighbourhood, they recognised him and slew him; and they sent his head, filled with turbulence, to Ahmadābād. As Burhān-ul-mulk was a man of big size, he could not run away, and concealed himself

hundred or three thousand men including free men and slaves with the Sultān; and they all washed their hands of their lives, and became thoroughly frightened. Some said let us go into such and such a mansion and shut the doors and defend ourselves. Others said, let us collect as much of the jewels and treasure as we can, and make our escape. The Sultān did not approve of either of these counsels, but armed himself, and bound his quiver round his waist; and with the thirty (three) hundred followers, and the elephants which did not exceed two hundred in number came out of the palace to meet the rebels. He posted the elephants at the heads of the various approaches so that the enemy might not attack from different sides, and advanced with the greatest calmness and composure. The people on seeing this immediately deserted the rebels, and some joined the Sultān, and others hid themselves. Col. Briggs’s account (vol. IV, p. 48) agrees with the above but he makes the number of the rebels thirty thousand and that of the Sultan’s followers, 300; although in the Persian text the one is ١٠٠,٠٠٠ and the other ١٠٠٠٠. It must be said, however, that the number of the Sultan’s followers is also given in the *Ṭabaqāt as

Bayley (p. 165) also says that the Sultan’s followers amounted only to three hundred in number; and some of them suggested that they should get out of the palace by the windows on the side of the Sābar(matl), and collect men and then return; but the Sultan did not listen to these cowards.

١ There is some difference in the readings. The MSS. have ١٠٠٠٠٠٠, head filled with turbulence, and ١٠٠٠٠٠٠, head placed on an arrow; and the lith. ed. has ١٠٠٠٠٠٠, which is not intelligible. None of the readings is quite satisfactory, but I have adopted the first. Firishtah has ١٠٠٠٠٠٠٠, having cut off his head.
near the town of Sarkhēj, in the uneven ground near the Sābarmati. It so happened that one of the eunuchs went to circumambulate the tomb of Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified! He saw Burhān-ul-mulk seated there, and immediately seized him, and brought him to the darbār, where by order of the Sultān he was executed. Maulānā Khiḍr, Safī-ul-mulk, was seized and sent to Dip in imprisonment. As this disturbance was suppressed in this way, and friend was discriminated from foe, 3 Imād-ul-mulk threw the skirt of his spirit over the grandeur of the vazārat; and like men freed (of the cares of the world) he held his hand from all worldly affairs; and took kindly to the nook of contentment and seclusion; and relinquishing his jāqir became a beadsman. 6 Sultān Maḥmūd began to show favour to his soldiers, granted favours to fifty-two of his own servants, so that in the course of a short time, the number of his soldiers became double that of Sultān Qutb-ud-din and of the former Sultāns. He conferred titles on all his own slaves; Malik Ḥājj was honoured with the title of Imād-ul-mulk, and the office of the paymaster of the forces. Malik Bahā'-ud-din was made Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, Malik Tughān Farḥat-ul-mulk, Malik 'Ain-ud-din Nizām-ul-mulk, and Malik Saʿad Bakht Burhān-ul-mulk.

1 Firishtah says, ֦, i.e., he was trodden to death under the feet of a mast elephant.
2 Firishtah says he was not executed as, i.e., as he was not so guilty as the others.
3 According to Firishtah the Sultān did not forget Imād-ul-mulk’s services. He says, and Sultan Mahmud made him a judge of courts, and made him a minister. He gave him a thousand dinars, and a hundred stirrups and a hundred swords, and a hundred dresses, and a hundred beds, and a hundred carpets, and a hundred gold crowns.
4 The lit. ed. has, but as both the MSS. omit it, I have also omitted it.
5 Some of these matters are mentioned with some variation in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 166).
6 It is not clear who these fifty-two servants or slaves were; and why the favours shown to them led to the increase in the number of troops. As to the increase the actual words are, in the MSS. and in the lit. ed. I have adopted the readings of the MSS., and think that it means in the proportion of twenty to ten, i.e., double. Some of these events are mentioned in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 167).
In the year 864 A.H. he marched in the direction of Kaparbanj; and having gone hunting as far as the boundary of Mālwa returned. In the course of this expedition he regulated the administration of the thānas, and of the parganas; and attended with care to the condition of the oppressed. In the year 2 866 A.H., he started from the capital city of Aḥmadābād with the object of seeing the country and hunting; and encamped on the bank of the river Khāri, which is fifteen karōhs from Aḥmadābād. At this time he received a letter from 3 Niẓām Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, the ruler of the Deccan in which after complaining (of the injuries he had received) at the hand of Sūltān Maḥmūd Khaljī, he asked for assistance and reinforcement. 4 Maḥmūd Shāh with a very large army and five hundred elephants advanced to help Niẓām Shāh. When he arrived at Nadarbār and Sūltānpūr, another letter came (to the effect) that Sūltān Maḥmūd Khaljī, in his pride of his large army, had advanced against this faqīr (i.e., he himself) by rapid marches; and after the two armies had met, in the first instance he was defeated; and the soldiers of the writer plundered his camp, and seized fifty elephants. But Sūltān Maḥmūd came out of ambush with twelve thousand horsemen, when his (i.e., Niẓām Shāh’s) men were engaged in plundering. Sikandar Khān Bukhārī and Khwājah Jahān Turk (who were commanders of Niẓām Shāh’s army) exerted themselves, as much as they could; (but) Sūltān Maḥmūd

1 This excursion is not mentioned by Firishtah or any other historian except the author of the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 175).
2 The year is 866 in the MSS., but 865 in the lith. ed. Firishtah also has 866 and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 49) 866 A.H., 1462 A.D. Bayley (p. 175) also gives the same year, and he calls the river Kahārī, and says, on the authority of the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī, it is eleven kāhs from Ahmadābād.
3 He was a mere child at this time, and the government was carried on by his mother and the prime minister, and there was a certain amount of jealousy and intrigue (see pp. 87, 88 in the history of his reign).
4 Firishtah says that the amīrs and the chief men of the city attempted to dissuade Maḥmūd Shāh from going away on a distant expedition, so soon after his accession, specially as Dāūd Khān was attempting to recover the throne, which he had occupied for a week; but he did not agree with them, and advanced arguments based on philosophical and humanitarian grounds in support of his determination. This is referred to by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 49), but it does not appear to be mentioned in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari or in the Cambridge History of India.
himself advancing within bowshot, shot an arrow, which hit the forehead of Sikandar Khan’s elephant. The animal turned round, and caused much havoc to the Deccan army; and Sikandar Khan and Khwajah Jahān Türk seized the bridle of the faqir’s horse, and started for Bīdar. The faqir is at present at Fīrūzābād; and Sultan Mahmūd is besieging the city of Bīdar. As His Majesty has advanced in this direction, with the object of helping the faqir, it is hoped that he would come with all rapidity.

Mahmūd Shāh directed his attention to the Deccan. He heard on the way that Sultan Mahmūd Khalji had turned back, and was going towards Mālwa. Mahmūd Shāh advanced into the country of Asir and Būrhānpūr, that he might close the path of his flight; and encamped in the neighbourhood of Tālnūr, which is in the country of Asir. Sultan Mahmūd Khalji leaving the well-known road travelled by way of Gōndwānā; and owing to the difficulty of the road, and want of water, his men suffered great hardship. They say that more than thousand men perished for want of water. Mahmūd Shāh wrote and sent a letter to the effect, that “Whenever that pupil of the

1 One MS. inserts between برو and سنة. I think this is correct and have inserted it, though it is not found in the other MS. and in the lith. ed.

2 The Cambridge History of India (p. 304) instead of saying that Sultan Mahmūd Khalji travelled through Gōndwānā like the other histories, says that he was compelled to retire through the Mahādeo hills into Northern Berar, where his army suffered severely both from want of water and from the attacks of the Korkus. I have nowhere else come across the name of the Mahādeo hills or of the Korkūs. In the Persian text of Muntākhab-al-labāb, edited by Sir W. Haig, the editor of the Cambridge History of India, the retreat of Sultan Mahmūd Khalji (vol. III, p. 98), is said to have been through Gōndwānā, and it is said that there was no sign of water along the route anywhere, and the troops are said to have suffered from thirst and at the hands of robbers roving over the hills. In the Index of the Cambridge History of India the Mahādeo hills are mentioned only once in this particular place, and the Korkūs are mentioned only thrice. From one of these references (p. 358), it would appear that the “Korkūs” is only another name for the Gōnd.

3 One MS. adds الی and the narrowing or difficulty of the road.

4 Both MSS. have ترزا سلطنت, but the lith. ed. has ترزا سلطنت. I have retained the latter, as it is the common form of the word, which means lit. the pupil of the eye, but is applied figuratively to some one who is very dear, such as one’s son or daughter.
eye of empire shall have need for help and assistance, he should notify
the fact to the writer; and there will be no neglect in according such
help". He then returned to Aḥmadābād.

1 It is recorded by tradition, that in this army there were seventy
thousand well armed and picked horsemen with Maḥmūd Shāh;
and that he had given away the whole of the country of Gujrāt in
fāgūr (fiefs) to the soldiers; and there was not a single village as khālsā
or royal land; and that in the course of four years, he had disbursed
a 2 tenth part of the treasures left behind by his ancestors.

In the year 867 A.H., another letter from Niẓām Shāh arrived,
to the effect that Sulṭān Maḥmūd Kḥaljī had invaded the Deccan
with ninety thousand horsemen; and as the promise of help and assis-
tance had been inscribed with the tongue of the pen, the writer
hoped that he would direct his great spirit to the fulfilment of that
promise. Maḥmūd Shāh with a well-equipped army marched towards
the Deccan. When he arrived at Sulṭān purse and Nadarbār, Sulṭān
Maḥmūd Kḥaljī having raided and ravaged the neighbourhood of
Daulatābād had gone back to his own country. 3 An epistle con-
taining his excuses (?) thanks came from Niẓām Shāh, with presents
and offerings to the Sulṭān; and he turned back and went to Aḥma-
dābād. He wrote to Sulṭān Maḥmūd Kḥaljī, that it appeared to be
contrary to the law of Islām and against humanity, to invade without
any reason, a country inhabited by Musalmāns; and to return without
fighting after such an invasion is reprehensible. If after this he again
attempts to injure and harass the inhabitants of the country of Deccan,
he should know for a certainty, that the writer would invade the
country of Mālwa. Sulṭān Maḥmūd replied, that as he (the Sulṭān
of Gujrāt) had directed his noble spirit to the aid of the Deccan, no
injury would after this happen 4 from him to the inhabitants of that
country.

1 These facts with some variations are also mentioned in the Mirāt-i-
Sikandari (Bayley, pp. 176, 177).
2 دو حمد
3 in the text edition.
4 This is also mentioned by Firishtah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley,
p. 177) and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309).
5 There is a little variation in the readings. The MSS. have اینجا بیان,
while the lith. ed. has اینجا بیان. There is not much difference, and I have retained
the reading in the lith. ed.
In the year 869 A.H. (1465 A.D.) it was reported to the Sultān that the zamindārs of Bāwār and of the fort of Dūn had for two years been causing damage to the ships; and as they had never received any punishment from the Sultāns of Gujrāt, they had got into a habit of refractoriness and revolt. Although his loyal advisers did not consider it advisable that he should march to attack them, owing to the difficulty of the route and the strength of the fortress, he determined to conquer that tract, and punish the rebellious chiefs. When after enduring a thousand hardships and difficulties, he advanced to the vicinity of the fort, the commandant came out to give battle; and made gallant efforts. (But) when night came, he again took shelter in the fort; and for some days, he fought battles every day, and fulfilled the duty of making war-like and gallant exertions. It happened, however, that one day the Sultān went to the top of the hill of Bāwār with his retinue and soldiers. When the men of the fort saw the royal umbrella, and became aware of the large number of soldiers, they with humility put their hands on the skirt of peace; and the

---

1 The MSS. have امین دار باور و بندزور دیون and the lith. ed. has زمین دار باور و بندزور دیون. I have adopted the reading of the second MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has قلعة مورا و بندزور دیون. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 51) calls Bāwār, Bayur “an extraordinary hill fort”. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 178) has the mountain of Bāwār, and Bayley says in a note that the best accounts of the expedition are to be found in the Tabakāt-i-Akbari, Firishtah and the Tārikh-i-Alfi; and he quotes from the first two, which both have Bāwār. As to Dūn he says there is a small port marked Dannu near to a spot where a spur of the ghats runs into the sea. He gives the various variants of Bāwār in the different MSS. and the MS. of the Tārikh-i-Alfi; and they all have some resemblance to Bāwār; yet the Cambridge History of India, without a single word of explanation or a single reference to any authority, transforms the zamindārs of Bāwār and of the port of Dūn to “the Hindu chief of Pardi near Damān” (see page 305). The conjunction between قلعة دیون and باور has unfortunately been changed into باور in the text edition, and as a result باور reads باور.

2 It would appear that the men in the fort were not up to that time aware of the presence of the Sultān in the camp.

3 Both the MSS. have معلا; but the lith. ed. has دماس معل. I have retained the last reading, as it has the correct oriental metaphor.

4 Both MSS. have only سودار, but the lith. ed. has سودار. Here I have adopted the reading in the MSS.
commandant came in all haste to wait on the Sultan, and prayed for quarter. Sultan Mahmud on account of his great mercy, drew the pen of forgiveness over their guilt; and gave assurances of safety to all of them. When the commandant of the fort and the chiefs of the neighbouring country came and waited on the Sultan, he distinguished them all by bestowing robes of honour and favours on them. He then mounted his horse and went to inspect the fort. After he had finished the inspection, the commandant presented a large tribute. The Sultan bestowed the amount of the tribute on him in the same majlis; and also conferred on him a special robe of honour and a golden belt. He also fixed the amount of the annual tribute, and entrusted the defence and government of the country to the commandant. He then returned, with success and prosperity, and took up his abode in Ahmadabad.

In the year 870 A.H., 1466 A.D., the Sultan went out hunting towards Ahmadnagar. On the way Bahah-ul-mulk, son of Alf Khan, killed Adam Silahdar (trooper) without any apparent cause; and fled into the country of Idar. 1 Sultan Mahmud sent Malik Haji and Malik Khalil Aquld-ul-mulk; and these men having gone a part of the way, allowed a falsehood to enter their minds; and 2 they induced two

---

1 The readings are different here. One MS. has با جامعت تعيين فنود انا دو شخص بیگنیا را اوردن و باسی قرار دادند که یکند دو کس از نژگران بهاء الملك دو اوردن و باسی قرار دادند که یکند ملک حاجی و ملک کالو عضد الملك را چرستاند و انا چو باز و زارت و نشسته نورمرتی بخاطر رسیده دو کس از نژگران را بیوز اوردن که قاتل ادام سلاحدار ما بودیم. The reading in the lith. ed. is حاجی و ملک کالو عضد الملك را چرستاند و انا چو باز و زارت و نشسته نورمرتی بخاطر رسیده دو کس از نژگران را بیوز اوردن که قاتل ادام سلاحدار ما بودیم.

I have after comparing the three readings and that in the lith. ed. of Firistah, which contains more details, adopted the reading which appeared to me to be the best. In the text edition is ملک کالو عضد الملك instead of عضد الملك.

2 According to Firistah, they induced the two men by giving them some money با جزوي مال. They also told them that the badshah was merciful, and would pardon them; and besides, he would not pass a sentence of death, without consulting them. The poor men, tempted by the money, and also actuated by good feeling towards their master, said as they had been taught. The Mirat-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 179) has a similar account, but it says that the men sent in pursuit of Bahah-ul-mulk actually found him, but apparently let him go.
of the servants of Bahá‘-ul-mulk, to say that they were the murderers of Ádam Siláhdár; and returning from the way, they reported to the Sultán, that they had seized and brought the murderers of Ádam Siláhdár, and they were confessing their guilt: and 1 Bahá‘-ul-mulk had fled into the country of Ídar. Sultán Maḥmúd ordered that those two innocent men should be executed. After some days when the veil was raised from the face of the matter, and it was known for certain, that those two poor men were not the murderers of the Siláhdár; and ‘Imád-ul-mulk had by fraud and deceit induced them to confess, the Sultán ordered that ‘Imád-ul-mulk and ‘Aṭd-ul-mulk should also be executed; and all the property and villages left behind by them should be escheated to the khálga (the Sultán’s treasury). Malik Iḵtíyár-ul-mulk was made ‘Imád-ul-mulk; and the appointment of nā‘ib ghāibat (regent in the Sultán’s absence) was conferred on him; and all the soldiers of ‘Imád-ul-mulk were made over to him.

2 The Sultán marched out in the year 871 A.H. (1467 A.D.) to conquer the fort of Karnál which is now known as Júnágarh. They

Bayley says in a note that every copy of the Mirát-i-Sikandārī says that the men sent in pursuit of Bahá‘-ul-mulk actually found him; but he also quotes the Tabaḵt-i-Akbārī to say that they returned after going a part of the way towards Ídar. According to the Mirát-i-Sikandārī, the two men were induced to confess, as they were told that the Sultán would sentence them to short terms of imprisonments, and they would be soon released at the intercession of those who asked them to confess. Rās Mālā and the Cambridge History of India do not mention the incident. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 51) refers to the incident “As an instance of the impartial justice of Mahmood Shah”. It was impartial, as even great orde were not spared; but it is also an instance of a great miscarriage of justice. In the text-edition the reading adopted is

1 This sentence, which occurs in both MSS. and in the litth. ed., appears to be redundant, unless it is taken as part of the false report.

2 Firishtah says that in 871 A.H. the Sultán saw the Prophet Muhammad in a dream, and that the latter bestowed on him two dishes of delicious viands. This was interpreted to mean that he would have two great gifts, viz., the conquest of the country of Diu, and the forthcoming conquest of Karnál. There is no mention of it in the Tabaḵt and I cannot find any mention in the Mirát-i-Sikandārī also. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 353) has a slightly different version, and refers only to an invitation “to the conquest of infidels, by spreading before him, in a vision, a magnificent banquet of the most delicious viands.”
say, that for nearly two thousand years, this country had been in the possession of the ancestors of Rāy 1 Mandalik. After Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh and Sultan Ahmad Shāh Gujratī, the hand of the possession of no one else had reached this country. Sultan Mahmūd Shāh advanced towards it, placing his trust in divine help and support, and in the course of the march he ravaged the country of Sūrath. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the hill of Karnāl, the inhabitants of the district placed their property and their families in distant places, and in hills filled with trees, and themselves took shelter in a strong place. Tughlaq Khān, who was descended from the Sultan of Sind, and was the maternal uncle of the Sultan, informed the latter of this. On the following day the Sultan proceeded in that direction, as if hunting along the way. 2 In spite of the

---

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 53) says in a note that the Manduliks, as he writes the name, are "like dessaiés, natgours, redwyars, zemindars and poligars so called in other parts of India". Mandalika is from Mandalula, a circle or a part of a country, and means the lord of the Mandalula. In the same note Col. Briggs on the authority of the Moontukhib-ool-Towareekh says that the name of this Mandalik was Humur Bay. I cannot find his name anywhere else but the Cambridge History of India, page 305, calls him Mandalak Chūdāsama, but does not quote any authority; and "Mandalak is certainly incorrect. It appears from a note in Bayley, page 183, that according to the Tārikh-i-Sūrath, Mandalik was also used as a proper name by the Raos of Girnār (Karnāl).

2 The meaning is not very clear, but it appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 184), that the Karnāl people, or the infidels of the country round, "gathered together their women and children and provisions, and went into the defile of Mahābalah, which is an exceedingly strong position" (mahābalah means very strong). The Sultan "resolved to carry the place". Prince Tughlaq (the Tughlaq Khān of the text) told the Sultan that it would be very difficult to seize the place. But the Sultan replied, "Please God, I will conquer it." "One day the Sultan mounted his horse to go hunting, and went in the direction of the Mahābala defile. When the Hindūs saw the small party, they took no heed to it. Suddenly the Sultan attacked them, and the infidels after a little fighting, fled into the jungle" (p. 185). Firistahā gives a somewhat different account. According to him, the Sultan, guided by Shāhzāda Tughlaq Khān, went with a selected body of warriors to the darrā or defile of Mahābala, without the Hindūs knowing anything. The Rājpūts, who were left to guard the place, and who were called Bariōs, on becoming aware of the Sultan's approach fought bravely, but being unprepared and unarmed were all killed. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 356) gives another version, according to which, the Sultan sent
difficulties of the paths and the entrances (probably passes), he succeeded in reaching that place; and after much effort and endeavour, the Rājpūts fled, and threw themselves into the fort of Karnāl, by way of the hills and jungles. Many prisoners and much property fell into the hands of the army. From that place the Sultān went towards the temple of the people. A body of Rājpūts who are called Pradhāns (Pradhāns or chiefmen), determining to die, placed their hands on their swords and lances inside the temple; and in the twinkling of an eye became food for the sword. The next day (the Sultān) started from that place, and encamped at the foot of the fort of Karnāl; and sent detachments to plunder and ravage the surrounding country. The Rāy Mandalik, in great humility and helplessness, asked for pardon of his offences; and sent a large tribute. Sultān Mahmūd, on account of the exigencies of the times, deferred the conquest of the fort to the next year, and treating the Mandalik with gentleness went back to Aḥmadābād.

In the year 872 A.H. (1468 A.D.), it was reported to the Sultān that the Rāy Mandalik on account of his haughtiness and pride had an umbrella held over his head; and placing valuable ornaments, on his arms and neck sat in public. Immediately on hearing this news (the Sultān) appointed forty thousand horsemen with famous elephants to punish him. At the time of bidding adieu to them,

---

4. A detachment under Toghzuk Khān "to occupy two outworks called Mohabilla. The Rajpoots who were entrusted with the post were surprised and cut off". The Cambridge History of India makes no reference to the matter.

1. According to Firishtah they comprised the women and children of the men who had been left to defend the Mahābala defile.

2. Firishtah says that the Sultān agreed to receive tribute and to defer the conquest for another year, because immense quantities of valuable jewellery and other booty had fallen into the hands of the soldiers; and the weather having become very hot, it was impossible to continue longer in that hilly country.

3. The MSS. have كردن and دمست (unintelligible) كردن in one, and دمست و فيحد in the other. The lith. ed. has simply دمست و فيحد. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has دمست و فيحد, leaving out the middle word. Firishtah says plainly, that the Sultān was simply waiting for a pretext, and this report enabled him to undertake another expedition.
he told the amirs and the heads of clans, that if the Mandalik came forward in the way of submission and fealty, and delivered up the umbrella and the valuable jewels, which on the days of idol worship he puts on his person, and pays the tribute which had already been fixed, they should not interfere in any way with his country. When the army of Gujřát arrived near the country of the Mandalik, the commandant sent a body of men to him, and communicated to him (through them), what the Sultān had said. The Rāy Mandalik came forward to meet the emissaries with all respect; and sent to the amirs, the umbrella and the jewels and valuable ornaments which on the days of worshipping the idols and on other auspicious days, he used to put on his person, together with a large tribute; and having tried to win their heart turned them back. When the amirs (after their return) waited on the Sultān, and placed before him all the things which they had brought, the latter in his festive assembly and convivial meetings, gave the things away to story-tellers and readers.

2 In the year 873 A.H., 1469 A.D., the news of the death of Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji, the ruler of Mālwa, came. The amirs represented

1 Firishtah quoting Niẓām-ud-dīn, says the same thing in identical words; but because such prodigality appeared to him, as it certainly appears to me, to be somewhat incredible, ends with the pious ejaculation, الله أعلم بالضواب i.e., God alone knows the truth. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55) says in his translation, the Sultān distributed the money produced by this expedition, in one night, among a set of female dancers. He may be right, but گویندکان و خواندگان means storytellers and readers, and not female dancers. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 186) modifies the story a little, and says the Sultān distributed the garments among his musicians. Bayley in a note finds some kind of fault with Firishtah, and says the latter places this expedition in 872 A.H. It appears to me that Firishtah does nothing of the kind; he places this expedition before the occurrences of 873 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55) however places this expedition in 874 A.H., which might have led to Bayley’s mistake.

2 This matter about the death of Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India, p. 305, mentions it, giving the 31st May, 1469, as the date of Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji’s death. It also refers to the discussion about the invasion of the country, and Sultān Maḥmūd’s refusal to undertake it; and then says that the Sultān “committed an act as wanton, by leading into Sorath a large army against the Mandalak of Gīnār.”
to Sultan Mahmud that at the time, when Sultan Muhammad, the
son of Ahmad Shiah had accepted the summons of the just God, Sultan
Mahmud Khalji arrived at the town of 1 Kaparbanj, intending to attempt
the conquest of the country of Gujerat. If the Lord of the world (meaning the Sultan) at this time, when the appli-
cances for the conquest of the country are all at hand and ready,
advances towards Malwa, that country would come into his possession
with very little effort. Sultan Mahmud declared, that it was not
right in Islam and Musalmání, that Musalmans should fall out
amongst themselves, and that people should be trampled down in
the calamities which would occur. Besides, at this time, when the
Sultan has died, and the affairs of the state have not been arranged,
it would be removed from the rules of humanity and the customs of
generosity to invade his country. He then left Ahmadabad with
the object of hunting, and having spent some days in the jungle, again
took up his abode in Ahmadabad.

In the year 874 A.H., he again sent armies to plunder and ransack
the country of Sorath; and within a short time, they returned after
devastating the country, and bringing an enormous quantity of
plunder. Among the great incidents of the year, one was this that
Sultan Mahmud, mounted on an elephant, went towards 2 Bagh-I-Iram.
On the way 3 another mast elephant, having broken his chain turned
on the Sultan’s 4 retinue. The other elephants seeing it, turned their
faces in flight, and it advanced on the elephant which the Sultan
was riding. The latter after bearing two or three onsets, also fled;
and when it was running away, the other elephants rushing forward,
struck it (apparently with their tusks) on the shoulder; and the Sultan’s
leg was injured by its tusks and blood began to flow from it. At this

1 Keryanj in the text-edition.
2 Apparently some beautiful park or garden, called the garden of Paradise.
Firishtah’s account agrees with that in the text, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55)
gives a somewhat different account. He says that the Sultan was on a hunting
excursion, and when he was attacked by the mast elephant, all his companions
fled, etc.
3 This word shows that the Sultan was also riding a mast elephant; and
Firishtah says so, but neither the MSS. nor the lit. ed. of the Tabaqát say that
the Sultan was on a mast elephant.
4 The word is fuuj, apparently the Sultan’s retinue or followers.
time, the Sultań with great bravery hurled a spear on the elephant’s forehead. The blood was now flowing, but the elephant made another onset, and had another spear hurled at it. The blood now bubbled out of its forehead as from a fountain. The animal now trumpeted and gave another blow to the Sultań’s elephant; but it received another spear with such force, that it had to turn tail and run away. The Sultań went to the palace with safety; and made all deserving persons happy by the distribution of votive offerings and 1 charities.

After a few days he summoned the amirs of the marches, and with a well-equipped army advanced to conquer the fort of Jūnāgarh and the hill of Karnāl. He distributed five kroes of gold in the course of a night and day among his soldiers; and included amongst these were two thousand and five Turki and ‘Iraqi and ‘Arab horses, the prices of some of which amounted to as much as twelve thousand tankas each, which were bestowed on the men. He also distributed five thousand jewelled swords and seven hundred jewelled belts and one thousand and five daggers with gold and embossed scabbards. When he arrived in the country of Sūrath by successive rapid marches, he sent detachments in every direction to plunder and devastation (the country). Rāy Mandalik in a state of extreme humility and helplessness waited on him; and represented that this slave (he himself) had lived a whole life-time within the bounds of allegiance and fealty; and no act which might have the least suspicion of any breach of engagement or promise had been committed by him. He was also at the present moment prepared to pay any tribute which His Majesty might order. The Sultań said, “All my energies are at present directed to raise the standards of Islām in this country, after bringing it into my possession, so that the institutions of Islām might be established here. I have no other object in view, except the introduction of Islām and the capture of the fort.”

2 When Rāy Mandalik understood from the purport of these words, that this army with other armies was ready to conquer the

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have خیرات, charity, but the other MS. has شکار, thanks offering.

2 The meaning of the sentence, این لسکریا لسکریایی دیکر نمی نماید is not clear. The sentence is the same in both MSS. and in the lith. ed., except that
country, he waited for an opportunity; and fled at night and retired into the fort of Jūnāgarh. The next day the Sultān moved forward, and encamped close to the citadel of Jūnāgarh. One detachment separated from the army, and advanced on the fort. A body of Rājpūts sallied out, and after fighting fled. The next day also there was some fighting; and on the third day the Sultān himself attacked the fort, and there was severe fighting from morning to evening. On the 4th day the Sultān’s pavilion was raised near the gate, and the fort was closely besieged; and covered passages were laid down from all sides. The Rājpūts at all times sallied out of the fort, and made violent attacks; and many good men were slain. For instance, they fell on a particular day on the battery of ‘Ālām Khān Fārūqī, and made a martyr of him. Sultān Maḥmūd made the siege such a close one, that the stones thrown by the ballistas sometimes fell in front of the Sultān’s throne. Although Rāy Mandalik made proposals of peace and of the payment of tribute, they had no effect whatever as the Sultān had determined on the conquest of the fort.

In the end, Rāy Mandalik, in his extreme humility and distress, prayed for mercy; and after surrendering the fort, took shelter with all his Rājpūts in the hill of Karnāl. Sultān Maḥmūd performed the rite of offering thanks, and occupied himself with settling the affairs of the country. After some days, he laid siege to the hill of Karnāl. In the end, Rāy Mandalik, having no other alternative,

the lith. ed. has by mistake ماند instead of ماند. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has exactly the same words, except that it has instead لشکر بایشکرهاي بار دیگر.

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 305, says, Rāy Mandalak retired to his citadel Uparkot. Uparkot of course means upper citadel; but I have not seen the place, to which Rāy Mandalik retired, called Uparkot in any other history. It is called Jūnāgarh in the other histories.

2 Firishtah calls it the fort of Karnāl, and he adds کردن. This is however not mentioned in any other history, not even in Col. Briggs’s translation. The Mirāt-i-Silahdāri however (Bayley, page 188) says that every day they sallied out and fought; and although Firishtah says that the Sultān became very angry, and himself led an attack on Karnāl, and seized it, his subsequent treatment of Rāo Mandalik does not make it very probable that the latter had committed theft and robbery.
joined the service of the Sultan; and having prayed for the safety of his men, surrendered the hill of Karnal also. 1 After this, as he for several days went every day and waited on the Sultan, and observed his pleasant manners and his praise-worthy morals, he submitted one day, that from the auspicious effect of the society of Shah Shams-ud-din Darvish, the love of Islam and of Musalmans had had a great effect on his mind; and now that he had been attending on the Sultan, and had become cognizant of the truth of the faith of Islam, he wished that he should join the Musalmân community. Sultan Mahmûd with great eagerness taught him the creed of the unity of God, and conferred the title of Khan Jahân on him. And in order that the institutions of Islam should be current in that country, he laid the (first) brick for building the city of Mustafâ-âbad in the ground; and he ordered all the amirs that they should lay the foundations of mansions for their residence there. In a short time, the city of Mustafâ-âbad became a model of Ahmadabad.

When the amirs and the soldiers took up their residence in Mustafâ-âbad, everywhere where there were thieves and disturbers of the peace round about Ahmadabad, they raised their heads and began to commit thefts and highway robberies; and the roads, by which people went about from place to place, became closed. When this news reached Sultan Mahmûd, he conferred the title of Mu'âazz Khan on Malik Jamal-ud-din, son of Shaikh Malik, who was 2 the kâtûwâl of the camp (provost-marshall), and who was entrusted with

---

1 The Mirât-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 190) gives another version of the story of the conversion of Râo Mandalik. According to this, he went in attendance on the Sultan to Ahmadabad. One day he went to Rasûlabâd, where his Holiness Shah 'Alâm lived, and is buried. He saw many horses and elephants and men assembled there, and inquired what amir lived there. He was told that His Holiness Shah 'Alâm resided there. He went and saw him, and was converted by him. It may be mentioned here as an extremely curious fact that according to Râs Mâlâ, Row Munduleek, who was throughout his life so unremittingly persecuted by the Musalmâns, was as Khan Jehân worshipped under the guise of a Muslim saint, by the descendants of the men who had persecuted him, at his tomb in Ahmadabad, up to the time, when Râs Mâlâ was published in 1856, and may be worshipped up to the present day. (See Râs Mâlâ, vol. I, page 337.)

2 The word کوتوال appears to me to be incorrect, although it is found in the MSS., and also in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I would either insert the word کوتولی before عهد کوتوال, or change کوتوالی.
the supervision of the silāh khāna (stores of arms and ammunition), and gave him a standard and a 1 trumpet; and sent him to Aḥmadābād after investing him with the post of shaḥna and kotwīl (Superintendent of manners and morals and of police) of that place.

Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn, Muḥāfīz Khān put the city of Aḥmadābād into such order as the heart could wish for, within a short time; and had five hundred thieves hanged. As this work of his met with the approbation of the Sultān, he had other appointments conferred on him; and the office of the isfāju-.i-mumālik was added to his other offices; and 2 gradually his affairs reached to such a position, that one thousand and seven hundred horses were collected in his stables;

1 The word is ʿulā in both MSS., and ʿonqūtas in the lith. ed. Firishtah has گرنش instead.

2 The whole of the passage about the appointment of Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn, and the increase of his power down to the end of the paragraph is copied almost verbatim by Firishtah; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 57) in his translation makes certain changes. Instead of the 1,700 horses in his stable he mentions 1,700 "bargeekhass", or persons equipped by him, and riding his own stable horses. He also says that his powers were so little under control, that his son, "in the absence of the king, marched without orders, and obliged the Rays of Idur, Wagur and Serohy, to pay him tribute". This might have been correct; but neither Nīzām-ud-dīn nor Firishtah explicitly says so. According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 192), "His son exacted tribute from the rebellious chiefs who had never paid it before". It appears also from a note on the same page that there is probably some MS. of Firishtah, which contains statements identical with those made by Col. Briggs. Bayley however quotes from Col. Briggs, and attributes the statement of Firishtah (see the note *, page 194). The Cambridge History of India (page 306) says something quite different. According to it, while Mahmūd "was besieging Gīrār, Jai Singh, the son of Gangādās of Champānīr had been committing systematic brigandage and highway robbery in the country between his stronghold and Aḥmadābād. He therefore sent Jamāl-ud-dīn Muhammad, conferring on him the title of Muhāfīz Khān to govern this tract, and he put down thieving and highway robbery with such a firm hand, that the inhabitants, we are told slept with open doors". This is not quite correct, Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn, or Muḥāfīz Khān was appointed kāsīrīl and shaḥna of the city of Aḥmadābād, and not governor of the country between that city and Champānīr. There is nothing said in any of the histories of any connection between Jai Singh and the thieves and robbers, except that he allowed the rebels of Barāda and Dabhoī to pass through his territory; and Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn is not said to have had anything to do with him except that he waited on the Sultān, when the latter was marching against Jai Singh, and was appointed the vazīr.
and wherever there was a good soldier, he was included among his retainers. His power and splendour reached such a height, that his son Malik Ḵẖiḍr extorted tribute from the Rājas of Bākar and Īdar and Sirohi.

In the beginning of 876 a.h., 1471 a.d., it was reported to the Sultan that Jai Singh, the son of Gangḍās Rāja of Chāmpānīr, having become proud by the help and patronage of Sultan Ghīyāṭh-ud-din of Mālwa, had allowed the rebels of Barōda and Dabōhī, a passage through his territory, and had the disposition of raising a rebellion. The Sultan marched from Muṣṭafā-ābād, and advanced to punish him. On the way, Muḥāfīz Ḵẖān had the honour of waiting upon him; and the appointment of vazīr was added to that of kōṭwāl. He left his deputies to perform the duties of the kōṭwāl, and occupied himself with the affairs of the vazārat.

When the Sultan heard of the disturbances created by the zamīn-dārs of Kach (Cutch); and their persecution of the Musalmāns was reported to him, the Sultan gave up the determination to conquer Chāmpānīr, and marched against that country with a large army. When he arrived 1 on the edge of the saline country, which is known as the Ran, he made a very rapid march and in the course of one day traversed a distance of 2 sixty karōhs. Out of his total army, not more than 3 six hundred horsemen were with him at the end of the

---

1 Firishtah has بجائی رسید که موسوم ست بشور which Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 80) has translated as “came suddenly upon the enemy’s encampment at Sheevur”. It appears from Firishtah that this part of Cutch was contiguous to Sind, and was inhabited by people whom he calls ماجینلین. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 306, the place is what is now known as the Thār and Parkār district.

2 There is some doubt as to the possibility of a march of this length, in the course of one day, as in the text, or a day and a night as in Firishtah, though Bayley, quoting Col. Briggs, makes it “without a halt ”, in a note on page 193; and comes to the conclusion, that it is impossible to cover the distance in one day, but it is possible though hardly likely to do so in one day and night. I should note here also that both MSS. have sixty karōhs as the length of the march, but the lith. ed. has sixty-one karōhs; and it appears from the note in Bayley that the MS. which he had had sixty-one karōhs.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. has six hundred horsemen, but the other MS. has three hundred. Firishtah lith. ed. has six hundred, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV,
march. When he reached the other side of that dangerous country, the enemy could be seen before them. They say that there were twenty-four thousand archers. The Sultân, in spite of the fact that he had such a small number of men, and the enemy were in such large numbers, dismounted and armed himself. When the enemy saw the boldness and gallantry of the Sultân, they 1 came forward with sincerity; and made excuses for their offences. The Sultân drew the pen of forgiveness across their offences, and made peace with them, after taking a large subsidy. He also took some of their chiefs with him to Muşťâfa-ābâd, and taught them the tenets of Islâm and Musâlmanî; and making everyone of them happy with largesses and favours gave them permission to go back. He granted a suitable jâgîr to each one of them, and retained those in his service who of their own free will chose to remain with him.

In the year 877 A.H. (1472 A.D.), it was reported to the Sultân, that forty thousand turbulent and refractory archers had collected together in the neighbourhood of the country of Sind, and 2 were harassing (the inhabitants of) the towns and villages on the border. He equipped an army and again turned in that direction. When he

---

1 Firishtâh's account of what happened, when the Sultân with his six hundred horsemen met the archers, agrees generally with that in the text, but he says that the hostile men became confused and frightened and the chiefs came forward with swords and shrouds hanging from their necks. Col. Briggs has a somewhat different account. He says they were defeated, and numbers of them were slain, after which the remainder came forward with their weapons slung round their necks to implore for mercy. The accounts in the Mirât-i-Sikandarî (Bayley, p. 194) and the Cambridge History of India (p. 306) agree generally with that in the text; but Bayley quotes in a note Col. Briggs's account and attributes it to Firishtâh.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 306, has forty thousand "rebels had risen against Jâm Nizâm-ud-dîn, the ruler of Sind!", but neither the Ta'baqât nor Firishtâh nor the Mirât-i-Sikandarî mentions Jâm Nizâm-ud-dîn. On the contrary they say that 40,000 men were harassing the residents of the parts of Gujût adjacent to their country.
arrived in the salt country, he ordered that 1 each horseman should take two horses with him, and take with him water and food for seven days. Then relying on divine help, he entered into that dangerous country, and traversed a distance of sixty karobs each day. When he arrived in the country of Sind, 2 the rebels became scattered and dispersed and there was no sign or vestige left of them. The country of Sind now came into his possession without any hindrance. Some of the amirs submitted, that they had traversed all that distance with very great trouble and it was right that a ruler (hākim) and a superintendent (dārogah) should be left in the country. The Sultān replied: as the Makhduma-i-Jahān was descended from the Sultāns of Sind in the line of chieftainship and royalty, the consideration of the rights of relationship was incumbent on him; and it appeared very far from kindliness and humanity to seize their territory. He hunted as far as the bank of the Indus, and returned to Muṣṭafa-ābād.

After a time, the resolution to conquer the port of 3 Jagat, which is a place of worship of the Brahmans, entered the Sultān’s mind. But owing to the narrowness and the difficulty of the road, he deferred carrying it out. It happened, however, that one day a learned man (fādil) of the name of 4 Maulānā Muḥammad Samarqandi,

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have هرمسوار, each horseman, but the other MS. has هرمسوار, one thousand horsemen. Firishtah also has بک هرمسوار چالاک, one thousand active horsemen.
2 The account of what happened is more circumstantial, and somewhat different in Firishtah, but it does not add very much to our information. According to Firishtah the inhabitants were Balūchis, they concealed themselves, but some of them were dragged out and killed, and their camp was plundered. The Cambridge History of India, page 306, says that before the Sultān returned, he received gifts and a letter of thanks from the Jām, who also sent his daughter, who was married to Qaisar Khān, grandson of Hasan Khān, Iftikhār-ul-Mulk of Khāndesh, who had taken refuge in Gujarāt. For the account given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, see Bayley, page 195.
3 Jagat appears to be identical with Dwārkā. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari the name is associated with Sāṅkhōdhār and in Rās Mālā with Bēyt. The country, according to a note in Bayley, page 195, was called Okāmandal, “and the Rajpūts, as they are to-day, were Pāghars and Wāghars, a poor but brave and hardy race, much given to piracy and robbery.”
4 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 60) describes him as “one of the most learned philosophers of his age”; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 195, describes
some with his two sons with their heads and feet bare and waited on the Sultān; and submitted that they had embarked in a ship to go from the Deccan to Samarqand; and were sailing towards Hormuz (Ormuz); that when they arrived opposite to Jagat, a body of men came out in boats filled with weapons of war, blocked their way, plundered them, and carried away the women and children of the Musalmāns into imprisonment. ¹ Among them he and his sons had also been imprisoned. Sultān Maḥmūd showed kindness to the Mau- lānā, and sent him to Aḥmadābād, and fixed an allowance on him. At the time of bidding him farewell, he told him, “You rest assured, that whatever has been taken from you will be returned to you in its original condition; and those men will receive condign punishment”. Then incited by his sense of shame, and his desire to help (Musalmāns), he sent for the amirs and the chiefs of the different sections to attend on him; and said to them, “If on the day on which inquest will be made of our actions, they ask me, ‘In your neighbourhood the kāfirs committed such oppression, and in spite of your having the power to stop it, you procrastinated’, what reply shall I give?”. The amirs opened their lips for prayer and praise; and ² said, “These slaves have nothing to do except to carry out your orders; and the destruction of these people is incumbent and due on our spirits”.

The Sultān being confirmed in his determination, moved out on the 16th Dhi-ḥijjah of that year towards ³ Jagat; and when with very great hardship on account of the narrowness of the way, and the dense jungle, they arrived at Jagat, the infidels fled to the island

him as “a man skilled in the rules and practice of poetry”. The Cambridge History of India, page 306, calls him a learned poet and merchant. Bayley interprets the sentence, I think incorrectly, by saying that Maułānā Muhammad’s literary name or non de plume was Fāzīlī.

¹ According to Firishta the Maułānā told the Sultān that his wife was still in the custody of the Kāfirs. According to Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 196, “the pirates turned the Mullā (as he is called there) and his two sons adrift, but kept his women, his property and the ship”. As the boys were of tender age, the Mullā had to carry them by turns, and in this way he traversed the distance of seventy kūs, and came to the Sultān.

² According to Firishta the amirs were tired of the annual expeditions undertaken by the Sultān.

³ One MS. inserts بند، port, before Jagat. جک Jakat in the text-edition.
of Beyt. Many snakes appeared there. At the place where the Sultān’s pavilion had been put up, seven hundred snakes were killed in the space of one pahar. Many tigers and lions and wolves caused much loss to the men in the island; and many of the wild animals were also killed. They ravaged the temple of Jagat, and pulled it down. Sultān Maḥmūd had to wait there for four months at this place; and during this time many boats were prepared to carry the soldiers and the artillery; and then they started for the island of Beyt. The men in the island embarked in boats, and advanced to fight; but in the end, they retreated to the island. The brave warriors (of the Sultān’s army) drove the ships, and threw themselves into the island; and having captured the citadel of Beyt, slew a vast number of Rājputs. The Rāja of the place, who had the name of Rāy Bhim, got into a boat, and fled to some place. The Sultān embarked a number of his men in boats, and sent them in pursuit of him. He himself entered the city of Beyt, and released all the Musalmāns who were imprisoned there. He got much plunder and an enormous number of prisoners of war. He left Malik Tūghān, who had the title of Farḥat-ul-mulk, as the thānadar of the place, and crowned with success and victory returned to Muṣṭafa-ābād. On Friday the 13th of

1 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بیت, Byet, but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has شکوندهار. Shakundhār. The two appear to be names of the same island.

2 The MSS., as well as the lith. ed. have شیر و ببر و یلند. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 61) has lions, leopards and wolves. As to the number of snakes killed, Firishtah (lith. ed.) also says that seven hundred were killed in the course of one pahar. Col. Briggs, however, has seventy killed in a day; and says in a note that the number would not appear to be exaggerated to any one who has been in India. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī also says that seven hundred snakes were killed in one night within the royal enclosure. According to the Cambridge History of India (p. 307) the Sultān moved from Jagat to Dwārkā to Arāmura, at the extreme N.W. point of the peninsula, and it was here, that the army was troubled by lions and venomous snakes and insects. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 196) mentions the village of Arāmrah; and Bayley says in a note that the name is variously spelt in the different MSS.

3 According to Firishtah, Rāy Bhim was seized and brought before the Sultān before the latter left for Muṣṭafa-ābād; and he was taken to that place. At Muṣṭafa-ābād the Sultān ordered that a letter be written to the Maulānā; but while the letter was being written he arrived; and his wife and children were
Jamīdī-ul-āwwal of the aforementioned year, the men who had gone in pursuit of Rāy Bhīm brought him under arrest and in fetters, and made him stand in front of the Sultān’s hall of audience. The Sultān sent for Maulānā Muḥammad Samarkandī from Aḥmadābād, and sent the wretched and miserable Bhīm Rāy to Muḥāfīz Khān, so that he might cut him up into four strips, and hang them up at the four sides of the city of Aḥmadābād, so that other turbulent men might be terrified by the sight.

1 In the month of Rajab of that year (874 A.H.), the Sultān left a number of his officers at Muṣṭafā-ābād, and started towards the fort of Chāmpānīr. On the way he received the news that a body

made over to him. Rāy Bhīm was also made over to him, to do what he liked with him; and the Maulānā asked the Sultān, that he should be made over to Muḥāfīz Khān, and should be taken round the city and killed with torture. Col. Briggs’s account is slightly different. The Cambridge History of India does not say that the Maulānā’s wife and children were returned to him; but he was asked to identify his property out of the immense quantity of plunder and he was given all that he identified, besides some big presents. Raja Bhīm was also made over to him but he returned the raja, and he was sent to Aḥmadābād, and impaled (p. 307).

1 The account of this incident as given in Firishtah (lith. ed.) does not differ materially from the text. The date is 666 in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, which is defective as in the words, the word for the tens is omitted. In figures the year is 887, and in Col. Briggs’s translation the year is 887 A.H. and 1482 A.D. In the Cambridge History of India, page 307, the attack on the Malabar pirates is said to have taken place between October 1473 and January 1474, i.e., about 8 years before the date given by Col. Briggs. The correct year would be 877 A.H., as given in the lith. ed. of the Taṣbaqāt. There are some details in Firishtah not mentioned by Nīzām-ud-dīn such as the fact that the Sultān’s men were armed with नोब तलानत ताब ताब काल. Col. Briggs’s account (vol. IV, p. 65) differs a great deal. He calls the Mālabārians Bulsar pirates, and he says that they had gained such an ascendancy at sea, as to threaten the invasion of his dominions; and had already intercepted the trade. The Mirāt-i-Sikandar’s (Bayley, p. 199) account is different, as it does not appear from it that the Sultān himself embarked on board his ships, and a battle was fought with the pirates; but Bayley in a note quotes the Tabakāt about the Sultān having commanded the fleet and fought a battle. He also says that according to Firishtah the pirates were of Bulsar. The Cambridge History of India, page 307, says that the Malabar pirates made a descent on his coasts.
of 1 Malābārīs had collected a large number of boats and were harassing people travelling by sea. Immediately on hearing this news, (the Sultān) arranged some ships, and himself, with a body of brave warriors, embarked in them; and relying on divine help and victory lifted the anchors. When they arrived near the ships of the Malābārīs, the latter fled, and some of their boats fell into his hands. He then sailed to the port of Kanbāyat, and disembarked there. He returned to the capital city of Aḥmadābād in the month of Sha'bān. 2 At the end of Ramaḍān, he raided a part of the country of Chāmpānīr, and again returned to Aḥmadābād.

3 In the year 875 A.H. the Sultān sent Malik Bahā'-ud-dīn Imād-ul-mulk to the thāna in the town of 4 Sonkhīr, and Qawām-ul-mulk to that in the town Kordhrā, Farḥat-i-mulk to the thāna at fort Beyt, and Jagat, and Malik Nizām-ul-mulk to the thāna at 5 Kīz; and

1 بمحترم traders in the text-edition.

2 This sentence is to be found in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but is omitted from the other MS. The Sultān is said to have returned to Ahmadābād according to both the MSS. and the lith. ed., but it is more likely that he went to Muṣṭafā-ābād.

3 Nizām-ud-dīn does not give the reasons of these appointments. It appears from Firishtah that the people (amīrs) were tired of the continual expeditions of the Sultān; and with the order to change their residence from Aḥmadābād to Muṣṭafā-ābād; and were in a mood to rebel. So the Sultān made these appointments so that the amīrs might keep their thānas in order, and he himself might have the leisure to organise the administration of the newly acquired territory of Karnāl or Sūrath. Col. Briggs says briefly that the Shah conceived his dominions to be too extensive for his own immediate management. The Cambridge History of India also refers to the tireless energy and ceaseless activity of the Sultān which had become wearisome to his soldiers and officers. I may point out here that the Cambridge History of India, page 307, suddenly jumps, in the course of about half a dozen lines, from January 1474 to December 1480.

4 سوثکیر in the text-edition.

5 This name is كیبر in one MS., is illegible in the other, and كنیر Kanīr in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is میر Maiz. According to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 62), Nizam-ool-Moolk was sent to Tama. The Cambridge History of India does not give the names of the governors and of their stations. تهابنیس in the text-edition.
appointed 1 Khudâwand Khân to be the vazîr of the kingdom, and left him in attendance on Shâhzâda Ahmâd Khân at Ahmâdâbâd. He occupied himself with the administration of Jûnâgarh and the surrounding country.

One day Khudâwand Khân, owing to his sincere attachment and intimacy with the Rây 2 Râyân, told him in private "I am much aggrieved at the many activities of Sulţân Maîmûd. Not a single year or a month passes, that he does not take up an enterprise and does not march the army about. If with your own men, and taking five hundred of my soldiers with you, you go to the house of 'Imâd-ul-mulk and get him out of the way, we can to-morrow raise Shâhzâda

1 Firishtah says Khudâwand Khân, who was the vazîr, was made the adâlug or guardian of Shâhzâda Muîzaffar Khân, and was left at Ahmâdâbâd. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 62) calls him Khoodabunda Khan "preceptor of the Prince Moozaffur Khan". The Mirât-i-Sikandari agrees with the Tabâqât; and Bayley in a note says that the Tabakât and the Mirât-i-Sikandari are correct as to the name of the prince; but he says that Firishtah says that Khudâbandâh Khân was made governor of Ahmadâbâd, which is certainly not correct. But Bayley always means Col. Briggs when he says Firishtah. According to the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Khudâwand Khân was induced by some designing men to acquiesce in the conspiracy (Bayley, p. 201).

2 His name does not appear, but as his title implies, and as the Cambridge History of India (p. 308) says, he was the chief Hindu noble.

3 Firishtah does not give the conversation between Khudâwand Khân and the Rây Râyân, but goes on at once to say that they sent for 'Imâd-ul-mulk and other nobles to Ahmadâbâd, and after swearing 'Imâd-ul-mulk on the Qurân made them join the conspiracy. 'Imâd-ul-mulk joined it, as he did not have his soldiers with him. The Mirât-i-Sikandari's account is very brief; and Bayley considered the account in the Tabakât had such details, and the matter was of such importance, as explaining the reasons why Prince Ahmad was passed over, that he has incorporated a translation of it in his book. I find, however, that his translation is not quite correct, if he made it from a text which was identical with mine; for instance he says that Khudâwand Khân told Rây Râyân, if I were to take my own followers and five hundred soldiers to 'Imâd-ul-mulk's house, I could easily get him out of the way.

The account of the conspiracy as given in the Cambridge History of India, page 308, agrees with that in the text, except that it says that the Rây Râyân refused to be a party to 'Imâd-ul-mulk's death. I do not know whether he would have actually refused; but all that the text says is that he believed that he would be able to gain him over, and that the conspirators would be all the stronger by his joining them.
Ahmad Khan to the satranat. For killing ‘Imad-ul-mulk, we will not have a better time (than this), when all his retainers have gone to his thana. I have submitted this matter to Shahzada Ahmad Khan; and he agrees with me, and is willing to join us’. The Ray Rayan said, ‘‘ ‘Imad-ul-mulk is sincerely attached to me, and tells me all his private matters. As he is also aggrieved with the Sultan, and has complaints against him, it is extremely likely that he would join with us in this matter, and by his union with us, our plans will acquire a new strength. Although Khudawand Khan forbade the Ray Rayan to communicate with ‘Imad-ul-mulk, it was of no avail. The Ray Rayan, relying on the friendship and affection of ‘Imad-ul-mulk, at first swore him in private on the Qur’an, that he would not disclose this secret, and later brought the matter into discussion. As ‘Imad-ul-mulk saw that his men had gone to his jagir, on the spur of the moment he signified his consent, and said, ‘In this matter I am at one with Khudawand Khan; but it appears to me that as Ramaidan is drawing to a close, we should attempt to carry out our intention after it is over’’. The Ray Rayan was pleased (with this suggestion); and communicated the message to Khudawand Khan.

After the Ray Rayan had gone away, ‘Imad-ul-mulk sent for Malik Miyain to come to him in private; and said to him, ‘In Sultan Qutb-ud-din’s time, I used to desire that I might have a second horse, and I could not have it; and now owing to the greatness of Sultan Mahmud, there is not a greater man than myself in his service’. He immediately wrote a letter to Malik Farhat-ul-mulk, who had encamped in the town of Sarkhej, and asked him to come and meet him. He also sent a letter to Malik Qayam-ul-mulk at Rakhiail, that he should not march from that place for some days. Early the next morning, Malik Farhat-ul-mulk arrived at ‘Imad-ul-mulk’s house with five hundred horsemen. They had an interview for a little while; and then Malik Farhat-ul-mulk was sent to his own house. After a time ‘Imad-ul-mulk sent for Mujaffir Khan the kotwal of the city, and said to him, ‘As there is relationship between us it is right

1 in the text-edition.
2 Contrary to this, Firishtah says he sent for his own troops.
3 The name of the place is printed as Rakhiail by Bayley also, but he has (?) after it (p. 203).
that we should endeavour to do good to each other. Your loyalty consists in your being present to attend to the affairs of the city, lest a disturbance should be created. On the day of the 'Id, you should be ready with your followers and retainers, and attend on Prince Ahmad Khan at the maslāh; and till midday you should make every endeavour to guard the city”.

Khudawand Khan on hearing the words (the news?) became anxious in his mind. He sent for Ray Rayān to his presence, and said (to him), “Did I not tell you, that 'Imād-ul-mulk would not agree with us in this matter. Now things have come to such a pass, that all our houses (families) would be ruined”. When the 'Id passed off, and 'Imād-ul-mulk's retainers all arrived, Khudawand Khan did not for fear (or consequences) disclose (his intentions); and his resolution remained in this way unaccomplished. It so happened, however, that after some days, a popular rumour reached Muṣṭafā-ābād that Khudawand Khan had killed 'Imād-ul-mulk on the day of the 'Id, and all the amirs had joined with him, and they had placed Shāhzhāda Ahmad Khan on the throne. One of the (amirs), who were with the Sultan, went with some audacity, and without any hesitation repeated the rumour to him.

---

1 The translation in Bayley, page 203, is “we must rival each other in loyalty”. This does not appear to me to be correct.

2 "Khāber Khwahī" does not mean loyalty (to the Sultan); but in the next sentence apparently means loyalty to him.

3 The sentence بکی از مقریان گفت این خبر این خبر بسلطان محمد رفت is somewhat cryptic; but the corresponding sentence in Firishtah which is و قیصر خان که از امرلی مقرب سلطان بود و در مصطفی آباد خبر ارائه دهند makes the meaning clear.

4 According to Firishtah the rumour reached Muṣṭafā-ābād; and Qaisar Khan secretly communicated it to the Sultan, and the latter determined on making a secret investigation. The Cambridge History of India, page 308, says “Qaisar Khan Fāríqu, who was at Ahmadābād, privately informed the king of the affair, so that it came to naught”. It does not appear, however, that Qaisar Khan was at Ahmadābād, or that he knew the real facts; and the Sultan did not know them till some time afterwards, when he got 'Imād-ul-mulk to divulge them.
Immediately on hearing this news, the Sultan sent for Qaisar Khan and Firuz Khan to his private chamber and said, "The news of the illness of the Shahzada had come before this, and today my mind is very sad as to what has happened to him. Go out a distance of two karohs, and come back with correct and detailed news from anyone (when you may meet), who should be coming from Ahmadaabād. When Malik Sa'id-ul-mulk had gone a part of the way, he saw one of his own relations, who was coming from Ahmadaabād. He asked him how things were there. He said I was in Ahmadaabād on the day of the 3 'Id-i-Fitr. The Shahzada came to make his namaz, and Khudawand Khan and Muhafiz Khan were in attendance at the darbar. When the Shahzada went back to the palace, Muhafiz Khan was present at the darbar, till two pahars of the day had passed. But the men of the city say that 'Imad-ul-mulk does not give his permission that the amirs should go to their thanas; and they are all at their houses. Malik Sa'id-ul-mulk came back, and reported all that he heard. The Sultan said, "A man had told me a falsehood, to the effect that the Shahzada had been ill". After two or three days he sent for Qaisar Khan and Firuz Khan into his private chamber, and having told them the whole 4 story, said, "I will tell people that I intend to go on a pilgrimage to the Hijaz. Whoever approves of this determination of mine, I shall know that he does not want me". After some days he gave orders that ships should be made ready, and he gave some lakhs of tankas to the superintendent of the ship, so that he might buy things that would be required in Mecca for devotional offerings. He then went from Muṣṭafa-ābād to the port.

---

1 The account in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 205) agrees with the text; but Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India, page 308, without giving any of the intermediate incidents, at once go on to say that the Sultan wanted to go out that he was going on a pilgrimage to Mecca.

2 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 204, the Sultan told Kaisar Khan and Firoz Khan to send Malik Sa'd-ul-Mulk to find out the true facts. The name is Sa'd-ul-mulk in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat in one place, and Sa'Id-ul-mulk in another, but it is Sa'id-ul-mulk in both MSS.

3 The 'Id of the opening or breaking of the fast of Ramadān, which takes place on the 1st Shawwal.

4 It is not clear how he got hold of it, or how much he knew.
of Ḡhogha, embarked in the boats; and disembarked at the port of Kanbāyat.

When this news reached Ḥmadābād, all the amīrs hastened to wait on the Sultān. The latter said that the Shāhzāda had come to a good age (buzurg shudah); and the amīrs have been trained as the heart might desire. "My mind is composed about the welfare of the kingdom, and it has occurred to me that I should now obtain the happiness of the Ḥajj". Imād-ul-mulk said, "Your Majesty should go once to Ḥmadābād, and then do whatever may appear to be proper". The Sultān knew that the cup is only half filled; and proceeded towards Ḥmadābād. When he arrived in the city, he sent one day for all the amīrs, and said, "Please give me permission that I might come back after performing the Ḥajj; as long as you do not give a reply, I shall not have any desire for food". The amīrs knew that the Sultān was testing them. All of them placed the seal of silence on their mouths. When the great luminary reached the meridian, Imād-ul-mulk said to the amīrs, "The Sultān is hungry, some reply should be given to him". Niẓām-ul-mulk went and waited

---

1 The name is in the text-edition.
2 Firishtah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī agree; but the Cambridge History of India, page 308, says that the nobles were summoned from Ḥmadābād to Cambay to consider this proposal, i.e., the proposal of the Sultān that he should go on a pilgrimage.
3 The sentence in both MSS., and the lith. ed. is . Firishtah has a slightly different sentence .
4 This is a curious and very early instance of a hunger strike.
5 Both the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī and the Cambridge History of India make Niẓām-ul-Mulk the spokesman of the amīrs, and attribute the speech to him; but Firishtah assigns it to Imād-ul-mulk. Niẓām-ul-mulk is called in the Cambridge History of India (p. 308) Niẓām-ul-Mulk Aisam; and is described as the oldest courtier. It would appear, however, that Firishtah is right, and the others are wrong. The fact that Imād-ul-mulk suggested to Niẓām-ul-mulk later, that as he was the oldest, he should go to the Sultān confirms it. This also appears from Firishtah. If Niẓām-ul-mulk had first gone to the Sultān there would be no necessity to ask him to go a second time on the ground that he was the oldest of the amīrs. Besides it is not likely that the Sultān would have said to Niẓām-ul-mulk, that the government of the country could not go on in his absence. He could have only said this to Imād-ul-mulk. As to the name of Niẓām-ul-mulk I have not seen it with the suffix Aisam anywhere else; but in
on the Sultan and submitted, "As the Shahzada has reached the stage of perfection, and the son of this slave, Malik Badeh, has acquired much experience, and knows how to endure the heat and cold of the times, this slave hopes that the thana of this slave should be made over to the slave's son; and that Your Majesty would not leave this slave behind him, when he goes on the auspicious pilgrimage". The Sultan said, "It is a great good fortune, if it can be secured; but the government of the country cannot go on without you, go and bring a plain answer from the amirs". Nizam-ul-mulk went back to the amirs and repeated what had happened; but no one attempted to give a reply. When Imam-ul-mulk saw that no one would give an answer, and the Sultan was starving, he said to Nizam-ul-mulk, "As you are the most senior in age among all of us friends, it would be better if you would go on behalf of all of us; and would submit, that the Lord of the world should first conquer the fort of Champa, where he might leave his treasures and the inmates of his harem behind in safety; and then he could turn his attention to the acquisition

the lith. ed. of Firishtah, in the passage in which the illness and death of Imam-ul-mulk are mentioned, he is called عين عداد البلاك, 'Alin Imam-ul-mulk. Is the Aisan of the Cambridge History of India a mistake for 'Alin, and has it been given to Nizam-ul-mulk by mistake instead of to Imam-ul-mulk?

The name of the amir's son is given in the MSS. of the Tabqaqat as Malik Badeh. The lith. ed. has Malik, but omits Badeh. It is not given in any other history in this place, but it is given as Buda on page 309 of the Cambridge History of India, and as Malik Badin in Bayley, page 209. The word which I have translated as "experience" is تجارب, merchandise or trade in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. This is so clearly a mistake that I have had no hesitation in inserting the correct word تجارب. Apparently there was the same mistake in the Mirat-i-Sikandari; and it puzzled the translator, who has rendered it "I have acquired wealth by trading, and am well acquainted with the seasons"; and then adds in a note "this sentence is doubtful" (Bayley, p. 205).

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 308, says, "it was now Mahmood's turn to be at a loss". I do not think he was very much at a loss.

2 The reading in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. is بي وجود 4. I think بي وجود 4 is more correct; and Firishtah has بني وجود 4. So I have taken the liberty to correct the text and this is followed in the text-edition.

2 The word 7 go, is not in the MSS., but is in the lith. ed.
of the good fortune of circumambulating (the sacred places)". (The Sultān) said, "If God so wills, it comes to pass". He then sent for his food, and partook of it. But he summoned Qaṣīr Khān into his private chamber, and said, "Imād-ul-mulk does not tell me the truth. I have determined that I shall not speak to him till he discloses the truth".

When a few days passed in this way, one day Imād-ul-mulk said to the Sultān in private, "This slave does not know what offence he has committed". The Sultān replied, "Until you tell the truth I shall not speak to you". He replied, "They made me swear on the Qurān". The Sultān said, "If in the discharge of your loyal duties, your life goes, you should say: let it go". Imād-ul-mulk then having no other alternative reported the whole of the truth. Sultān Majmūd acted with great forbearance; the only penalty which he inflicted on Khudāwand Khān was this, that he gave the name of Khudāwand Khān to one of his pigeons. After a time he went to Nahrwāl; and from that place he sent Imād-ul-mulk to conquer Jālōr and Sājōr; and he sent Qaṣīr Khān with him. Imād-ul-mulk on receiving leave to go, encamped near the tomb of Shaikh Hāji Rajab, may his soul be sanctified! In the night Majhīd Khān, son of Khudāwand Khān, in concert with Sāhib Khān his cousin, came out of his house, and entered the pavilion of Qaṣīr Khān, and murdered.

1 The word كبوتران, pigeons, is printed نورکوان in both MSS., and in the lith. ed.; and Col. Briggs apparently having نورکوان in the MSS., from which he made his translation, has turned the humorous and whimsical punishment of Khudāwand Khān, whom, by the way, he always calls Khoosabunda Khan into a matter of disgrace to the latter, by causing the person employed in the meanest office of his household to be called by his name. Bayley on page 293 says that the Sultān called one of his pigeons Khudāwand Khān; but, as usual, in a note he attributes Col. Briggs's statement to Firishtah.

2 The name is written سانچور in both MSS., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but it is سانچور in the lith. ed. of the Taqāqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 64) has Julwara and Aboogur in place of Jālōr and Sājōr. Bayley (p. 306) has Jālōr and Sājōr; but the Cambridge History of India, page 309, has "Sānchur and Jālōr in Marswār".

3 Firishtah agrees that the murder was committed by a son and a nephew of Khudāwand Khān; but the Cambridge History of India, page 309, says that it was committed by his two sons.
him. Early in the morning, 'Imād-ul-mulk went to wait on the Sultān and disclosed the truth to him. Another man, however, reported (to the Sultān) that Azdar Khān, son of Alf Khān, had committed this heinous act. The Sultān immediately, on hearing this, sent Firūz Khān that he should arrest and bring Azdar Khān. When night came, Mujāhid Khān and Sāhib Khān fled with their family and children. In the morning, when it became known that Azdar Khān was innocent, and Mujāhid Khān and Sāhib Khān had murdered Qaṣar Khān, the Sultān ordered that Khudāwand Khān should be put in chains, and should be made over to Muḥāfīz Khān; and Azdar Khān should be set at liberty. After some days the Sultān returned to Aḥmadābād; and about this time the poor 'Imād-ul-mulk bound up the goods of existence (died). The Sultān took pity on his family, and gave his eldest son, who had the name of 1 Malik Badeh, the title of Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk; and he transferred the duty of the vazārat to Muḥāfīz Khān.

In the 2 year 880 A.H., the people of Gujrāt suffered the privations of a failure of the rains and a famine. It so happened, that 3 Malik

---

1 See note 1, pp. 269, 270. The name is written in the MSS. here as بده and بده is printed in the lith. ed. as بده. I have retained the name previously given to him. According to Firishtah on 'Imād-ul-mulk's death, his son Tābār-ul-mulk obtained his father's place, and became very near (to the Sultān), and having attained to the post of vazīr his affairs reached such a high position, that he became the person to whom the high and low all looked up. Col. Briggs, so far as I can see, omits all reference to this matter. Bayley quotes the Ṭabakāt. The Cambridge History of India, page 309, agrees partially with Ṭabaqāt, and partially with Firishtah. According to it, on the death of 'Imād-ul-Mulk, he "was succeeded by his son Buda 'Imād-ul-Mulk".

2 This is the year in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. According to Firishtah it was 887 A.H., and according to Col. Briggs 887 A.H., 1482 A.D. Bayley gives the same year; while the Cambridge History of India briefly refers to a failure of rains and famine.

3 He is called "Malik Sīdā Khāssiah Khēl Sultānī who was posted at Mor Imli otherwise called Rasūlābād", in the Mīrūt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 207; and Bayley says in a note that he is called Malik Sādā in the Ṭabakāt-i-Akbari. The Cambridge History of India, page 309, calls him Malik Śūdha, governor of Rasūlābād; which is said there to be 14 miles S.E. of Chāmpānār. Firishtah apparently does not mention him, though he says that the Rājpūts of Chāmpānār harried the Musalmāns of Rasūlābād.
Sadhā had raided certain villages in Chāmpānīr; and 1 Rāy Baṭāl, the son of Rāy Udaı Singh, Rāja of Chāmpānīr, collected troops and attacked him; and in the battle Malik Sadhā and a body of his followers attained to the rank of martyrdom. Rāy Baṭāl plundered and carried away two elephants and all goods and equipments belonging to Malik Sadhā and his men. When this news reached the Sulṭān, he set out on a march to Chāmpānīr, on the first of the month of Dhi-qadh of the aforementioned year; and when by successive marches, he arrived at the town of Barōda, Rāy Baṭāl, becoming ashamed and repentant of the reprehensible act and wicked deed he had perpetrated sent ambassadors to wait on the Sulṭān, and petitioned for the pardon of his offences. He also submitted that both the elephants, which had been wounded, had become disabled; but he was willing to send two other elephants loaded with gold. The Sulṭān replied, “The answer to this message will be given to-morrow by the sword, which cuts like a diamond”; and he turned the ambassadors back. He sent in advance of himself Tāj Khān and ‘Aḍl-ul-mulk and Bāhrām Khān and Ikhtiyār Khān. They arrived at the foot of the fort on the 2 7th Safar. The Rājпутs rallied out of the fort every day; and fought from morning to evening with great gallantry.

The Sulṭān also advanced from the town of Barōda, and passing Chāmpānīr, encamped in the village of 3 Karnārī. He appointed

---

1 The name is Rāy Basālī in the MSS., and Rāy Baṭāl in the lith. ed. It appears to be Rāy Banāḥī in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, Col. Briggs calls him Bany Ray. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī has Rawal Patāl. According to Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 371) his real name was “Jye Singh”, or as it should be correctly transliterated Jaya Sinha, which undoubtedly is the right name for the son of Udāya Sinha “and by Ferishta” (or rather by Col. Briggs) “entitled Beny Ray, and widely known in Hindu tradition under the name of Phutāce Rawul”. In the Cambridge History of India, page 309, he is called Patālī, and it is also stated that he sacked and destroyed Rasūlābād, but I cannot find this anywhere else. Firishtah has been followed in the text-edition.

2 It is 17th in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. also has 7th.

3 Both MSS. have, while the lith. ed. has. Firishtah lith. ed. has, Karnārī; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67) has “Girnary on the Malwa road”. 
Saiyid Badr Alangdār for guarding the road and for the bringing in of provisions. It so happened, that one day when the Saiyid was escorting a convoy of provisions, the Rājpūts fell on them from an ambush; and they slew a body of the troops, and carried away all the provisions. The Sultān, on hearing this news, became very depressed and sad; and he sat down at the foot of the fort of Chāmpānīr, till the end of Shāfar of that year; and did everything to carry on the siege with great vigour. Muḥāfiz Khān mounted every morning, and inspected all the batteries till midday, and then returning made report of the state of things to the Sultān. When the siege had progressed in a satisfactory and perfect manner, he ordered that covered ways should be laid down from (all) four directions. They say that for every plank that they carried to the top of the hill, the wages of the men carrying it amounted to one lakh tankas. Rāy Batāi, seeing this state of things, and owing to great weakness and exhaustion, again sent ambassadors and submitted, that he would send a tribute of nine mans of gold and of grain which would suffice for feeding the army for two years. The Sultān said “It is impossible that I should rise from the place, till this fort should have been conquered”.

When the ambassadors returned despondent, Rāy Batāi in the year 888 A.H. sent his experienced vākil Sūrā to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din Khālji, and asked for help; and undertook to pay one lakh of tankas for every stage in the march of his army, as a contribution to his expenses. Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din mustered his troops, and advanced to and encamped in the town of Na’lēha. When this news reached the Sultān, he left his amīrs at the different stations, and marched himself

---

1 The name of this man appears to be Saiyid Badr Alangdār in the MSS. It is Saiyid Badr in the lith. ed. He is called Saiyid Badr in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Syud Mudun Lung by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67).

2 Both MSS. have Aẓīz Abū Zaymīn Ṭakhtūsī, and the lith. ed. has Aẓīz Abū Zaymīn Ṭakhtūsī, but the lith. ed. has Aẓīz Abū Zaymīn Ṭakhtūsī, and the lith. ed. has Aẓīz Abū Zaymīn Ṭakhtūsī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67) has Shew Ray; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 209) has Sahūrā; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309) Sūrī.

3 He is called Mūṣā in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Mūṣā; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67) has Shew Ray; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 209) has Sahūrā; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309) Sūrī.

4 The name is written in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is Lūlaj. Firishtah, lith. ed., has Nalja. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley) Na’lēha.
as far as the town of \(^1\) Dahūd to meet him. At this place the news reached him, that \(^2\) Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din had sent for the learned men one day, and asked for an expression of their opinion on the following point: "a bādshāh of the Musalmāns has besieged a hill of the infidels, is it right according to the Šara' that I should reinforce and go to help the latter". The learned men said, "it is not right". Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din immediately went back to Mandū. The Sulṭān on hearing this tune (of joyfulness) was delighted; came back to Chāmpānīr; and laid the foundation of a \(^3\) Jāma' mosque.

The amārs and the sardārs now knew for certain, that the Sulṭān would not leave the place until the fort should be conquered, and made a very great effort in planning the conquest. When the construction of the covered ways was completed, the soldiers in the Sulṭān's own battery saw one day from the covered way, that most of the Rājputs went away in the morning for cleaning their teeth and for their ablutions, and only a few remained on the bastions. When they reported this to the Sulṭān he ordered that Qawām-ul-mulk on the following \(^4\) day in the year 889 A.H., at the true dawn should

\(^1\) The name of the town should be transiterated as Dahūd. Firishtah, lith. ed., has Ḍūrd, apparently a mistake; Col. Briggs has D'har; Bayley (p. 208) has Dahūd; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309) Dohad.

\(^2\) Firishtah agrees with this; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 68) says that the Soolṭān "on being reproached by his nobles and officers, for entertaining an intention of marching to the assistance of an infidel" disbanded his army, and returned to Mandū.

\(^3\) The Cambridge History of India, p. 309, says that the mosque, which still adorns the ruins of the city, was built before Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-din's offer to aid the Raja. This does not agree with the other histories, according to which the foundations of the mosque were laid after the Sulṭān's return from Dahūd. The author of the Mirāt-i-Sikandari laments the ruin which had overwhelmed Chāmpānīr during his time. He says (Bayley, p. 212) "Now thanks be to God, Chāmpānīr is not still the same. The buildings are in ruins, it is inhabited by the tiger, and the gardens are for the most part jungle, nor is there any sandal wood produced; its very name is unknown". The first sentence is curious. There is, however, no mention of the mosque.

\(^4\) No date is given in either the MSS. or the lith. ed. Only the year is mentioned at this place, but it appears a few sentences further on, that the date was the first of Dḥā-qa'dah. Firishtah in the corresponding passage gives neither date nor year. Bayley after giving the account of the capture of Chāmpānīr, says
take the Sultan's own troops with him, and should advance his sābāt (covered way) into the fort. There was every hope that the flag of victory should be unfurled from the flag-staff of hope. On the following morning which was the 1st of Dhī-qa'dah, Malik Qawām-ul-mulk with the Sultan's own troops hurled himself from the covered way into the fort and slew a large number of the garrison, and a great fight took place. They drove the Rājpūts to the gate of the citadel. Rāy Batāi and other Rājpūts then prepared for jauhar and Qawām-ul-mulk and the other leaders having the great good fortune of martyrdom before the eyes of their noble spirit lavished all efforts and made every endeavour.

It so happened that a few days before this, they had shot a cannon ball on the rampart of the fort from the western side; and several cracks and fissures had appeared in the rampart of the great citadel. Malik Āyāz Sultanī availing himself of an opportunity went to the crack in the rampart; with a body of soldiers from that crack, which was in truth, the crack by which the angel of the death of the garrison made his entrance, they rushed into the great citadel and by way of the 1 bārah ascended to the top of the great gate. At this time Sultan Maḥmūd came to the top of the sābāt and placing his face of humility in the dust offered prayers, and, as victory and triumph still delayed, he sent reinforcements. The Rājpūts being harassed and discomfited threw bombs filled with gun-powder on the roof of the gate. It so happened, however, that from the seat of divine mercy the breeze of success and victory blew, (the men on the top of the gate) seized those very bombs and threw them into the courtyard of the palace of Rāy Batāi. When the Rājpūts found that things had come to this condition, at every place where they had arranged a jauhar

that the Tabakāt and Firishtah give a fuller account of how it was seized; and proceeds to quote from them. It would appear from his account, page 210, that the attack of Kiwām-ul-Mulk was made on the 1st Zil-ka'dah, 889 A.H. The Cambridge History of India does not specially mention this particular incident.

1 The word is رُبْهُ, bārū in both MSS., but it is رُبْبَ, bārah in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have retained bārah, as it occurs in Imām-burah, etc. The translation in Bayley gives no help. It says: from that breach "they fought their way to the roof of the principal gate". M. Hidayat Ḥosain has bārah in the text-edition.
they set fire to them, and burnt all their dependents and children. The whole of that day and night and the next day the entire (Musul-
mān) army remained under arms and fought. On the second day which was the 2nd of Dhī-qa'\‘dah, 889 A.H., they forced open the door and got into (the citadel) and slew a large number. Sultān Muḥam-
mad also advanced as far as the door. A body of the Rājpūts then threw down their arms and assembled round a reservoir. They all got into the water and washed their bodies, and coming out of the water seized their swords, and stood up. As the body of the Sultān's troops went near the reservoir, seven hundred Rājpūts at once rushed on them and very large number on both sides were slain, but Rāy Batāl and Dūngarsi and a number of others were captured and brought (before the Sultān).

The Sultān performed the ceremony of offering thanks to God and made over Rāy Batāl and Dūngarsi to Muḥāfīz Khān, so that he might have their wounds medically attended to. The same day the Sultān gave the name of Muḥāmmadābād to Chāmpānūr, and made an entry into it. A number of the Rājpūts fled, and entered the third citadel. They were brought down the same day in distress and wretchedness. When Muḥāfīz Khān reported that Rāy Batāl's wounds had healed, the Sultān urged 1 him to accept Islām. He did not agree. After he had been in prison for 2 five months; and as he did not still accept Islām; he and 3 Dūngarsi were, by order of the learned men, executed. This occurred in the year 890 A.H. In the same year he passed orders for the erection of a special citadel of citadels, Jahān Panāh, and of palaces and gardens; and placed the work in the charge of Muḥāfīz Khān. In the year 892 A.H., he bestowed the country

---

1 Both Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 310) say that Rāy Batāl and Dūngarsi were both invited to accept Islām; and both refused.

2 According to Firishtah he was in chains during the whole of the five months; and was every day threatened with death.

3 The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says, that the minister Sūrī was executed at the same time; but this does not appear to be mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt or in Firishtah; and the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 211) says, that the Sultān ordered the execution of the Rāy, and of his minister; but whether this refers to Dūngarsi or to Sūrī is not clear.
of Sörath and the forts of Jünägarh and Karnäl on Shähzāda 1 Khāli Kil Khān.

In the year 892 A.H. (the Christian year is given as 1486 A.D.), some merchants coming from Dehli arrived in 2 Muḥammadābād and complained that they were bringing 3 four hundred and three horses.

1 Firishtah calls him the Sultān’s or younger son, but he is not mentioned by Col. Briggs. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari he is mentioned on page 216; and it is said in a note that he afterwards became Muzaffar II. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, page 239, that he was the Sultān’s fourth son by Rānī Harbā, daughter of the Tāh Rānah, a Rājpūt zamīndar on the bank of Mahindri. The Rānī died the fourth or fifth day after the prince’s birth. It is said that immediately after his birth the prince was taken by the Sultān to Háns Bāi (the swan-like lady, as Bayley takes the trouble to explain that her name signifies), the widow of Sultān Muḥammad, and Sultān Mahmūd’s step-mother. She educated the prince with more than a mother’s care; and Sultān Muḥammad (sic) used to say, whenever he saw him, “The line of my kingly ancestors will be carried on by this boy and his descendants”.

It is curious that at least three of Sultān Mahmūd’s four sons were born of Hindū mothers, viz. (1) Muḥammad Kālā, whose mother was Rānī Rūp Manjari, who had previously been married to Sultān Kutb-ud-dīn, and after his death came to Sultān Mahmūd. The prince and his mother both predeceased the Sultān; (2) Aḥā Khān, whose mother was Rānī Firāl. He was poisoned by his father’s order because he had gone to some one’s house who found him there and thrashed him; (3) Ahmad Khān, who was nick-named Khudāwand Khān’s Ahmad Shāh, as Khudāwand Khān had conspired to place him on the throne, as had already been mentioned. His mother’s name is not mentioned. The fourth son was Khāli Kil Khān.

2 There is some difference as to the place where the merchants complained to the Sultān. Both the Tabaqāt and Firishtah say that they came to Muḥammadābād, and made their complaint there. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 216, it is said, “he then went to Ahmadābād. A party of merchants came to him complaining”, etc. from which one would infer that the complaint was made at Ahmadābād. The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says, that the complaint was made when he was “hunting at Hādol near Chāmpāner”.

3 He is called رَآیَ تَلَعَّبةٌ آبُو in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and the number of horses is said to be four hundred there. Col. Briggs says that the name and the country of the chief is omitted in the original, and he does not give the number of the horses. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari says that the merchants complained that “they were bringing four hundred Persian and Turki horses from Irāk and Khorāsān, and some rolls of Hindustānī fabrics”. But on reaching the foot of mount Abū, the Rājah of Sirōhī had seized them all (Bayley, pp. 216, 217).
The Rāja of the hill of Ābū had taken them all by force and had looted the whole caravan. (The Sultān) on hearing their words immediately ordered that the price of the horses might be paid to the merchants from the treasury, and having conferred robes of honour on them, commenced to muster his troops and after some days advanced to devastate that country. He sent a farmān addressed to the Rāja of Ābū, by the hands of the merchants, in advance of himself. The purport of the farmān was this that as the merchants were bringing the horses and other merchandise for the Sultān, and he (the Rāja) had taken them with violence, he should at once give back to the merchants exactly what he had taken from them; otherwise he should be prepared to meet the anger and wrath of the Sultān. When the merchants took the farmān the Rāja of Ābū, in great alarm, made over to them three hundred and seventy horses, which he had in their original condition, and gave them the price of thirty-three horses, which had become disabled; and also sent a heavy tribute (to the Sultān) by their hand. ¹ The merchants came and waited on the Sultān, informed him of the true state of things, and also placed the tribute of the Rāja before him, upon which he turned back and came to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr.

In the year ² 896 A.H. (1491 A.D.) news came that Bahādur Gilānī, servant (کاشتہ) of Khvājah Maḥmūd Gilānī, had turned his head from the obedience due to his master Sultān Maḥmūd ³ Lashkari,

Cambridge History of India (p. 310) makes the number of horses four hundred and three and the name of the chief who had seized them, the Raja of Ābū.

¹ Firishtah says that the Raja sent an ambassador with the merchants; and placed himself in the band of the Sultān’s servants. The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says that the Sultān “permitted the merchants to retain the horses, as well as their price”. I have not seen this anywhere else; and it does not appear reasonable, that the merchants who had come from great distance to sell the horses, should have them returned to them.


³ The MSS. have لشکری but the lith. ed. has معمود. Sultān Muhammad Lashkari had, however, died some time before this; and his son Sultān Maḥmūd was the nominal ruler, though much of the power was in the hands of Qāsim Barid. It appears from other histories that Sultān Maḥmūd was in command of the troops that were sent against Bahādur Gilānī. I have therefore substituted Sultān Maḥmūd for Sultān Muḥammad Lashkari.
the ruler of the Deccan; and having taken unlawful and forcible possession of the part of Dabul, was causing harassment to ships passing over the sea; and the passage of coming to and going from Gujrat had become closed and he had also forcibly carried away the Sultan’s own ships. Immediately, on hearing this news, the Sultan mustered his troops and sent an army under Malik Qawam-ul-mulk by land route, and he also despatched many ships. When this news reached Sultan Mahmud Bahmani, he summoned the amirs and said, “On several occasions help has come to us from his ancestors; and the greatness and grandeur of Sultan Mahmud is known to all; and the consideration of the rights of this great dynasty is obligatory and incumbent on our spirit and energy. It is, therefore, right and proper that we should turn our attention to his (Bahadur Gilani’s) destruction.” The amirs and vazirs applauded the opinion and acknowledged the truth of the statement and began to collect troops. (At the same time) a letter couched in terms of sincerity was sent to Sultan Mahmud; and preparations were made for the punishment of Bahadur Gilani, and of teaching him a lesson. At the moment which the astrologers declared to be auspicious to Sultan Mahmud, he marched from the city of Bidar to affect the destruction of Bahadur; and after fighting slow him. The particulars of this occurrence have been narrated in the section about the Deccan.

In the year 897 A.H., (1474 A.D.), Sultan Mahmud marched towards the Mahrasa; and on the day, spies reported to him that Alf Khan, son of Ulugh Khan, had fled as he had spent stipends (due to his retainers) for his own purposes, and was afraid that they might apply to the Sultan for redress, and indignities might be inflicted on him. 1 The Sultan sent Sharfi-Jahan to reassure him, and although

1 Firishtah and Col. Briggs say that Alf Khan revolted in 904 A.H., 1498 A.D.; and their account is briefer than, and somewhat different from that in the Tabakat. In the Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 220, the Sultan is said to have marched to Morasaah on account of Alaf Khan’s rebellion. In a note Bayley gives the version in the Tabakat. The account given in the Cambridge History of India, page 311, differs from the others. The year of the revolt is said there to be 1492; and the name of the rebel is Bahadur-din Ulugh Khan, son of Ulugh Khan Suhrab. He is said to have fled because the people rose against him, on account of his oppressing them, and of appropriating the pay of the troops.
the emissary preached sermons and advices to him, they had no effect whatever.

He sent some elephants, which he had with him in charge of Sharf-i-Jahân, and entered the country of Mandû; but as his father had acted towards Sultân Maḥmûd Khalji, Sultân Ghiyâth-ud-dîn gave him no place in his dominions and showed no favour to him at all. Alf Khân in distress and at a loss what to do came towards Sultânpur. Sultân Maḥmûd sent 1 Qâdî Pîr Işâq to reinforce 2 Malik Shaikhâ. When Qâdî Pîr Işâq arrived in the vicinity of 3 Sultânpur, Alf Khân fought with him, and son of the Qâdî Malik-ul-Mashâîkh and some other men were slain in the skirmish in the end. After much wandering Alf Khân sent a petition to the Sultân, containing an account of his great suffering and distress and praying for the pardon of his offences. 4 As he was a khânahzâd (one brought up in the family, a hereditary servant) of the Sultân the latter drew the pen of forgiveness over his offences. He came and waited on the Sultân in the year 901 A.H., had the honour of rendering homage; and had favours and kindness bestowed on him. But as the star of his fortune was on the decline, after three months he murdered his naīb-i-`ard (officer in-charge of petitions) without any cause, and was put into prison, and died in prison.

The name of his father according to the Mirât-i-Sikandari was 'Alâ-ud-dîn bin Suhrâb.

1 Firishtah’s account is entirely different. According to him Qâdî Bîr was sent against the rebel and pursued him through hills and jungles, till he at last fled by way of Sultânpur to Mâlwa. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 72) says that, “Sheikh Burra Deccany the Kazy-oool-Koozat of Ahmudahad” was sent in pursuit of him. The Mirât-i-Sikandari says that Alîf Khan fled from place to place, and at last went to Sultân Ghiâs-ud-dîn Khîljî. The account in the Cambridge History of India agrees generally with that in the text, but it does not say that Alîf Khân fought with the force under the Qâdî. On the other hand, it says that when the relieving force arrived, he fled into Baglânâ.

2 This is apparently the Qâdî mentioned by Firishtah.

3 He appears to have been the governor of Sultânpur. He does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah or in the Mirât-i-Sikandari. The Cambridge History of India, page 311, calls him 'Azîz-ul-Mulk Shaikhan.

4 The latter part of his history is narrated very briefly by Firishtah and the other historians.
As 1 'Ādil Khān Fārūqī, governor of Asīr, had not for a long time remitted the tribute which had been fixed and was walking in the path of pride and haughtiness, the Sulṭān collected his troops and in the year 906 A.H. (1149 A.D.), advanced to punish him and teach him a lesson. When he arrived on the bank of the river Tāpti 'Ādil Khān sent a large tribute; and prayed to be excused. Sulṭān generously accepted his excuses, returned to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr.

In the course of the same year, i.e., 906 A.H. (1499 or 1500 A.D.), news came that 2 Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-din 'Abd-ul-Qādir having acted with ingratitude had taken the kingdom from Sulṭān Qhiyāt-ud-din, and assumed the title of Sulṭān. Sulṭān Maḥmūd wanted to advance to Mālwa to punish him and teach him a lesson. At this time a subsidy came from Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-din, with a petition expressive of his humility and submission. He also stated in the petition that whatever he had done had been done with the consent of his lord, master and father, but as Shujā' Khān and Rānī Khurshid had ac-

1 Firishtah says that Qāḍī Bīr with some other asāirs first invaded Khāndēsh in 905 A.H. 'Ādil Khān was unable to meet them, and asked 'Imād-ul-mulk, the ruler of Berār for help, but as he received none, he sent the tribute which was in arrears and asked for pardon. Firishtah adds that according to some historians, Sulṭān Maḥmūd himself advanced as far as the bank of the Tāpti, when 'Ādil Khān sent the tribute. Col. Briggs in a note in vol. IV, page 73, calls the demand of tribute by the King of Guzerat from Adil Khan, an unimaginably wanton exercise of power; but as Bayley has pointed out in a note on page 221, the Fārūkī rulers "were more or less in a kind of feudal duty to the Gujarāt kings". The Cambridge History of India (p. 313) describes 'Ādil Khān II, as one of the most energetic and most powerful rulers of Khāndēsh, and he had scorned to pay tribute in his career of victory, yet a mere demonstration of force by Sulṭān Maḥmūd was enough to bring him to his senses.

2 This sentence requires explanation. Nāṣir-ud-din was the son of Sulṭān Qhiyāt-ud-din of Mālwa. He was suspected of having poisoned his father. I have not been able to find any reference to this in Firishtah or in Col. Briggs, but Firishtah says in one place that he was accused of it, but he stoutly denied it. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 221) says that Nāṣir-ud-din poisoned his father and seized the kingdom. Bayley says in a note that there is no positive evidence of the poisoning. The Tārikh-i-Álfi, though hostile in tone, merely says that there was a suspicion. The Cambridge History of India (p. 311) says Qhiyas-ud-din was deposed on November 20th, 1500, and died in February 1501, not without suspicion of poison.
quired influence over (the mind of) Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ūd-dīn, they exerted themselves in concealing the facts. The Sulṭān having taken pity on his humility and distress, gave up the intention of marching there.

In the same year, as the *Firangīs* (apparently the Portuguese) created disturbances in Musalmān ports, the Sulṭān proceeded to the port of Mahāim, and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of 2 Dūn, news was brought to him, that ʿAyāz one of his slaves had prepared some of the Sulṭān's ships, and ten of the Turkish ships at the port of Dip and had fought with the *Firangīs* of the port of 3 Chaul. In the action many *Firangīs* and four hundred Turks were slain. The *Firangīs* fled; and 4 one of their large ships, the cargo in which was valued at one *krōr*, having had its mast struck and broken off by a cannon ball was sunk. Sulṭān Maḥmūd after carrying out the rites of offering thanks to God, returned to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr.

In the year 914 A.H. 5 ʿĀdil Khān, son of Ḥasan Khān, made a representation to Sulṭān Maḥmūd, through his mother, who was the

---

1 Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says that the *Firangīs* wanted to build forts on the coast. The Sulṭān of Rūm, who was their enemy had, on hearing this, sent many ships to carry on a war of religion, and to prevent their carrying out their objects. Some of these ships had arrived in the Gujrat ports. Sulṭān Maḥmūd also intending to carry on religious war there, started towards the ports of Dīsī, Daman and Mahāim; and when he arrived at Daman he sent his special slave Ayāz Sulṭānī, who was the Amīr-ul-umrār and Satarsāl from the port of Dip. Col. Briggs's account (vol. IV, p. 74) is similar but he says that the Turkish fleet was under "Ameer Hoossein" whom the Portuguese called Meer Hashim. The account given in the Cambridge History of India, page 312, is long and comprehensive, but it is unnecessary to refer to it here in detail.

2 See note 1, page 246.

3 The name is written in Persian as جدول, but is written in English as Chōul or Chaul.

4 This was their flag-ship, and probably had on board Don Laurence, the son of Vasco da Gama, who was killed.

5 He is called ʿAdil Khān in both MSS. and in the lithe. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and by Firishtah and Col. Briggs and also in the *Muntakhab-al-labāb*, vol. III, page 155; but is called ʿAlām Khān in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* and in the Cambridge History of India. He is called ʿĀdil Khān bin Ḥasan Khān, but whether he was the son of Ḥasan Khān, or he was the great grandson of Ḥasan Khān, as stated in the Cambridge History of India in respect of ʿAlām Khān, is not
Sultān's daughter, that 'Ādil Khān, the son of Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr had died, seven years and some months ago, leaving no son; and he hoped that the Sultān would bestow the place of his ancestors on the faqīr (i.e., himself). The Sultān accepted the request and prayer of his daughter, and collected an army in the month of Rajab of that year. In Shābān he marched towards Asīr and Burhānpūr, and having passed Ramaḍān on the bank of the Narbada, in the village of 1Sīlī, he marched towards Nadarbār in Shawwāl. When he arrived at that place, he learnt that 2Malik Hisām-ud-dīn Mughūl, who was in possession of half the country of Asīr and Burhānpūr, had, in concert with Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri, the ruler of Kāwl, placed 3Khāznūdā 'Ālam Khān, who was a
clear. Ādil Khān was probably the son of Qaṣīr Khān Fāruqī. Ḥaṣān Khān was the younger son of Malik Rāja of Khāndēsh, who died in 1399. He was deprived of his share of the patrimony by his elder brother Nāsir Khān in 1417; and took up his residence in Gujrat, where his descendants intermarried with the royal family.

1 It is written as سبلي in the MSS., and printed as سبلي in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and also in the lith. ed. of Firīshṭāḥ. It does not appear to be mentioned in any history.

2 Malik Hisām-ud-dīn Mughūl is called Malik Hisām-ud-dīn in the lith. ed. of Firīshṭāḥ and Hissām-ood-Deen of Kandeish by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 76). He is called Hisām-ud-dīn Mughal by Bayley (p. 223) and Malik Husain the Mughul in the Cambridge History of India (p. 314).

3 FIRISHTAH SAYS ملك حسام الدين مغل زاده عالم خانخاز. It is not clear whether the word Mughal is part of the name of Hisām-ud-dīn or whether, as is more likely Mughalzada is a description of 'Ālam Khān. In any case this does not explain the exact connection of 'Ālam Khān to the family. According to a note by Bayley Khāznūdā may signify that though he was not a prince; he might have belonged to a collateral branch of the family of Asīr. It appears also from the Mīrāt-i-Sikandar, Bayley, page, 223, that Hisām-ud-dīn had previously written to 'Ālam ('Ādil) Khān that if he would join him, he would raise him on the throne of his ancestors; but finding later that Sultān Mahmūd was also interested in him, retracted his promise; and with the help of Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri placed the other 'Ālam Khān on the throne.

The Cambridge History of India, page 313, says that Sultān Mahmūd induced 'Ādil Khān II, to nominate his youthful kinsman, as his heir, to the exclusion of his brother Dāūd; but is 1501 A.D., Mahmūd was not in a position to press his grandson's claim; and Dāūd succeeded 'Ādil Khān II without any opposition. Dāūd died in August, 1508 A.D. He was succeeded by his son
descendant of the rulers of Asir and Burhanpur on the throne of that kingdom; and Malik Ladan Khalji, who was in possession of (the other) half of the country of Asir had taken up an attitude hostile to Malik Hisam-ud-din Maghul, and had taken up a fortified position on the hill of Asir. Sultan Mahmud, on hearing of these happenings, advanced to Thalnir. Malik Alam Shah, the thanaadar of Thalnir, came and waited upon him, through the intervention of Aziz-ul-mulk Sultan, thanadar of Sultanpur; and evacuating his thana, surrendered it to the Sultan.

On hearing this news, Nizam-ul-mulk Bahri left four thousand horsemen with Alam Khan and Malik Hisam-ud-din and himself went to Kawil. As Sultan Mahmud felt slightly indisposed in Thalnir, he remained there for some time; and sent Aasf Khan, and Malik Aziz-ul-mulk, with a well-equipped army to punish Malik Hisam-ud-din and Alam Khan. When these officers advanced towards Burhanpur, the troops left behind by Nizam-ul-mulk Bahri turned their faces to their own country, without (obtaining) the permission of Hisam-ud-din. Malik Ladan Khalji came forward to welcome Aasf Khan, and had an interview with him. Aasf Khan took him with himself to wait upon the Sultan. Malik Hisam-ud-din also, ashamed and repentant, came and joined the Sultan’s camp; and both were honoured with kindness and favour. After the ‘Id-ud-duha, at an auspicious moment, the Sultan conferred the tile of Azam Humayun on Adil Khan, and bestowed on him four elephants and 3 thirty lakhs of tankas as a contribution towards his expenses; and entrusted to him the reins of the government and defence of Asir and Burhanpur. He conferred the title of Khan Jahan on Malik Ladan, and gave him permission to go back with Azam Humayun Adil Khan. As

Ghazi Khan, who was poisoned after a reign of ten days. Ahmad Nizam Shah now invaded Khandes with the object of placing another scion of the Faruqi house, also named Alam Khan, who had taken refuge in his court.

1 This incident does not appear to be mentioned anywhere else.

2 It is लक्सी thirty lakhs in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah, however, on page 204 of the lith. ed. (vol. II) has लक्सी three lakhs. Col. Briggs has not mentioned the various gifts. The Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 225, has thirteen lakhs. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the gifts.
Malik Lādan had been born in the village of 1 Banās, that *moudah* was granted to him as a reward. The Sultān also conferred the title of Ḥāzī Khān on 2 Malik Muḥammad Bākhār, son of ‘Imād-ul-mulk Asīrī, and that of Quṭb Khān on Malik ‘Alam Shāh *thānādār* of Thānlīr, that of Muḥāfiz Khān on Malik Ḥāfiz, and that of Saif Khān on his brother Malik Yūsuf, and sent them back in attendance on Aʿzam Humāyūn. 3 He left Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Mujāhid-ul-mulk Gujrātī in the service of Aʿzam Humāyūn, after giving them money to defray their expenses. On the 17th Dhī hilījah, he marched from that station and proceeded towards Sultānpūr Nadarbār. At the first station (in the march), he conferred the title of Shahryār on Malik Ḥīsām-ud-dīn Maghūl, and having bestowed the *moudah* of 4 Dhanūra, which is one of the dependencies of Sultānpūr, and two elephants, gave him permission to go back. He himself then by successive marches arrived at Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr on the 16th of the sacred month of Muḥarram in the year 916 A.H. (1510 A.D.).

ʿĀdil Khān, after his arrival at Burhānpūr, (found that) 5 Malik Ḥīsām-ud-dīn Shahryār, Malik Bākhār and Ḥāzī Khān had, on account

---

1 The name is باناس in the MSS., and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 76) makes it the district of Ahwas. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 225, has "The village of Banās in the paragana Sultānpūr". In the text-edition باناس is apparently a typographical error.

2 The name is as I have it in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah lith. ed. has ملك تشتها Malik Nāhā, son of ‘Imād-ul-mulk Khān-dōshī; and the Mīrāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 225, has Muḥammad Mākhā.

3 The sentence from در خدمت اعظم همبورون غراشفت و ملك حسام الدين is not to be found in one MS., but is in the other and in the lith. ed.

4 The name is رهنوز in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is Dhanūrah also in the Mīrāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 225; but Col. Briggs has (vol. IV, p. 76) "the town of Dhoor".

5 There are variations in the readings. The MSS. have the reading which I have adopted. The reading in the lith. ed. is different. The other histories do not give the details of the way in which Ḥīsām-ud-dīn was murdered. Firishtah merely says سلطان اعظم همبورون ملك حسام الدين شهير را كشته اعوان اور ا قندل عام نبود. And the Cambridge History of India, page 314, says "one of his (ʿĀdil Khān III's) first acts was to cause Malik Husain, who was again plotting with the king of Ahmadnagar, to be assassinated".
of an ill-feeling which they had with Malik Lādan Khaḷjī Khān Jahān, left Burhānpūr; and had taken up their residence in Thāhnīr. After some days, news was brought to Aʿzam Humāyūn, that Malik Ḥīsām-ud-dīn Shahryār had combined with Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī, and wanted to raise the dust of disturbance. Having become cognisant of this treachery on his part, Aʿzam Humāyūn sent a message to summon him. Malik Ḥīsām-ud-dīn knowing the state of things came towards Burhānpūr with four thousand horsemen. When he arrived in the vicinity of the city, Aʿzam Humāyūn went forward to receive him with three thousand Gujrātī horsemen, took him to his palace, and after conferring on him a robe of honour, gave him permission to go back to his camp. On the following day he arranged with the men in his confidence, that when Malik Ḥīsām-ud-dīn would come to the hall of audience, he should be taken by the hand to the private chamber; and when he would be bidding farewell, Daryā Shāh Gujrātī, who would be carrying the sword of Aʿzam Humāyūn ʿAdil Khān, should deal him a fatal wound. After he is murdered, his men should also be murdered at the various places (where they happen to be). According to this agreement, a man was sent to summon Ḥīsām-ud-dīn. The latter, in his great pride and conceit, came with all his followers. After they had met, (Aʿzam Humāyūn) in the way of consulting him took him by the hand into the private chamber. They had a short conversation, after which Aʿzam Humāyūn handed him pān (betel), and bade him farewell. At this time Malik Ḥīsām-ud-dīn straightened himself up, and Daryā Khān struck him on the head with the sword with such force, that it was cloven in two.

When Malik Burhān ʿAtā-ul-lah, who was the wazīr of Aʿzam Humāyūn, became aware of what had happened, he ordered a number of Gujrātīs, who were with him, to smite the wretches. When those men drew their swords from the scabbards, Malik Muḥammad Bākhā

---

1 The number is سیصد thirty hundred or three thousand in both MSS.; it is سیصد هزار thirty hundred thousand, which is of course incorrect, in the lith. ed.; Firdaūsī has سه صد three hundred, which is more probable; and in the Persian text of Muntakhab-al-labāb, vol. III, page 443, has دو صد دو صد two hundred three hundred.

2 The same man is called Daryā Shāh a few lines earlier.
and the other sardārs, who had accompanied Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn turned their faces in flight. Four hundred Ḥabshīs, who were present at the durbār, cut them all down, and Malik Muḥammad Bākhā and the other leaders were thrown wallowing in the dust and blood. The half of the country, which was in his possession, came without further dispute into Aẓam Ḥumāyūn's possession. When the account of these events in great detail and clearness reached Sulṭān Maḥmūd in the month of Rabī'-ul-āwwal of the afore-mentioned year, 1 he declared that whoever did not regard the rights of the salt, fell in the end into the place of destruction.

2 In the year 916 A.H., 1510 A.D., a petition from Aẓam Ḥumāyūn reached (Sulṭān Maḥmūd), to the effect, that he had, on one occasion, gone to the fort of Asūr; and that he had found Shēr Khaṅ and Saif Khaṅ who were in charge of it, full of mischief and hostility; and now that Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn had been slain, these two wretches had combined together in their enmity and malice; and they had written a letter to Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri, and had summoned Khaṅzāda 'Alam Khaṅ. This slave (i.e., he himself) in concert with Malik Lādan Khaṅ Jahān and Mujāhid-ul-mulk and other amirs had advanced to the fort, and is besieging it. Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri has brought 'Alam Khaṅ with him, and has come with his army, and is stationed near the border. It is true, if he should enter this slave's territory, he would have to raise the siege, and would have to go and fight with him. The Sulṭān bestowed five lakhs of tankas

---

1 This is also mentioned by Firishtah.

2 This also is mentioned by Firishtah; but he says that Nizām-ul-mulk had come to his border bringing with him 'Alam Khaṅ, and with the Rāja of Kālāna. It may be mentioned also that he says that the five lakhs of tankas were ٤٥١٠ or silver tankas. Col. Briggs after mentioning Mahmood Shah's return to Sooltanpoor says (vol. IV, p. 76) "Notwithstanding these arrangements, internal commotions occurred at Aseer during the following year, which were amicably adjusted through the agency of Mahmood Shah, who sent his own son to carry into effect his orders, and to confirm the authority of Adil Khan". This is scarcely correct. The adjustment was anything but amicable, so far as Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn and Malik Muḥammad Bākhā, etc., who accompanied Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn, were concerned; and not even so far as Shēr Khaṅ and Saif Khaṅ and Khaṅzāda 'Alam Khaṅ were concerned. It does not also appear that any son of Sulṭān Maḥmūd was sent to Khāndīsh to settle matters there.
as a contribution to his expenses, and sent Dilâwar Khân, Şafdar Khân and other amirs to help and reinforce him. He also wrote in reply, "let my (grand)son’s mind remain assured, that whenever there should be any necessity, I shall myself go to his aid. How can Niżâm-ul-mulk Bahârî, who is a slave of one of the Sultâns of the Deccan, have such power that he should cause any damage to the territory of my (grand)son". The amirs mentioned above had not yet marched from outside the city, when ¹ Shâhzâda Mużaffar Khân, an account of whom will before long be narrated, came from the town of Barâda, and having obtained the honour of kissing his father’s feet prayed for and obtained a further sum of seven lakhs of tankas towards A’zam Humâyûn’s expenses.

After some days, an emissary of Niżâm-ul-mulk Bahârî came and waited on the Sultân and presented a petition (of his master) to the following effect. "As Álam Khânzâda came as a suppliant to me; I hope that he (the Sultân) will be pleased to bestow a part of the

¹ It appears from the Cambridge History of India, page 314, that A’zam Humâyûn or ‘Adîl Khân III cemented his alliance with Gujûrât by marrying a daughter of Sultân Mużaffar. I have not seen this mentioned anywhere else, except in the Muntakhab-al-lahâb, vol. III, page 445; but it is stated there that Sultân Maḥmûd gave a daughter of Sultân Mużaffar in marriage to him at the same time that he conferred the title of A’zam Humâyûn on him, and confirmed him in the government of Khândesh. So that it was more the act of Sultân Maḥmûd than of A’zam Humâyûn. Besides it was scarcely necessary for A’zam Humâyûn to cement his alliance with Gujûrât by marriage. He was the grandson (daughter’s son) of Sultân Maḥmûd; and was being treated with great affection and kindness by the Sultân himself, and by his son Shâhzâda Mużaffar, (who is somewhat loosely and incorrectly called Sultân Mużaffar, while his father was still alive, both in the Cambridge History of India and in the Muntakhab-al-lahâb). It appears from Firishthah that the Shâhzâda prayed for the additional grant, not for his son-in-law, but for his nephew (khuḍâhar-zâda), so that the earlier relation had greater force and validity with Sultân Maḥmûd and Shâhzâda Mużaffar than the later one. The Muntakhab-al-lahâb, vol. III, page 444, has a somewhat different account. It says Sultân Maḥmûd, immediately on becoming acquainted with the purport of the letter, sent twelve lakhs of Maḥmûdis, which amount to six lakhs of rupees current at that time, and various articles, such as vessels of gold and silver, etc. The twelve lakhs may include the five lakh originally given, and the seven lakhs given at the request of Shâhzâda Mużaffar. He also made an assignment of eight lakhs of tankas out of the revenues (mâhsûl) of pargana Sultânpur.
country of Asîr and Burhânpûr on him." The Sultân sent for the emissary, and told him, "Since he (i.e., Niẓâm-ul-mulk) places his foot further than his blanket, he will soon receive his merited punishment". In short, when the amîrs mentioned above (Dilâwar Khân, etc.) arrived at the town of Nadarbâr, Shâr Khân and Saîf Khân, being now aware of the disastrous end of their affairs, carried their application to Malik Mujâhid-ul-mulk, and prayed for protection. A'zam Humâyûn, finding this to be an unhoped for boon, gave them promise and engagement. Shâr Khân and Saîf Khân, relying on his promise, came out of the fort, and went away to the territory of Kâwil. After the arrival of Dilâwar Khân and the other amîrs, 2 'Adîl Khân determined on raiding the country of Kâlna. After he had harried a few of the villages and hamlets, the Râja of Kâlna sent tribute, and prayed for forgiveness of his offences. 'Adîl Khân then gave the Gujrât amîrs leave to go back to their country, and returned to Burhânpûr.

It was in this year that Sultân Sikandar Lûdî, the Bâdshâh of Dehlî sent, as a matter of special friendship, some nice things as presents to the Sultân. Before this no Bâdshâh of Dehlî had sent any presents to any Bâdshâh of Gujrât. It was also in Dhi-bihijah of the year 916 A.H. (1510 A.D.) that Sultân Mâhâmid travelled towards Nahrwâla, and made the learned and pious men and the faqîrs, living there, happy by granting largesses and favours to them. He told (them), that the object of his coming there was this, that he should 4 bid adieu to the sainted ones there; perhaps the angel of death would not give him further respite. The learned and great men all offered prayers for him, each in his particular way. He then

1 The word is omitted from the MSS. According to Firîstah, the Sultân's words to the emissary were a good deal sterner and more emphatic.
2 'Adîl Khân, whom Niẓâm-ud-dîn has been calling A'zam Humâyûn, is here again called by his proper name.
3 A sentence, which occurs in the lith. ed. at this place, but is omitted from both MSS., is ; and means, and 'Alâm Khân left that country. I have omitted it from the text, but in the text-edition is retained between and .
4 One MS. inserts after which appears to be illegible and unintelligible.
mounted and proceeded to circumambulate the tombs of the Shaikhs of Pattan, may the mercy of God be on them all! On the 4th day, he started on the journey to Aḥmadābād; and having circumambulated the holy tomb of 1 Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified! turned towards Muḥammadābād. As at this time he felt very ill and weak, he summoned Shāhzāda Muẓaffar Khān from the town of Barōda, and gave him pleasant advice. After four days, when he saw some signs of improvements in his health, he granted leave to the Shāhzāda to return to Barōda. But after a few days the illness increased and he became extremely infirm and weak.

At this time, one day, Farḥat-ul-mulk reported to him, that Shāh Iṣmāʿīl, the Bādshāh of Irān, had sent Yādgār Bēg Qazīlbāsh, with a body of other Qazīlbāshes with elegant presents, in the way of an embassy. He said 2 "May the great God not show me the face of a Qazīlbāsh, who is (a follower of) the enemies of the 3 companions of the Prophet of God, may the benediction of God and salutation be on him! and of the perpetrators of oppression; and as a matter of

1 This was at Sarkhēj. Firishtah also says that it was the tomb of Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, that he visited here; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 77) makes it the tomb of "Sheikh Ahmad Geesoo-Duraz".

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 315, says that "Yādgār Bēg Qazīlbāsh was commissioned to invite Mahmūd to embrace the Shiāh faith". This may be correct, but I have not seen it stated in any work of a Muḥammadan historian. Elphinstone on page 765 of his History of India (edition 1889) says "the reign of Mozaffer opened with a splendid embassy from Shāh Iṣmāʿīl king of Persia". This is not strictly correct; the embassy had been sent to Sulṭān Mahmūd, but it only arrived after his death, and the accession of Sulṭān Muẓaffar. Elphinstone concludes the paragraph by saying that the embassy "was probably designed to conciliate their favour to the Shiāh religion". If this is the foundation of the statement in the Cambridge History of India, it scarcely justifies the positive assertion that is made there. It also adds somewhat picturesquely that Mahmūd sent a message to "the heretics bidding them begone". This is also not mentioned anywhere as far as I have seen. On the other hand, it is said both in the Ṭabarqāt and by Firishtah that he expressed a pious wish, that God might not show him the face of a Qazīlbāsh; and this actually happened for he died before Yādgār Bēg could reach Muḥammadābād. It would, in fact, appear that he could not be approaching Muḥammadābād, if the Sulṭān had bade him begone.

3 Firishtah says more precisely اصعاب نيئة or the three companions, namely Abū Bakr and ʿUmr and ʿUthmān.
fact it happened so. He then ordered that Shāhza ḍa Muṣaffar Khān should be quickly summoned; and Yādgār Beg Qazlbāsh had not yet arrived, when at the time of evening prayer, on Monday the 2nd of Ramadān in the year 971 A.H. (23rd November, 1511 A.D.) he bound up the goods of existence (i.e., died).

He lived for 169 years and 11 days; and he reigned for 55 years and one month and 2 days. He is described in farmāns (manāshīr) as Khudāīgān Ḥallīm (the patient or calm Lord). He is also called Mahmūd 2 Bēgarah; and Bēgarah means a cow whose horns turn upwards and then curl round. His moustaches were of this shape, and on this account he has been named 3 Bēgarah. He was a 4 Bādshāh, calm or patient, merciful, brave, liberal and God-fearing.

---

1 Firishtah makes it sixty-nine years and eleven months.
2 The word is written as Bēgra or Bē Gurra by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 77), Begurra by the translator of Rās Mālā, Begara by Elphinstone, Begara by Bayley, and Begarha in the Cambridge History of India; but it is سکرا in the MSS. of the Tabaqāt and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and in the Persian ed. of the Muntakhab-al-labāb. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted بیگر in the text-edition. So that it was always written with a G in English and with a K in Persian. I do not know sufficient Gujrātī to say which is correct.
3 Firishtah gives another etymology of the word, on the authority of Shāh Jamāl-ud-dīn Anjū, who says that as he captured two renowned forts, he was called بیگر; and Firishtah adds that this is nearer the correct etymology. Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 379, says be means two, and gurū means a fort. If this etymology be correct then the correct Persian spelling would be بیگر, and the correct English spelling would be Bēgarah. The meaning of the two curled cows' horns may, if I may venture a guess, be correct if the word is changed to بیگر, Bēgirah (bē meaning two and gīrah meaning a knot or curl).
4 The Cambridge History of India, page 315, says that he had made himself immune from the effects of poisons by gradually absorbing poisons into his system; and quotes Hudibras, Part II, Canto I, where it is said that

The prince of Cambay's daily food
Is asp and basilisk and toad.

He goes on to say that "his voracious appetite demanded large supplies of more wholesome food. His daily allowance was between twenty and thirty pounds' weight, and before going to sleep he placed two pounds or more of boiled rice on either side of his couch, so that he might find something to eat on whichever side he awoke". I was at first inclined to think that the author of the
AN ACCOUNT OF \(^1\) SULTÁN MUZAFFAR SHÁH, SON OF MAHMÚD SHÁH.

As on Monday, the 2nd of Ramadán in the year 917 A.H., Maḥmúd Sháh son of Muḥammad Sháh passed away from the narrowness of bodily existence to the wide spaces of the spiritual world, Sháhzáda Mużaffar Ḳhán arrived after two hours (sāţat) of the night of Tuesday the 3rd of Ramadán (had passed); and by the exertions of the amírs and the men learned in divine knowledge, sat on the throne of sovereignty. The people performed the ceremony of the offering of service and of wave offerings. On the same night, he sent the body of his father to the tomb,—which is the resting place of light, of the chief of Shaiks, Shaikh Aḥmad Khatīb, may his soul be sanctified! He made over two lakhs of tankas to 'Azīz-ul-mulk so that he might distribute it, among deserving people in the town of Sārkēj. He bestowed robes of honour on the amírs, and the great men of the kingdom; and honoured some of them with suitable titles. On the same day, khutba was read in his name on the pulpits of Islām. Among his khāṣṣa khasil (men of his own household), he conferred the title of

Cambridge History of India had either made a mistake or had exaggerated what he had found in some Persian history; but I find that he has if anything greatly diminished the quantity of Sultān Maḥmūd's food. According to the author of "The coins of the Gujarát Saltanat" published in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. XXI, page 290, his daily allowance was one Gujarát man in weight, i.e., forty-one pounds. His little breakfast consisted of 150 plantains, a cup of honey and another of butter; but it is not stated whether this was included in the one Gujarát man, or was in addition to it. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 162, also gives him a similar quantity.

I find that the fact of his having made himself immune from the effect of poisons is based on the account of two European travellers, Bartema, as Elphinstone calls him (or more correctly Di Verthema) and Barbosa, mentioned by Elphinstone on page 764 of his History of India, 7th edition. I should be inclined to doubt the statement about the quantity of food. It is curious that the European travellers say nothing about it, and the Indian historians are equally silent about his being able to absorb abnormal quantities of poisons. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Danes, the editor of the book of Barbosa for the Hakluyt Society, page 122, that probably out of the stories about the enormous quantities of food eaten by him, arose the stories about the abnormal things he ate.

\(^1\) The lith. ed. has سلطان مظفر شاه before سلطانت; but both MSS. omit it.

\(^2\) سر کمی in the text-edition.
'Imād-ul-mulk on Malik Khush-Qadam, and of Khudāwand Khān on Malik Rāshid-ul-mulk and placed the reins of the vazārat in the latter's powerful hands.

In the month of Shawwāl of the afore-mentioned year, Yādgār Bēg Qazīlbāsh, the ambassador of Shāh Ismā'īl arrived from ʿIrāq to the neighbourhood of Muḥammadābād. The Sultān sent all the amīrs and vazīrs to welcome him, and met him on his arrival with pleasure and gratitude. Yādgār Bēg placed the beautiful presents which he had brought for Maḥmūd Shāh, at the service of Muẓaffar Shāh. The latter conferred kingly robes on Yādgār Bēg and all the Qazīlbāshes and selected a special mansion for their residence.

After some days he went from Muḥammadābād to the town of Barōda, and he gave the name of Daulatābād to that town. At this time news came that 2 Sāhib Khān son of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn Khaljī, who had revolted with the help of Khwājah Jahān the eunuch of Sultān Maḥmūd, and had seized Mandū and assumed the title of 3 Sultān Muḥammad, and had made most of the nobles take his side, as the pen has attempted to narrate these events in the section about Mālwa, now fled from Mandū, and came praying for help. Sultān Muẓaffar sent Muḥāfiz Khān to receive and welcome Sāhib Khān, so that he

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have تلقتi but the other MS. has تلقت. It appears that the embassy from the Shāh of Persia in respect of which Sultān Maḥmūd had expressed a pious wish that he might not have to show his face to them, and whom in the forcible language of the Cambridge History of India he ordered to be begone was received with much favour by Sultān Muẓaffar. Firishtah goes a little further than Niẓām-ud-dīn. He says و در شرایط تعظیم و تکرم دقیقه فروکداشت نشد, i.e., in the observation of respect and honour no minutia was omitted.

2 There is some slight difference in the readings here; both MSS. read خواجه سرا بر سلطان معمود but the lith. ed. has خواجه سرا بر سلطان معمود. I have adopted the former reading. The sentence requires some explanation. Sāhib Khān was the elder brother of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, but the latter deposed him and became the Sultān, and took the title of Sultān Maḥmūd (II.). Afterwards Sāhib Khān rebelled against him; and having seized Mandū assumed the title of Sultān Muḥammad, but on being defeated afterwards, came to Sultān Muẓaffar for help.

3 The correct title Sultān Muḥammad is given in one MS. but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Maḥmūd.
might carry out the rites of hospitality and try to please his heart. After an interview (Sultān Mużaffar) remained for some days at Barōda in order to entertain Šāhib Khān; and then went away to Muḥammadābād. He sent Qaisar Khān to the town of Dahūd, that he might report a correct and detailed account of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, and of the condition of the country of Mālwa and of the behaviour of the amīrs. As the rains (now) commenced, the people halted at the various places where they happened to be. Šāhib Khān sent a message one day to the effect that a long time 1 had elapsed since the coming of the faqīr, but he does not see that there has been any progress in his affairs. The Sultān replied, "If the great God so wills, I shall at the end of the rains, either amicably or by force recover half the kingdom of Mālwa from the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd and shall make it over to you". But as the star of the fortune of Šāhib Khān was on the decline, it so happened, that he became friendly with Yādgār Bēg Qazibāsh, who had become known to the people of Gujrat by the name of Surkh kulāh, i.e., red cap, owing to their living near each other. 2 One day there was a quarrel between the servants of the

---

1 One MS. has بنده instead of تقيیر in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah about Šāhib Khān's complaint about Qaisar Khān having done nothing to carry out the work which he had been deputed to perform, the Cambridge History of India, page 316, says, that Qaisar Khān returned with a report favourable to Šāhib Khān's claim. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 245, gives a somewhat different account of the work which Kaisar Khān was to do, but it says nothing about his return, or his submitting any report.

2 This incident is variously stated in the different histories. Firishta's account is similar to that in the text; but he adds that the Qazibāshes wounded some of Šāhib Khān's men. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 80, 81) says that the Kuzībashes wounded several persons wholly unconnected with the affair. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, pages 245, 246, begins with the altercation between the servants, but goes on to say that there was some trouble between Šāhib Khān, who is called Shāhzāda Muḥammad, and the Persian envoy, who is called quite incorrectly Mirza Ibrāhīm. Šāhib Khān went in the evening to some old servant of his who lived in the same serai as the Persian envoy. Some strife monger told the latter that Šāhib Khān wanted to rob him; and he shut the door of the serai, and afterwards took Šāhib Khān to his own appartment. In the morning Šāhib Khān escaped, and spread a report, that an order had been issued to plunder the Kuzībashes. A great crowd collected and a fight took place. Many
two households); and it ended in a fight, and the house of Yādgār Bāg was looted. A report spread among the Gujrāt soldiers, that the Turkmāns had seized Śāhib Khān. The latter being ashamed at such a report, left without taking leave of Sūltān Muẓaffar. The details of this brief statement have been mentioned in the section about Mālwa.

As, after the departure of Śāhib Khān, news came to Sūltān Muẓaffar about the power and violence of the 1 Rājpūts and of the weakness of Sūltān Maḥmūd Khalji, his high spirit induced him to undertake the punishment of the former. In order to carry out this resolution, he went to Ahmādābād, so that he might be sure of the safety of the thānas of his own dominions; and he might advance into Mālwa,

of the Kuzilbāshes were slain and the house was set on fire and plundered. Afterwards Sūltān Muẓaffar paid six lakhs of tankahs to the envoy; and sent him back to Irāq with many presents. The Sūltān was annoyed with Śāhib Khān; and he, having received invitations from some amirs of repute in Mālwa, went away without taking leave of the Sūltān. The Cambridge History of India, page 317, has an entirely different story. It says that before Sūltān Muẓaffar could redeem his promise to help him, Śāhib Khān left Gujarāt, owing to “the gross misconduct of the Persian ambassador, who invited him to dinner and assaulted him. The prince’s servants attacked the ambassador’s suite, and plundered his lodging, but the affair was noise about, and Śāhib Khān was so overcome with shame, that he fled from Gujarāt”. I do not know what the authority for this version is, but the fact that the Persian ambassador was paid a large sum by Sūltān Muẓaffar as compensation, and was sent off with presents and all marks of honour; and Śāhib Khān was overcome with shame and fled from Gujarāt show that the statement about the gross misconduct of the Persian ambassador is very improbable.

1 They are called “Poorby Rajpoots” by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 81). According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 247, they were an army of Hindūs, collected at the instance of Sūltān Maḥmūd himself, who gave their leader the title of Mēdinī Rāo. According to a note by Bayley in the same page, he “must have been a man of very remarkable, and in many respects, of a very noble and generous character”. According to Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 381, “Mednee Rāee, the Hindoo minister of that prince, had, it was represented, acquired such authority, that nothing but the name of king was left to the sultan, and infidelity was, therefore, rapidly regaining its dominion”. The Cambridge History of India, page 317, does not mention Mēdinī Rāy, but says that “Nāsir-ud-din of Mālwa had employed in his army a large number of Rājpūts from eastern Hindustan, who had become so powerful in the kingdom, that Maḥmūd II, was a puppet in their hands”.
after asking for the help of the great ones there, both dead and living. He remained in Aḥmadābād for a week; and then proceeded to Kōdhrah (Gōdhrah). He halted there for some days to collect his troops. In the course of these days news was brought to him, that Malik ‘Ain-ul-mulk, the governor of Pattan, was coming with his retainers to wait on him, i.e., the Sultān; but on the way, he received information that the 1 Rāja of Īdar, taking advantage of such an opportunity, had raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion in that locality; and had raided the country as far as the borders of the Sābarmati. Malik ‘Ain-ul-mulk, therefore, on account of his loyalty and devotion wanted that he should come, and attend on the Sultān after punishing him. He had therefore gone, and attacked the town of Mahrāsā. But in the meantime, the Rāja of Īdar, having collected a large force, came forward to meet him; and a great battle took place between the two armies. As Malik ‘Abd-ul-mulk with two hundred men attained to martyrdom, and an elephant which he had with him was cut to pieces, ‘Ain-ul-mulk being unable to stand firm fled.

On hearing this news Sultān Muẓaffār advanced towards Īdar; and when he arrived at the town of Mahrāsā, he sent an army to plunder and devastate the country. The Rāja evacuated the fort, and concealed himself in the hills 2 of Bījānagar. When the Sultān arrived at Īdar, there were only ten Rājpūts, who stood there deliberately, with the intention of immolating themselves and were 3 barbarously and cruelly slain. They left no vestige of any building

---

1 His name according to Firishtah was Bhīm Rāy. He also describes ‘Abu-ul-mulk as a sandār, and Col. Briggs calls him an officer of distinction. According to the Mirāṭ-i-Sikandārī, Bayley, page 249, Abd-ul-Mulk was the brother of ‘Ain-ul-Mulk. Bayley says, in a note on page 249, that according to the Tabakāt, ‘Ain-ul-Mulk lost forty men. This is not correct according to the MSS. or the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt or the lith. ed. of Firishtah or Col. Briggs, according to all of whom 200 men were slain. The Cambridge History of India, page 317, agrees with the text.

2 So called in both MSS. and in lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 81) has “Beesulmuggur”. The Mirāṭ-i-Sikandārī and the Cambridge History of India and Rās Mālā all say went to the hills or hill country.

3 The words are ‘I am not quite sure that my translation is quite correct. It sounds rather offensive.
or temple or garden or trees. The Rāja came forward with great humility; and sending 1 Malik Kōbī Zunārdār (Brahman), to wait on the Sultān; and prayed for pardon. He sent a message to the effect that Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk, owing to the great enmity which he had against this slave, had come and plundered his country; and owing to his distress this helpless one had committed certain acts. If he has committed any offence, he was deserving of the anger and wrath of the Sultān. He was sending 2 twenty lakhs of tankas and a hundred horses by the hand of the vakils. As the conquest of Mālwa was in the forefront of the Sultān's spirit, he accepted the Rāja's excuses, and returned to Kōdhrah. He bestowed the twenty lakhs of tankas and the hundred horses on 'Ain-ul-mulk, so that he might equip his men.

He sent Shāhzhāda Sikandar Khān from Kōdhrah to act as the governor of Muḥammadābād. When he arrived in the town of Dahūd he ordered Qaiṣar Khān, that he should take possession of the country as far as the village of 3 Dēvāla, which was in the possession of Sultān

1 The name is Kōpā in both MSS. and Malik Kōpt in the lith. ed. It is Malik Gōpā in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Mudun Gopal in Col. Briggs's (vol. IV, p. 82). The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 249, has Malik Kōbī a Brahman and a minister of the Sultān in the text, and this is corroborated by Bayley who says in a note, that he was really a minister of Muẓaffar Khān and "he will be found often mentioned in the sequel". He is not mentioned at all in the Cambridge History of India. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ملک کورا in the text-edition.

2 It is twenty lakhs and eight lakhs of tankas respectively in the two MSS., and eight lakhs of rupees in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has twenty lakhs of tankas which is equivalent to two thousand tumāns. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not give the amount; but Bayley says in a note that the Tārikh-i-Alfi says that it was twenty lakhs of tankas (equivalent to two thousand tumāns). Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 82) has "two hundred thousand tankas"; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 317) has eight hundred thousand rupees.

3 The place is دیولہ in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt it is دلواہ. Col. Briggs has "the town of Dydla". The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 250, has "the pass of Deōlah which is very difficult". The Cambridge History of India, page 317, has Deolī near the Mähī and in a note in 22° 57' North and 74° 58' East. The Cambridge History of India goes on to say that the Sultān had now changed his intention of aiding Mahmūd by crushing the Rājputs, and had formed.
Maḥmūd Kḥalji’s men. After that he advanced towards Dhāriāgarh. On the way the 1 son of Ḥarḥkhūḳā, who was a resident of Dhār, came and waited on the Sultān; and begged for quarter for the people of the city. The Sultān gave him assurances of safety; and sent Qawām-ul-mulk (son of Qawām-ul-mulk) and Iḵṭiyār-ul-mulk, son of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, in advance of himself, to reassure and encourage the citizens of Dhār. At this time intelligence came that Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji 2 had been left alone; and the amīrs of Chandīrī had risen against him; and he had gone towards that place. Sultān Muṣṭafār summoned back his amīrs, and told them, “My object in undertaking this expedition was really that I should drive away the Pūrabīa Kāfīrī; and divide the kingdom equally between Sultān Maḥmūd and Shāhib Khān, the sons of Sultān Nāṣīr-ud-dīn. Now that Sultān Maḥmūd has gone to put down the amīrs of Chandīrī, and has taken away the tyrannical Rājpūts with him, it would be removed from the rules of humanity, and the customs of brave men, to enter his country”.

Qawām-ul-mulk, who had now joined the Sultān, reported to the latter something of the 3 beauties of the deer-park of Dhār; and made him desirous and anxious to see the place, and to enjoy the pleasures of the chase. Sultān Muṣṭafār left Qawām-ul-mulk, to guard the

the design of conquering and annexing Mālwa. I have nowhere found any evidence of such a change of mind. All his acts culminating in the restoration of Māndū to Sultān Maḥmūd, after it had been recovered from the Rājpūts in 924 A.H. (1518 A.D.), show that there was no such change. It is true that Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji had great fear about Sultān Muṣṭafār’s intentions, but Māndū was restored to him; and Sultān Muṣṭafār returned to Gujrāt.

1 Firishtah says چون مرکم دحار باستقبال اعدام امام خواسنند, and does not name anyone as the spokesman of the people of Dhār. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 250, says the son of the head man of Dhār came.

2 The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are باخون در مادنئ the meaning of which is not clear. There are no similar words in Firishtah, who says that Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji had gone to crush the amīrs of Chandīrī, who had risen against him. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 250, also says that Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji and Mēdinī Rāḥū had gone towards Chandīrī.

3 The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 251, says “gave such a glowing description of the buildings of the deer-park, which had been formed there under the orders of Sultān Ghūs-ud-dīn”, etc.
camp; and with 1 two thousand horsemen and one hundred and fifty elephants proceeded to Dhār. When he arrived there, he mounted the same afternoon, to go on a pilgrimage to the tombs of Shaikh ‘Abd-ul-lah Jangāl and Shaikh Kamāl-ud-din Mālwi. It is said that in the time of Rāja Bhōj Shaikh ‘Abd-ul-lah had the name of Pandey Brij, and was his vazir; and because of inclination having accepted Islām, attained to spiritual greatness by pious exertions and exercises. In short the Sultān, 2 having in the neighbourhood of Dhār given leave to Nizām-ul-mulk so that he might hunt in the neighbourhood of Dilāwara. Nizām-ul-mulk passed through Dilāwara, and went to Na‘lcha; and when he was returning, a 3 body of Pāmbia Raqūts came on and obstructed him, and they obtained their deserts; as is mentioned in the section about Mālwa. Sultān Muẓaffar on being apprised of this occurrence, was very angry with, and reproved Nizām-ul-mulk, for it was his only object, that this year he should simply see the country and return; and acts like these which had been committed by Nizām-ul-mulk 4 caused him much thought. The Sultān then turned back, and marched towards Gujrāt, and took up his quarters at Muḥammadābād Chāmpānir.

In the month of Shawwāl in the year 921 A.H. (1515 A.D.), as after the death of 5 Rāy Bhīm, Rāja of Īdār, Rānā Sānkā had come to

1 It is two thousand in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 82); but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 251, has “twelve thousand light horse”.

2 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, the Sultān did not give Nizām-ul-Mulk permission to return, but he told him and some others to go and see the deer park. They did not return; and the Sultān was informed later on, that Nizām-ul-Mulk had probably gone to Na‘lcha to see his brother, (who apparently was a Hindū and named Rāj Singh) who dwelt there. It appears from the Cambridge History of India, page 318, that Nizām-ul-Mulk was a son of Raja Patāl (or Rāy Batāl of Chāmpānir).

3 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 252, they “came from Mandū and pursued him. Nizām-ul-Mulk faced about, and fought. Forty of the infidels were killed, and the rest fled back to Mandū”.

4 The actual words are بام بَاغِلو نافَر مْبَگَشِت.

5 It appears that Rāy Bhīm was the younger son of Rāy Bhām, and he had dispossessed his elder brother. Rāy Mal was the son of the latter, and having now grown to man’s estate claimed the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 318, calls Rāj Mal the brother-in-law of Rānā Sānkā. The
the aid of Rāy Mal, son of Sūraj Mal, who was his son-in-law, and had invaded the country and having taken it and the fort of Īdar, from the possession of Bihār Mal, son of Rāy Bāhīm, had made it over to Rāy Mal, Sūltān Muẓaffar appointed Nizām-ul-mulk, that he should recover the country from Rāy Mal and make it over to Bihār Mal. He himself proceeded towards Aḥmadnagar. On the way, when Bihār Mal joined Nizām-ul-mulk, the latter brought him to have the honour of waiting upon the Sultān. From that station, the Sultān left Khudāwand Khān and Nizām-ul-mulk to guard the camp; and went to Pāttan. He conferred favours on the residents of the city in general and on the wise and learned men in special; and coming back joined the camp. He then sent Bihār Mal with Nizām-ul-mulk and granted leave to the latter to go and recover possession of Īdar from Rāy Mal and make it over to Bihār Mal. After Nizām-ul-mulk had made over possession of Īdar to Bihār Mal, Rāy Mal retired for protection to the hills of Bijānagar. Nizām-ul-mulk pursued him, and fought with him; and many people were slain on both sides. When this news reached Sultān Muẓaffar he sent an order (to the effect) that, as the country of Īdar had been recovered, the act of going to Bijānagar, and fighting a battle there was the cause of a number of soldiers being slain without any necessity; and it was right that he (Nizām-ul-mulk) should return that very day.

After the return of Nizām-ul-mulk the Sultān came from Aḥmadnagar to Aḥmadābād. He arranged a great entertainment, and cele-

Tabaqāt and Fīrishtah call him Rānā Sāṅkā’s dāmād or son-in-law; and Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 382, says expressly that he had married the daughter of “Sung Rānā of Cheетor”. The Cambridge History of India also says that Rānā Sāṅkā “welcomed the opportunity of asserting his ill-founded claim to supremacy over all Rājput princes”, but surely he could support his own brother-in-law, without any such ulterior motive. In fact Sultān Muẓaffar had about as much or as little right to interfere as Rānā Sāṅkā.

1 It is Bijānagar in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; and also in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah; but Col. Briggs has the Beesulmugger territory; and the Cambridge History of India, page 318, has the Bichahhera hills. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī does not mention the incidents, but Bayley quotes from the Tārikh-i-Alfī and the Tabakāt; but the hills are not mentioned in the quotations. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 382) says “the hills”. It mentions Veesulmugger later in connection with the Sultān’s order to Malik Noorṣut-ool-Moolk to plunder and lay waste the country, which is described as the “receptacle of renegades and the asylum of rebels” (p. 383).
brated the marriages of 1 Shāhāzādas Sikandar Khān, Bahādur Khān and Latīf Khān. He bestowed favours on the amīrs and the well-known men of the city, giving them horses and robes of honour. After the rains he advanced towards Īdar to see the country, and to hunt there. As Nizām-ul-mulk was ill, he left physicians to attend to him; and in the early part of 923 A.H., he went to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr. From that place he sent Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk to Īdar, and summoned Nizām-ul-mulk to his presence. Before the arrival of Naṣrat-ul-mulk, Nizām-ul-mulk left Zahir-ul-mulk at Īdar with a hundred horsemen; and on wings of speed and 2 steps of eagerness came to Muḥammadābād. Naṣrat-ul-mulk was still in the neighbourhood, when Rāy Mal, seizing the opportunity, advanced on Īdar. 3 Zahir-ul-mulk, in spite of the small number of his friends and the vast number of his enemies, advanced to meet him, and was slain with twenty-seven of his men. When this news reached Sultān Muẓaffar he sent a farmān to Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk, to invade and devastate as far as 4 Bijānagar, which had become an asylum of the disturbers of the peace, and the shelter of rebels.

About this time His Holiness 5 Shaikh Jāīldah, who was the first man of his time (in learning, etc.), and 6 Habīb Khān the

1 Firishtah lith. ed. says the Sultān celebrated the marriage of Shāhāzāda Sikandar Khān, but does not mention the other two; and the marriages do not appear to be mentioned anywhere else.

2 The words افادات شوق are left out in one MS., but are to be found in the other and in the lith. ed.

3 The other histories agree; but Col. Briggs has a totally incorrect account. He says (vol. IV, p. 83) “Zeheer-ool-Moolk marched against him, but was killed at the head of the cavalry; on which occasion two hundred and seven men fell, and the Guzeratties were defeated”.

4 See note 1, page 300. The Cambridge History of India (p. 319), which had a few lines before called the Bijānagar or Visālnagar hills, the Bichabhera hills now gives them an entirely different name, viz., the Vajinagar hills.

5 The name is written in one MS. as جالندہ, and in the lith. ed. as جالندہ. Firishtah lith. ed. has شیخ حامد, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 84) has “Sheikh Humeed of Bhilsa”. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 233, has Shekh Jābulandah. Neither Rās Mālā nor the Cambridge History of India mentions him. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has used جالندہ.

6 There is no doubt about his name; but the name of his sīf is 웅 in the MSS., and داشته است نگر in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls him حبيب خان.
feudatory of Ashtanagar fled from Mandū on account of the violence of the Pūrabā Ṛājpūts and waited on the Sultān, and ¹ complained of the great power which they had acquired. ² A few days later, a representation came from the dārōgha of Dahūd that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had become alarmed at the great power of the Pūrabā Ṛājpūts, and had come praying for help. As he had arrived at the village of Bhakōr, which was situated on the boundary of Gujrat, this slave (i.e., he himself) had waited on him, and as far as lay in his power, had left nothing undone in rendering service to him. Sultān Muẓaffar was pleased on hearing of these incidents; and he sent tents and a red pavilion with necessary equipages and many beautiful gifts and presents and all that is specially reserved for bāḍshāhs by the hand of Qaisar Khān; and he himself advanced to welcome Sultān Mahmūd. They met in the village of ³Dévla. Sultān Muẓaffar did everything to please his guest, and exhorted him not to be much distressed owing to the separation from his children and his kingdom, as before long

¹ The purport of the complaints is given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 233.
² The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, pages 254, 255, describes at some length the way in which Sultān Mahmūd Khiljī escaped with his favourite wife Rānī Kanākrā (Bayley says in a note Kanākrā means golden) on two horses provided by Kishnā, a Rājpūt zamīndār, who was also one of his guards. The village to which Sultān Mahmūd Khiljī came is called Bhakōrā in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari.
³ What follows is copied almost word for word by Firishtah, but the name of the village where the two sovereigns met is mādīwār in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The account given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 235, is similar, but it appears from it that the name of the dārōgha or governor, as he is called by Bayley, was Kaisar Khān. The presents mentioned in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari are also different. They consisted of horses and elephants and male and female attendants. The account in the Cambridge History of India, page 319, is similar, but Qaisar Khān is described as a Gujarāt noble, and the presents are somewhat different, and the village to which Sultān Mahmūd Khiljī came is called Bhāgor.
with divine help he would be able to destroy the Pūrabīs, and purify the kingdom of all disturbances and rebellions, and restore it to his servants (euphemism for himself). He halted at the place, and gave orders for the mustering of his troops, and in a short time an immense army advanced into Mālwā.

When Médini Rāy received information of the advance of Sultān Muṣaffar, he left Rāy Pithōrā with a body of Rājpūts in the fort of Mandū; and himself with two thousand Rājpūt horsemen and the elephants belonging to Sultān Maḥmūd proceeded to Dhār. From that place he went to Rānā Sānkā to bring him to his aid. Sultān Muṣaffar advanced to Mandū with the object of laying siege to it. When the army arrived near Mandū, the Rājpūts sallied out, and fought with great bravery; but in the end, they fled and took shelter in the fort. The next day also the Rājpūts came out and fought a great battle. Qawām-ul-mulk exerted himself in a notable way and slew many Rājpūts. That day Sultān Muṣaffar divided the different sides of the fort, and entrusted them to the amirs, and made the siege closer. At this time Médini Rāy sent a letter to Rāy Pithōrā, and informed him, "I have come to Rānā Sānkā, and I am bringing him with all the Rājpūts of Mārwār and the neighbouring country. You should keep Sultān Muṣaffar inactive for the period of one month by tales and excuses". Rāy Pithōrā with great deceit and trickery sent emissaries with the following message, "As the fort of Mandū has for a long time been in the possession of the Rājpūts, and they have got their families and dependants in it, they would be able to remove them and vacate the fort in the course of a month, and would then make it over to him; and they would also hasten to his service and become his loyal adherents, if he would go back, and take up a station

1 The name is spelt in different ways in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but the correct spelling appears to be what I have adopted in the text. Pithōrā, as the reader will remember, was the name given by the Musalmān historians to the celebrated Prithī Rāj of Dehil. The Rāy Pithōrā in the present case appears to have been a son of Médini Rāy. According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 256, Médini Rāo sent Shāhī Khan, Pithōrā and three other Hindūs to hold the fort of Mandū, but according to most historians the command was confided to Rāy Pithōrā. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 84) calls him Bhew Ray.

2 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, the emissaries went to Khudāwand Khān the vāzir, and he took them to the Sultān.
one stage behind his present position". Although Sultân Muẓaffar knew that these people were merely temporizing and were waiting for reinforcements, still as the sons and other relations of Sultân Maḥmūd were in the fort, he had no other alternative, except to agree to their prayer; and he went and took up a position three *korōhs* further back.

At this station, 1 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Āsîr and Burhānpūr, arrived with a fresh army and joined the Sultân. At this time news came to the latter, that Mēdīnī Rāy had given 2 some elephants and much gold to Rānā Sānkā, and had brought him to aid and reinforce his men; and they had arrived in the neighbourhood of Ujjain. The noble spirit of Sultân Muẓaffar was now aroused, and he sent 'Ādil Khān Fārūqī, the ruler of Āsîr and Burhānpūr and Qawām-ul-mulk Sultānī to attack Rānā Sānkā, and himself began anew the siege of the fort of Mandū. He devoted all his energy to it, so that the fort might be taken before the battle with Rānā Sānkā took place; and 3 he stationed the *amīrs* and the leaders of the different bodies, at the various stations round the fort. On the morning following the night of the 14th Šafar, 924 A.H., (the Musalmāns) came in crowds from all sides of the fort, and attacked it; and placing ladders (against the wall) entered the fort. The Rājpūts performed *jauhar* and set fire to their houses, and killed their families and children, and burnt some of them, and then commenced fighting, and fought as long as they had any life left in them. Sultân Muẓaffar entered the fort and ordered a general massacre. It has been stated correctly that on that day

---

1 He was Sultân Muẓaffar's nephew and son-in-law.
2 These were some of the elephants belonging to Sultân Maḥmūd which Mēdīnī Rāy took with him.
3 The operations are differently described by Firishtah, who says that for four days continuous attacks were made, so that the garrison had no sleep or rest. On the 5th night there was a cessation of assaults, and the garrison became careless. Then when midnight came, the soldiers went with ladders; and as they found the men in the citadel asleep, they mounted to the top of the ramparts, and slew the guards at the gate. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 85) says that false attacks were made on the first four nights; and the garrison being worn out with fatigue, on the fifth night ladders were applied and Mando fell. The Cambridge History of India, page 319, says, "On February 23rd, 1518, the day of the Hindu festival of the Holi, Mândū was carried by escalade".
19,000 Rājpūts were slain. The particulars of this brief statement have been mentioned in the section about Mālwa.

In short, when he had finished the massacre of the Pūrabā Rājpūts, Sultān Mahmūd waited on him, and offered congratulations and felicitations, and inquired in great anxiety, “What does Your Majesty say to this slave?” Sultān Muẓaffar said, “May the great God make you happy with the fort of Mandū and the kingdom of Mālwa.” He then turned back, and went to his camp. The next day he advanced towards 1 Rānā Sānkā. One of the notable men among the Rājpūts, who had been wounded, and who had fled from the fort, had gone to the Rānā; and had described to him the great power of, and the ferocity of the massacre by Sultān Muẓaffar in such a way, that the Rānā 2 was thoroughly frightened, and he fled incontinently towards Chitīr; and 3 that Rājpūt died in the same majlis (assembly). As Sultān Mahmūd came from Mandū to Dhār, and prayed that 4 “The Sultān is in the place of my father and uncle, I hope that he would add fresh kindness to his former favours; and would make the hovel of this insignificant one bright with the grandeur of his pleasant advent.” Sultān Muẓaffar accepted his prayer and went to Mandū, taking Shāhzādas Sikandar Khān and Latīf Khān and ‘Ādil Khān, the ruler of Asīr and Būrānpūr with him. They stayed that night at Na’lēcha, and in the morning, mounted on elephants, entered the fort, and dismounted at Sultān Mahmūd’s palace. Sultān Mahmūd endeavoured, to the best of his power, to perform the rites of hospitality, and himself standing before Sultān Muẓaffar

---

1 One MS. has 2 before Rānā Sānkā, but neither the other MS. nor the lith. ed. has it. متوجحة جنگ رانَا ساکا in the text-edition.

2 The actual words are رنَّا رانَا راَبِّدَتْ حَلََتْ, lit. the Rānā’s liver melted. Firāštah’s account does not differ materially from the text, but he says that the Rānā fled towards Jaipur, and ‘Ādil Khān pursued him, plundering and slaying those who fell behind.

3 It would appear that he was so excited that his wounds burst open, and he bled to death.

4 One MS. has a reading different from that in the other MS., and in the lith. ed., and the one which I have adopted. That reading is کہ بجائے بدر و جم تصدیق میں شوہد, which would mean: Be thou in the place of the father and the uncle of this faqir.
waited on him. After they had finished eating, he placed presents of all kinds before Sultan Muẓaffar and the Shāhzādas; and again made his excuses. Sultan Muẓaffar then saw all the palaces and other buildings of the former Sultan of Mālwa; and afterwards went back to Dhār. There he bade adieu to Sultan Maḥmūd, and leaving Āṣaf Khān Gujrātī with ten thousand horsemen to reinforce him, started for Gujrāt. Sultan Maḥmūd owing to his great affection accompanied him as far as mauḍa Dēvla, although Sultan Muẓaffar had already said farewell to him; and there, after again taking leave of him, returned to Mandū.

On his arrival in Gujrāt, Sultan Muẓaffar remained for some days in Muhammadābād Chāmpānūr; and the great and noble men of the country of Gujrāt hastened to wait on him, with their felicitations and congratulations; and were made happy with his largesses and favours. At this time, one day one of his courtiers reported to him, that at the time, when the shadow of his conquest had been spread over the kingdom of Mālwa, Rāy Mal, Rāja of Īdar had come out of the hills of Bijānagar, and had raided a part of the country of Pattan and the town of ¹ Gilwāra; but as Nasrat-ul-mulk left Īdar, and advanced to give him battle, he fled and concealed himself in the caves of Bijānagar. The Sultan declared, “God willing, I will, after the rains, determine what to do in this matter”. After the rains in the year 926 A.H., 1519 A.D., he advanced towards Īdar to chastise and punish Rāy Mal, and other disturbers of peace. As ² Rāja Māl was the protector and the asylum of Rāy Mal, the Sultan thought that the chastisement of the former should be undertaken first; and he levelled his territory to the dust; and after halting at Īdar for a few days, he came back to Muhammadābād Chāmpānūr and stayed there.

¹ The name of the town is گلوارہ ¹ in the Mss., and گلوارہ in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has قصبے انحداد without giving any names. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 87) has the town of Gilwara. I cannot find any mention of it in the Mīrāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India, but Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 383) agrees with Col. Briggs and calls it Gilwārā. کہرالہ in the text-edition.

² The name is راجہ مال in both MSS., but it is راجہ مال in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls him راجہ مل Rāja Mal. I cannot find him or his territory mentioned anywhere else.
After a few days, news came that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had, in concert with Aṣaf Khān marched against 1 Bhīm Karan Pūrabīa, with the object of seizing 2 Kākrūn, when Mōdīnī Rāy brought Rānā Sāṅkā to aid him, and a great battle took place. Most of the amīrs of Mālwa were slain; and Aṣaf Khān’s son and a number of other warriors were also killed. Sultān Mahmūd received many wounds, and was taken prisoner. Rānā Sāṅkā, however, treated him with kindness; and sent him with a body of troops to Māndū. Sultān Muẓaffar hearing this news became depressed and sad; and sent some other surdārs to Sultān Mahmūd’s aid, and wrote an affectionate letter inquiring about him. About this time, Sultān Muẓaffar went to Īdar to see the country and to enjoy the pleasures of the chase; and commenced erecting some buildings there. On his return, he brought Naṣrat-ul-mulk to Aḥmadābād with him; and entrusted the government of Īdar to Malik Mubāriz-ul-mulk.

It so happened, that one day a bard or wandering minstrel waited on Mubāriz-ul-mulk, and said something about the bravery of Rānā Sāṅkā. Mubāriz-ul-mulk, on account of his great arrogance and pride, spoke to him in improper language; and giving 3 a dog the name of Rānā Sāṅkā, kept him tied up at the gate of Īdar. The bard went back, and told this story to Rānā Sāṅkā. The Rānā owing to his pride and boorishness turned towards Īdar, and advanced and

---

1 There is no mention of Bhīm Karan or Kākrūn in any other history, except the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, page 263) where it is said that Sultān Mahmūd marched to surkār Gāgrūn, where he attacked Bhīm Karan; and it is said in a note “that Bhīm Karan is said to have been a deputy of Mōdīnī Rāo, and was holding Gāgrūn (?) for him. He was certainly one of his chief officers and very probably a relative”. Evidently some lines have been left out in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs, the Cambridge History of India and Rās Māla, all say that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had attacked the combined forces of Mōdīnī Rāy and Rānā Sāṅkā, and had been defeated by them.

2 One MS. has before Kākrūn, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have it.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 329, says that Mubāriz-ul-Mulk called the dog Sangrama. I am afraid Sangrama, or the more correct Sangrāma would have been Greek to Mubāriz-ul-Mulk. I doubt whether Rānā Sangrām Singh’s parents or he himself ever called himself Sangrama or Sangrāma. Sangrām was quite sufficient for them.

4 The word used is , but it appears to me to be extremely inappropriate and unjust.
ravaged the country to the boundary of Sirōhī. About this time Sultān Muẓaffar went to Chāmpānīr, leaving Qiwām-ul-mulk, son of Qiwām-ul-mulk, in Aḥmadābād, for the control of the 1 grāssias. 2 When Rānā Sāṅkā arrived in the country of 3 Bākār, the Rāja, although he was obedient and submissive to Sultān Muẓaffar, in his fear and distress joined Rānā Sāṅkā. The latter then came to Dūngarpūr. Mubāriz-ul-mulk wrote an account of what had happened to the Sultān. As the Sultān’s vazīrs were not friendly to Mubāriz-ul-mulk they told the Sultān that it was not 4 right for him to give the Rānā’s name to a dog, and thus bring him into contempt; and afterwards being afraid of him, to ask for reinforcement; otherwise the Rānā would not have dared to put his foot into the Sultān’s territories. It so happened, however, that at that time, the army which had been left to protect Idar had, on account of the 5 excessive rains gone to their own homes at Aḥmadābād and only a small number had remained with Mubāriz-ul-mulk.

---

1 Grās according to a note on page 98 of the Mirāt-i-Sikandari comprises (1) blackmail paid to powerful local chiefs for protection and immunity from plunder, or rather land held in lieu of such blackmail; (2) lands or allowances allotted by government, or allowed to be retained by them to land-holders, both as a politic measure to keep them quiet, and as a retainer for military and other services. Here apparently the word is used to mean the holders of such land.

2 Firishtah’s account agrees generally with the text; but he says that Rānā Sāṅkā plundered and ravaged Mubāriz-ul-mulk’s fief before coming to Bākār; and he also says that the Sultān on hearing what his vazīrs told him delayed sending in reinforcements. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 264) gives a detailed account of Nizām-ul-Mulk’s talk with the bard, Rānā Sāṅkā’s march against Idar and the former’s prayer for reinforcement, and the action of the Sultān’s minister about it, down to the battle of Aḥmadābād and the sack of that city. Its version of the story of the dog is somewhat different from that in the other histories. It is said, that in the talk with the bard, Nizām-ul-Mulk repeatedly called the Rānā a dog, and finally he called for a dog, and having had it tied up at the door of the darbār, he said, “If the Rānā does not come he will be like this dog”.

3 Called Bāgār in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 266, and Bagry by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 88).

4 The word is مناسب لابقی in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but برسات باران و in the other MS.

5 One MS. inserts برسات before 3.
Rānā Sānkā becoming cognizant of all these things, advanced against Īdar. When he arrived near, Mubāriz-ul-mulk with the other sardārs prepared for battle, and went out to meet him; but before the two armies should come together, they turned back and returned to Īdar. The sardārs said that the small number of their friends and the vast host of their enemies were patent to all. It was advisable that they should go to Ahmadnagar and fortify themselves there, till the arrival of the reinforcements; and on this decision they went to the fort of Ahmadnagar, taking Mubāriz-ul-mulk with them, whether he liked it or not. On the following morning Rānā Sānkā arrived at Īdar, and enquired about Mubāriz-ul-mulk. The grāssias, who had fled from Qawām-ul-mulk, and had joined the Rānā told him that Mubāriz-ul-mulk was not a man that would run away, but the amirs had taken him away to Ahmadnagar; and they were waiting for reinforcements. Rānā Sānkā then advanced against Ahmadnagar with a large force. The bard who had praised Rānā Sānkā in the presence of Mubāriz-ul-mulk again went to the latter; and said, "Rānā Sānkā has come with a large army. It would be a great pity that men like you should be killed for nothing. It is advisable that you should remain in the fort of Ahmadnagar. The Rānā would return after giving his horse a drink of water below the fort, and he would not do anything more". Mubāriz-ul-mulk said in reply, "It is impossible that I should allow him to give water to his horse in this river." He thereupon with great bravery crossed the river with the few men that were with him; and who were not a tenth part of the number of the Rānā's army. When the Rānā arrived there, there was a great battle. Asad Khān who was one of the commanders was killed with a number of other horsemen. Šafīdar Khān was wounded; and Mubāriz-ul-mulk, after making several attacks on the Rānā's troops, received many wounds; and most of the Gujrātīs

---

1 To show, I suppose, that he had come as far as the fort and Mubāriz-ul-mulk had not dared to come out. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 89) says, "till his horse drank out of the ditch of Ahmadnuggur"; but I suppose, and the next sentence shows, that he meant the river which flows below the city and the fort.

2 The clause is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but it appears to be redundant. Firishta inserts چو before گئن and omits the ڑ after ہند. This improves the clause a great deal. The meaning of the
were slain. Mubāriz-ul-mulk and Şafdar Khān now retired to Aḥmadābād. The Rānā ravaged Aḥmadnagar, and halted there for one day. The next morning he marched towards Badnagar. When he arrived near it, most of the inhabitants came to him and said, "We are zunnārdārs (men with the sacred thread, Brahmans) and your forefathers have always respected and honoured us". Rānā Sāṅkā desisted from attacking and plundering Badnagar and advanced to Bēsālnagar. Malik Ḥātim the thānadār of the place came out with the resolution of becoming a martyr; and gave him battle; and attained his object. Rānā Sāṅkā after ravaging Bēsālnagar returned to his own country.

amended clause is, as most of the Gujrātīs were slain Mubāriz-ul-mulk and Şafdar Khan retired to Aḥmadābād.

1 The readings are different. One MS. has مَتْوَجَهُ بِدَنَّكُر كَرِيدُ, marched towards Badnagar. The other has عَاظَمُ بِدَنَّكُر كَرِيدُ. The lith. ed. has مَتْوَجَهُ بِدَنَّكُر كَرِيدُ. Firishtah has مَتْوَجَهُ بِدَنَّكُر كَرِيدُ. I have adopted this, as it agrees with the reading in the first MS. The place is called Barnagar in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and Vadnagar in the Cambridge History of India, page 320. I do not know why and how بِدَنَّكُر has been transformed into Vadnagar. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 269, says that the grāssīaḥs incited the Rānā to plunder Barnagar, as the inhabitants of the place were merchants, and who were very rich; but the Rānā did not on the representation of the inhabitants, as stated in the text, allow the place to be plundered.

2 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India say that Rānā Sāṅkā accepted tribute from the people; but neither the Ṭabaqāt nor Firishtah says so. A Brahman who has always called himself a mendicant is not likely to have paid much tribute.

3 The place is written like بِسَلَنَگَر Bēsālnagar in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it looks like Bēshnagar. Col. Briggs has Bēsālnagar. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 269, has Bīshnagar. The Cambridge History of India, page 320, has Vianagar. I think Bēsālnagar is identical with the hills of Bījānagar, to which the Rājās of İdar used to escape whenever hard pressed by the Sultāns of Gujrat; and which the Cambridge History of India had in previous pages called Bichabhera (page 318) and Vajinagar hills (page 319) and now gives it the entirely new name of Vianagar (see notes 1, page 300 and 3, page 301). بِسَلَنَگَر Bēshnagar in the text-edition.

4 Contrary to what is stated here, and in Firishtah, the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 269, says, he shut himself in the fort and it was beleaguered till the hour of evening prayer, and in the fighting and confusion the town was plundered.
Malik Qawām-ul-mulk sent a detachment with Mubāriz-ul-mulk and Saḍdar Khān to Aḥmadnagar that they might bury the dead. Mubāriz-ul-mulk arrived at Aḥmadnagar, and buried the martyrs. About this time the 2 kōlis and grāssias from the neighbourhood of Īdar, seeing the small force under Mubāriz-ul-mulk's command, attacked him. Mubāriz-ul-mulk came out of the fort and fought with them; and after slaying sixty-one of the leaders of the grāssias, returned victorious and triumphant to Aḥmadnagar. As Aḥmadnagar, however, was in ruin, 3 and the people suffered privations for want of grain and all other necessaries, they started from there; and came to the 4 town of Parāntēj.

When news of all these events reached Sultān Muẓaffar, the latter appointed 5 'Imād-ul-mulk and Qaisar Khān with an enormous army and one hundred elephants to crush Rānā Sāṅkā. 'Imād-ul-mulk and Qaisar Khān arrived at Aḥmadābād, and taking Qawām-ul-mulk with them went to Parāntēj. From that place, they wrote to the Sultān, that Rānā Sāṅkā had returned to his own country, and asked

1 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 270, gives a fairly detailed account of how Kiwām-ul-Mulk started to reinforce Mubāriz-ul-Mulk, how he heard of the latter's defeat, and sent for him with the object of going in pursuit, but hearing that this was impossible, sent Mubāriz-ul-Mulk to bury the dead, and this was done sixteen days after the battle.

2 Firshtah agrees with the text; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 90) says that the Kōlies and Girasias attacked Moobariz-ool-Moolk on the march to Ahmudnuggur, but were defeated. Rās Mālā also says so. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 270, says that the Kōlies of Kanth came to carry off grain from Ahmadnagar.

3 There is no 4 in this place in the MS. or in the lith. ed.; but I have inserted it as it is required to complete the sense.

4 The name appears to be یومنس Wahnj, and یومنس Dahēj in the MS., and یومنس Hēch in the lith. ed. and یومنس Rahēj in the lith. ed. of Firshtah. Col. Briggs has Puranty. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 270, has Parāntēj and Rās Mālā has Poorāntēj. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matter. I have adopted Parāntēj. M. Hidayat Ḥosain, however, has یومنس Dahēj in the text-edition.

5 There are slight variations in the readings. The lith. ed. has یومنس before یومنس but the MSS. omit the words; and one MS. and the lith. ed. have یومنس , but the other MS. has یومنس.
for permission to march to Chitôr. The Sultân wrote in reply, that as the rains had commenced they should wait in Aḥmadnagar; and after the rains should advance towards Chitôr. The amîrs, in accordance with this order remained at Aḥmadnagar. Sultân Muṣaffar paid the soldiers a year's wages from the treasury; and went to Aḥmadâbâd. He intended to march to Chitôr himself to chastise Rânâ Sânkâ.

At this time 2 Malik Ayâz Sultânî came from Sûrath with a large army; and after rendering homage represented that the 3 imperial grandeur of the Sultân is higher and more exalted, than that he should go in person to punish and chastise Rânâ Sânkâ. The training of slaves like myself is for the purpose, that if a work like this has to be done, the Sultân should not have to take the trouble to do it. In the month of Muḥarram in the year 927 A.H. (December, 1520 A.D.) Sultân Muṣaffar arrived at Aḥmadnagar. When the army had all collected Malik Ayâz 4 again prayed (that he should be employed)

---

1 Firishtah lith. ed. agrees with the text, but the place where the amîrs remained is called سرکھی Sarkach, or Sarkhâj; and calls the Rânâ's capital Jaipur instead of Chitôr. He also says that the Sultân ordered the payment of one year's wages to the soldiers. Col. Briggs has a different account. He says Imad-ool-Moolk and Kaisur Khan retreated from Ahmudnaggur, but the Sultân ordered them to remain there during the rains; and he intended to advance to Chittoor in person after the rains. The Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 271, says that the allowances of the whole army were increased from ten to twenty per cent., and a year's pay was issued from the treasury, so that every man might provide himself with all that was requisite for the campaign.

2 According to the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 233, Malik Alâz "was originally a purchased slave, yet he attained to the rule of provinces, and to unlimited wealth." Bayley also says in a note that some authorities declare he was a renegade Portuguese, but this assertion seems opposed to such an origin. He was possibly a slave brought from the southern provinces of Europe or Asia Minor or Armenia by the Turks. But contrary to this Firishtah says ایازخان سلطانی کے از علامہ پدری بود and Col. Briggs has "originally a slave born in the king's family" (vol. IV, p. 90).

3 In the corresponding passage, Firishtah has اور between کینواری and جمال.

4 This would be somewhat impertinent on his part, but Firishtah says, that when he made the request on the previous occasion, the Sultân did not give any reply.
to chastise Rānā Sānkā. The Sultān sent him for that purpose with one laikh horsemen, and a hundred elephants. He also sent 1 Qawām-ul-mulk with twenty thousand horsemen, a little later to join Malik Ayāz. When the two commanders encamped at Mahrāsa, the Sultān with great caution and farsight sent Tāj Khān and Nizām-ul-mulk Sultānī also to that place (to join them). Malik Ayāz sent a representation to the Sultān, in which he submitted, that the act of sending so many great amirs for the punishment of Rānā Sānkā would be a reason for his pride and glorification. He also reported that so many elephants were not at all necessary; and that this slave (i.e., he himself), owing to the grandeur of His Majesty, was quite sufficient for this service; and after 2 sending back most of the elephants, he marched from Mahrāsa, and encamped at the village of 3 Dhōl. From that place many detachments were sent out to plunder and ravage the country. Şafdar Khān was sent from here, to chastise the Rājpūts of 4 Lakiākōt. He marched to this place, which was in a rough and uneven country, and ravaged it, and slew many Rājpūts, and taking those who escaped the sword, with him as prisoners of war, re-joined Malik Ayāz. They marched from that place, and having burnt down, and rased to the ground Dūngarpūr and Bānswāla, advanced

1 The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī says, on the authority of the Tarikh-i-Bahādar Shāhī, Bayley, page 272, that he had a hundred elephants in addition to one hundred thousand horsemen.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. agrees; but Col. Briggs says that he left behind him nearly all the elephants, and the greater part of the cavalry which had lately joined (vol. IV, p. 91).

3 The village is called Dhōl in one MS; and in the lith. ed., and Dādūd in the other MS. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or by Col. Briggs; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 272, calls it Dhamōlah in the district of Bāgar, but in a note which purports to be a translation of a passage of the Tabakāt Bayley calls it Dabāl.

4 The name is ḏd in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is not mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī; but Bayley translating a part of the Tabakāt in a note calls it Lakiā Kōt. The Cambridge History of India (p. 320) mentions Gāliākot and Bānswāra among the five places, which were ravaged and gives the lat. and long. of each. Apparently the author had a map on a very large scale in which all these places were marked and from which their lat. and long. could be calculated. Gāliākot is probably identical with Lakiākot and Bānswāra with Bānswāla.
towards Chitôr. It so happened that at this station, a man came and gave information to ¹ Malik Ashja'-ul-mulk and Şafdar Khân, that Udaya Singh, Râja of ² Mâl, had, with a body of Râjpût soldiers of Rânâ Sânkâ and Ugar Sên Pûrabia, come and were lying in ambush behind a hill; and they wanted to make a night attack. Ashja'-ul-mulk and Şafdar Khân without sending any information to Malik Ayâz Sulţânî, galloped to that place, taking two hundred horsemen with them. There was a great battle. Ugar Sên was wounded, and fifty Râjpûts fell on the battlefield; and the other Râjpûts fled. When Ayâz Sulţânî came to know of these happenings, he advanced with his army fully equipped to reinforce and help Şafdar Khân. When he reached the battlefield, he was amazed at the (gallant) efforts of Şafdar Khân; and applied the ointment of kindness on the wounds of the ghâzîs (victorious heroes of Islâm).

On the following morning, Malik Qawâm-ul-mulk Sulţânî penetrated into the hill of Bânswâla in pursuit of the men (i.e., those who had fled); and did not leave a vestige of men and habitation there. Ugar Sên, wounded as he was, went to the Rânâ, and told him all that had happened. When Malik Ayâz arrived at Mandisôr, and besieged it, Rânâ Sânkâ came to the aid of his thânadar; and halting at a distance of twelve karôhs from Mandisôr sent ³ the following

¹ One MS. calls him Malik Ashja', but the other and the lith. ed. omit. Firishtah calls him Malik Ashja', but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 91), apparently following the Mirât-i-Sikandari, calls him Shooja-ool-Moolk. Bayley, of course, calls him Shujâ'-ul-Mulk.

² The name of the place is Mal in the MSS. and Pal in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is that of the Râja, but calls him the Râjah of Bânabîlah. Firishtah's account of the information of the intended night attack, and the skirmish with the men who were in ambush, agrees word for word with the text. The account in the Mirât-i-Sikandari is somewhat different. Ugar Sên is not named, but is probably included in "some relatives of Mûdîn Râo". It is also said that the Musulmân were greatly outnumbered, but they fought bravely and defeated the Râjpûts (Bayley, p. 272).

³ The lith. ed. of Firishtah gives the same version of the message as the text; but Col. Briggs says that "there were certain conditions so extravagant, that Mullik Kiaz determined to continue the siege". The Mirât-i-Sikandari,
message to Malik Ayâz, "I am sending ambassadors to wait on the Sultan; and I shall be enlisted among his adherents. Do you abandon the siege." Malik Ayâz made some polite speeches, which had really no meaning, to the messengers; and devoted all his energy to the capture of the fort; and carried the mines so far, that it became a matter of to-day or to-morrow.

At this time Sharzah Khan Sharwâni came from Sultan Mahmûd Khalji, and delivered a message to Malik Ayâz, to the effect, that if there was any necessity for help and reinforcement, he would at once come to render it. Malik Ayâz was delighted, and asked him to come. As Sultan Mahmûd was bound by ties of gratitude to Muzaffar Shâh, he came to Mandisâr bringing Silhâhadi Purâbî with him. Râna Şânkâ was frightened at the coming of Sultan Mahmûd; and sent Mâdini Rây to Silhâhadi with the following message, "It is right that one should favour one's own community. It is right, therefore, that he should not himself excuse from rendering his duty to his community; and at present he should exert himself in bringing about a treaty of peace".

After some days things came to such a pass, that the garrison was reduced to the greatest straits. Qawâm-ul-mulk advanced his battery

---

Bayley, page 273, gives the terms of the message in some detail, but I do not find anything extravagant in them.

1 The name is mentioned only in the Tabaqât and in Firishtah. It is Sharzah in the MS. of the Tabaqât, and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât it is Shâr. The MS. of the Tabaqât has Sarwânî, but the lith. eds. of both the Tabaqât and Firishtah have Sharwâni.

2 The name of Silhâhadi is written as سلیم‌دی in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât, but in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is سلیم‌دی. In the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 273, he is called "Silahdî, a Tuar Râjput by tribe", but Bayley says in a note that the description of Silahdî's tribe is only in MS. A, and there also doubtful. On an earlier page, I ventured a guess in respect of another Silahdî that the name might be a corruption of Sâlya Devâ but it occurs to me now that it is more probably a corruption of Silâdri, the rocky mountain.

The Mirât-i-Sikandari tells a different story about Silahdî. It says he was coming from Râslân with one hundred thousand horse to have an interview with Malik Alâz, but Mâdini Rây went and met him on the way, and enticed him over to the Râna.

3 Firishtah adds سلیم‌دی هرچند سعی کرد ماج ماند, i.e., although Silhâhadi made (every) effort, peace could not be effected.
and wanted to get into the fort. Malik Ayāz, fearing that the victory might be attributed to Qawām-ul-mulk, kept him back that day from engaging the enemy. The amirs of Gujrat, hearing of this intention, were grieved in their hearts against Malik Ayāz. Mubāriz-ul-mulk and some other commanders advanced the next morning to fight with Rānā Sānkā’s troops, without taking his permission. Malik Tughlaq Shāh Fūlādī went and brought them back from the way. There was now a discussion among the amirs; but for fear of the punishment by the Sultān, they could not advance again without the permission of Malik Ayāz. The latter, in spite of the opposition of the amirs, made his soldiers ready, and set fire to the mines. When the bastion was shattered and fell down, it was found, that the Rājpūts having become aware of the state of things, had built another wall opposite to the bastion.

The next day emissaries came from Rānā Sānkā, and said, “The Rānā says that the slave (i.e., he himself) wants to become enlisted among the loyal adherents (of the Sultān), and to send back the elephants which he had seized in the invasion of Ahmadnagar, with his son, for the service of the Sultān. He did not know what was the reason of all this unkindness and harshness on their part.” Malik Ayāz, owing to the opposition of Malik Qawām-ul-mulk, gave his consent to the proposed peace and began to settle the terms. The other amirs refused their consent; and waited upon Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji, and inviting him to carry on the war, determined that they should begin the battle on the following Wednesday. A man who was present at the assembly waited on Malik Ayāz, and informed him of all that has passed. Malik Ayāz sent a man that very moment to wait on Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji; and represented to him that His Majesty the Sultān had entrusted the reins of controlling the army in his hands, so that he may carry into effect everything in which he saw its welfare; and now that he (i.e., Sultān Maḥmūd) at the instigation and incitement of the amirs of Gujrat wanted to carry on the war, this slave could not agree to that, for there was a great probability, that on account of the ill-luck, which always attends on perversity and dissension, the hand of hope will not reach the skirts of our object.

1 This was one of the terms of the previous message of Rānā Sānkā given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (see note 3, page 314).
On the morning of Wednesday, which had been selected for the battle, Malik Ayāz moved his camp; and encamped at Khaljipūr; and after bestowing robes of honour on the emissaries of Rānā Sāṅkā, 1 gave them leave to go back. Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji also marched away in the direction of Mandū. When Malik Ayāz had the honour of waiting on the Sultān at Chāmpānīr, 2 he reproved and reprimanded him; and gave him permission to go to the port of Dip, so that after equipping his retainers, he might return, and wait on the Sultān after the rains. It was also settled that after the end of the rains, the Sultān in his own august person, should proceed to chastise the 3 Rānā.

Malik Ayāz sent one of his trustworthy men to Rānā Sāṅkā and gave him this message, “As friendship has grown up between us, it is proper that we should both do everything that may be beneficial and advantageous to each other; and as on account of the return of the amīrs from that country, the noble heart of the Sultān has become heavy; and he wishes that the shadow of his conquest should be cast over that country, and he should punish the insurgents. This will cause much evil to that country. It is right and proper, that he should send his son on the wings of peace with tribute and much beautiful presents, so that the inhabitants of that country might be preserved from the assaults of the Sultān’s wrath.” Sultān Muẓaffar came from Chāmpānīr to Aḥmadābād in the month of Muḥarram of 4 928 A.H., (December, 1521 A.D.), so that he might advance towards Chitār, after making the necessary preparations. In the

---

1 Firishtaah agrees with the text, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India say that Malik Ayāz concluded peace with Rānā Sāṅkā. He could not have done so without the Sultān’s express order; and it appears from what happened later that the Sultān intended to carry on the war.” Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 93) says, “A suspension of hostilities was accordingly agreed on, until communications could be received from the king.” But this is not mentioned by Firishtaah.

2 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 275, says that in consequence of his displeasure, the Sultān did not give Malik Aīāz the usual robe of honour at his departure.

3 One MS. has Sāṅkā after Rānā, but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. do not have it.

4 The year is 1522 A.D. in the Cambridge History of India, page 321; and 929 A.H., 1523 A.D. in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 275.
course of some days he collected and equipped an army at Aḥmadābād, and encamped at the reservoir of Kānkria; and there was a 1 delay of three days at this place for the mustering of the troops. At this time news came that Rānā Sāṅkā had sent his son with much tribute to wait on the Sultān; and the son had arrived at the town of Mahrāsa. After a few days, when he waited on the Sultān, and presented the beautiful things (which he had brought), the Sultān forgave his father’s offences, and presented to him a princely robe of honour; and having 2 cancelled the mustering of the army, he spent some days in the neighbourhood of Jhālāwār in seeing the country and hunting; and then went to Aḥmadābād. There he again 3 bestowed a robe of honour on the son of the Rānā, and bade him farewell. After that he himself went to 4 Kaparbhānj.

In this year Malik Ayāz, who was a support of the empire, bound up the goods of existence (i.e., died). Sultān Muẓaffar was 5 pained and grieved on hearing this news; and conferred his jāgīr on his 6 eldest son.

In the year 7 930 A.H., 1524 A.D. (the Sultān) rode out from Chāmpānīr, in order to chastise some rebels and refractory persons;

1 The word توثف delay, is to be found in only one of the MSS., but is not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have, however, inserted it as it appears to be required.

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have قفم لئ لشاک نمود. This is so clearly a mistake that I have had no hesitation in substituting قفم نم نم for قفم لئ لشاک نمود. I find the lith. ed. of Firishtah has the correct word. The text-edition has the reading in the MSS.

3 One MS. has عطاك نمود instead of لطاف نمود.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. says he went to Sarkhāj; but no other historian mentions either Kaparbhānj or Sarkhāj. سرکھ ک in the text-edition.

5 Firishtah also says so, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 275, says, “When the Sultan heard of Malik Alāz’s death, he said, ‘The life of Malik Alāz has come to its close. It would have been better, if he had been killed fighting against the Rānā, for then he would have been a martyr’.”

6 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt have پسر بزرگ but Firishtah lith. ed. omits پسر. Col. Briggs also has “some” without any qualifying adjective; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari has “to his eldest son Ishāk”.

7 Firishtah agrees almost word for word, but Col. Briggs changes the year to 929 A.H., and says, he marched to Champanere and “caused the town of
and halted for some days between the towns of Mahrāsa and Harsōl. He entirely rebuilt the fort of Mahrāsa and then returned towards Aḥmadābād. On the way he heard that the member of the harem (of the Sultān), who was most beloved of him, had died. The Sultān and the Shāhzāda grieved sorely; and they went to her grave, and performed the mourning rites. After the termination of the period of mourning, they came to Aḥmadābād, with sorrow-stricken hearts and grief-laden minds. The Sultān passed most of his time in indulging in his grief. One day, Khudāwand Khān, who was distinguished among the amīrs and the vazīrs for his intellect and wisdom, waited on the Sultān and represented in clear language the advantage and benefit of patience, and freed him from grief and pain. As the rainy season had commenced, he induced the Sultān to take a trip to Chāmpānīr. The Sultān remembered the breezes of Chāmpānīr and went there.

One day 'Ālam Khān, son of Sultān Sikandar Lūḍī Badshāh of Dehli represented to the Sultān, that "Sultān Ibrāhīm, son of Sultān Sikandar, had, owing to his inexperience, drawn his blood-drinking sword out of the scabbard; and had put the great amīr to death; and those who had escaped the sword had sent repeated letters and petitions, and had asked this slave (i.e., himself) to come. As this faqīr had Mahrāsa to be repaired." The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 276, agrees generally with the text. The Cambridge History of India does not mention these matters at all.

1 Firishtaı copies the Ṭabaqat almost verbatim. Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India do not mention the death. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 276, says, "On the way his chief wife, Bibi Rānī, mother of prince Sikandar Khān died"; which would imply that she was travelling with the Sultān. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari praises her right judgment, her great influence in the affairs of the kingdom, her motherly care of high and low, and the singular firmness of her judgments.

2 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari says, he fell ill, and after his recovery went to Chāmpānīr, or as Bayley calls the place Muhamadābād. It does not mention Khudāwand Khān's advice and admonition.

3 This long-winded and highly metaphorical request is copied by Firishtaı. 'Ālam Khān was a son of Bahālū Lūḍī and not of Sikandar Lūḍī, as stated in the text, and he was therefore an uncle of Ibrāhīm. As stated in the text his later career is narrated in the section about Dehli. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 95) calls him Julul Khān.
attended on Your Majesty for a long time in the hope that by the advantage of the attention of this great family he would arrive at greatness; now that time has come, that the star of his good fortune would ascend from the nādir of defeat, and the image of hope should shine in the mirror of success, he hopes that the wing of (the Sultān’s) generosity and the shadow of his kindness, should be spread over the head of this faqir, so that his ancestral dominion should come into his possession.” Sultān Muḥaffar sent him back with a detachment of troops and gave him some money. He advanced towards Dehlī to fight with Sultān Ibrāhīm. A full account of his adventures has been given in the section about Dehlī.

In the year 931 A.H. 1 (1524 A.D.) the Sultān went through Chāmpānīr to Īdar. On the way Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān complained about his meagre income, and his large expenses, and prayed that his allowance may be made equal to that of Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān. The Sultān delayed in fulfilling his expectations on account of certain objections, and made a promise for a future consideration. Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān was pained and discouraged at this, and went away to Āḥmadābād without obtaining the Sultān’s leave. He went from there to the country of Māl. The Raja of Māl whose name was

---

1 Bayley (p. 277) gives 1525 as the corresponding year of the Christian era, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 96) has 1524, and the Cambridge History of India, page 321, has, “late in 1524”.

2 As regards Māl see note 2, page 314. M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition has مال for مال. Firishtah lith. ed. does not here give the name of the Rāja, but calls him the Rāja of Māl, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī gives the name as Rāwal Ćdi Singh (as Bayley transliterates it) and describes him as Rājah of Dungarpūr. Bayley, however, says in a note that the Tabakāt “calls him the Rājah of Pāl”; and goes on to say that “Pāl seems to have been used in those days, as a kind of general name given to a congeries of petty hill states, of which the rulers were Hindūs and probably all or nearly all Rajpūts. They seem to have included Dungarpūr, Bijanagar, Bānabālah and others” (Bayley, page 277). Col. Briggs calls the Raja Cody Singh the Raja of Poloh, and the Cambridge History of India (p. 321), apparently following the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Udai Singh of Dungarpūr. The account of the travels of Bahādur Khān as given by Firishtah agrees almost word for word with that in the text and by Col. Briggs; the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India also agree generally, but the last two do not mention the pilgrimage to the tomb of the holy Khwājah at Ajmēr.
Udai Singh considered the arrival of the Shâhzâda a very great blessing; and rendered him services of various kinds. Then when the Shâhzâda went to the country of Chitôr, Rânâ Sânkâ came forward to welcome him; and presented him with articles of every kind as tribute. He submitted, "This country belongs to your servants, and whatever you order will be obeyed". The Shâhzâda out of his noble spirit did everything to please him; but after rejecting his prayer, proceeded to go on pilgrimage to the tomb, which is the resting place of illuminating rays, of his Holiness Khwâjah Mu'in-ud-din Hasan Sanjari, may his soul be sanctified! After performing the pilgrimage he proceeded to the country of Miwât, where Hasan Khan Miwâti advanced some stages, and carried out the rites of hospitality and entertainment; and from that place he went towards Dehlî.

It so happened that at this time, His Majesty Firdûs Makâni, Zahir-ud-din Muhammed Bâbar Bâdshâh had come to 1 Hindûstân with the desire of conquering the country; and had encamped in the neighbourhood of Dehlî. Sultân Ibrâhîm having gained power and help from the arrival of Shâhzâda 2 Bahâdur Khân treated him with the greatest respect and honour. One day the Shâhzâda mounted his horse, and with some of the Gujrât warriors, went to the battlefield; and fought with 3 some Maghûl soldiers, and both parties exerted themselves with great bravery. The Afgân amirs who were thoroughly disgusted with Sultân Ibrâhîm wanted to do away with him; and place 4 Sultân Bahâdur on the throne. Sultân Ibrâhîm hearing

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have فندوسفان, but the other MS. has فندوسفان.  
2 The name of the Shâhzâda is omitted in the text-edition.  
3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بحمد خان, but the other has بحمد خان. This is apparently a mistake. The word مغول is in both MSS. after بحمد خان, but not in the lith. ed.; but I have inserted it.  
4 The Mirât-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 278) gives a different version of this, according to which Bahâdar Khân with some of his own men pursued a party of Mughals who were carrying off some of Sultân Ibrâhîm's men as prisoners, and on coming up with them, slew some of them, and returned with the men he had rescued.  
5 He is called Sultân in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, in this place, though further on, he is again called Shâhzâda.
attended on Your Majesty for a long time in the hope that by the advantage of the attention of this great family he would arrive at greatness; now that time has come, that the star of his good fortune would ascend from the nādir of defeat, and the image of hope should shine in the mirror of success, he hopes that the wing of (the Sultān's) generosity and the shadow of his kindness, should be spread over the head of this faqīr, so that his ancestral dominion should come into his possession". Sultān Muẓaffār sent him back with a detachment of troops and gave him some money. He advanced towards Dehlī to fight with Sultān Ibrāhīm. A full account of his adventures has been given in the section about Dehlī.

In the year 931 A.H. ¹ (1524 A.D.) the Sultān went through Chāmpānīr to Idar. On the way Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān complained about his meagre income, and his large expenses, and prayed that his allowance may be made equal to that of Shāhzāda Sīkandar Khān. The Sultān delayed in fulfilling his expectations on account of certain objections, and made a promise for a future consideration. Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān was pained and discouraged at this, and went away to Aḥmadābād without obtaining the Sultān's leave. He went from there to the country of ² Māl. The Raja of Māl whose name was

1 Bayley (p. 277) gives 1525 as the corresponding year of the Christian era, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 96) has 1524, and the Cambridge History of India, page 321, has, "late in 1524".

² As regards Māl see note 2, page 314. M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition has فیروز به for مل. Firishtah lith. ed. does not here give the name of the Raja, but calls him the Rāja of Māl, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari gives the name as Rāwal Udi Singh (as Bayley transliterates it) and describes him as Rājah of Dūngarpūr. Bayley, however, says in a note that the Tabakāt "calls him the Rājah of Pāl"; and goes on to say that "Pāl seems to have been used in those days, as a kind of general name given to a congeries of petty hill states, of which the rulers were Hindūs and probably all or nearly all Rajpūts. They seem to have included Dūngarpūr, Bijanagar, Bānsbālah and others" (Bayley, page 277). Col. Briggs calls the Raja Oody Singh the Raja of Poloh, and the Cambridge History of India (p. 321), apparently following the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Uday Singh of Dūngarpur. The account of the travels of Bahādur Khān as given by Firishtah agrees almost word for word with that in the text and by Col. Briggs; the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India also agree generally, but the last two do not mention the pilgrimage to the tomb of the holy Khwājah at Ajmēr.
Udai Singh considered the arrival of the Shāhzāda a very great blessing; and rendered him services of various kinds. Then when the Shāhzāda went to the country of Chitār, Rānā Sānkhā came forward to welcome him; and presented him with articles of every kind as tribute. He submitted, “This country belongs to your servants, and whatever you order will be obeyed”. The Shāhzāda out of his noble spirit did everything to please him; but after rejecting his prayer, proceeded to go on pilgrimage to the tomb, which is the resting place of illuminating rays, of his Holiness Khwājah Mu'īn-ud-dīn Hasan Sanjārī, may his soul be sanctified! After performing the pilgrimage he proceeded to the country of Miwāt, where Ḥasan Khān Miwātī advanced some stages, and carried out the rites of hospitality and entertainment; and from that place he went towards Dehlī.

It so happened that at this time, His Majesty Firdūs Makānī, Zahir-ud-dīn Muhammad Bābar Bādshāh had come to 1 Hindūstān with the desire of conquering the country; and had encamped in the neighbourhood of Dehlī. Sultān Ibrāhīm having gained power and help from the arrival of Shāhzāda 2 Bahādur Khān treated him with the greatest respect and honour. One day the Shāhzāda mounted his horse, and with some of the Gujrāt warriors, went to the battlefield; and fought with 3 some Maghul soldiers, and both parties exerted themselves with great bravery. The Afghān amīr who were thoroughly disgusted with Sultān Ibrāhīm wanted to do away with him; and place 4 Sultān Bahādur on the throne. Sultān Ibrāhīm hearing

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have هندوسكلاً but the other MS. has بندوسكلاً.
2 The name of the Shāhzāda is omitted in the text-edition.
3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بھاڑان, but the other has بھاڑان مگول. This is apparently a mistake. The word بھاڑان is in both MSS. after بھاڑان, but not in the lith. ed.; but I have inserted it.
4 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 278) gives a different version of this, according to which Bahādur Khān with some of his own men pursued a party of Mughals who were carrying off some of Sultān Ibrāhīm’s men as prisoners, and on coming up with them, slew some of them, and returned with the men he had rescued.

He is called Sultān in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, in this place, though further on, he is again called Shāhzāda.
this had treacherous thoughts in his mind; and Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān perceiving this started towards Jaunpūr.

When the news that Bahādur Khān had gone to Dehlī, and Firdūs Makānī Bābar Bādshāh had arrived in those parts with the Maghūl army reached Sultān Muẓaffar, he on account of the separation from his son became depressed and sorrowful; and ordered Khudāwand Khān to send letters and petitions to summon the Shāhzāda. At this time there was a great famine in Gujrat, and the people suffered great distress. Sultān Muẓaffar, owing to the love which he had for the people, began a complete recitation of the great book (Qurān) and of the six canonical books of Ḥadīṣ (Ṣahih). The great and Holy God taking account of the true and pious intention of the Sultān removed the calamity from his people. At the same time, the Sultān fell ill, and his illness increased from day to day. One day he in great sorrow spoke of Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān. Someone taking advantage of the opportunity informed him that the army was divided into two factions. One of them wanted the succession

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 321, says that he possibly selected “this town in response to an invitation received from the local nobles, who are said to have offered him the throne”. This is also stated in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 279; but it also appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī that he was about to go to Jōnpūr, when he heard of the death of his father, and went off to Gujrat.

2 Bayley, page 279, says that Sultān Muẓaffar was exceedingly vexed on hearing that Bahādar Khān had gone to Dehlī; and then says in a note that according to the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī, “he distinctly stated, as his reason that he was afraid lest Bahādar Khān by fighting against the Moghals, might involve the country of Gujrat in hostilities with the latter people”. There is nothing like this in the Tabaqāt as far as I can see.

3 I suppose, as a pious act, which would avert the calamity from his people. The actual words are شروت دی خلّم مصحبل معجد و خلّم مصحبل ستہ نومود. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī’s account is different. It says, on the authority of the Tārikh-i-Bahādār Shāhī, that Sultān Muẓaffar lifted up his hands in prayer to God, and said, “Oh Lord, if for any fault of mine my people are afflicted, take me from this world, and leave my people unharmed, and relieve them from this drought”. This reminds one of Bābar’s act of devoting himself for affecting the recovery of Humāyūn from his illness. But in this case Sultān Muẓaffar offered himself up, not for the sake of his dear son, but for relieving the distress of his subjects.

4 One MS. inserts ١٠٣٢٢٣ after شدر.
of Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān; while the other was inclined towards Latīf Khān. Sultān Muẓaffar on hearing this said, "Has any news come from Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān?" Intelligent and wise men have inferred from this that he wished to make Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān his heir. He then called Sikandar Khān to his presence, and gave him some advice in the matter of his brothers and then gave him leave to retire. Then he went to the ḥaram sarr, and again came back outside, and rested for a moment. After a moment he heard the call of Friday prayer. He said, "I do not find the strength in me to go to the masjid". He sent the men who were there to the mosque, and said the midday prayer. After he had finished he rested for a moment; and then passed away into the mercy of God. The period of his reign was fourteen years and nine months.

**AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR, SON OF SULTĀN MUẒAFFAR SHĀH.**

As the inevitable happened to Sultān Muẓaffar, Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān, by the exertions of Ṭimāūd-ul-mulk Sultānī and Khudāwand Khān and Faṭḥ Khān, son of Faṭḥ Khān, sat on the throne of the empire. He sent the body of his father to the town of Sarkhēj, and performed the rites of mourning.

---

1 This is a very simple, and as it appears to me, a very graphic and impressive word-picture of the passing away of a good man. Firishtah as usual copies the sentences almost word for word, but he adds the day and date, which were Friday the 2nd Jumādī-ul-awwal, 932 A.H. Firishtah also says that he died in his forty second year, and was a pious Musalmān and a good calligraphist. That he always copied the Qurān, and as the copies were finished sent them to the two sacred places. That many great men from Ṭīrān, Tūrān, Rūm and Ṭarakistān came to Gujrat in his reign, but he gives the name of only one, namely, Mūllā Mahmūd Siwāsh, who was a great calligraphist and came from Shīrāz. Col. Briggs gives the 3rd Jumād-ul-awul, 932, 17th February, 1525, as the date of his death, and says he died in his 56th year (vol. IV, p. 97).

The Mirāt-i-Sikandari describes the death scene at somewhat greater length, Bayley, page 281; and it also describes his character, giving many anecdotes, extending over many pages. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari says, Bayley, page 281, that Sultān Muẓaffar died on the 2nd Jumādī-ul-ākhir, 932 A.H. (1526 A.D.); but places the accession of Sultān Sikandar (page 307) on the 22nd Jumādī-ul-ākhir, 932 A.H., 7th April, 1526. The Cambridge History of India (p. 322) has the 7th April, 1526, as the date of Sultān Muẓaffar's death.
On the 3rd day, 1 at the end of those rites, he proceeded to Châmpānīr. When he arrived in the town of 2 Batūh, he 3 went on a pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy men of the place. He heard that 4 Shāh Shaikh Jiū, who was one of the descendants of Quth 'Alam Shaikh Burhān-ud-dīn, had said, that the kingdom would pass to Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān; he attributed false speaking to Shāh Shaikh Jiū; and spoke unseemly words about him. When he arrived at Châmpānīr, he showed favour 5 to his own servants, and conferred fiefs on them; and did not show any kindness whatever to the amirs of his father and grandfather. Owing to this reason all the amirs 6 were sick at heart, and thoroughly vexed, and waited for what might appear from the womb of divine providence. 7 Simā 'Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī, who was one of the Mu'azzafar Shāhī slaves, and the slave of the mother of Sikandar Shāh, was very much aggrieved in his heart.

1 The text in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. is as I have got it; but Firishtah lith. ed. has زر حسوم ار تعزیت و شکافته. This makes better sense. Firishtah begins the account of the reign by saying that there were two factions, the larger one in favour of Sikandar Khān, and the smaller in that of Latif Khān; but as Sultān Mu'azzafar had appointed Sultān Sikandar to be his heir, the great nobles took his side; and Latif Khān being unable to assert his claim went away to his fief of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār.

2 سلوا and بتوا in MSS. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted the former in the text-edition.

3 Firishtah agrees; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandārī, Bayley, page 307, says that "he went away without caring to visit the tombs of the holy men at Batūh".

4 The name is شیم خو شیم خو خو جو جو جو خو خو خو in the MSS., and شیم خو خو خو خو خو خو in two places in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is شیم خو خو خو خو خو خو; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 98) has Shah Sheikhje. The Mirāt-i-Sikandārī, Bayley, page 307, has Shēkh Jiū.

5 Firishtah explains كن نوکوران ایام شاهزادگی بودنود, i.e., who were his servants, during the time when he was a Shāhzāda.

6 The word كشنة, which I have inserted in the text, is in one MS.; but not in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

7 The prefix سیما occurs in both MSS., but not in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him 'Imād-ul-mulk Ḥabshi; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandārī, Bayley, page 308, calls him, "'Imād-ul-mulk Khush-kadam, who was a king in his own way". The meaning of the last clause is not clear. The Cambridge History of India, page 322, calls him "'Imād-ul-Mulk Khush Qadam".
Some of those who had been honoured by Sultān Sikandar also now began to commit improper acts. The hearts of the soldiers and the ra’iyats now became altogether averse (to Sultān Sikandar); and they prayed to God for his destruction. One day Sultān Sikandar arranged a special darbār; and conferred robes of honour, and seventeen hundred horses on the amirs and the chief men of the kingdom; but as most of these were bestowed on undeserving persons, the people applied their energies to the coming of Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān, and hoped for his return. Sultān Sikandar, becoming cognizant of what was happening, became anxious and alarmed about his final destiny. At this time also he came to know that Shāhzāda Latif Khān, who was in the neighbourhood of Nadarbār and Sultānpūr, had thoughts about seizing the throne; and was waiting for a suitable opportunity. On hearing this news, he conferred the title of Sharzah Khān on 1 Malik Latif Khān Bāriwāl; and appointed him to attack and put down Latif Khān. 2 Malik Latif Khān went to the border of Nadarbār, and came to know that Latif Khān was in the 3 hilly country of Mūnkā Baham, and the jungle of Chitōr. Malik Latif, without waiting at all, entered the jungle of Chitōr; and the Rāja of the jungle relying on (the density) of the forest and the roughness of the country, came forward to meet him. Malik Latif with a number of noted chieftains was slain in the battle; and as the road of retreat was closed, the Rājpūts and kötis attacked the army from behind, and slew seventeen hundred men.

---

1 He is called Malik Latif Khān Bāriwāl in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Latif Khān Bārdār. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 99) has Mullik Luteef without any suffix. The Mirāt-i-Sikandar also calls him Malik Latif, while the Cambridge History of India (p. 322) says that the force against Latif Khān was under Sharza Khān.

2 One MS. omits Khān.

3 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has در کوہستان مونکا ہیم و جنگل چندر. The other has the same except that it has ہیم instead of ہم. The lith. ed. has در کوہستان مونکا ہیم جنگل پہم و جنگل چندر. Firishtah lith. ed. has در کوہستان مونکا ہم و جنگل ہیم پہم. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 99) has "had gone to Chittoor". The Mirāt-i-Sikandar, Bayley, page 308, has "had set himself up in the hill country of Sultanpūr and Nandarbār with the support of Bhīm Rājah of Mūnkā"; and the Cambridge History of India, page 322, has "he retired into Baglāna". I have adopted the reading in the first MS.
The people of Gujrāt, considering this defeat to mean an omen of the downfall of Sultān Sikandar, awaited further results. Sultān Sikandar appointed Qaisar Khān with a large army for the punishment of those wretched people.

While these things were happening, some of the Mużaffarī āmīrs, who were noted for their wickedness, said to 'Imād-ul-mulk, “Sultān Sikandar wants to put you to death; as there are relations of sincere attachments between you and us, we have informed you”. As 'Imād-ul-mulk made himself intoxicated with what those men of evil destiny told him, (he determined) that by any means that might be possible he would remove Sultān Sikandar from the way; and would raise one of the infant sons of Mużaffar Shāh on the throne; and himself carry on the political and revenue administration of the country. One day Sikandar rode out on his horse. 'Imād-ul-mulk completely armed his retainers and followed him with the intention of murdering him; but found no opportunity. On the way, some persons disclosed the state of things to Sultān Sikandar; but he, in his simple-mindedness, said in reply, “The people want that I should harass the āmīrs, and particularly the slaves of Mużaffar Shāh. 'Imād-ul-mulk is one of our hereditary slaves. How should he attempt such a wicked act?” In spite of what he said, however, he became grieved and pained at what he had heard. He told one of his intimates and confidants, that it is repeated among the common people from time to time that Bahādur Shāh is coming from Dehli to conquer Gujrāt; this becomes the cause of worry to their minds.

It so happened, that on that very night, he saw in a dream His Holiness the leader of the wayfarers in the path of the faith, Saiyid

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 322, says that the choice of Qaisar Khān shows “either ignorance and folly of the king, or the treachery of the nobles, for Qaisar Khān was Latif’s principal adherent”. This may be correct, but I have not seen anything anywhere in support of this statement.

2 The word is مَعَسَر in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah who, as usual, copies a great deal from the Tabaqāt has the word مَعْتَر* here instead of مَعَسَر.

3 The word is مَعَتِل, minor sons, and as a matter of fact only Naṣīr Khān.

4 In the account of the dream in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 308), Shāh 'Alam and Shēkh Jiā are the only two mentioned; and Sultān Mużaffar is
Jalāl Bukhārī and Shāh ʿĀlām and a number of other Shaikhs. Sultān Muzaffar was also in attendance on them. Sultān Muzaffar was saying, "Son Sikandar rise from the throne". Shaikh Jiū was also saying, "Rise. It is not your place. Bahādur Shāh is the heir to the throne". When he awoke Sultān Sikandar immediately sent for a man, and repeated to him what he had seen in the dream. He became very agitated on account of the dream; and in order to keep his mind occupied, mounted to go and play chaugān. The fact of the dream became known to some people. After a pās or pahar, he went to the palace, and had some food, and went to rest. As the amirs, and the Sultān’s particular attendants went to their houses, ‘Imād-ul-mulk with some of the men of that group (i.e., those who had told him that the Sultān wanted to put him to death) and two of Sultān Muzaffar’s slaves and another Ḥabashi slave went to the palace. This was on the 19th Sha’ban 932 A.H. (May 30th, o.s. and April 12th n.s., A.D. 1526).

‘Imād-ul-mulk said to the men, who were with him, "Look at this palace, for it is one of the wonders of the age". When they arrived on the bank of the reservoir, they met Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm, son of Jauhar, who were there. They at once drew their swords from the scabbards and rushed towards them. Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm also placed their hands on their swords; but the wounds inflicted by them were of no avail, and they were both slain. From that place the assassins went to Sultān Sikandar’s bed-chamber. Saiyid ʿIlm-ud-din was seated before the bed, and was keeping

to have declared, "Surely it is not fated that Sikandar Khān should descend from the throne;" but Shēkh Jiū said, "Yes, it is even so".

1 The story has a flavour of unreality. The men had surely seen the palace before; but Firishtah says the same thing, and he agrees generally as to the incidents of the day on which Sultān Sikandar was murdered. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 100) gives the name of Baha-ool-Moolk, Dar-ool-Moolk and Seif Khan, as the men who accompanied Imad-ool-Moolk, besides the two Turkish slaves and one Abyssinian; and he says that Sikandar Shah, awakened by the noise rushed out to ascertain its cause, when the assassins put him to death. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 311) has a somewhat different account, but I need not repeat it here. According to it the Sultān was actually murdered by one Bahādur, or Bahādar as Bayley transliterates the name.

2 One MS. inserts عابٌ بعابٌ after حواری.
guard. When suddenly those men rushed in, the Saiyid on seeing what was happening, became agitated, but placed his hand on his sword and wounded two men; but he himself became a martyr. The assassins then inflicted two or three wounds on Sultan Sikandar, while he was still on the bed. The Sultan, the victim of these attacks, in great fear and alarm jumped up from the bed and stood on the ground, when one of them smote him with the sword of cruelty, and made a martyr of him. His rule lasted for two months and sixteen days.

3 An account of Naṣīr Khān entitled Sultan Mahmūd, son of Sultan Muẓaffar.

As Sultan Sikandar became a martyr, 'Imād-ul-mulk in concert with Bahā-ul-mulk forthwith brought Naṣīr Khān out of the harem, and placing him on the throne gave him the title of Sultan Mahmūd. The amirs of Sultan Sikandar fled (on account of their suspicions and fears) in different directions; and their houses were plundered and sacked. The martyr Sultan's body was sent to maudā' Halōl, one of the dependencies of Chāmpānīr, and was deposited in the earth. The amirs and the chief men of Gujarāt had to come out of necessity to offer their congratulations. 'Imād-ul-mulk in accordance with the customary law gave royal robes of honour to the amirs and the great men, and comforted them, and also conferred titles. Titles

1 The words appear to be in the MS. The second word appears to be hardship or cruelty.

2 The MSS. have two months and sixteen days. The lith. ed. has ten months. Firshtah lith. ed. does not mention the period, but Col. Briggs has three months and seventeen days, from Jumad-col-Awal 3rd to Shaban 19th. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 317) makes it only one month and sixteen days from the 28th Jamādi-ul-Ākhir to Sha'bān 14th; but Bayley says in a note that some MSS. and the Tārikh-i-Alfī make it two months and sixteen days, but it appears that, according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari itself, Bayley, page 281, Sultan Muẓaffar died on the 2nd and not on the 28th Jamādi-ul-Ākhir, and that Sultan Sikandar was assassinated on the 19th Sha'bān; two months and sixteen days was the correct period.

3 The heading I adopted is that in both the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is Dārbar Sultanam, Muẓaffar, which is quite incorrect.
were conferred on one hundred and eighty-one persons, but the stipends and emoluments of the amirs were not increased. Most people waited for the arrival of Sultān Bahādur; and made every effort by sending messages and emissaries to summon him. They were angry at the leadership and eminence of 'Imād-ul-mulk, who had been one of the Sultān’s slaves, and did not lower their heads in obedience and submission to him. Khudāwand Khān and Tāj Khān more specially sought to be ahead of the others in this matter. 'Imād-ul-mulk, on account of his ancient and recent enmity, attempted to injure them. Tāj Khān, having put the girdle of endeavour and energy on his loins, advanced with a well-equipped army, drawn from his own caste and tribesmen, to bring back Sultān Bahādur. 'Imād-ul-mulk in great distress wrote a letter to 2 Nizām-ul-mulk Dakī, sent him much money and summoned him to come to the boundary of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār. He also wrote a letter to the 3 Rāja of Māl, and summoned him to the border of Chāmpānūr; and the Rāja, on account of his being in the vicinity, collected his forces, and came to the neighbourhood of Chāmpānūr. ('Imād-ul-mulk also) owing to his great caution and far-sightedness sent a petition to His Majesty Firdūs Makānī 4 Bābar Bādshāh, to the effect that if he would send one of his many powerful armies, he would present the

1 The whole of the sentence from نوود نمي اوردند to واروزن is omitted from one of the MSS. It is also omitted in the text-edition.

2 Firishtah says that Nizām-ul-mulk kept the تعاevil, but passed the time with negligence. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 101, 102) has presents consisting of jewels and money. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah, the Mirāt-i-Sikandarl, Bayley, page 318, says that, 'Imād-ul-Mulk wrote to 'Imād-ul-Mulk Ilīchpūrī to come to Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, and wrote to Rānā Sānkā, and conciliated the neighbouring zamindārs, and also wrote to Bābar.

3 See note 2, page 314.

4 One MS. has Humāyūn Bādshāh here by mistake; but a few lines further down it has Bābar Bādshāh. Firishtah’s account of the petition to Bābar agrees generally with the text, but he says that 'Imād-ul-mulk suggested that if one of Bābar’s army would come to Dīp, he ('Imād-ul-mulk) would present a krūr of tankas towards the expenses. Col. Briggs explains this by saying that it was intended that Babur should send the force down the Indus to land at Diū, and he adds that the letter to Babur never reached its destination, having been intercepted by the ruler of Dongurpur (vol. IV, p. 102).
fort of Dip, and one krôr of tankus in cash towards the expenses of His Majesty’s servants.

The thânadâr of Dûngarpûr, having received information that ‘Imât-ul-mulk had sent a petition to Bâbar Bâdshâh, and had asked His Majesty to come to Gujràt, sent a letter to Tâj Khân and Khudâwand Khân; and the amîrs of Gujràt sent a man to Bahâdûr Shâh and summoned him. 1 The messenger sent by the amîrs waited upon Sulţân Bahâdûr in the neighbourhood; and presented to him their petition. Sulţân Bahâdûr was sad and grieved at his father’s death, and performed the mourning ceremony. He gave Pâyinda Khân Afghân, who had come from Jaunpûr to take him there, permission to go back; and although the latter dilated (on the splendour) of the empire of the eastern country, and incited him to go there, he turned his face towards Aḩmadâbâd. They say, that men came at one and the same time from Jaunpûr and Gujràt to summon him. He said, he would leave the choice to his horse, in whichever direction he would take him. The horse started towards Gujràt. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Chitôr, soldiers arrived one after another from Gujràt; and they brought the news of the assassination of Sulţân Sikandar, and the accession of Naṣîr Khân. Sulţân Bahâdûr was pained to hear of it, and starting from there encamped at Chitôr. There Chând Khân and Ibrâhîm Khân, sons of Sulţân Muzaffar, came to him. He was pleased and delighted at meeting his brothers. Chând Khân took leave of him and remained at Chitôr; but Ibrâhîm Khân chose the service of his brother, and accompanied him. In a short time after passing Chitôr, 2 Udaî Singh, Râja of Mâl, and some adherents

1 The account in Firishthah agrees generally with that in the text, only he calls Pâyinda Khan Afghan Pâbind Khân, and says he came from the Afghâns of Jaunpûr. He is also clearer about Bahâdûr’s leaving the choice between Gujràt and Jaunpûr to his horse. According to him Bahâdûr said, he would ride out, and then let go the reins. As to Chând Khân and Ibrâhîm Khân, he says they were with Rânâ Sânkâ, being probably fugitives from Gujràt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 102) says that Chând Khan and Ibrâhîm Khan first gave Bahâdûr the news of the assassination of Sultan Sikundur, and he also says clearly that they had fled to the Rana after that event.

2 Firishthah lith. ed. here calls Udaî Singh, Râja of Mâlpûr, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 102) has Raja Oody Sing of Poloh as before.
of Sikandar, such as Malik Sarwar and Malik Yūsuf and Latif and others, came and entered Sultān Bahādur’s service.

Sultān Bahādur sent Malik Tāj Jamāl with a farman conveying assurances of his favour to Tāj Khaṅ and the other amirs; and gave them news of his 1 approach. Tāj Khaṅ on seeing the letter advanced from Dandūqa with a great force to join the service of Sultān Bahādur; and 2 he bade farewell to Latif Khaṅ, son of Muẓaffar, after giving him a sum of money to pay his expenses; (telling him) now that the heir of Muẓaffar’s and Maḥmūd’s kingdom had arrived, it was not advisable that he should remain there. Latif Khaṅ with a heart which was crying, and with eyes which were shedding tears went as a supplicant to Fath Khaṅ who was a cousin (uncle’s son) of Sultān Bahādur. When the Sultān arrived at Dūngarpūr, Khuṟram Khaṅ and other Khāns hastened to welcome him; and the amirs and sardars of all the provinces turned their faces towards him. ‘Īmād-ul-mulk on hearing this news, and being deserted by these adherents began to collect troops. He began to empty the treasury, and sent a number of men with an army ready to fight and fifty elephants, under the command of ‘Add-ul-mulk to the town of Mahrāsa; so that they might on their arrival there, close the roads to the coming and going of the people, and 3 permit no one to go to Sultān Bahādur. When Sultān Bahādur arrived in the town of Maḥmūdābād, the amirs who had joined Sikandar, and who had fled for fear of their lives, came and obtained the honour of the service (of Sultān Bahādur). The men who were with ‘Add-ul-mulk fled from Mahrāsa. On the following morning when

---

1 The word خود is omitted in one MS.
2 It would appear that Shāhzāda Latif Khaṅ was with Tāj Khaṅ, and this is stated expressly by Firishtah, as he says کہ بار. Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 326, says that when Bahādar came to Dūngarpūr, Tāj Khaṅ left Dhandūkah to wait upon him. Just then prince Latif Khaṅ arrived at Dhandūkah, and solicited the help of Tāj Khaṅ, offering to place the administration of the country to his hands. Tāj Khaṅ told him that he had already promised his support to Sultān Bahādar.
3 There is a difference in the readings here. One MS. has کہ کس یہ سلطان بہادر. The other omits the word Sultān. The lith. ed. has کہ کس بھالوئے سلطان بہادر. I have adopted the first reading, which is also the reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but he substitutes Shāhzāda for Sultān.
the Sultān arrived at Mahrāsa, Tāj Khān, with the royal umbrella and the other insignia of royalty; came and saw the Sultān; and the latter with great pomp and power encamped in the city of Nahrwāla. 1 Pattan on the 26th of the auspicious month of Ramadān in the year 932 A.H., August 15th N.S., 1526 A.D. From that place he advanced towards Ahmadābād after assuming the insignia of royalty. On the 22nd of the month, he performed the pilgrimage to the tombs of the great Shaikhs and his royal ancestors; and then entered Ahmadābād.

‘Imād-ul-mulk in his agitation and confusion paid a 3 year’s wages to the soldiers in advance, and incited them to fight. 4 Sultān Bahādūr had after three or four days left Ahmadābād with great pomp and splendour. During this interval most of the amirs, after taking much money from ‘Imād-ul-mulk, joined the Sultān. 5 Bahā’ul-mulk and Dāwar-ul-mulk who were the actual murderers of Sultān Sikandar sought for a disagreement with ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and joined the Sultān’s service. The latter, considering it desirable in the cir-

---

1 The word بُنُن is left out in one MS.
2 The word is علی in both MSS., علم in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The 26th of Ramadān 932 A.H. corresponds to August 3rd, 1526 A.D., according to Col. Briggs and August (without any date) 1526 A.D., according to Bayley. Col. Briggs’s date is according to the old style. The date of the assumption of the royalty would accordingly be 15th of August (N.S.), 1526 A.D., and the place Nahrwāla. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, gives the 11th July, 1526, and Ahmadābād as the date and place respectively of the accession.
3 One MS. has زر يکالة, the other has only يکالة. The lith. ed. has مولج بکالة. Firishtah also has مولج يکالة. I have, therefore, retained the reading in the lith. ed. Firishtah adds that ‘Imād-ul-mulk also sent an emissary to Shāhzāda Latif Khān, so that he might with the latter’s aid be able to fight with Sultān Bahādūr.
4 This sentence is not in the lith. ed. but is in both MSS. There is, however, a slight difference between the two readings. One MS. has باب محمد ایباد while the other has از أحمد آباد. I think the latter is correct. It appears from Firishtah that he went from Ahmadābād to Muḥammadābād; and بدر امده means leaving and not entering.
5 Baha-ool-Moolk and Dar-ool-Moolk were mentioned by Col. Briggs as two of the men who attacked and killed Sikandar Shah. See note 1, page 327.
cumstances of the time, tried to please them, and endeavoured to comfort (their?) hearts. The period of the rule of Sultan Mahmud Nasir Khan did not exceed four months.

1. **AN ACCOUNT OF THE ACCESSION OF SULTAN BAHAḌUR SHAḤ.**

As the day of the Id-i-Ramāḍān of the year 932 A.H. was according to the selection of astrologers fixed as the time of the accession of Sultan Bahadur he sat on the throne of his great ancestors (on that day) by the exertions of the amirs and the great men of the country, and raised the standard of empire. The rites of making offerings of loyalty, and of wave offering were carried out; and (the hearts) of the amirs and of the great men and of the commanders of the army were gladdened by increases in their stipends, and by addition to their titles, and by grants of money and horses and robes of honour.

In the beginning of Shawwal he moved from that place, and advanced towards Champaṇīr. At the first stage of the journey Mu'āzm Khan with a number of other respected leaders hastened to wait on him, and received favours and kindness. When he started from that station, on the way he conferred the title of Shams-ul-mulk on Nūḥ  

---

1 The heading I have in the text is the heading in both the MSS., with this difference that one has Shāh at the end, while the other omits it. The heading in the lith. ed. is 'ذکر سلطنته سلطان باهدور بن سلطان مظفر'. This is more like the heading of other reigns.

2 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 327, Bahāḍur Shāh assumed the royal insignia at Nahrwālah on the 25th Ramazān, 932 A.H., August 1526; and the formal accession took place at Ahmadābād. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 103) says, he was formally crowned at Nehrwalla Puttan on the 26th Runzaṇ, 932 A.H., August 3rd, 1526 A.H. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says he ascended the throne on July the 11th, 1526, at Ahmadābād.

3 The words و اعياان are not to be found in one MS.

4 There is a difference of readings here. One MS. has the reading I have accepted, The other MS. and the lith. ed. have نوم بن يوسف ملك و حميم بن ملك را شمس الملك خطاب داد. Apparently there is some mistake, for one title could hardly be conferred on two persons. I have consulted Firishtah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, but have not received any help from either. There is no mention of the fact in either. Firishtah after mentioning the arrival of Maẓaffar Khan goes on to say that the ب و نرک river Bātrak was in such flood, etc. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 331, at once takes Sultan Bahadur to the
bin Yūsuf-ul-mulk; and when news came that the river of Bātrak was in such flood, that it was critical to cross it, Sulṭān Bahādur halted at the town of 1 Sahvunj; and left Tāj Khān on the bank of the river, that he might send the army over in different bodies one after another. The next day a number of the amirs of Chāmpānir, who had taken their 2 salaries from the treasury, came and joined him. Sulṭān Bahādur owing to the nobility of his spirit made a present of that 3 money to them. When Sulṭān Bahādur arrived at the bank of the river Mahindri, at the fort of Kānpūr, his army commenced to cross over.

‘Imād-ul-mulk sent men towards Barōda and in other directions, so that they might raise the dust of rebellion and keep the Sultān occupied with it. But the latter rapidly crossed the river, and advanced towards Chāmpānir. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city, Dīā’-ul-mulk, son of Naṣīr Khān, 4 came and saw him. The

Mahindri. Bayley in a note on that page says that the Tabakāt-i-Akbari is rather fuller at this place, and makes a quotation from it; but the grant of the title on Nūh bin Yūsuf-ul-mulk or on Ḥusain bin Saif-ul-mulk is not mentioned in it. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 105) does not mention the Bātrak, but says that Bahadur Shah was compelled to halt at the Sabrunutty on account of the heavy rain, from which one might infer that the Bātrak is probably another name of the Sabrunutty. Bayley in the quotation from the Tabakāt calls it the Wātrak.

1 The name is written as سونت in both MSS. and سیمونت in the lith. ed.
and سونت in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

2 The word is ماهینات in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is مالها in the
other MS. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have not before this seen the
word ماهینات in respect of the stipends of amirs and soldiers. The word ordi-
narily in use is علوفة. It is not clear in what way the amirs had taken the
mahāna or māl, but it may be inferred from what he says in the next sentence,
that there was something reprehensible or wrong about it.

3 The lith. ed. adds ب ر زیان نباورد but neither the MSS. nor the cor-
responding sentence in Firishtah have those or any similar words.

4 One MS. has امیر سلطان باو دید گفت. The other has امیر سلطان باو دید. The
word دید has evidently been misplaced from before دید to after باو, and has
been written امیر. The lith. ed. has only امیر. The account given in the
Mīrāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 331) is different. It does not mention Dīā-ul-mulk
at all, but says the Sultān crossed the river with four hundred horsemen and some
elephants, before the rest of the army; and sent Tāj Khān with three hundred
Sultân told him, "Go in advance, and convey this order to your father, that he should surround the house of 'Imâd-ul-mulk and seize him". He also sent Tâj Khân very quickly with some other īkâns to attack 'Imâd-ul-mulk; and he also himself mounted to follow him. Tâj Khân went with great quickness, and surrounded 'Imâd-ul-mulk's house. The latter threw himself from the wall of the house, and took shelter in the house of Shâh Jiû Sadîqi. His house was pillaged and his sons taken prisoner. It so happened that Sultân Bahâdur crossed in front of the house of Khudâwand Khân. The latter came out of his house, and rendered homage. After that his slaves seized 'Imâd-ul-mulk, and brought him before the Sultân. The latter ordered that 'Imâd-ul-mulk and Saîf-ud-dîn and the other murderers of Sultân Sikandar should be hanged. The title of 'Imâd-ul-mulk was conferred on Rafî'-ul-mulk, son of Malik Tuâkil, who was one of the Muzaffar Shâhî slaves; and he was made the 'Arîf-i-Mumâlik (the head-munshi of the kingdom).

Aţd-ul-mulk fled from Barâda, but on the way the kôlis plundered all his equipage and things. Sultân Bahâdur appointed Shamsâr-ud-dîn to seize Aţd-ul-mulk; and he appointed Nîzâm-ul-mulk to attack Muḥâfiz Khân. The rebels fled and sought the protec-

horsemens in advance to seize 'Imâd-ul-Mulk. Of course the Tabaqât also says that Tâj Khân was sent later to attack 'Imâd-ul-mulk.

1 One MS. has گنگر کرد, which I think would be better; but as the other MS., the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firâshthah all have عبرت كرد, I have retained it.

2 It appears from Firâshthah that he was seized in the house of شاه جنورد, who, according to the Mirât-i-Sikandarî, Bayley, page 332, was not the man that had cursed Sultân Sikandar, but was the head keeper of the diwân.  

3 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 105) says that Imaâd-ol-Moolk's son was also executed, but this does not appear anywhere else. The actual words about the mode of punishment in Firâshthah are سرانا تاکنمان پاس زندگی پوست کندند. As regards Imaâd-ul-mulk, however, Mir Abû Tûrab says, on page 3 of his Tarikh-i-Gujaratî, that در میدان دربار در میال بازار سرانا تاکنمان پاس زندگی پوست کندند, i.e., in the plain of the darbâr, in the bâzâr his skin was flayed, while he was still living, from his head to the nails of his toes.

4 Firâshthah lith. ed. agrees generally with the text; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106) says that the fugitives "sought refuge with Oody Sing, Raja of Poloh". This partly agrees with the Mirât-i-Sikandarî, which says that 'Azd-ul-mulk and Muḥâfiz Khân fled to the hill country of Pal, Bayley, page 333.
tion of Rāy Singh; and the troops sent against them returned after plundering their goods and chattels. After two or three days news was brought that the son of 'Arz-ul-mulk and Shāh Jīā Šādiqī and a number of the murderers of Sikandar Shāh had been slain in the house of Qadr Khan. Bahā'ul-mulk taking advantage of an opportunity fled from Chāmpānīr. On the way, the shahna (police superintendent) of Dēhlī seized him, and brought him before the Sultān. As he had inflicted a wound on Sultān Sikandar, and the wound which ʻIlm-ud-din had inflicted on him was still fresh (i.e., unhealed), Sultān Bahādur ordered that he should be lashed and then hanged. The three other men, who were among the murderers of Sultān Sikandar, were all (to use the quaint phraseology of the original) placed at the mouth of the cannon and sent into the air, or as one would say in ordinary language blown up at the mouths of cannon. In short, in a little while, all the murderers of Sultān Sikandar were put to death with great torture.

It so happened that on the day on which Sultān Bahādur entered Chāmpānīr, Latīf Khan, son of Muẓaffar Shāh, at the instigation of (some) amīrs, also came to the city and for some days remained concealed there. Qaisar Khan and Alf Khan and some other amīrs sent a message to Latīf Khan that it was not fitting that he should remain there any longer; and he should in any case conceal himself in some other corner. He became hopeless and scratching the back of his

1 One MS. has مراجعات نموذج instead of مراجعات نموذج.
2 The MSS. have what I have got in the text. The lith. ed. agrees, with this difference that it has یسر عرض الملك instead of یسر عرض الملك. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has یسر عرض الملك. This appears to be correct. No person of the name of عرض الملك is mentioned anywhere else.
3 He was one of the murderers of Sultān Sikandar, whose services Sultān Bahādur had at first thought it advisable to accept, but who, now according to Firishtah, became doubtful of his safety and fled. See also note 5, page 332.
4 One MS. has عالم الادبین.
5 One MS. omits the Khan after Latīf.
6 The words are باد بوساند in one MS., and in the lith. ed. They are رسالید in the other MS. I have accepted the latter, as it is more correct grammatically.
7 The word پس is not to be found in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; but is in the other MS., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have retained it, as
head, \(^1\) went to the country of Māl. The Rāja of Māl did not show any favour to him. ‘Aḍḍ-ul-mulk and Muḥāfīz Khān then joined him, and they went from there to \(^2\) Mūnḳā; and there they passed the time in wandering about in the hilly country.

In short, Sūltān Bahādur now commenced to attend to the welfare of the rukuyats and of the soldiery; and made all the people, and all sections of the community participators in his boundless largesses. He increased the stipends of the soldiers generally by \(^3\) ten-twenties and ten-forties; and gave them one year’s wages, and made them contented and thankful. He also gave to the faqīrs, who lived round the tombs in Sārkhēj and Bātūh and Rasulābād happy by giving them stipends and allowances.

It is the back of the head that one scratches when in a quandary.  

\(^1\) Firishtah lith. ed. says that Latīf Khān went to the country of Māl, but does not say what happened to him there, or whether he afterwards joined ‘Aḍḍ-ul-mulk and Muḥāfīz Khān. Col. Briggs says he went to Poloh. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 333) does not appear to mention the fact that Latīf Khān came to Chāmpānīr, and remained concealed there, but says ‘Aḍḍ-ul-mulk and Muḥāfīz Khān fled to the country of Pāl, and joined Latīf Khān. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says he fled to Pālānpūr.

\(^2\) The name is مونکا in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has مونکا. Col. Briggs says, vol. IV, page 106, that Aẓz-ool-Mulk and Mohafiz Khan fled to Mutwar, and in a note on the same page he gives the boundaries of Mutwar as between the Nerbudda and Tapti rivers, N. and S., and Little Oodipoor and Choly Maheswur, E. and W. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī does not give the name of the place, but Bayley in a note on page 334, in which he refers to the Tabakāt, says that Latīf Khān fled to the hill country of Bōṅgā.

\(^3\) The meaning is not quite clear; it apparently means doubled and quadrupled, but this is not likely. Firishtah lith. ed. inserts a ५५ between ५५ and ५५ : This would be 300 per cent. None of the translations refers to this. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 333, says that “The Sūltān now opened the hand of bounty, and like a cloud rained down gold and jewels and allowances and favours all round”; but there is no mention of the proportion by which the wages of the soldiers were increased. It appears from page 334, however, in connection with the allowances to Ghāzī Khān that ५५ does mean twofold, and consequently ५५ also mean threefold and fourfold.
And as at that time, the fort of Châmpânîr was the capital of Gujrât, and the Sultâns ascended the throne there, he on the 15th of Dhî-qâ'dah, at the moment chosen by the astrologers, adorned and decorated a jewelled throne, inlaid with gems, in the manner of the old Sultâns near the eastern darbâr, and on the date previously mentioned, which was in the year 932 A.H., he placed the crown on his head, and according to the custom of his ancestors, sat on the throne. The great men and the Shâikhs and the amirs and the Khâns spoke words of congratulations, and carried out the ceremonies of making loyal offerings and wave offerings. On that day, a thousand persons had the distinction of robes of honour being conferred on them; and a number of people were honoured by the grant of titles. Ghażî Khân was then appointed to the government of Nadarbâr and Sultân-pûr; and although his allowances had been increased by ten-twenty (i.e., double) at the accession at Ahmadâbâd, it was again doubled now.

At this time news came that Latif Khân had, at the instigation of 'Add-ul-mulk and Muḥâfiẓ Khân, gone to the hills of Āwâs in the vicinity of Sultân-pûr and Nadarbâr, with the intention of creating a disturbance and raising a revolt. Sultan Bahâdur ordered that an army should be sent, which would in co-operation with Ghażî Khân crush and destroy him. At this time, the date of the accession on

---

1 This second coronation is mentioned by Firishtah lith. ed. and very briefly by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106). The Mirât-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 334) also mentions it briefly after mentioning the famine.

2 It appears from the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 334, that the Sultan ordered Tâj Khân to command the army against Latif Khân and his adherents, but Tâj Khân represented that Ghażî Khân son of Ahmad Khân was the best man for the work, and the latter was then appointed to the sâbah of Nandarbâr.

3 According to the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 333, the famine occurred before the receipt of the news of Latif Khân's revolt, and the appointment of Ghażî Khân, or at least the famine is mentioned there before the revolt.

4 The place is so named in the MSS., in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106) calls it the Ahwas hills. They do not appear to be mentioned in the Mirât-i-Sikandari.

5 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have the text as I have it, but in the corresponding passage of Firishtah there is the word نَاقِرَانَ before, and the word نَاقِرَانَ after the word مَنْتَار. This is, I think, a better reading. The date of the accession on the 'Id-ul-duha was the anniversary of the accession at Ahmadâbâd which took place on that day.
the 'Id-ud-duha arrived. On this day the Sultán arranged a grand festive assembly, and again bestowed on many of the amirs robes and belts and daggers and swords, and in this way made them pleased with him.

It so happened, that at this time a famine took place, and (the Sultán) ordered Hushiyár-ul-mulk, who was the treasurer, to attend at his stirrups, so that at the time when he was riding, he should give a 1 Mużaffarî to everyone who should ask for help. The Sultán rode out every day twice to play chaugán; and in every city many alms houses were established for faqirs and poor people; and the Sultán 2 endeavoured with all his energy to ameliorate the condition of the ra’iyats; so that in a short time a new grandeur and splendour appeared in the country of Gujrát.

A considerable time had not yet elapsed, when the men, who had been creating disturbances, began to move again. Shuja’-ul-mulk fled and joined Latif Khán, and Qaisar Khán who was one of the great amirs of Mużaffar Sháh sent a number of his retainers with him. As Qaisar Khán and 3 Ulugh Khán had been in agreement with ‘Imád-ul-mulk in the matter of the murder of Sultán Sikandar, and were afraid of suffering the punishments for their acts, they did not abandon their hostile attitude. The loyal amirs having come to know of this informed the Sultán. 4 The latter sent Ulugh Khán with a well

1 The Miráţ-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 333, says, “a gold ashrafi”. The Sultán’s riding out to play chaugán is mentioned in this connection, I suppose, to indicate that the Mużaffarîs were given away on these occasions.

2 The wording in the MS. and in the lith. ed. which is appears to be defective. Either there should be the preposition & before or the words should be omitted. These words are omitted in the corresponding sentence in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

3 One MS. and Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs and the Miráţ-i-Sikandari have نأل خان, so I have taken that name, though the other MS. and the lith. ed. have ألف خان.

4 There is apparently some misstatement in the sequence of events. Apparently Ulugh Khán had already been sent in command of the army sent against Latif Khán, when the loyal amirs made the representation in the matter; but the difficulty is that it is said that Qaisar Khán and Ulugh Khán were put into prison. Probably Ulugh Khán was recalled, or he had not started, although the troops he was to command had. The Miráţ-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 335,
equipped army against Latif Khān. Some of the loyal adherents of the Sultān represented to him, that as Qaisar Khān and Ulugh Khān had combined with ‘Imād-ul-mulk in the murder of Sultān Sikandar, and now they were again awakening the rebellion, which had fallen asleep, by sending letters, etc., it was not right that they should be in that neighbourhood. The Sultān was considering this matter, when news came to Tāj Khān, that Ulugh Khān and Qaisar Khān had summoned Latif Khān to Nādōt by a road which was not well known and they were about to join him. Tāj Khān reported all this to the Sultān in private, and took an oath on the word of God (i.e., the Qurān) that there was no untruth in what he was saying. The next day, when the amirs, according to daily custom, came to salute (the Sultān), Qaisar Khān and Ulugh Khān were put into prison. Dāwar-ul-mulk, who had escaped by means of an excuse, was arrested. Dīā-ul-mulk and Khwājah Bābū who were suspected of associating with the conspirators were also imprisoned; they were brought into the public audience hall, with their heads uncovered and their hands bound. The men of the city assembled in multitudes and plundered their houses. Dīā-ul-mulk placed a robe round his neck, and made humble supplication; and Bābū agreed to pay 5 fifty lakhs of tankas as the ransom of blood. Sultān Bahādur gave up the idea of putting them to death and ordered them to be released. His kingdom was now purified from the weeds of disturbance and rebellion.

In the beginning of the year 933 A.H., 1527 A.D., a body of silāhdārs (troopers), whose numbers reached 3 ten thousand, made a

---

1 The name is written as قرار المک in the MS., and دوار الملك in the lith. ed.

2 One MS. has here by mistake بیچاره helpless, as an adjective to بابع instead of بنجاء fifty.

3 The number is ten thousand in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. But Firishtah lith. ed. has two thousand. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 107) makes it a large party headed by nearly two thousand officers. According to Firishtah they
complaint on a Friday, that they had not received their allowances, and did not allow the Khutba to be read. Sultan Bahadur excused the offence on account of his innate forbearance, and ordered the payment of their allowances. These men had intended to go to Latif Khan, and they had also instigated others to do so.

At this time a petition came from Ghazi Khan to the effect that "Latif Khan has come to Sultânpur with a large force and has raised the standard of hostility. I went and met him, and after the battle, Aḍḍ-ul-mulk and Muhāfiz Khan fled, and Ray Bhim with his brothers fell on the battlefield, and Latif Khan was wounded and taken prisoner." Sultan Bahadur immediately on hearing this news, sent Muhīb-ul-mulk, and a body of other amirs, so that they might properly and kindly attend to the condition of Latif Khan, and bring him to his presence, after placing ointments on his wounds; but as he was mortally wounded he died on the way. He was buried in the village of Hālōl, one of the dependencies of Chāmpānir, by the side of Sultan Sikandar. In the course of the same year 1 Naṣir Khan, who had received the title of Sultan Mahmūd also died. The Sultan appointed a number of beadsmen (وفد رضوان) at his brothers’ tombs, and ordered the daily distribution of cooked and uncooked food there.

In the same year, also, news came that 2 Rāy Singh, Raja of Māl on hearing of the execution of Qaisar Khan, sought an opportunity

made their complaint in the Jāma’ Masjid, and this is also indicated by the fact mentioned in the text, that they prevented the reader of the public prayers to read them. Fīrishtah also does not attribute the act of the Sultan to his forbearance, but says he knew they intended to go over to Latif Khan; and therefore ordered their allowances to be paid, as a matter of policy. Their intention of going over to Latif Khan is also mentioned in the text.

1 This was a young king who was placed on the throne by ‘Imād-ul-mulk after the murder of Sultan Sikandar. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says that he was secretly put to death, but I do not know the authority on which this statement is made. Neither the Tabaqāt nor Fīrishtah nor the Mirāt-i-Sikandari says so, though it is quite possible that the young prince was secretly murdered.

2 The reason of the hostility of Rāy Singh on hearing the news of the execution of Qaisar Khan, and of his invading the Sultan’s dominion, and of sacking the town of Dahūd is not at all clear, nor is it clear why Rāy Singh should have seized a lot of the properties of Ḍū‘ul-mulk, the son of Qaisar Khan. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says that it was the murder of the
and sacked the town of 1Dahūd, and much property belonging to Diā-ul-mulk, son of Qaiṣar Khān fell into his hands. The Sultan on hearing this news became anxious, and wanted to advance in person. Tāj Khān, however, submitted to him, that at the beginning of a reign, many occurrences like this take place, and His Majesty should not at all allow any distress or pain to lodge in his heart. If this slave is commanded to undertake this service, he would with the divine favour and the auspiciousness of His Majesty’s attention, chastise that turbulent man, the Rāja of Māl, as he deserves. The Sultan immediately conferred a robe of honour on him, and sent one lakh of horsemen with him for the punishment of Rāy Singh, the Rāja of Māl. Tāj Khān

child Mahmūd II, that alienated Udai Singh of Pālanpur, or, as he is described in the text and in Firishtah, of Rāy Singh, Rāja of Māl. But it is not clear why this Hindū chief should have taken the murder of the young Musalmān prince so much to heart as to put his country into such danger by raiding the territory of the powerful Sultan of Gujrat. The text both of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah make it clear that it was on hearing of the execution of Qaiṣar Khān, that he sought an opportunity and sacked Dahūd. In respect of Naṣr Khān both the Tabaqāt and Firishtah had used the word, death. So that when they speak of the death, the name cannot be a mistake for Nusrat Khān. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 335, does not directly connect the raid by Rāi Singh of Pāl, as he is called there, either with the execution of Kaisar Khān or the death of Naṣr Khān but it connects it indirectly with the former, and not in any way with the latter. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not mention the fact of the property of Ziā-ul-mulk being taken in the text, but Bayley in a note on page 336 quoting from the Tabakāt says that Rai Singh “made his attack on hearing of the execution of Kaisar Khān, apparently because he supposed that that showed disunion in Bahādur Shāh’s camp”. This is not a very cogent reason, but I mention it for what it is worth. Later on in the same note Bayley calls Ziā-ul-mulk, the son of Naṣr Khān; and that Rāi Singh’s son afterwards came in and submitted and was honoured with a dress (Khiḍar). Both these statements appear to me to be incorrect. The Tabaqāt and Firishtah both calls Diā-ul-mulk, the son of Qaiṣar Khān. There is no Naṣr Khān mentioned anywhere, about this time except the young prince, who certainly had no sons. As to the visit of Rāy Singh’s son to the Sultan, it will be seen from the text that it was Rānā Sānkā’s son and not Rāy Singh’s, who came and paid a visit to the Sultan. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, however, says that it was Rāy Singh’s son. Probably Bayley had some MS. before him, that also said so.

1 Dehor
1 invaded the country of Māl and began to devastate it. Rāy Singh then, with great humility and distress, submitted a petition for the pardon of his offences, through the intervention of Sharīf-ul-mulk who was one of Sultān Muzaffar’s amirs. It did not, however, meet with acceptance; and Tāj Khān penetrated into the country and stretched his hands to plunder and ravage it; and did not leave anything undone in devastating it. Rāy Singh chose a difficult position, and prepared to fight there, and Tāj Khān standing firm and strong met him. A large number of active and strong men were killed on the side of Rāy Singh, and 2 only one man was killed on the side of the Musalmāns. Tāj Khān remained one month in the country of Māl, after which he hastened to the service of the Sultān.

In the month of Rabi‘-ul-āwwal of the same year, Sultān Bahādur left his capital with the object of hunting. At this time a number of the ra‘iyats of Kanbāyet came, and made complaint of the acts of the officer in-charge of the town. The Sultān sent Tāj Khān to arrange the affairs of that neighbourhood; and issued an order for the dismissal of the dārōgha of Kanbāyet. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānir, the son of Rānā Sānkā came to render homage, and after staying there for some days, and after being made happy by favours and kindness, received permission to leave.

In the year 934 A.H., 1528 A.D., the Sultān cast the shadow of conquest over the countries of Idar and Bākar, and having in a short time conquered those countries, returned to Chāmpānir. He then went with a small retinue to rebuild the fort of Bahrōj, and after

---

1 There is a little difference in the readings. One MS. has در امده پیاناد خرایی تهاد, i.e., having invaded the country began to devastate it. The other has only در امده, i.e., invaded the country. The lith. ed. has در امده. I have adopted the first reading as it gives reason for Rāy Singh’s humility. Firishtah also has the same reading.

2 This is somewhat curious, but Firishtah also says از مسلمان، ک گنفر بقتل نیا، i.e., of the Musalmāns more than one man was not killed. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 108) also says the same thing, but he describes it as a remarkable feat; and he says only one man of Tāj Khan’s army is said to have fallen. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī also says the same thing, and says that the man who was killed was named Muhamad Hasan (Bayley, p. 336). M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted واز مسلمان، یک سو نفر باقتل آمده in the text-edition.
finishing his work there, went to Kanbâyet. One day, when he was amusing himself on the coast, a ship happened to arrive from the port Dip. The men, who came in it, reported, that a ship belonging to the firangis had been cast ashore by the wind. Qawâm-ul-mulk had seized the property on board the ship, and was 1 causing the firangis the hardship of being made slaves. On hearing this news after breaking his 2 fast the Sultân travelled to Dip by road. Qawâm-ul-mulk hastened to meet him, and produced the firangis before him. He invited them to accept Islâm, and having made a large number of them Musalmâns, raised the standard of return.

In the same year 3 a letter came from 'Âdîl Khân, governor of Âsîr, who was a nephew (sister’s son) of Sultân Bahâdur, the purport

1 The meaning of the words which are بدل عبودیت جمیل دارد in the MSS. (though the word بدل is written as بدل in one of them) is not quite clear, but I suppose my translation is correct. Firishtah has the word بدل instead of بدل. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 109) says the crew had been made prisoners.

2 The word is انطار in both MSS. and انظر in the lith. ed. Firishtah says the Sultân became very pleased on hearing the news, and agrees generally as to the facts of the incidents; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 109) says in the text that all the Europeans taken on this occasion were circumcised, and became Mahomedans; but in a note he says that “The Portuguese historian states that they resisted being converted and were eventually released. James de Mesquita was the name of the officer; and his whole crew consisted of only sixteen men in a boat. It is certain that James de Mesquita was with Bahadur Shah afterwards, at the siege of Chittoor, and was employed by him as his envoy to Nuno de Cunha in the year that Bahadur Shah lost his life”. This incident does not appear to be mentioned in either the Mirât-i-Sikandari or the Cambridge History of India.

3 The tenor of the letter is rather vague and disjointed. Firishtah lith. ed. agrees generally but the names of the party are somewhat different. 'Âdîl Khân is called Mirân Muhammed Shâh, Nizâm-ul-mulk Bahri Burhân Nizâm Shâh Bahri, Barid Bîdarî Qâsim Barîd and 'Imâd-ul-mulk, 'Alâ-ud-din 'Imâd Shâh; and instead of the three hundred elephants mentioned in the Tabaqât, Firishtah says some elephants, جنود سلسله بدل, were carried away as plunder. Col. Briggs’s account is similar to Firishtah; but he calls Mirân Muhammed Shâh “Meeran Mahomed Khan”. The Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 340, generally agrees; but says that the confederacy against 'Imâd-ul-Mulk Gâwîl or Mirân Muhammed Khân consisted of besides Nizâm-ul-Mulk and Barid, Khudâwand Khân Pâthîrî, and 'Ain-ul-Mulk and others; but it says nothing of the looting of the elephants and the taking of the fort of Mâhûr; but Bayley mentions them
of which was this, "As 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwili had prayed with humility for help from this faqīr, and Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri and Malik Barīd of Bidar had forcibly entered into the country Kāwil, the faqīr went to help and reinforce 'Imād-ul-mulk; and a great battle took place. The faqīr drove away the men in front of him. Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri, who was in ambush, attacked and defeated 'Imād-ul-mulk; and carried away as plunder three hundred elephants belonging to the faqīr. The faqīr has now come, relying on the generosity of Your Majesty. Whatever noble order is issued by you will be entirely for the welfare of all; and he (I suppose, Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri) has violently taken possession of the fort of Māhūr, which is the greatest fort in Kāwil." An order was issued to the following effect, "Last year a petition came from 'Imād-ul-mulk, and Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk, the governor of Nahrwāla, in accordance with orders, went and amiably settled the matter between the parties. Now that this violence has been perpetrated by Nizām-ul-mulk; therefore in accordance with the saying—the offender is a tyrant—he is the tyrant and 'Imād-ul-mulk the victim of his oppression; and it is a duty incumbent on the energy of all merciful people to help the oppressed." In the month of Muḥarram in the year 935 A.H., September, 1528 A.D., the Sultān advanced with an immense army with the object of conquering the Deccan, and encamped in the town of Barōda; and a long time elapsed there for the mustering of the troops.

About the middle of that year 935 A.H., 1529 A.D., Jām Firūz, the ruler of Thata, had to leave his country owing to the growing power of the Arghūns, and came and joined Sultān Bahādur.

---

in a foot-note. The account of the Cambridge History of India, page 324, is somewhat similar; but it says in addition, that the cause of the quarrel was the possession of the town and district of Pāthri on the Godāvarti, which belonged to the ruler of Berar by right but were coveted and had been annexed by that of Ahmadnagar ('Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād Shāh).

1 مديربدر in the text-edition.
2 The word is حائلا in one MS., but حاليا in the other and in the lith. ed.
3 The word is مكاءهمل in one MS.
4 Firishtah's account agrees, but he does not name the Arghūns, but substitutes Maqthūs. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 110) calls them Arghoons. Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not mention the allowance of twelve lakhs of tankas.
The latter showed kindness to him, and fixed a stipend of twelve lakhs of tankas for his personal expenses; and promised that, "God willing I shall give you your hereditary dominion after recovering it from the Maghuls".

As the fame of the grandeur of Bahādur Shāh, and the report of his imperial gifts spread in the inhabited fourth part of the world, the Rāys from near and far turned their faces to his threshold, which was a seat of prosperity. The nephew of the Rāja of Gwāliar with a body of Pūrabia Rājpūts came, and were enlisted among his special attendants. Bahrūn, son of Pritihī Rāj, nephew of Rānā Sāṅkā, also came with some notable Rājpūts, and entered his service. Some Dakini sardārs also came and attained to the good fortune of an audience (of the Sultān). All of them, in accordance with their status and position, obtained a share in his favours and gifts.

As a long time elapsed (in the Sultān’s) residence in Chāmpānīr, Imād-ul-mulk sent his son Ja’far Khān to wait on the Sultān, and represented that, owing to his arrogance and pride, Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī had no inclination towards a treaty of peace. If the Sultān would once advance into the Deccan, the object of this slave would be attained. The Sultān granted his prayer, and decided to invade the Deccan. About this time, Ja’far Khān submitted, that if the Sultān permitted, he would like to go and see the city of Ahmādābād and the country of Kanbāyet; and would soon come back to attend on the Sultān. His prayer was allowed, and he had arrived in Kanbāyet, when he was informed, that the Sultān had moved out of Ahmādābād to carry out his expedition into the Deccan, and had

---

1 The word خرج is left out from one MS.
2 His name is given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 343, as Nar Singh Dēō brother’s son of Mān Singh, Rājīsh of Gwāliār.
3 The name is بنگر or بنجر in the MSS., and مبین in the lith. ed., and بنجر in the lith. ed. of Firīshthāh. Col. Briggs calls him Sreeputty Ray (evidently mixing up the names of the father and the son), nephew of Rānā Sūṅkā. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī says that it was Pritihī Rāj, nephew of Rānā Sāṅkā and not his son who came. Following the Tabaqāt and Firīshthāh, I have adopted Bahrūn as the name of the Rājpūt chief, son of Pritihī Rāj, who came. Of all the names it is the only one which has any similarity to a Hindū name. M. Hidayat Hosain has بنگر بن پرنی Rāj in the text-edition.
encamped in the town of ¹ Dabōhī. Jaʿfar Khān waited on the Sultan there. ² The Sultan halted there for some time and again returned to ³ Muḥammadābād and passed the rainy season there. ⁴ He then in the year 937 A.H. marched towards Bākār and Īdar; and he sent Khudāwand Khān and ʿImād-ul-mulk from the village of Khānpūr with a well-equipped army and many elephants to Bākār; and himself proceeded towards Kanbāyet. He spent one day at Kanbāyet, and then embarked in a ship for the Dip. At the latter place all the stuffs and other merchandise, which were in the ships; that arrived from the various ports round about, were put into various store-houses. Among these things, there were one thousand and six hundred mounds of roses (or rose water) from Damascus. He also showed very great kindness to the body of Rūmīs (Turks) who had ⁵ come with Muṣṭafī

¹ The name of the town is in one MS., and درولوف in the lith. ed. In the other MS. the name of the town is not mentioned. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 344, that the names of the two stations in the Sultan’s march were the town of Dabōhī and the village of Dhārūlī. I have adopted the name of Dabōhī. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has درولوف in the text-edition.

² Bayley says in a note, on page 343 of his History of Gujarāt, that the Tārikh-i-Alfi, Firishtah and the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī say very little about this campaign. He gives a very brief summary of what the Tārikh-i-Alfi and Firishtah say, but none of what is said in the Tabakāt. What is said in the Tabaqāt is so mixed up with other matters, and with accounts of more or less aimless wanderings, that it is difficult to give any summary. I have not attempted to give a summary of what Firishtah, the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī and the Cambridge History of India say about it, but have confined myself to a translation of the text.

³ M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted احمد آباد درولوف in the text-edition.

⁴ Firishtah mentions this, after giving a brief account of the campaign. His account of these journeys agrees generally with that in the text, but he says that instead of buying sixteen hundred mans of roses or rose water of Damascus, he bought sixteen hundred mans of یسته و موینى, pistachio nuts and dried grapes. Col. Briggs does not mention these purchases, and I cannot find any mention of them anywhere else.

⁵ Firishtah says that they had come نجعات, i.e., as merchants; and it is not clear why they were in such helpless condition and could not go back to their own country.
Rūmi, and were in a strange country. He arranged residences for them; and returned after recommending them to the favour of Malik Ayāz.

When after travelling over the various stages, he arrived at Chāmpānir, 1 Umr Khān and Qutb Khān, and a number of other amīrs of Sultān Ibrāhīm, who had, for fear of His Majesty Firdūs Makānlī, fled to Gujrat, waited upon the Sultān; and were exalted to high ranks. On the 1st day 2 three thousand robes of honour woven all over with gold thread, and fifty horses, and some lakhs of tankas in cash were bestowed on them; and after pleasing their hearts, the Sultān had the drum beaten for a march to Mahrāsa. After his arrival there, Khudāwānd Khān and the other amīrs came and waited upon him. He then penetrated into Bākar by successive marches; and arranged for the perfect government of that territory, and appointed thānādārs at all necessary stations. Pars Rām, the Rāja of Bākar, becoming thoroughly helpless entered the Sultān’s service. His son having attained to the nobility of Islām became a Musalmān in the presence of Sultān Bahādur. But 3 Jagā, Pars Ram’s brother, with a number of insurgents moved about in the hills and forests. Afterwards he went for fear of his life to 4 Ratan Sēn, son of Rānā

1 One MS. inserts Qāzi Khān, after Qutb Khān.
2 It is in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah; but I think three hundred was the correct number.
3 The name is in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. It is in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 112) calls him Jugut Ray. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the text of the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, but in a note, on pages 340, 348, he is called Chagā or Jagā or Jagat. M. Hidayat Hosain has in the text-edition.
4 The name is in the MS. and also in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah, but it is Rānā Singh, Ratan Sēn in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Col. Briggs has Rana Ruttan. He is called Rānā Ratanī in the text of the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 350, but in a note it is said that he was variously called Ratan Sēn, Ratanī Chand. The Cambridge history of India (p. 326) calls him Ratan Singh, in an unsuccessful attempt to give the Sanskrit form of the name; but just as Sangrāma Singh is not correct Sanskrit so Ratan Singh also is not correct Sanskrit. It should be Ratna Sinha. But the Musalmān historians and even Tod, the author of the Rājasthān are content with Sanga Rānā or Rānān Sānkā, and Ratna and Bikramājīt the names of the brother and successor of
Sānkā for protection; and made him the medium for his entering the service (of the Sultān). It so happened that the Sultān had at that time gone to Bānswāla on a hunting expedition. Ratan Sēn sent emissaries there and with great humility and meekness prayed for the pardon of Jagā’s offences. The Sultān acceded to his prayer, and sent for Jagā. He then laid the foundation of a noble mosque in the 1 village and ghāṭ of Karchi, and gave that town (Karchi) to Prithī Rāj; and divided the rest of the territory of Bākar between 2 Prithī Rāj and Jagā in equal shares.

He remained there for some days with the object of hunting, when scouts brought the information, that Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji,

Ratan Sēn which the author of the Cambridge History of India has correctly transliterated into Vikramādiyā.

1 The name of the village is Dakhñāt Karjī in one MS. and Dakhñāt Karjī and Dakhñāt Karjī in the lith. ed. In Dakhñāt Karjī, in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it looks like Lahāt Karjī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 113) says that the king having caused a mosque to be built in the village of Larky G’hat gave it over in perpetuity to Jugut Ray. Whether the mosque or the village was given in perpetuity to him is not clear and in any case the statement differs from that of Firishtah, who says the Sultān gave the town to Prithī Rāj. It appears from the Mīrāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 348, that waqīs of Ratanī Rājah of Chītōr waited upon the Sultān at the pass of Karchi. I think therefore that the correct reading is in the text-edition.

2 There must be some mistake here. Pars Rām and not Prithī Rāj was the Rāja of Bākar. Prithī Rāj appears to have been Rāja of Dūngarpūr. It is not at all clear why he should have got half of Bākar to the exclusion of Pars Rām and his son, the former of whom had entered the Sultān’s service, and the latter had become a Musālmān. The Cambridge History of India, page 325, says in a few words what happened to Bāker (as it calls it), and Bānswārā. It says he “led an expedition in to Bāker and Bānswārā. The Rānā, Ratan Singh II, who had succeeded Sangrāma after the battle of Sikrī interceded for the two chiefs, and Bahādur stayed his hand”. I am afraid this does not give much information of what actually happened, and what information is given is not accurate. There is no mention of the division of Bākar, whether it was between Prithī Rāj and Jāgā, or between Pars Rām and the latter. There was also no expedition into Bānslāh or Bānswārā. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandari says definitely that the Sultān left his army behind, and went to Bānswālā on a hunting excursion and nothing appears to have been done in respect of him or of the Rāja. The names Ratan Singh and Sangrāma are also both incorrect.
who had been bound by ties of gratitude to the late Sultân Muzaaffar Shâh, and had received many favours from him, had sent 1 Sharzâh Khân, who was the civil and military governor of Mandû, that he might plunder and ravage some of the towns in the territory of Chitôr; and Ratan Sên, son of Rânâ Sânkâ had with a large force plundered and devastated the villages of Sipla and Balâvat; and was confronting Sultân Mahmûd Khalji at Ujjain. 2 Ratan Sên’s ambassadors also came at this time, and represented to the Sultân, that he should forbid Sultân Mahmûd Khalji, so that the latter might not without any reason move the chain of hostility. They also informed him, that Sultân Mahmûd Khalji had gone from Ujjain to Sarângpûr; and had taken Silhadi Pârabâ with him, with the object of putting him to death; and Silhadi having become aware of his intention had in conjunction with Sikandar Khân Satwâl gone to Chitôr, and had sought the protection of Ratan Sên; and Sikandar Khân and Bhûpat, son of Silhadi, were coming from there to wait on His Majesty. Accordingly on the 27th of Jamâdi-awwal, Sikandar Khân and Bhûpat came and waited on the Sultân. The latter bestowed on them seven hundred robes woven entirely of gold thread and seventy horses; and did everything to please them.

When Sultân Mahmûd received information of the departure of Sikandar Khân and Bhûpat, he sent Darya Khân, as an ambassador, with a message that he also intended to have the honour of presenting himself; but the acquisition of that blessing had remained in abeyance owing to certain reasons; but God willing he intended on this occasion to have the great pleasure of meeting His Majesty. Sultân Bahadur

1 The lith. ed. of Firishtah appears to be defective here, as it says that Sharzâh Khân after plundering certain towns in the territory of Chitôr, was confronting Sultân Mahmûd Khalji at Ujjain. Col. Briggs does not say that Ratan Sen plundered any villages in Mâlwa, or was confronting Sultân Mahmûd Khalji at Ujjain. On the other hand, he says that Shirza Khan had passed through Qojein to Sarungpoor. The Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 349, also does not say that Ratan Sen had plundered any villages in Mâlwa; but it does mention that he was confronting Sultân Mahmûd Khilji at Ujain.

2 Firishtah and Col. Briggs and the Mirât-i-Sikandari generally agree with the text; but Col. Briggs says that Moin Khan, son of Sikundur Khan Mewaty, and not the latter himself had fled to Chittor. Sikandar Khân is said in the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 349, to have been the governor of Siwâs.
said to Daryā Khān, "On various occasions, the glad tidings of a visit have reached my ears. If Sūltān Maḥmūd comes and meets me, I shall certainly not give an asylum to the fugitives from his courts". He then granted permission to the 1 ambassador of Sūltān Maḥmūd to return, after bestowing favours on him. Then he marched towards Bānswāla, and when he arrived at the ghāt or pass of Karchi, Ratan Sēn and Silhadi hastened to wait on him. On the first day the Sūltān bestowed on them thirty elephants and one thousand five hundred robes of honour made of stuff of woven gold thread. After a few days, Ratan Sēn obtained leave to go to Chitōr; but Silhadi having elected to enter the Sūltān’s service stayed on.

Sūltān Bahādur depending on the promise of Sūltān Maḥmūd Khalji proceeded towards 2 Sambla; and determined, that if Sūltān Maḥmūd came, he would perform the ceremonies of receiving and hospitably entertaining him; and then go as far as Kanbāyet and the pass of Dēyla, and after bidding him farewell there returned to the capital. At this place Muḥammad Khān Āsīri came and waited upon him. 3 When the latter arrived at Sambla he waited for ten days for Sūltān Maḥmūd. After that Daryā Khān again came from Sūltān Maḥmūd, and informed him that his master had fallen from his horse while hunting, and had broken his right arm; and it was not fit that he should come in his present condition. The Sūltān said,

1 The word is نرسنادة in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt.
2 The name is Sanbila in one MS. Sandla in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and Sandla in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 114) has Tandla, and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 350, has "the village of Sambalia". Sanbila in the text is apparently a mistake for Sambla.
3 The Cambridge History of India, page 326, gives a very good summary of the matters in dispute at this time between the Sūltān of Gujarāt and Mālwa, but unfortunately ends with a mistake, when it says, "Sūltān Mahmūd owed his tenue of his throne to the capture of Māndū from rebellious Rājputas by Mahmūd Begarha". It needs scarcely be said that it was Sūltān Muẓaffār, and not Sūltān Maḥmūd Begarha, who captured Mandū from the rebellious Rājputas (see pp. 318, 319 of the Cambridge History of India itself). It may also be mentioned that مندو should be transliterated as Mandū and not as Māndū.
"As he has broken his promise several times, if he does not come I shall go myself". Daryā Khān again said, "Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar is with Sultān Māhmūd. If the latter comes and Your Majesty demands the surrender of Chānd Khān, it would be very difficult to give him up, and it would be impossible to withhold him. In truth that is the reason why he cannot come". Sultān Bahādur said, "I have relinquished the idea of demanding the surrender of Chānd Khān. Please go and tell Sultān Māhmūd, that he should come soon". When the emissary of Sultān Māhmūd received leave to go back, Sultān Bahādur travelled slowly along, and waited for Sultān Māhmūd's arrival. When he arrived at Dīバルpur, it became known that Sultān Māhmūd wanted to confer the title of Sultān Ghīyās-ud-din on his eldest son, and he sent him to the fort of Mandū whilst he himself should leave it and seclude himself somewhere else; and he had no desire to meet Sultān Bahādur. Some of the amīrs of Sultān Māhmūd, who were aggrieved with him on account of his disagreeable behaviour towards them, came and saw Sultān Bahādur; and several of them represented to him, that Sultān Māhmūd was passing the time with idle excuses; and did not intend voluntarily to come; and Sultān Bahādur's army should without delay begin the siege of the fort (of Mandū).

Sultān Bahādur then started from that place, and encamped at Südpūr; and at that station, Sharzat-ul-mulk fled from the fort of Mandū, and hastened to wait on him. The next morning the army moved from that place, and encamped at the village of Dilāwarah. When the Sultān arrived at Na'leha, he directed the different detachments to take up their position for the siege. Muḥammad Khān Āstīr

1 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has selected بتلنتی طی منارال می نموند in the text-edition.
2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 114) says, "the delay which this arrangement involved gave the Guzerat courtiers an opportunity of again misrepresenting the conduct of Sultān Mahmood Khilji". This is not quite correct. It was the Mālwa and not the Gujrat amīrs who complained of Sultān Māhmūd's conduct, and it does not appear that even they misrepresented it.
3 This clause appears in one MS. where the place is called سورد پور and in the lith. ed. where it is called سورد پور; but not in the other MS. or in Firishtah. Neither Südpūr nor Sūrpūr is mentioned in any other history.
was posted to the west at the battery of 1 Shāhpūr, and 2 Ulugh Khān to Bhilpūr. He sent the Pūrabīa contingent to 3 Pahalwānā; and himself took up his quarters in the maḥals (palaces) at 4 Muḥammadpūr.

On the 5 9th Sha'bān, 937 A.H., at the time of the true dawn, the standards of Bahādur Shah rose above the horizon of the fort of Mandū. At that very moment, Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, got out of the fort and fled. Sultān Maḥmūd armed himself and with the few men that he had, came out to give battle; but as he 6 did not see that he was sufficiently strong to do so, he went into the palace

---

1 The name is شاه بیل Shāhpūr in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtāh. It is شاه بیل Shāhpūr in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. The Miṛāt-i-Sikandāri, Bayley, page 351, has “the trenches at Shāhpūr”.

2 The name is گلف خانīn Ulugh Khān in both MSS. The lith. ed. of Firishtāh has گلف خانīn Lughmān, which is certainly incorrect, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 115) improves it by making it Lōkmun Sing. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has گلف خانīn Alī Khān and the Miṛāt-i-Sikandāri has Alī Khān. As to the name of the place the MSS. have بیل بھیل بھیل بھیل بھیل Bihlpūr and Pahlpūr. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has بیل بھیل Bihlpūr and that of Firishtāh has بیل بھیل Bihlpūr. Col. Briggs has Seetulpooor, and the Miṛāt-i-Sikandāri, Bayley, page 351, Bahlōlpūr.

3 The MSS. have بھگوانہ Pahalwānā, and the lith. ed. has بھگوانہ Bhaqwānā. The lith. ed. of Firishtāh has سلموانہ Salhwānā. Col. Briggs has Jūlwarā, and the Miṛāt-i-Sikandāri has Bahalwānāh. M. Hidayat ʻOsānī has adopted سلموانہ Sahlwānā, in the text-edition.

4 The MSS. have محمد بیل Muḥammadpūr, and محمد بیل Muḥmūdpūr, while the lith. ed. has محمد آباد Maḥmūdbād. The lith. ed. of Firishtāh has محمد بیل Muḥmūdpūr, and Col. Briggs has Mahomedpooor, while the Miṛāt-i-Sikandāri, Bayley, page 351, does not state where the Sultān took up his quarters, but says that on the 20th Rajab he advanced his camp to Mahmūdpūr.

5 The date is the 9th Sha‘bān in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. and also in Col. Briggs, but the lith. ed. of Firishtāh has the night of the 29th Sha‘bān, and the Miṛāt-i-Sikandāri, Bayley, page 351, has the same date. The Miṛāt-i-Sikandāri describes how Sultān Bahādar himself with some great men effected an entrance into the fort by climbing a steep and high hill on the side of Sangār Chāṭārī. The exploit was something like that of Humāyūn, who six years later, in 942 A.H., captured Chāṃpānīr, by climbing a steep hill, by driving spikes into it. (See translation, vol. II, pages 54, 55.)

6 One MS. has نداشته, but the other and the lith. ed. have ندید.
to slay his wife and children. Sultān Bahādur's soldiers surrounded the mahal (palace), and sent a message that there was full assurance of safety to the inmates and to the amirs; and no one would interfere with the property or the honour of any single person. Some of Sultān Maḥmūd's loyal adherents made him refrain from the slaughter of his family; and told him, whatever unkindness the Bādshah of Gujarāt might show to him, his kindness and generosity would be greater than those of others. There was also a strong likelihood, that he would follow the example of his father and would leave the kingdom of Mālwa in the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd's servants. About this time, Sultān Bahādur ascended to the top of Lat' Mahal, and sent a man to wait on Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter came with seven of the amirs. 2 Sultān Bahādur received him with respect and courtesy, and embraced him; and tried to please him. Then when they began to converse with each other, Sultān Maḥmūd showed a little harshness in his language. This displeased Sultān Bahādur; and a silence fell on the meeting. Then Sultān Maḥmūd and his son were placed under arrest, and sent to Chāmpānīr; and Bahādur Shāh took up his residence.

1 Wishing apparently to follow the Rājput rite of jaubhar, but Firishtah says بواصطة رعايت أحوال عائل و أطفال محمد جانب منجل خرد شتاف، from which it would appear that he intended to look after his family and children, and not to kill them. As to what happened later, Firishtah follows the Taqāqat almost verbatim. But the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 352, says that “the plunder and the killing and the making of prisoners went on for one watch; and then a proclamation of quarter and safety was made”. The date according to Mirāt-i-Sikandari was the 9th (and not the 29th) Sha'bān, 937 A.H., 28th March, 1531 A.D. Col. Briggs gives the date of the 9th Shaban, February 26th and the Cambridge History of India, page 327, has March 17th.

2 Firishtah leaves out the show of courtesy and respect and the embrace; but says that Sultān Bahādur was inclined to forgive Sultān Maḥmūd, but when he asked the latter, why he had not come to meet him, he gave a harsh reply, after which things happened as stated in the Taqāqat. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari's version (Bayley, pp. 352, 353) is somewhat different. It says that Sultān Maḥmūd sought safety by asking for quarter and mercy, and came out with seven sons to wait on Sultān Bahādar. He was placed in the custody of trustworthy guards, and on the 12th Muḥarram he was sent to Gujarāt. This last date can scarcely be correct, as there is an interval of four months between Sha'bān and Muḥarram. The account given in the Cambridge History of India, page 327, appears to be a brief summary of that in the Taqāqat.
at Mandū. He gave permission to most of his amirs to go back to Gujrat, to their own jāfirs.

After the rains, Sultān Bahādūr 1 went to see Burhānpūr and Asir; and there Nizām-ul-mulk Daknī joined his service. 2 He conferred on him the title of Muḥammad Shāh, and then returned to Mandū. About this time it became known that Silhādī 3 Pūrubāia was not inclined to come and wait on the Sultān, for the reason, that he had in the time of Sultān Māḥmūd Khaljī taken some Musalmān women; and in fact even some of the members of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn's harem into his own house, and had kept them there. Sultān Bahādūr ordered that whether he came or not, it was incumbent on him (i.e., the Sultān), that he should release the Musalmān women from the disgrace of kufr (heathenism) and the wretchedness of the slavery of Kāfirs, and should give condign punishment to Silhādī. For this purpose he sent 4 Muqbal Khān to Chāmpānīr, so that he might go there and guard the fort and send Ikhtiyār Khān, with artillery and troops and treasure. Ikhtiyār Khān came with a large army, and joined the Sultān in the town of Dhār, on the 20th Rabi'-ul-āakhir, 938 A.H. Sultān Bahādūr 5 proclaimed that he was going back to Gujrat;

---

1 There is a slight variation in the reading in the MSS. One has بسیر اسمر بسیر برہانپور و اسمر برہانپور, while the other has بسیر برہانپور و اسمر برہانپور بسیر اسمرو, which is incorrect.
2 Firishtah says that he did so because he wanted that Nizām-ul-mulk Daknī, or as Firishtah calls him Burhān Nizām Shāh Bāhri would help him in the war with Humāyūn, which he intended to carry on; but as a matter of fact, the opposite of this happened, for Nizām-ul-mulk sent an emissary to Humāyūn, and wanted him to come and attack Gujrat. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, does not mention this, but it describes the interview between Bahādūr Shāh and Burhān Nizām Shāh.
3 The suffix Purabiya is omitted in one MS. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, does not mention anything about Silhādī having taken Musalmān women into his house, but says that he showed no disposition to fulfil his promise to return.
4 It appears that Sultān Bahādūr gave out that he was going to Gujrat, and went away as if on a hunting excursion to Dibālpūr, etc., so that Silhādī might not take fright, and go away to Ratan Sēn, son of Rānā Sānkā. This is expressly stated in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari.
5 He is also called مقبر خان مکاریب خان (مقرب خان) in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 356, and is there described as brother of Ikhtiyār Khān.
and went to Mandū, so that after making the necessary preparations there, he might commence his march towards Gujrāt. He left Ikhtiyār Khān in charge of the government of Mandū, and encamped at Na’lcha on the 25th of the month of Jamādī-ul-Āwval. At this time Bhūpat, son of Silhādi, submitted to the Sultān, “As the sublime standards are advancing towards Gujrāt, if this slave obtains permission to go to Ujjain, he would bring Silhādi to wait on Your Majesty after giving him assurances of safety”. The Sultān gave him permission, but with great caution himself advanced towards Ujjain by successive marches. On the 15th of that month, he arrived at the town of Dhār and leaving the army there went away to Dibālpūr, Banharia and Sa’dulpūr, as if on a hunting excursion.

Silhādi on hearing this news left Bhūpat at Ujjain; and came and waited on the Sultān. 2 Amīn Naṣīr who had been sent to summon him told the Sultān in private, that he had brought Silhādi, by deceiving him with a promise of the grant of Kanbāyet and a 3 krōr in cash.

1 About Dibālpūr there is no dispute; it is spelt دیالپور in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī calls it Dīpālpūr. The second name is Banharia, and نهر بنهرا Taharia in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 117) calls it Bensrode. The third place is Sa’dulpūr in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt it is راسولپور Rasūlpūr. Col. Briggs calls it Shoojalpoor. It is called 'Adlpūr in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 357, and Bayley says in a note, “The Tab. Akbari calls it Sādilpūr”.

2 This man’s name is variously given. Both the MSS. call him امیر نصیر Amīr Naṣīr, while the lith. ed. has امیر نصیر Amīr Naṣīr. Firishtah lith. ed. has Amīr Naṣīr, and Col. Briggs has Ameer Nuseer. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 356, calls him Malik Amīn Nas, and it is said there, that Nas was probably a nickname, and means, among other things, one who is beginning to be corpulent. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, calls the man Nassan Khān, and says that he had been sent to Raisen and brought Silhādi to the court. According to the other historians he was sent, but Silhādi came only on receiving his son’s message.

3 One MS. has كور after تنک, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have it. Firishtah says the same thing but in a different order. According to him Silhādi had no wish to submit to the Sultān, and would not have if he had not been deceived by the offer of Kanbāyet and a krōr of tankūs. The Mirāt-i-
As Silhadi had no thought of remaining in allegiance to the Sultān, and wanted to give up his fort and to go to Mewār; if he now got permission to leave, it would be difficult to see him again. The Sultān then started from Sa’dulpur for Dhār, and talked with the amirs, and his other adherents about seizing Silhadi. When he arrived at the camp, he left the army outside, and took up his residence in the fort of Dhār. He took Silhadi with him. When the Sultān got inside the fort, the men who had been directed to seize Silhadi, came and took him with the two other Pūrabās who were with him into custody. At this time one of Silhadi’s attendants raised a clamour, and placed his hand on his 2 dagger. Silhadi told him, “Do you want to kill me”. The man replied “I wanted to do it for your sake, but as it causes injury to you, now I can smite myself, so that I might not see you in captivity”; and striking his dagger under his abdomen went to 3 hell. When the news of Silhadi’s arrest was spread about, the Gujrat army and the populace of the city plundered his camp, and killed a large number of his followers; and his elephants and horses and equipage were seized for the Sultān’s government. Those who escaped the sword, fled and joined Bhūpat.

Towards the end of the day Sultān Bahādur sent 4 ‘Imād-ul-mulk to attack Bhūpat. He left Khudāwand Kham to accompany the camp; and in the morning himself started towards Ujjain. ‘Imād-ul-mulk told him at this time, that before his arrival, Bhūpat had received the news of Silhadi having been seized, and he had fled and gone to Chitōr. Sultān Bahādur conferred the government of Ujjain

Sikandarī, Bayley, page 357, says the promise was to give him the port of Kam-bhāiat and lakh of tankahs and one hundred Arab horses.

1 There are slight variations in the reading. The MSS. have دیدن أو راز معاالست معاالست دیدن او بار معاالست; while the lith. ed. has دیدن او بار معاالست دیدن او بار معاالست and Firishtah lith. ed. has دیدن او بار معاالست.

2 The word jamdhar, a kind of dagger, was used once before describing the attack on Khār Muhammad Kham by one of the Rājpūts who came as ambassador to him from the Rāja of Sirōhi.

3 The word is جشم in both MSS., and in the corresponding passage of Firishtah; but it is جشم non-existence in the lith. ed.

on Daryā Khan, who was one of the old amirs of Mālwa, and had formerly come as the ambassador to Sultān Bahādur; and advanced towards Sārangpūr. He bestowed Sārangpūr on Mallū Kān, son of Mallū Kān, who had in the time of Sultān Muẓaffar gone away from Mandū; and 1 had entered the service of . . . . . , and who in the reign of Shīr Kān had assumed the title of Qādir Shāh, and had the public prayers read and the coin struck in that country in his own name; some account of him will be written before long. And having given permission to 2 Habīb Kān the ruler (walī) of Āshṭa to go back to Āshṭa, himself marched towards Bhilsa and Rāisin. Habīb Kān went to Āshṭa, and took possession of it, after slaying a large number of the Pūrabīs. When the Sultān arrived at Bhilsa, it became known (to him), that it was eighteen years since the time when all vestiges of Islām 3 had disappeared from that country; and the rites of heathenism had gained currency there. At this time spies 4 informed the Sultān, that when Bhūpat, the son of Silhādi,

1 The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah who copies the Ṭabaqāt closely, are علیم شده بود without specifying the person whose servant he had become, but, according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 358, he had from the time of the Sultān’s (i.e., Sultān Bahādar’s) accession been in continuous attendance upon him; this explains his having become a maulāzim. It appears that he was a servant of the Khalji Sultāns of Mālwa, who afterwards assumed the title of Qādir Shāh, and ruled in Mandū, Ujjain, Sārangpūr and Rantambhūr.

2 The readings in the MSS. are حضيب الله حضيب خان اشته وَلَى رَا and in the lith. ed. حضيب خان وَلَى رَا. I have changed the sequence to حضيب خان وَلَى اشته رَا.

3 The language in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is آثار اسلام ازبن دیاز کوهگیر. The “marching away” of the vestiges of Islām appears to me to be inappropriate. The language in the other MS. آثار اسلام ازبن دیاز برطوف شده is better, and I have adopted it. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has منقطع گشته instead of برطوف شده. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 358, that “Bhilsah which had been converted to Islām by Sultān Shama-ud-din of Dehli”, but having been eighteen years in the possession of Silhādi, “Muhamadan law and custom had been set aside for idolatry”.

4 The reading in one MS. is بسم اللہ و رضا الله و رضوان لسائیدن, but the lith. ed. has neither بسم اللہ و رضا الله nor سلطاٽ لسائیدن.
went to Chitōr, \(^1\) Lakhman Sēn the brother of Silhadī had strengthened the citadel of Rāīsin, and was making preparations for a battle, and was waiting for reinforcement from Chitōr.

2 Sultān Bahādūr waited at Bhilsa for three days for the erection of mosques, and other houses for pious purposes (بِقَاءٌ خِيرٌ درَان), and marched from there on the 7th of Jamādī-ul-āwwal of that year and encamped at a distance of two karōhs from the town on the bank of the river. On the morning of Wednesday the 8th of the aforesaid month, he had the kettle-drum of victory beaten, and set up his position on the 3 bank of the reservoir of Rāīsin. The army had not yet arrived, when the Pārābī Rājpūts divided themselves into two detachments and sallied out of the fort. Sultān Bahādūr with the few men that he had with him attacked them, himself 4 hewing down two or three men into halves from their wastes. The army of Gujrat arrived one after another from behind, and completely routed the

---

1 The name is لکھمن Lakhman, and لکھمن سین Lakhmān Sēn in different places in the MSS. and لکھمن سین Lakhmān Sēn in the lith. ed. It is Lakhman in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs has Lokmun Singh and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 360, has Lakhman Sēn. The Cambridge History of India, page 328, has Lakhman Singh. I think Lakhman Sēn is the correct form of the name and I have adopted it.

2 Firishtah agrees as to what Sultān Bahādūr did at Bhilsa; but he does not mention his encamping on the bank of the river; and he says that he set up his بارگا in Rāīsin on the 8th of the Jamādī-ul-āwwal. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 358, says the Sultān left Bhilsah on the 17th Jumādī-ul-ākhir, and proceeded by successive marches to a river two kās from Rāīsin. On the next day he pitched his camp on the bank of the tank near the fort of Rāīsin. In spite of these contradictions about the date the Cambridge History of India, page 328, says that Bahādūr “was attacked as he approached the town on January 26”.

3 Both MSS. have بَرَاحی تُصِیب بارگا بِراعوخت; and Firishtah lith. ed. has بِرَاحی تُصِیب در رایسر; but I prefer بِرِاحی تُصِیب, which is in the lith. ed., and which agrees with the Mirāt-i-Sikandari. M. Hidayat Ḥosain, however, has followed the MSS. in the text-edition.

4 Firishtah agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 119) says Bahadur Shah slew ten men with his own hand; and Bayley in a note, on page 358, ascribes, as in the other cases, Col. Briggs’s statement to Firishtah.
infidels: The *Pūrabias*, 1 being struck by the bravery and courage of Sūltān Bahādur, took shelter in the fort. The Sūltān forbade his soldiers from continuing the fight, and postponed it for the following day.

The next day he marched from that place; and fixing on the fort as the centre, distributed the batteries (among the different commanders); and commenced the construction of covered passages. Within a short time these reached a place whence they commanded the garrison. The Sūltān went there himself, and leaving Rūmī Khān with the artillery, returned to his quarters. Rūmī Khān brought down two of the bastions of the fort by firing from his cannons. He also dug a mine from another side, and setting fire to it blew down some yards of the wall on that side. Silhādi seeing the weakness of the *Pūrabias*, and the great strength of the enemy sent a message to the following effect, “This slave wishes to be dignified with the nobility of Islām; and after that if he gets leave, he would 2 go above, and after evacuating the fort, make it over to the representative of the Bahādur Shāhī government”. The Sūltān was delighted on hearing this news, and summoning Silhādi to his presence, repeated to him the words expressing the unity of God. When Silhādi accepted the faith, the Sūltān gave him a special robe of honour; and sent him various kinds of food from the (royal) kitchen. He then took Silhādi with him to the foot of the fort.

Silhādi summoned Lakhman, his brother, and said to him, “As I am now included in the community of Musalmāns, Sūltān Bahādur will, either on account of a feeling of communal favour, or on account of his noble spirit, raise me to a high rank. It is fit that after surrendering the fort to the adherents of the Sūltān, I

---

1 The actual words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are گوتنہ غوش the meaning of which is not quite clear to me.

2 The meaning is not quite clear. The words are یابا رجنتہ in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but they are omitted from the lith. ed. of the Šabaqāt. The meaning probably is, “Going up into the fort”. It would be remembered that he was a prisoner in the Sūltān Bahādur’s camp, and it appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 359, that he informed the Sūltān, “Having obtained the friendly offices of some of the chief nobles”.
should bind the girdle of service strongly and should continue to render him service". 1 His brother then told him privately, that now that it is not right, according to their religion, to shed your blood, and Bhūpat is coming to their assistance, bringing the Rānā and 2 forty thousand men with him; something should be done, so that there might be a delay of a few days longer, in the capture of the fort. Silhādī having applauded this opinion, said to the Sultān, "Let this matter be postponed today. Tomorrow after two watches (pās) of the day, the fort would be evacuated, and made over to the servants of the Sultān".

Sultān Bahādūr then left that place and returned to his residence; and waited for two watches of the (next) day to pass. When a moment elapsed after the appointed time, Silhādī again represented to the Sultān, "If you order, this slave would go near the fort, and having ascertained the state of things would report". Sultān Bahādūr made Silhādī over to trustworthy men, and sent him to the neighbourhood of the fort. Silhādī went to the fallen bastion, and began to give advice to the people in the fort. He said, "Oh ye careless Rājpūts! take note of the Sultān. He would immediately come out of the battery, and put you all to death". His object was this, that they should immediately rebuild the bastions. Lakhman gave no reply, and Silhādī returned in a state of fear. That night Lakhman

---

1 According to this the plan of deceiving the Sultān first originated with Lakhman, and according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 360, Silhādī informed the Sultān, that he was willing to become a Musalman, as he was afraid that the Sultān’s attack would be successful and all his people would be slaughtered; but according to the Cambridge History of India, page 328, "Silhādī conciliated Bahādūr, by perfidiously feigning to accept Islam, and thus obtained permission to meet his brother, ostensibly with the object of arranging for the surrender of the fortress, but when he and Lakhman Singh met, they agreed to await the relieving force expected from Chitor".

This is, on the face of it, somewhat contradictory. If they agreed to await the arrival of the relieving force (only), when they met, Silhādī could not have perfidiously feigned to accept Islam, and have met his brother.

2 The relieving force is said to have been forty thousand in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firāštah and in Col. Briggs’s translation. It is four thousand in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 360, makes it "forty or fifty thousand picked horse and artillery and innumerable infantry".
sent two thousand Parabia with a son of Silhadi to the station where Bhūpat was. Silhadi's son began to fight, and the Gujrāt army having exerted themselves beyond the power of men, killed many of the Rājpūts, and sent the head of Silhadi's son with the heads of other Rājpūts to the Sultān.

When Silhadi received information of the death of his son, he fainted. Sultān Bahādur now became aware of the real state of things, and made Silhadi over to Burhān-ul-mulk, so that he might be kept in prison in the fort of Mandū. At this time news came, that Bhūpat was bringing the Rānā with him from Chitōr. As he knew that the Sultān had arrived jarida, or with a small force, the Rānā with great audacity came along by successive marches. The Sultān said, "Although I may have only a small force with me still in accordance with the saying, that one Musalmān is equal to ten Kāfira, I shall meet them". The Sultān's wrath became violent on hearing the news of the Rānā's approach; and he immediately sent Muḥammad Khān the ruler of Burhānpur, and Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī for their chastisement. When Muḥammad Khān and Imād-ul-mulk arrived in the town of Sarisa, news came that the Rānā and Bhūpat had arrived near the town of Kahrār. Muḥammad

---

1 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say simply Silhadi's son, but Firishtah has Silhadi's younger son (Silhuddy's youngest son). He is called a younger son of Silhadi in the Mirāt-i-Sikanī, Bayley, page 361, and Silāhdī's youngest son in the Cambridge History of India, page 328.

2 He was apparently intercepted by the Gujrāt army. The Mirāt-i-Sikanī, Bayley, page 361, gives a different version of the incident. According to it, "A younger son of Silhadi's made an attack upon a royal post in the town of Barsia with two thousand horse. But the Musalmāns were victorious; and the infidel fled to his elder brother, Bhūpat".

3 One MS. has but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have.

4 The name of the town is Sarisa in one MS. and looks like in the other. In the lith. ed. it is Sīrās. Firishtah and Col. Briggs do not give the name of the place, but say they had not gone far when they met Poorummal. The Mirāt-i-Sikanī, Bayley, page 361, has Barsia. The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of the place.

5 The name is Kahrār and in the MS. It is Kahrār in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kehrla. Col. Briggs does
Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk arrayed their troops for battle and advanced towards them; and when they arrived in the vicinity of Kahār, Pūran Mal, another son of Silhādi, 1 appeared there with two thousand Pūrabās Rājpūts. Muḥammad Khān advanced to attack the fort, but Pūran Mal fled without fighting, and some of the Pūrabās who were under him were taken prisoner. Muḥammad Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk submitted a report to the Sulṭān to the effect that Pūran Mal had fled and joined the Rānā; and the latter had arrived quite near; and although the force under him was beyond any computation, still relying on divine help, and the auspicious fortune of His Majesty, they would not hold themselves excused from making all efforts to attack him.

On receiving this report, the Sulṭān left Ikhtiyār Khān and other amār to carry on the siege, and marching very rapidly traversed in the course of a night and a day, seventy Mālwa karōhā; and shone like a flash of lighting in the neighbourhood of Kahār. Muḥammad Khān went a part of the way to receive him and brought him to his own quarters.

The spies of Rānā and Bhūpat took them the news, that the Sulṭān had on the preceding night joined his army; and his troops, which were like swarms of locusts and ants, would arrive almost immediately. The Rānā on hearing this news retired, and sat down one stage behind (his previous camp). In the morning Sulṭān Bahādur advanced one stage beyond Kahār. At this place two Rājpūts came as emissaries with the object of making inquiries and delivered the following messages from the mouth of the Rānā, "The Rānā was one of the servants of the threshold, and his object in coming to these parts was, that he would advance his foot by way of intercession,

not give the name of the place. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 361, has Kharōd, while the Cambridge History of India, page 328, has Kamkera.

1 The word is حاکم in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and حاکم in the other MS. Firishtaḥ lith. ed. also has حاکم. According to the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabarqāt, as well as the lith. ed. of Firishtaḥ and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 361, and the Cambridge History of India, page 328, the force under Pūran Mal was two thousand men; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 121) makes it ten thousand cavalry.
and ask for the pardon of Silhadi's offences". The Sultān said, "At present his forces and grandeur are greater than mine. If he had submitted a petition without fighting, he would of course have attained his object". When those two Rājpūts went back, and reported that they had seen the Sultān with their own eyes, the Rānā and Bhūpat in spite of all their great strength and pomp fled, making three or four stages into one. At this time, news came that Ulugh Khān with thirty-six thousand horsemen, and the elephants and artillery of Gujrat had arrived in the neighbourhood. The Sultān, owing to his great bravery, did not wait for the arrival of Ulugh Khān, but pursued the enemy for seventy karōhs with only the troops that

1 The word is استغفار, and looks like in the MS. It is in the lith. ed. I have retained the latter, though Firishtah has استغفار. Of course and have the same meaning; the latter has been used by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text-edition.

2 The words are جمعت و شوکت شما جمعت و شوکت اور in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and جمعت و شوکت ناکرده in the other MS. I think the latter reading is better and I have adopted it. The Sultān was addressing the emissary, but the force and grandeur he was referring to was not theirs, but the Rānā's.

3 The reading in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is جنگ ناکرده but in the other MS. it is جنگ ناکرده. This latter is the correct reading and I have adopted it. Firishtah lith. ed. also has جنگ ناکرده.

4 The reading is مطلب شما in both MSS. and in the lith. ed.; and مطلب شما also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, although it is misplaced there before I would be better, and I have adopted it; but M. Hidayat Hosain has retained مطلب شما in the text-edition.

5 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have جیار but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has جیار. The making of three or four stages into one shows the rapidity of their flight.

6 The name is Ulugh Khān in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has Alif Khān, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 121) has Aluf Khan. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari has Alaf Khān; but Bayley in a note, page 362, says there is the usual confusion between Alaf and Ulugh. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the arrival of the reinforcement, or the name of the commander. The number of horsemen is thirty-six thousand in the MSS. and in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari; but it is thirty thousand in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and also in Col. Briggs's history.
he had with him. The Rānā however got into Chitōr; and the Sultān leaving the punishment and castigation of the Rānā to the next year, returned to Rāisīn; and on arriving there made the siege closer than before.

About the end of Ramadān, when Lakhman became hopeless of receiving reinforcement and saw destruction before his eyes, he came forward with humility and submission; and submitted a representation, that if the Sultān could summon Silhadi to his presence, and would draw the pen of forgiveness across the page of his offences, and would give him assurance of safety, this slave (that is he himself) would evacuate the fort, and would surrender it to him. The Sultān, after much consideration, reminded himself that his object in undertaking the expedition was to free the Musalmań women from the disgrace of kufr (heathenism). If their (i.e., Lakhman's and Silhadi's) prayer is not acceded to, it is likely, that there should be a jauhar, and those helpless women would all be killed. Considering all this he granted Lakhman's prayer, and summoned Silhadi to his presence from the fort of Mandū. Burhān-ul-mulk hastened from Mandū bringing Silhadi with him.

After Silhadi had come, Lakhman hastened to wait (on the Sultān); and having obtained a formān granting assurance of safety (to Silhadi), went up to the fort. The Sultān detailed a body of soldiers to guard the fort. Lakhman brought down the families of the other Rājpūts from the fort; but kept his own family and those of 2 Tāj Khān and of the principal Rājpūts in the fort. He again represented to the Sultān that there were about 3 four hundred women, who appertained to Silhadi, and Rānī Durgāwati, the mother of Bhūpat had a prayer, that as Silhadi had become one of the special slaves of the Sultān,

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have تسليم ميناماده, but the other MS. has تصليم ميناميد. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt omits the passages from بخارى أورندند to تسليم ملازمان ميناميد.

2 It is not clear how Tāj Khān got mixed up with the Rājpūts. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 121, 122) says that "Taj Khan, who had come to negotiate on the part of Lokmun, was permitted to return to the fort".

3 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 363, makes the number seven or eight hundred.
if he was allowed to come to the fort, and to take down the members of his own family from it, the latter would be protected from the taunt of being taken down by strangers. The Sultān sent Malik 'Ali Shēr with Silhādi to the fort; and when the latter arrived there, Lakhman and Tāj Khān asked of him, "What would the Sultān grant to them in exchange for the fort of Rāisin, and the country of Gōndwāna". Silhādi said, "At present the town of Barōda with its dependencies has been determined upon for our residence; and it is likely that the Sultān would, out of his generosity, exalt me (more)".

Rānī Durgāwati and Lakhman and Tāj Khān said, "Although the Sultān would show us favour and kindness, still for many generations this country has been in our possession, in reality if not in name, like an empire; and now fate has ordained that we should all be (again) together. The right way of bravery is this, that we should perform jauhar of our women and children, and should ourselves fight and be slain; and there should be no further longing left in our hearts". Silhādi was much moved by Rānī Durgāwati's words, and assumed an attitude of rebellion and revolt. Although Malik 'Ali Shēr offered much friendly counsel, it was of no avail. (Silhādi) said in reply to Malik Shēr, "Every day one krōr of betel leaves, and some seers of camphor are consumed in my harem, and every day 1 three hundred women put on new garments. If we are killed with our women and children, what honour and glory!" He then arranged for the rite of jauhar, and Rānī Durgāwati, taking her 2 daughter-in-law, who

---

1 The word is سیصد, but I suppose it means three hundred, and not thirteen hundred, or three thousand. The lith. ed. is defective here, having مال instead of پان, and leaving out the words زین دارم که. There is a slight difference in the MSS. also; one has سیصد زین هر روز, but the other has سیصد زین دارم که. Silhādi's ideas of his own pomp and grandeur were rather curious.

2 The word is عروس, which ordinarily means a bride, but it can only mean a daughter-in-law here. The lith. ed. of Firishtah, however, omits the word عروس, and makes Rānī Durgāwati herself the daughter of Rānī Sānkā. The passage in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari is doubtful. It is said there according to the translation, that a daughter of the Rānī, who was the wife of Bhūpat was among the seven hundred women who were burnt. Bayley, page 365, in a note says that the word wife may be a mistake for mother. I think, however, that the account in the Ṭabaqāt is correct.
was the daughter of Rānā Sānkā, with (her) two children by the hand got into the jauhar; and they with seven hundred beautiful women were burnt. 1 Silhadi with Tāj Khān and Lakhman then armed themselves, and coming out fought with the Dakini infantry, who had gone up to the fort. When the news reached the camp, the Gujrāt army galloped up to the fort, and sent that ill-fated band to hell; while of the army of Sultān Bahādur, only four foot soldiers attained to the happiness of martyrdom.

About this time Sultān 'Ālam, the ruler of Kālpi came as a supplicant to Sultān Bahādur, against the assaults of the armies of 2 His Majesty Jinnat Aṣhāfā. Sultān Bahādur granted the forts of Rāśīn and Chandīrī, and the territories of Bhilsa as a jāgīr to him. He also appointed Muḥammad Khān, the ruler of Asir, to capture the fort of Kākrūn, which in the time of Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji had come into the possession of the Rānā; and himself started on an expedition to hunt elephants. He captured many elephants; and after meeting out their deserts to the rebels of the 3 hilly country of Kānūr, made it over to 4 Ulugh Khān. He also took possession of Iṣlāmābād and Hūshangābād and the whole of the country of Mālwa, which was in the possession of zamīndārs; and granted them as jāgīrs to the amirs

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 328, says that the Rājpūts showed little of their usual spirit, as although they were all slain, the losses of the Muslims amounted to no more than four or five. It appears, however, from Firishtah, that the total number of Rājpūts was not more than one hundred; and according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, they offered a stout resistance.

2 Firishtah agrees with this; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari gives an account of Sultān 'Ālam, from which it appears that he was placed in charge of Kālpi by Nizām 'Ali Khalifshā, Bābār’s wazir. He ruled Kālpi well during Bābār’s lifetime; but after his death he rebelled against Humāyūn, and then sought shelter with Sultān Bahādar. The Cambridge History of India, page 328, however, says that “He had fled from his principality before Bābūr”.

3 The name is كورا in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and كورا in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. also has كورا, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 368, has the fort of Kānūr; and the Cambridge History of India, page 328, Kanūr. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted كورا in the text-edition.

4 The name is “Al-Fāl Khān” and بحجان in the MS., and بحجان in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has ‘Al-Fāl Khān; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India, page 329, have Alp Khān.
of Gujrat, and to his own trusted adherents. When Muhammad Khan, the ruler of Asir, was advancing towards Kakraun, Sultan Bahadur also arrived in that neighbourhood with great rapidity. A man of the name of Ram, who was the governor of the place on behalf of the Rana, evacuated it, and fled. Sultan Bahadur occupied himself there for four days in festive assembly and entertainment; and granted rewards and favours to each one of the men who were near his person. He then sent 'Ina'il-ul-mulk and Ightiyar Khan, who were among his great nobles, to capture the fort of Mandisor; and himself went to Mandu. The governor of Mandisor, who was an officer of the Rana evacuated it and fled; and in the course of one month the forts of Kakraun and Mandisor came into the Sultan's possession.

The Sultan advanced from Mandu to Champanir. Information came at the latter place, that the "firangis" had come to the port of

1 The MSS. have Ram Name, while the lith. ed. has Ram Name. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has Ram Jee Namei. The name is not given either by Col. Briggs or in the Mirat-i-Sikandari or in the Cambridge History of India. It would appear from Col. Briggs and the Mirat-i-Sikandari that Muhammad Shah had not yet succeeded in capturing Gagraun, but when Sultan Bahadur appeared, the place was evacuated (Bayley, pp. 367, 368).

2 The name is Dantur, and Dastur in the MSS.; and looks like Damtur in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Rumi Banur, and Col. Briggs has Runtumbhore (vol. IV, p. 123). The Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 368, and the Cambridge History of India have Mandisor or Mandasor, which I have adopted.

3 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has "Times Ramhi Kalan Ghaashat". The other has the same, but inserts between "Kalim" and "Ghaashat". Firishtah lith. ed. has the same reading as the first MS., and I have adopted it.

4 With reference to this, see the footnote in Col. Briggs, vol. IV, page 123, from which it appears that according to Faria-e-Souza (tome I, part IV, chapter IV) it was one of the greatest efforts made by the Portuguese, but it appears to have failed entirely. The fleet consisted of four hundred vessels, on which were embarked three thousand six hundred European soldiers and ten thousand native soldiers, besides seamen and Lasars. The Mahomedans under Moostafa Khan the Governor of Diu or Dip so completely repulsed the attack that the Portuguese had to return to Goa. Bayley also in a note, on page 369, says that it was a very important struggle, and he hoped to discuss it more.
Dip, and had raised the standard of power. The Sultān advanced towards Dip and when he arrived in its neighbourhood, (he heard) that the firangīs had fled; and a great cannon, which exceeded in size all other cannon in India, came into his possession. The Sultān had it conveyed to Chāmpānīr by means of a special machine. He then determined to seize Chitŏr, and marched from Dip to Kan-bāyet and from there to Aḥmadābād. Here he went on pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy Shaikhs and of his great ancestors. He collected troops, and with the artillery of Dip and Gujrāt advanced towards Chitŏr. 1 At this time Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā fled from the court of His Majesty Humāyūn Bādshāh, and came as a suppliant to the Sultān. When the latter arrived at Chitŏr, the Rānā shut himself up in the fort; and the period of the siege was prolonged to three months. On many occasions brave men prepared for combat came out from the two armies, and performed gallant deeds. On most of these occasions victory and triumph fell to the lot of the Gujrāts. In the end the Rānā came forward with humility, and paid a large subsidy and making the crown and the 2 jewelled belt, which he had taken from Sultān Maḥmūd Kharī the ruler of Mālwa, and some horses and elephants, the ransom of his life, turned the Sultān back to Gujrāt.

This victory and the coming of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā, and the gathering together of the descendants of Sultān Bahālīl Lūdī in his service became the cause of the increase of Sultān Bahādur’s pride. It also became the cause, that set on move the chain of hostility with His Majesty Muḥammad Humāyūn Bādshāh. In order to carry out this intention, he conferred favours on Tātār Khān, son of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Bahālīl Lūdī, who was distinguished above

---

1 Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā was a prisoner in the fort of Blāna, and fled from there in the year 940 A.H.

2 About this belt see Note on page 124 of Col. Briggs’s History, vol. IV, from which it appears that it was sent with Bahadur Shah’s family to Medina; and it eventually found its way in the shape of a present to the Grand Seignior, Soliman the Magnificent.
all his equals in manliness and bravery; and paid 1 thirty króra of gold to Burhán-ul-mulk, the governor of the fort of 2 Ranthambör, so that in concert with him and with his advice the money might be spent by Tátár Khán in collecting an army. Within a short time about forty thousand horse assembled 3 round Tátár Khán. He began to make inroads on the outskirts of the dominions of His Majesty Jinnat Áshlānū. In the year 941 a.h. repeated 4 letters came from

---

1 The actual words in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. are, سی کور زہ, which means thirty króra of gold coin (probably Muṣaffarīs) and Firishtah has definitely سی کور مئیشی thrity króra of Muṣaffarīs. Col. Briggs, however, has three crores of rupees and says, in a note, three millions sterling. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 382) does not mention the amount, but it says that thirty (not forty as in the text) thousand horse were placed under Tátár Khan Lodí to march to Dehli by way Bāīnāh.

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have بہری ملک حاکم قلعہ راتھमبور, Burhán-ul-mulk, the governor of the fort of Ranthambör; but Firishtah lith. ed. has بہری ملک حاکم قلعہ آسر, Burhán-ul-mulk the governor of the fort of Asr; while Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 125) has Imād-ool-Moolk, the governor of Rantumhore. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not mention Burhán-ul-mulk or 'Imād-ul-mulk. The Cambridge History of India, page 330, has Burhán-ul-Mulk governor of Ranthambhor.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بہری تاتار خان; but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has با تاتار خان. I have adopted the former reading.

4 It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 375, that several letters passed between Humāyūn and Bahādār about the extradition or expulsion of Muhammad Zamān Mirzá. In the first letter Humāyūn urged Bahādār to act in an amicable spirit; in the second he expressed surprise at Bahādār’s unfriendly conduct. A copy of the third letter is given in Mir Abū Turab’s Tārikh-i-Gujarat, and a translation of it in Bayley’s History of Gujarāt. A copy of the fourth letter, which was Bahādār’s reply, is also given in the Tārikh-i-Gujarat and a translation of it by Bayley. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 380, that Bahādār’s replies were written by Mullā Mahmūd Munshi, who had been formerly in Humākūn’s service, but had done something which had greatly incensed the latter, and he had accordingly fled and taken refuge with Sultān Bahādār. The drafts of these letters by this man were in rude and insolent language, but Bahādār’s ministers, who were wise and prudent men, had all the insulting expressions erased before the letters were sent. The last draft was, however, brought by the Munshi to the Sultan when he was drunk, and he directed it to be despatched at once, and it was sent accordingly, when the Munshi had affixed the Sultan’s seal to it. Next morning when the ministers and the other amirs saw the draft they were surprised at its insolent language,
Humāyūn Bādshāh to Sūltān Bahādur, to the effect that even if he does not send Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā to his presence, he should at least expel him from his own dominions. Sūltān Bahādur on account of his great pride and self glorification did not send a satisfactory reply. In addition to this Tātār Khān attacked Bīāna and seized it. His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī sent Hindāl Mīrzā to crush him. When the Mīrzā arrived in the neighbourhood of Bīāna, the men who had gathered round Tātār Kān dispersed; and not more than two thousand horsemen remained with him. Owing to his great shame and remorse, that he had spent such a large sum of money upon his faithless soldiers, he could not go and wait on the Sūltān and ask him for further help. Having no alternative left, he decided on a battle; and, when the two armies met, he made an onslaught on the centre of Mīrzā Hindāl’s army; and was, with the three hundred men who were with him, slain; and the fort of Bīāna came into the possession of Mīrzā, the royal officer.

His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī took this victory to be a good omen, and advanced to crush Sūltān Bahādur. It so happened that the latter had at this time again advanced to seize the fort of Chitār, with a large army, and all the appliances for the capture of fort. When the news of the defeat and death of Tātār Kān, and of the advance of His Majesty (Humāyūn) reached him at the foot of the fort of Chitār, he became extremely anxious, and had a conference as to the course he should adopt. The opinion of most of the amīrs was to the effect, that he should raise the siege of Chitār, and advance to meet Humāyūn; but 1 Sadr Kān, who was the greatest of his nobles, submitted, “We are besieging the Kāfir; if a Bādshāh of the Musalmāns comes to attack us, he would be supporting and helping the Kāfir; and such an act would be talked about among Musalmāns.

A messenger on a swift horse was at once sent to intercept the letter but he was unable to do so; and the letter reached Humālūn, and was the direct cause of the war between the two sovereigns.

1 It is curious that although he is called the بزرگترین امرا, he has never been mentioned before. Firishtah lith. ed. has by mistake حیدر خان, Haidar Kān. The Cambridge History of India, page 330, has “Sadr Khan, one of his officers”.

2 One MS. has by mistake ابین امر روزتا قیامت
till the day of the resurrection. It is right for Your Majesty’s benefit, that we should not abandon the siege; and there is a strong likelihood that he (i.e., Humayun) would not attack us during this time”. When His Majesty Jinnat Ashiané encamped at Sārangpur, and the facts of this conference were reported to him, he halted there for a few days; so that Sultán Bahadur having erected covered ways, took the fort of Chitār by force and violence; and put a large number of Rājpūts to death.

When Sultán Bahadur after his mind had been freed from all anxieties about the conquest of Chitār advanced to fight with Humayun Bādshāh, the latter also having had the drum of departure beaten, prepared to meet him; and the two armies met each other in the vicinity of Mandisór. While the tents had not yet been fixed, Saiyid ‘Alí Khān and Khurāsān Khān, who were the commanders of the vanguard of Sultán Bahadur’s army, fled from the army to His Majesty the Humayun Bādshāh, and united with the main body. The Gujrātīs on seeing this were heartbroken. Sultán Bahadur then took counsel with the amirs and the leaders of different groups as to the way in which the war should be carried on. Şadr Khan said, “We should fight a drawn battle tomorrow, 1 for the troops have gained strength and courage from the capture of Chitār, and their eyes have not yet been frightened by the power and grandeur of the Mughal army”. 2 Rūmī Khān, who was the officer in-charge of the artillery of Sultán

1 The MSS. have چراکه لکھویہ ہی ہے; while the lith. ed. has چراکہ لکھویہ ہے.
2 Rūmī Khān’s statement that cannon and muskets do not come into action in a battle appears to be preposterous on the face of it; and it is strange that his advice was accepted by Sultán Bahādur, and acquiesced in by the other leaders. None of the other histories says anything about the treachery of Rūmī Khān, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 383, and the following pages, gives a circumstantial, and what appears to me, a convincing account of such treachery: It appears that Sultán Bahādār had given a promise to Rūmī Khān, that he would place him in command of the fortress of Chitār, but after it was taken, the ministers and nobles were jealous and strongly objected; and the Sultán could not keep his promise at the time. Rūmī Khān was deeply offended, and he wrote secretly to Humāyūn, and informed him that if he would march in that direction the defeat of Sultán Bahādār might easily be compassed, “for”, he wrote “the Sultán places entire reliance on my judgment, and I will contrive a way for the success of the Emperor’s army”. The words within inverted
Bahādur, submitted that cannon and muskets do not come into use in a battle; and the artillery, which has come into the possession of this government is such, that it is not known whether any sovereign except the Qāṣar of Rūm (the Sultān of Turkey) has anything like it. On this account it is advisable that a ditch should be dug around the army, and skirmishes should be fought every day, and bold warriors of the Mughal army would come and deliver attacks all round the camp, and would be killed by the discharges of cannon and the muskets.

Sultān Bahādur approved of this plan and a ditch was dug round the camp. At this time Sultān ’Ālām Kālpīwāl, on whom Sultān Bahādur had conferred Rāśīn and Chandērī and that sūba as jāgīrā, came with a large army, and joined the Gujrat camp. For two months the two armies sat face to face; and the Mughal troops raided round the camp, and shut up the way of the ingress and egress of grain. After some days had elapsed in this way, a great scarcity made its

commas are also within inverted commas in Bayley’s history, from which it would appear that the writer had seen the letter and was quoting from it; but unfortunately no reference has been given.

1 The Tarikh-i-Gujrat (Denison Ross, p. 14), however, says something which is slightly different, and which if correct makes the advice less absurd. It says what Rūmī Khān said was ما نوب وتفغک بييار داريم انها را كار نفيايم وسيا هخدود را وندرمه هر روز طرح جنگ انداخته - غرفاننا روبویی نویخانه په يدارند و نوبها را آسر دهد. As a matter of fact, however, much use does not appear to have been made of the cannon and muskets.

2 The Tarikh-i-Gujrat (p. 14) says آرابة كئند. Sir Denison Ross, the editor of the Tarikh-i-Gujrat, says araba means “an enclosed camp or zariba”, although in the dictionary it only means a cart or wagon.

3 Firishtah’s account explains better, how it was that the Mughal army suffered such small loss from the cannon and muskets of the Gujratīs, and was still able to blockade the camp.

4 A graphic, but what appears to me, to be a somewhat exaggerated account of this scarcity is given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarl, Bayley, page 384. On the same and also on the next page a further instance is given of Rūmī Khān’s treachery. It appears that a leader of Banjārās came and told Sultān Bahādar that he had brought a million bullock-loads of grain, but could not bring them into the camp for fear of the Moghals. Sultān Bahādar accordingly sent out five thousand men secretly at night to escort the Banjārās; but Rūmī Khān wrote and informed Humāūn, and the Gujratī escort was defeated, and the grain was intercepted and taken into the Moghāli camp.
appearance in the Gujrat army; and all the fodder that was in the neighbourhood was entirely exhausted. Owing to the attacks of the Mughals, no one had the power, that he should go to a distance from the camp and bring grain and fodder. Sultan Bahadur saw that his remaining there any longer would result in his capture. Therefore one night he came out from behind his pavilion and, with five of his trusted amirs, one of whom was the governor of Burhanpur and another 1 Mallu Qadir Khan, governor of Malwa, 2 fled towards Mandu. When his army came to know of his flight, 3 each man fled in a (different) direction.

His Majesty Jinnat Ashaun Humayun Badsahe 4 pursued (Sultan Bahadur) to the foot of the fort of Mandu, and on the way many men were killed. Sultan Bahadur shut himself up in Mandu; and after some time 5 Hindoo Beg Qulehin and a number of other Mughal amirs got into the fort from the bastion of the seven hundred steps. Sultan

1 One MS. omits Qadir.
2 A somewhat different account of the circumstances attending and immediately proceeding Sultan Bahadur's flight is given in the Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, pp. 385, 386. The date of the flight is given as the 20th Ramazan, 941 A.H., 25th March, 1535 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, p. 331, gives 25th April, 1535, as the date of the flight. The Ta'rikh-i-Gujarat (pp. 17, 18) has a rather incoherent account of Sultan Bahadur's proceedings immediately before his flight.
3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ميركدامن 5945 but the other MS. has ميركدامن I have adopted the former.
4 One MS. and the lith. ed. have تعلق پرمسود در راه; the other MSS. have تعلق پرمسود و در راه. I have adopted the latter reading.
5 The names are هندو پچق چوچہس and هندو پچق چوچہس in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is هندو پچق چوچہس باورون پچق چوچہس, which is incorrect. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Hindoo Beg without any suffix. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the Ta'rikh-i-Gujarat, the Mirat-i-Sikandari or the Cambridge History of India.
6 The words are برچہ فاتفصہ زیبہ in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has incorrectly با هفتفسہ گنر, i.e., with seven hundred men; and Col. Briggs says that "Hindoo Beg and seven hundred Moguls who entered the fort at night along with his followers". The Ta'rikh-i-Gujarat (p. 17) says the Mughals got into the fort طرف راه فاتفصہ زیبہ, i.e., from the direction of the path of the seven hundred steps. The Cambridge History of India (p. 331) says, "A division escaladed the walls of the fort at night". The Mirat-i-Sikandari
Bahādūr was asleep when there was a great noise; and the Gujrātīs in great dismay took the path of flight. Sultān Bahādūr with five or six horsemen went away in the direction of Chāmpānīr. Ṣadr Khān and Sultān Ālām, governor of Rāislīn and that ǧāba, took shelter in the citadel of 1 Sūnkār; and after two days they asked for assurances of their lives being spared, and waited on Jinnat Āshānī. Ṣadr Khān was taken into the latter’s service; but Sultān Ālām, as he had been guilty of improper behaviour, had, by order of Humāyūn, his sinews cut off (i.e., he was hamstrung). Sultān Bahādūr sent the treasure and jewels which he had at Chāmpānīr to the port of Dīp, and himself went to Kanbāyet. When His Majesty Jinnat Āshānī in pursuit of him arrived at the foot of the fort of Chāmpānīr he marched from there and proceeded towards Kanbāyet on 2 wings of speed. Sultān Bahādūr took 3 fresh, strong horses and went on to the port of Dīp. His Majesty Humāyūn arrived at Kanbāyet the very day that Bahādūr started for Dīp, and leaving Kanbāyet he 4 took possession of Chāmpānīr. Ikhtiyyār Khān Gujrātī, the governor of the fort, occupied himself in defending it, but his Majesty Jinnat Āshānī seized it by a 5 plan which has been described in the narrative of his history. Ikhtiyyār Khān took shelter in the citadel of the fort, which was called Mūlim; and in the end after praying for quarter, acquired the honour of serving His Majesty. As he was distinguished by great excellence and accomplishments above all the other amirs of Gujrāt, he was enlisted among the courtiers of Humāyūn’s special majlis.

(Bayley, p. 387) ascribes the capture of Mandū to the treachery of Rūmī Khān. It says that the latter wrote to Bhūpat son of Siḥādi, who had charge of one of the gates, to revenge the wrongs of his family by throwing it open, and the Moghals entered by it.

1 Written as گنگر in the MSS., and گنگر in the lith. ed.
2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بجھاج تعمیل but the other MS. has بجھاج تعمیل. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted بجھاج تعمیل in the text-edition.
3 The actual words are اسپیان تاڑ روز in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but the lith. ed. of the Šabaqāt has by mistake اسپیان تاڑ روز. قبیل کرندہ, and قبل فرمودند. The lith. ed. has قبل کرندہ, قبل فرمودند. I have adopted قبل کرندہ.
4 See ante, Translation, vol. II, pp. 54 and 55. See also note 55, page 353.
All the treasures of the Sultãns of Gujràt, which they had collected in the course of many long generations, fell into his hands and were distributed among the soldiery by shield-fulls.

As much booty had fallen into the hands of Humâyûn's soldiers, no one that year paid any heed to the collection of the revenue; and in the beginning of 940 A.H., in spite of the fact that His Majesty continued to be at Châmpánir, repeated petitions were sent by the ra'iyya of Gujràt to Sultân Bahâdur, to the effect that if he would appoint one of his servants to collect the revenue, the proper amounts would be remitted into the treasury. Sultân Bahâdur deputed his slave 'Imâd-ul-mulk, who was noted for his great bravery and the excellence of his powers of management, with a large army for collecting the revenue. When 'Imâd-ul-mulk began to collect troops, and arrived in front of Aḥmadâbâd; according to a statement, about fifty thousand men had already collected round him. From that place he deputed officers to all the neighbouring countries to collect the revenue. When this news reached Jimnat Āshârî, he entrusted the guarding of the treasure to Târîkh Bâg Khân, who was one of the great amirs, and a man on whom he reposed his trust; and himself advanced towards Ahmadâbâd. He sent Mîrzâ 'Askari with Yâdgâr Nâsîr Mîrzâ and Hindû Bâg one stage in advance of him. In the neighbourhood of Mâhmûdâbâd, which is twelve karõhâ from Mûhâmadâbâd, Mîrzâ 'Askari had a severe battle with 'Imâd-ul-mulk, and the latter was defeated; and many Gujràtîs were slain.

---

1 The words in the MSS. are زر به سپر به لشکریان and زر به سپر به لشکریان. The lith. ed. has با سپر به لشکریان, I have not been able to find out in any other history how the money was measured and distributed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage simply says زر به لشکریان قسم شد. Babikî a'zamâr-mlâh, and the other MS. has بیکي از مالکان; I have adopted the former.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بیکی از ملعیان; but the other MS. has بیکی از متعلقین; I have adopted the former.

3 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have بتعشیل ولايت فرستاد, but Firishtah in the corresponding passage has بتعشیل مالیات ولايت which is better, and the Târîkh-i-Gujràt (p. 25) has تعشیل مال و اجیبی.

4 According to the Târîkh-i-Gujràt (p. 27) the treasure was entrusted to Maulânâ Mâhmûd Lârî who is said to have been اخوند or tutor; and the fort to Târîkh Bâg.

5 Firishtah copies the language of the Ṭabaqat almost word for word, but here he says عماد الملك شکست یافته با گجراتان پیشمار بفت, from which it
After that His Majesty encamped in front of Aḥmadābād; and made over the government of that place to Mīrzā 'Askārī, and Pattān Gujrāt to Yādgār Nāṣir Mīrzā, and Bahārōj to Qāsim Ḥusain Sultān and Barōda to Hindū Bēg Qūlchīn, and Chāmpānīr to Tardi Bēg Khān, and himself went to Burhānpūr. From there he went to Mandū.

At this time, Khān Jahān Shīrāzī who was one of the amirs of Sultān Bahādur, collected an army and took possession of Nausāri; and Rūmī Khān having joined him from the port of Sōrāth, they marched towards Bahārōj. Qāsim Ḥosain Sultān finding that he was not strong enough to meet them went to Tardi Bēg Khān at Chāmpānīr; and disturbances and rebellion commenced over the whole of Gujrāt. At this time Ghaḍanfar who was one of the amirs of Mīrzā 'Askārī fled and went to Sultān Bahādur, and incited him to advance to Aḥmadābād. The details of this brief statement have been narrated in their proper place. All the amirs except Tardi Bēg Khān now would appear that 'Imād-ul-mulk was himself slain, though this is not expressly stated anywhere else. The battle and most of the incidents narrated here were narrated previously in the history of Humāyūn’s reign; see translation, vol. II, p. 57. A rather long account of the battle with some irrelevant matter is given in the Tārīkh-i-Gujarat (p. 27); but the purport of it agrees with that given in the Akbarnāma.

This distribution of governments has already been mentioned in the history of Humāyūn’s reign (translation, vol. II, p. 58).

The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have بورودرا, but I have as before adopted the present spelling Barōda, but M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained بورودرا in the text-edition.

The Cambridge History of India, page 333, says Humāyūn marched to Burhānpur. Muhammad Shāh or Muhammad Khān Asīrī wrote to him to spare his little kingdom, and invited the other rulers of the Deccan to form a league for their mutual defence; but Humāyūn’s operations were confined to a military promenade through Khāndesh.

According to ante, translation, vol. II, page 58. The conduct of Rūmī Khān contradicts, to some extent, the accounts given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī of his treachery against Sultān Bahādār. The Tārīkh-i-Gujarat (p. 29) describes in some detail, how Humāyūn’s governors vacated or were made to vacate their various districts or fiefs.


Both MSS. have بعده ترتدى بيك خان; but the lith. ed. has بعده ترتدى بيك خان.
assembled in Ahmadâbâd. Sultan Bahâdur advanced into Gujrat. Askari Mirza and Yâdghâr Nasir Mirza and all the amirs agreed among themselves, that as it was difficult or in fact impossible to meet and withstand him, and as Jinnat âshâfâni was in Mandû, it would be most advisable to seize the treasure which was in Châmpânîr, and advance towards Agra; and having taken possession of those districts, read the public prayer in the name of Mirza ‘Askari. At the same time the rank of vazâurat should belong to Hindû Bég, and the other Mirzâs should go and take possession of any province which they might think of. On this decision they relinquished the country of Gujrat for nothing; Gujrat which had been acquired with so much trouble and hardship. They advanced towards Châmpânîr. Tardi Bég Khân having obtained information of the wicked design of the Mirzâs and the other nobles endeavoured to strengthen the fort.

3 The amirs started from Châmpânîr in the direction of Mâlwa; and commenced to tread along the desert of disgrace and shameless-

---

1 He was at Dip, which was in Sûrath.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 333, says, “Askari Mirza at Ahmadâbâd was meditating his own proclamation as King of Gujrat”. This appears to me to be totally incorrect. Askari Mirza and all the other Mughal nobles were giving up the possession of Gujrat, and were marching towards Agra. He could not, therefore, think of proclaiming himself as the king of Gujrat. He wanted to proclaim himself as Bâdshâh of Dehli. The Cambridge History of India further goes on to say that Mirza ‘Askari and others besieged Tardi Bég at Châmpânîr. This is scarcely correct. Neither the Tabaqât nor Firishtah says so; and even the Târikh-i-Gujrat which gives, on page 31, the negotiations between the Mirzâs and Tardi Bég Khân does not say so. The Târikh-i-Gujrat which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross is slightly incoherent; for instance, the sentence beginning with دریم ایام and ending with بجھانپنی است, on the page referred to is incomplete. The punctuation is peculiar. There are two marks, a * and a — ; and it is not clear what they exactly represent; but whether the sentence referred to ends with بجھانپنی است or دو کودنی اند سلطان نبادر; and if the sentence begins and ends with the star mark then it curiously jumbles up two totally unconnected matters.

3 Both the MSS. have no nominative to the verb امر, but the lith. ed. had امر. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed.
ness. When Sultân Bahâdur found Gujrât unguarded, he advanced towards Châmpânîr to crush Tardi Bêg Khân. The latter took with him such portion of the treasure of Châmpânîr as he could, and commenced to retrace his steps to Āgra. Sultân Bahâdur halted at Châmpânîr for ten days, and occupied himself in arranging the affairs of that neighbourhood. As, in the times of the power of Jinnat Āshiâni, he had owing to his great distress and weakness asked for help from the firangis, he knew for certain that they would come; and knowing that the ports of Gujrât were unguarded, and being afraid that they should come under the possession of the firangis, he started from Châmpânîr, and advanced towards Sôrath and Junâgarh, so that, on the arrival of the firangis, he might turn them back by any means that might be possible. ¹ He had been engaged for some days in travelling about and hunting, when news came that five or

¹ The circumstances attending Sultân Bahâdur's death are given in the different histories in a way which mainly agrees with the text. Firishtah copies it almost word for word. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 132-141) reduces the number of Europeans to four or five thousand but otherwise agrees. He, however, gives extracts from Fariah-e-Souza's History of the Portuguese in Asia, and also from the Mirut Iskundry, to give the two opposite versions of the incidents connected with Sultan Bahadur's death. The Portuguese version shows that Nuno de Cunha, who commanded at Goa, but who having been informed by Emanuel de Souza, who commanded at Diû, had come to the latter place, were both convinced that Badur intended to seize, and put them to death, and to secure the fort of Diû which he, when hard pressed by Humâyûn had given them permission to build; and they were also contriving to seize him, put him to death. As to the actual occurrence, the Portuguese version is that Emanuel de Souza was going to invite the king to the fort . . . . He came up with the king's barge, and made the offer (invitation?) by means of Rume Cham (رومي خان). The latter cautioned the king, but he slighted the warning, and invited Emanuel de Souza to come into his barge. The latter when doing so fell into the sea, but was pulled up, and taken to the king. At the same time another Portuguese barge came up with some gentlemen on board, who seeing Emanuel de Souza hastily got into the king's barge. The king suspecting their sudden coming on board, and remembering the caution given by Rume Cham ordered his officers to kill Emanuel de Souza. James de Mesquita understanding it, flew at and wounded the king. Emanuel de Souza was killed and there was a bloody fray. Finally Badur attempted to escape by swimming, but he was in danger of drowning. Then Tristan de Payva de Santarem reached out an oar to him to take him on board,
six thousand *firangis* had arrived in *gharābs*. When they arrived at the port of Dip, and heard of the restoration of Sultān Bahādūr to power, and of the return of His Majesty Jinnat Āshlǎni, they became ashamed and repentant about their coming. They agreed among themselves, that by any deception that might be possible they should take possession of Dip. Their chief, in accordance with this plan, feigned illness and spread a report about it. His object was that he might not have an interview with Sultān Bahādūr. The latter sent men one after another to summon him, and got (the same) reply. In the end thinking that the *firangis* were afraid of him he got into a barge, with a small number of men, to go and reassure them. The *firangis* finding the opportunity which they had been seeking, planned to act treacherously. The Sultān perceiving this, tried to get back into his barge. At the time when he was stepping into it, from the *gharāb* of the *firangis*, the latter separated the two vessels; and the Sultān being unable to get into his own barge fell into the sea, and having sunk once, put his head out of the water. At this time one of the *firangis* struck him with a spear and drowned him. The Gujrāt army returned without any delay to Aḥmadābād; and the

when a soldier struck him across the face with a halbert, and so others, till he was killed.

The Mirut Iskundyār’s account is different. According to it the Portuguese built a fort at Dūū after obtaining Bahadur Shah’s permission to build an enclosure on a *hide* of land, but they cut the cow hide into narrow strips and enclosed a large area on which they built a strong fort. When Bahadur was restored to power, he began to think of a stratagem to expel them and the Portuguese becoming aware of his intention became suspicious. When he came to the neighbourhood of Dūū, he sent one Noor Mahomed Khuleol to the Portuguese chief with instructions to persuade the latter to come and visit the king. The envoy when drinking with the Portuguese chief divulged the king’s real intentions to the latter. The Portuguese chief told him that he was unable to go on account of his indisposition. The king determined to go on board the Portuguese chief’s barge on the plea of inquiring about his health, but really with the object of allaying his suspicions. When he got on board, the Portuguese, according to a pre-conceived plan, cut him and his companions down. The date of the murder is given as 3rd Rumzan, 943 A.H., 14th February, 1537 A.D.

The Cambridge History of India, page 334, gives 13th February, 1537, as the date of Sultān Bahādūr’s death.
port of Dip came into the possession of the firangis. This event happened in the month of Ramaḍān, in the year 943 A.H.

The period of Sultān Bahādur’s reign was 1 eleven years and nine months.

2 A narrative of Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr.

When Sultān Bahādur packed up the goods of existence, his mother Makhhdūma-i-Jahān and the amīrs, who had been attending on his stirrups, retraced their steps from Dip to Aḥmadābād. On the way intelligence reached them, that Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā, whom Sultān Bahādur had, in the time of the disturbances, sent towards Dehlī and Lāhōre, that he might create disturbances in northern India, and cause dissensions in the Chaghtāī army had returned from the neighbourhood of Lāhōre, and had arrived at Aḥmadābād. Immediately on hearing of the martyrdom of Sultān Bahādur, he commenced weeping and making much lamentation, and changed his dress, i.e., put on mourning; and started towards Dip in order to offer his condolence. When he joined the camp, Makhhdūma-i-Jahān, as far as lay in her power, sent the necessary articles for his entertainment, and made him put off his mourning garb. 3 But that fortunate Mirzā made his inquiries into the circumstances

1 One MS. has only eleven years, but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. have eleven years and nine months.

2 The heading is partly obliterated in one MS. In the other it is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has حكومت between مير strands and substitutes for حاكم.

3 The Tabaqāt and Firishtah confine themselves to the above narrative of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā’s misdeeds; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, and the Tārikh-i-Gujarat say that he attempted to usurp the throne of Gujārāt. Their accounts are, however, different. According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 400, he went to the apartments of the Sultan’s wives, and after offering many condolences, he urged that they should adopt him as a son and help him. The ladies said that they never interfered in politics; and the question of the Sultan’s successor should be settled by the ministers. When his pretensions became known, the amīrs decided that the task of putting him down must have precedence of all other matters; and should be entrusted to ’Imād-ul-Mulk. There was some opposition to the latter part of the plan by Aflāt Khān. ’Imād-ul-Mulk, however, started with a large army for Sūrath; and when he reached
of the Sultân’s mother, and showed his kindness towards her; in this (strange) way, that at the time of his departure he made an attack on the treasury, and carried away from it, according to a reputed statement, seven hundred chests of gold, and went away to a distance; and twelve thousand horsemen, Mughals and Hindústánis collected round him.

The amirs of Gujrat became perturbed on beholding this new disturbance, and took counsel with one another, about the choice of a bádshâh. As Sultân Bahâdur had repeatedly expressed his intention of making Mirân Muḥammad Shâh, who was his nephew (sister’s son), his heir, 1 everyone agreed to select him as the Sultân, and had

the neighbourhood of U’nah the Mirzâ came out and bravely offered battle; but was defeated and was obliged to take refuge in exile.

The Târikh-i-Gujrat (pp. 36–39) says that Muḥammad Zamân Mirzâ hastened to Dîb, that he might take his revenge of Sultân Bahâdur’s murder from the firânghis. He then seized the treasure which was being brought from Dîb, and took possession of it; and, according to the account which is generally believed, there were nine hundred chests of gold. He also had the public prayer read in his own name at Dîb. When this news reached Ahmadâbâd, the amirs determined to vacate Ahmadâbâd, and go away to different places. At this juncture ‘Imâd-ul-mulk came to the majlis and demanded of Afzal Khân and Ikhtiyâr Khân, who were the vakîls of the Sultân, what they intended to do. On hearing their views he reproached them that they could think of lowering their heads before Muḥammad Zamân Mirzâ. They say that the people of Gujrat were too weak to meet the army, which Muḥammad Zamân Mirzâ had raised with the treasure he had robbed. He exhorted them to remain quietly at Ahmadâbâd and allow him to deal with Muḥammad Zamân Mirzâ. They agreed. He had at that time only nine horsemen with him. He started from Ahmadâbâd, and halted at ‘Uthmânpur, and made a proclamation of the grant of jâgir, etc., to the soldiers. Within one month he had forty thousand horsemen. He then marched against Muḥammad Zamân Mirzâ. The latter however took shelter in an entrenchment. His sukîl, and the commander of this army Ḥisâm-ud-din Mirak, son of Mir Khalîfa, offered battle; and on the 3rd day when he was fighting, Muḥammad Zamân Mirzâ escaped from the entrenchment, and fled to Sind.

The Cambridge History of India, pp. 334, 335, says that Muḥammad Zamân Mirzâ claimed the throne of Gujrat on the ground that Sultân Bahâdur’s mother had adopted him but says nothing further about what happened to him later.

1 Firishtah agrees generally, and so does the Mirât-i-Sikandari. The Târikh-i-Gujrat, however, says that while the amirs were engaged in discussing
the *khutba* read and the *sikka* struck in his name in his absence. They sent swift messengers to bring him. They also nominated ¹ Imād-ul-mulk with a large army for the destruction of Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā. The ² latter fought with him and was defeated.

Mihrān Muḥammad Shāh, whom Sūltān Bahādur had sent as far as Mālwa in pursuit of the Chaghtāī army, died of natural causes, a month and half after the *khutba* had been read in his name.

**AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD SHĀH, SON OF LAṬĪF KHĀN, SON OF MUẒAFFAR SHĀH.**

As Mihrān Muḥammad Shāh Fārūqī passed away from the evil place of the world to the well-filled land of the after-world; and ³ except

the matter of Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā, ambassadors came from Mihrān Muḥammad Shāh demanding the kingdom on the ground of his appointment by Sūltān Bahādur to be his successor, and on that of his right of inheritance and kingship.

¹ See note 3, page 381.

² One MS. and the lith. ed. here call him Muḥammad Zamān, but the other MS. prefixes Mīrzā to the name; and adds ‘retired to the country of Sind’.

³ Both MSS. have بعده, but the lith. ed. has بعده. Firishtah lith. ed. also has بعده. The Cambridge History of India, page 335, in order I suppose to be original and quaint, calls Maḥmūd Khān the last remaining heir of Muḥammad Karīm instead of calling the latter Sūltān Muḥammad or Sūltān Muḥammad I. The Cambridge History of India also says that “Mubārak II, who had succeeded his brother in Khāndesh, and had almost certainly hoped to receive a summons to the throne of Gujarāt, would not surrender him, until a force led by Ikhtiyār Khān invaded Khāndesh”. It appears to me that there are several mistakes in this sentence. In the first place, Mubārak II did not succeed his father. The latter was succeeded by his infant son, and after the latter had been put to death by Mubārak he ascended the throne of Khāndesh. In the second place there is no evidence to show that he had hoped to be summoned to the throne of Gujarāt. Even the Tārīḵ-i-Guṭarāt, which has been edited by Sir. Denison Ross, who is also the author of Chapter XIII of the Cambridge History of India, does not say so. The Tārīḵ-i-Guṭarāt (p. 39) says that the emissaries from Khāndesh claimed the throne of Gujarāt for the infant son of Mihrān Muḥammad Shāh, but Mubārak II, who had put that infant son to death, would hardly have the face to claim the throne of Gujarāt, or had the hardihood to expect a summons to it. And finally it does not appear that Ikhtiyār Khān had to lead a force into Khāndesh. He did not even go there. Maḥmūd Khān was, according to the testimony of all the historians, brought to Gujarāt by Ikhtiyār Khān’s brother Muqbil Khān. According to the Tārīḵ-i-
Mahmūd Khān, son of Latīf Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, there was no heir left to the throne; and he was imprisoned in the custody of Mirān Muḥammad Shāh by order of Sultān Muẓaffar; the amīrs of Gujrat sent a man to summon him. 1 Muḥammad Shāh’s son raised objections about sending him. The amīrs of Gujrat collected an army, and decided to march to Burhānpūr; and 2 he (apparently the son of Mirān Muḥammad Shāh) becoming aware of this sent Mahmūd Khān to Gujrat. He was placed on the throne of Gujrat on the 3 10th Dhi-bijja, 944 A.H., 10th May, 1538 A.D., with the title Gujarāt, as also according to the Ṭabaqāt and Firistah, there was a threat of an army being sent to Burhānpūr; and the Ṭarikh-i-Gujarat only adds that tents were sent out.

It is, however, true, as Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 144) says that a Guzerat chief marched to Boorhanpoor to invite Mahmood to the capital.

1 It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari that Mirān Muhammad Shāh’s son was an infant at the time of his father’s death. He was, however, placed by the ministers on the throne; and they determined to put Mubārak Khān Muhammad Shāh’s brother to death, lest he should rebel against his nephew. They accordingly had him brought to Burhānpūr and made him over to a nobleman of the name of Ṭarāb Khān. He, however, gained the latter over; and with his help attacked the palace, and placed his nephew in confinement. He then told the amīrs that the regency belonged of right to him. They knew that they were helpless. He then put his nephew to death, and was proclaimed as Mubārak Shāh (Bayley, pp. 404, 405).

The Ṭarikh-i-Gujarat (pp. 39, 40) says that the ambassadors came to Gujarāt, and demanded that as khūpha had been read in the name of Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, it should be read also in the name of his son. The Gujarāt amīrs did not agree to this argument and pointed out that as Mahmūd Khān was living in safety in the fort of Blāwal, they should send him to Gujrat. They also appointed Muqbil Khān, brother of Iqtiyār Khān, to bring him; and threatened, that, if he was not sent, they would march to Burhānpūr. When Muqbil Khān went there, Mahmūd Khān was made over to him.

2 Firistah says that it was Mirān Mubārak Shāh, brother of Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, who raised objection to the sending of Mahmūd Khān. See also the preceding note.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 335, mentions August 8th, 1587, as the date of the accession. I suppose this is a misprint, for otherwise it is incorrect by 59 or 60 years. The date given in the text agrees with that of Firistah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 144), however, makes it “10th Zeekad 944 A.H., April 5th 1538”. The Cambridge History of India also gives the new Sultān the title of Sa’d-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh III. This may be correct, but I have seen it nowhere else; and no other biddābāḥ of Gujrat had the first name ending in dīn.
of Maḥmūd Shāh. 1 Ikhtiyyār Khān Gujrātī, who had gone to Burhānpūr to bring him, became all-powerful; and the reins of the affairs of the kingdom 2 came into his grasp of power.

3 After a few months, in the year 945 A.H. the amirs fell out amongst themselves. Daryā Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk united together and put Ikhtiyyār Khān to death. 'Imād-ul-mulk became Amīr-ul-ʿumārā, and Daryā Khān, the vazīr. 4 At the end of that year enmity appeared between them also. Daryā Khān took Sultān Maḥmūd out of the city on the pretext of a hunting excursion; and went away in the direction of Chāmpānīr. When 'Imād-ul-mulk

1 Frishtah also says that it was Ikhtiyyār Khān who went to Burhānpūr; but see note 1, page 384, from which it would appear that it was his brother Muqbil Khān who went. Col. Briggs also says that it was Mokbil Khān.

2 The word یار is omitted in one MS.

3 Frishtah agrees generally but he calls Daryā Khān, Daryā Khān Ghūrī; and he calls 'Imād-ul-mulk's jaqīr, Siramgangān and Sūrāt. Col. Briggs does not say that 'Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān combined together, and put Ikhtiyyār Khān to death; but he says Yekhtiar Khān lost his life in an affray. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandar, Bayley, pages 407, 408, gives a circumstantial account of how Ikhtiār Khān was killed. According to it, the young Sultān was kept practically in confinement by Ikhtiār Khān, Mukbil Khān and the latter's son Lād Khān. He was dissatisfied, but feigned to be totally indifferent. Lād Khān one day proposed to him that if he would give the word, he would so manage that Dariā Khān and 'Imād-ul-Mulk would go to retire behind the veil of death. The Sultān at once rode to the house of 'Imād-ul-Mulk; and the latter and Dariā Khān went to the palace; and Ikhtiār Khān, Mukbil Khān and Lād Khān were all hanged in front of the audience hall; Ikhtiār Khān protesting his innocence to the last moment.

The account given in the Tārīkh-i-Gujarat (pp. 41, 42) is not very clear; but according to it there was a quarrel between Ikhtiyyār Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān, because the young Sultān was kept in charge of Ikhtiyyār Khān's brother Muqbil Khān. 'Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān charged Ikhtiyyār Khān with disloyalty to the Sultān; and with conspiring with the ruler of Burhānpūr. He stoutly denied it; but they appeared to have wrung his neck; and buried his body in the garden of the palace where the quarrel took place.

The Cambridge History of India, page 345, seems partially to follow this version.

4 As to the quarrel between 'Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān, all the histories appear to agree. It appears that most of the nobles were on the side of Daryā Khān; and 'Imād-ul-mulk was deserted by them and by the army he had collected; and so had to give in.
became aware of these happenings, he began at once to collect his forces; and opening his hands for lavish gifts, got an immense army together, and advanced towards Châmpânîr. After two or three months most of the Gujratī soldiers, who had obtained large sums of money from him, separated from him and united with the Sultan. ‘Imâd-ul-mulk in his distress agreed to an amicable settlement, and it was settled that ‘Imâd-ul-mulk should go away to Jhâlâwâr, and some purganas of Sōrath which were in his jâgûr; and the Sultan should return to his capital of Aḥmadâbâd.

Again in the year 949 A.H. Daryâ Khân advanced towards the country of Sôrath, taking Sultan Mahmûd and a well-equipped army with him, in order to extirpate ‘Imâd-ul-mulk. The latter came forward to meet him; but after a battle fled and went as a suppliant to Mirân Mubârâk Shâh, ruler of âsîr and Burhânpur. Sultan Mahmûd advanced towards Burhânpur in pursuit of him. Mirân Mubârâk Shâh assembled his army and came forward to aid ‘Imâd-ul-mulk. He encountered the Gujrat army in the battlefield, but was defeated. ‘Imâd-ul-mulk then fled from Burhânpur, and took shelter with Qâdir Shâh, the ruler of Mâlwa. 1 Mirân Mubârâk Shâh sought the intervention of the great men of the age, and coming in by the door of peace rendered homage to Sultan Mahmûd. Daryâ Khân acquired much power and strength owing to the departure of ‘Imâd-ul-mulk, and took upon himself the performance of all matters and affairs of the government and revenue administration; and allowed no one else to interfere in them. Gradually things came to such a pass that he made Sultan Mahmûd a puppet and acted himself as the bâdshâh. Then one night, in concert with 2 Jarjîû, a pigeon fancier, the Sultan

---

1 The reason for Mirân Mubârâk Shâh’s asking for peace, and doing homage to Sultan Mahmûd is explained by Firishtah, who says قرغ سلطان محمود شاه جون, i.e., Sultan Mahmûd invaded Khândesh, and occupied himself in plundering and ravaging (the country).

2 The name is given as جرجيرو کبتو کبتو in the MSS., and جرجيرو کبتو in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the Târîkh-i-Gujarat. In the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 416, the man is called Jarji the bird catcher; and the Cambridge History of India, page 337, has Chirji a fowler. I have adopted Jarjîû, a pigeon fancier. The way in which the Sultan fled
came out of the citadel of the fort of Ahmadrābād; and went to 'Ālam Khān Lūdī, who held Dūlqa and Dandūqa as his jāgīr.

1 'Ālam Khān Lūdī considering the advent of the Sultān a great honour, collected his troops; and four thousand horsemen gathered round him. Daryā Khān brought forward a 2 boy of unknown descent, and gave him the title of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh; and collected the army of Gujrat. He brought the commanders of the army over to his side by promising to increase their jāgīrs and add to their titles; and advanced towards Dūlqa. 'Ālam Khān came forward, and met him, and 3 a great battle raged between the two armies. At the first onset, however, 'Ālam Khān defeated the vanguard of Daryā Khān's army; and advancing into his special detachment fought with great gallantry and courage. But when he came out of the battlefield there

to 'Ālam Khān is described in almost identical words in the Tabaqāt and Firishtah. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 416, gives a circumstantial account which differs in various particulars from that in the Tabaqāt. The Tārikh-i-Gujarat gives some account of what happened before the flight, but does not say anything about the flight itself. The Cambridge History of India's account is somewhat different. چرجیٰ in the text-edition.

1 One MS. has معمار عالم خلائ. but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have عالم خلائ لودی. Firishtah also has عالم خلائ لودی and I have adopted it.

2 The description of the MSS, and in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has معمار از قبله. The Tārikh-i-Gujarat has معمار سلطان أحمد بانی أحمد آباد ; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 417, describes the boy as a descendant of Sultan Ahmad, the founder of Ahmadābād. The Cambridge History of India calls him a child of obscure origin. It appears that Daryā Khān was willing to give up his position; and in fact sent in his resignation; but was overruled by Fattūjī Muhāfiz Khān, who was a relation of his, and a man of much experience; and then he produced the pretender, and marched out to meet 'Ālam Khān and Sultān Mahmūd (p. 388).

3 The account of the battle as given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari is entirely different. According to it Dariā Khān was victorious, and took possession of Dhōlkāh; and both the Sultān and 'Alam Khān fled. After their defeat, however, large bodies of troops joined him, and Dariā Khān found his army dwindling away. He attempted to enter Ahmadābād, but the people shut the gate in his face, and attacked him with arrows and musket fire. Then the Sultān and 'Alam Khān advanced to Ahmadābād. Dariā Khān sent his family and treasures to Chāmpānīr; and went himself to Burhānpūr to bring Mirān Mubārak Shāh as his ally.
were no more than five horsemen with him, and he could not find Sultān Maḥmūd, whom he had left with his own troops at the gate. He became perplexed and distressed, but it came into his mind that as after the first attack the vanguard of Daryā Khān's army had fled and gone away towards Aḥmadābād, the news of his defeat might have been spread about in the city; and he should therefore betake himself there. Then with the five men who were with him he advanced to Aḥmadābād; and going to the royal palace made a proclamation of his victory. When the citizens saw 'Ālam Khān, as they had seen some of the fugitives belonging to (Daryā Khān's) vanguard a moment before, they became sure of Daryā Khān's defeat. They came in a large 1 body; and waited on him. He gave an order, and in a moment the people plundered Daryā Khān's house and having strengthened the gates of the city, sent swift messengers to bring Sultān Maḥmūd. The messengers from Aḥmadābād came to Daryā Khān, who had after gaining the victory (over the troops that were opposed to him), halted in his camp; and informed him of what was happening at Aḥmadābād. He then advanced towards that city. As the families of the amirs were in the city, which was in the possession of 'Ālam Khān, most of them separated from Daryā Khān before he arrived there. About this time Sultān Maḥmūd also arrived. Daryā Khān then fled towards Burhānpūr and matters turned 2 upside down. Daryā Khān did not find a resting place at Burhānpūr, and went to Shēr Khān Afgān, and 3 was received with favour by him. After the departure of Daryā Khān, 'Ālam Khān took up the post and the work of the vazārat. But he also, owing to his great pride, wanted

1 One MS. has جماعة جماعة while the other has جماعة جماعة and the lith. ed. has جماعت جماعت but I prefer جماعة جماعة.
2 The words are كفريسة منعكس شد. There are no similar words in Firishtah and the Tārikh-i-Gujarat. I think the meaning is, that Daryā Khān had defeated Mirān Mubārak Shāh, and the latter had to sue for peace. The tables were now turned, and Daryā Khān had to go and seek shelter in Burhānpūr.
3 Firishtah and the Tārikh-i-Gujarat also say so. The latter says he entered the service of Shēr Khān; but the Cambridge History of India, page 339, gives an account of some of his further adventures, and of an unsuccessful attempt made by him and 'Ālam Khān Lodī, who according to the Cambridge History of India had now joined him to place 'Alā-ud-dīn Fath Khān of the royal line of Sind on the throne of Gujarāt.
to be independent and overbearing like Daryā Khān in all respects. Sulṭān Maḥmūd got the amīrs to combine with him, and attempted to seize him. He received warning of this, and fled and went to Shēr Khān. After his mind had been set at rest by the termination of the dissensions of the rebel amīrs, Sulṭān Maḥmūd set himself to manage the government of the country, to increase the cultivation and to comfort the soldiers. Within a short time he restored the country to its original condition. He treated the nobles and other great men, and the gentry and pious men with kindness and favour. He carried on the government till the year 961 A.H. without any dissension and any enemy.

1 But in the month of Rabi‘-ul-āwwal of that year, one of his servants who had the name of Burhān, and who showed himself to be a man of piety in the eyes of men, and devoted most of his time in prayer and worship, and always acted as the Sulṭān’s pēsh-namāz or leader in the prayers, in a hunting excursion murdered him. The particulars of this brief statement are these: on one occasion, the Sulṭān shut him up between walls on account of some fault committed by him in his service, and left an aperture for his breath to pass

1 Before mentioning the assassination of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, Firishtah mentions the foundation of the new city of Maḥmūdābād, which, however, could not be completed by the Sulṭān, and also the erection of the fort of Sūrat under the supervision of Qhāṣanfar Aḥā, his Turkī slave, who had the title of Khudāwānd Khān. The Tārīkh-i-Gujrāt says that Humāyūn after his restoration wrote a letter to Sulṭān Maḥmūd, proposing an alliance, and suggesting that Sulṭān Maḥmūd should invade Mālwa, while he himself would advance against others, whom he, rather vaguely, describes as مخالفان باطئ or rebellious enemies. Accordingly, Sulṭān Maḥmūd took a muster roll of his troops, and جادل بر سر مندود زندد, which I suppose means, invaded Mandū (pp. 43, 44). The Mirāt-i-Sikandari has a long account of Sulṭān Maḥmūd’s liking for low company, and of his conferring the title of Muhāfīz Khān on Jarjī the pigeon fancier; and of this man’s insolence towards the amīrs, and his getting a kannān from the Sulṭān for the execution of ‘Alā-ud-dīn Lōdi and Shujā’at Khān. The amīrs then demanded that Jarjī should be made over to them. The Sulṭān refused to do so. The amīrs pretended to accept the Sulṭān’s order, but prayed that he would allow them to make their obeisance to him. The Sulṭān held a darbār, and when Jarjī appeared there, he was murdered in open darbār in the Sulṭān’s presence. The amīrs then made a plan for guarding the Sulṭān, and later of blinding him, and dividing the kingdom among themselves (Bayley, pp. 421–423).
through, but after a time released him. The wretched Burhān kept this old grudge concealed in his mind. He united with himself a number of hunters, whose occupation was to hunt tigers, and promised each one of them the rank of an amīr. One night when the Sultān had gone to sleep after coming back from hunting, he in concert with his nephew (sister’s son) named Daulat, who was in close attendance on the Sultān, tied 1 the latter’s hair firmly to the wood of his bedstead, and passed a sword across his throat. That victim (of their cruelty) had placed both his hands on the edge of the sword, so that his hands were also cut, and he was murdered. (Burhān then) kept the tiger hunters hidden in a corner, and sent men to summon the great amīrs. He also told the musicians that the Sultān had ordered that they should play on their instruments outside the house.

Half the night had passed when he secured the attendance of Khudāwand Kān and Āsaf Kān, who were both the vażīrs; and took them to a private chamber, and had them murdered. In the same way he summoned twelve of the great amīrs and killed them all. Then his men went to summon I’tmād Kān. The latter said, “The Sultān cannot possibly have sent for me at such a time; I have only a little while ago come from attending on him” ; and he delayed in coming. Burhān sent another man to summon him. His suspicion and alarm became greater, and he did not come. When Afdal Kān, who was one of the distinguished amīrs and with whom Burhān had ancient friendship came, Burhān took him to a private place, and told him, “The Sultān is displeased with Khudāwand Kān and Āsaf Kān, and wants you to take their place, and he has sent this robe of the vażīrat for you”. Afdal Kān said, “Until I go to the Sultān’s presence and see him, I shall not put on the robe”. Burhān then took Afdal Kān to the place, where the martyr Sultān was lying, and said, “I have killed the Sultān and the vażīrs and all the nobles. I now make you my vażīr,

---

1 The accounts of the murder as given in Firishtah and the Tārīkh-i-Gujarat and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī and the Cambridge History of India agree mainly with that in the text; but there are various differences in details. It was committed on the night of the 12th of Rabī‘-al-‘Awwal, the anniversary of the birth of the Prophet Muhammad. The murderer is called Burhān in all the histories, except the Cambridge History of India, where he is called Burhān-ud-dīn (p. 342).
and will entrust all the power to you". Afdal Khan commenced calling him names, and made an outcry. That wicked man then murdered him also. He then conferred titles on each one of a number of obscure soldiers, and vulgar men who came that night; and gave them hopes of being made amirs. He stretched his hands to the public treasure and gave much gold to the people. He was occupied till the morning with the giving away of the gold; and in the morning placed the royal umbrella over his head, and made a general proclamation. He then collected all the elephants belonging to the Sultān, which were in the city and having distributed the horses in the Sultān's stables among the people of the lower classes, made them the supports of his power. When it became morning, the news of the Sultān's martyrdom spread about. Imād-ul-mulk, the father of Chengiz Khan and Ulugh Khan Hābšī and other amirs collected together, and attacked that man of wretched destiny. He, in accordance with the line:

Hemistich:

Empire if even for a moment is precious,

had the royal umbrella raised over his head, and came to oppose them with a mob of common people and a few elephants; and at the first 1 assault fell on the dust of wretchedness, and was slain by Shērwan Khan. A rope was then tied round his leg, and he was dragged about all round the bāzār, and in different parts of the city.

The period of the reign of Sultān Maḥmūd was eighteen years and two months and odd days.

It so happened that Islām Khan, son of Shēr Khan, the ruler of Dehli, and Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahri, the ruler of Ahmādnagar, died during 2 this year by natural death; and a poet has composed the following couplets, giving the date of their death:

1 The manner in which Burhān met his fate is described in much the same manner in Firishtah and the other histories. The account in the Tārīkh-i- Gujārāt (p. 49) is very circumstantial. The encounter with Shirwān Khan is somewhat differently narrated in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari.

2 According to Firishtah, the year was 961 A.H.; and his own father Maulānā Gholām ‘Ali Hindū Shāh was the writer of the couplets. The couplets are also given in the Tārīkh-i-Gujārāt, but the name of the author is not mentioned there and there are slight variations in the wording (p. 49).
Couplets:

Three sovereigns died in the course of a year, 
Through their justice, was Hind (India) the seat of peace.
One Maḥmūd Shāh, of Gujrat Sultān, 
Who like his grandeur, youthful was;
The other Islām Khān of Dehli Sultān, 
Who in his reign, was a Lord of Conjunction great.
The third was Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahrī, 
Who in the Deccan, held sovereign sway.
Of the date of the death of these sovereigns three
If they ask thee 't was “the death of monarchs great”.

Sultān Maḥmūd was 1 a virtuous ruler, and possessed pleasant manners. He spent most of his time in the society of learned and pious men; and on great days, such as the day of the death of His Holiness the Prophet, may the blessings of God and His peace be on him! and on the dates of the deaths of his own ancestors, and on other auspicious days, he gave food to faqirs and other deserving persons. He held the ewer and the basin in his own hand and washed the hands of the men. 2 And sarīṣāf and all pieces of cloth, which were intended for his own garments, were first made into 3 tablecloths for darwishes and faqirs, and afterwards fashioned into wearing apparel for him.

1 The actual words are بادشاه نبی نهاد و پسنیده اطرار بود.
2 The readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are unintelligible at this place. The MSS. have اول دستار و جامه درویشان میکردن. The lith. ed. has the same with the exception that instead of دستار it has دستار خوان. The corresponding passage in Firishtah has اول دستار و جامه درویشان میکردن. This makes sense. It means the sarīṣāf and other kinds of cloth, which were intended for garments for his own use, were first made into turbans and garments for the darwishes, etc. Firishtah has been followed in the text-edition except that بود has been changed to بود.
3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have دستار خوان, but the other MS. has دستار خوان. See the preceding note, from which it will appear that in the corresponding passage Firishtah has دستار و جامه.
At a distance of twelve karōhs from Aḥmadābād, he laid the foundation of the city, to which he gave the name of ¹ Maḥmūdābād; and built an arcaded bāzār from Aḥmadābād to that place. He also established a deer park on the bank of the stream called ² Khari nadi, and built a wall of burnt bricks adorned with turrets for a distance of seven ³ karōhs. In this deer park he erected beautiful structures at different places; and various kinds of animals were allowed to roam about free in the park; and they increased and multiplied by breeding in it. As he was very fond of the society of women, he collected a large number of them in his harem. He always hunted and played chaugān in the deer park with them. The trees in it were wrapt in red and green velvet. There were many pleasant gardens in it and handsome women were engaged in attending to them.

Whenever any of the women in his harem became pregnant, he ordered that she should have a miscarriage; and did not allow any of them to have a male child. He had made Iʿtmād Khān the attendant of his harem, and had directed him to attend to the direction of the ladies. Iʿtmād Khān had by way of prudence and caution, destroyed his own virility by eating camphor. The writer of this book has on various occasions visited the deer park and the buildings in it.

As visits to the tomb (of holy men) by the women, and their gathering together on various ⁴ pretexts had become extremely common in Gujrāt; and immorality and licentiousness had become, as it were, a matter of habit and custom, and there was (in the opinion of the people) no wickedness in such conduct, Sultān Maḥmūd forbade the going of women to these places, and their going and coming during days and nights to the houses of people. He also

1 The town had been built by his ancestor Maḥmūd Bēgarha; and Sultān Maḥmūd III, took up his residence in it, and restored and enlarged it.

2 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has كهارز ندي in the text-edition.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have the words دهلي را between هفت گروه and دیوار از خشت بیکنده.

⁴ One MS. has خانه instead of پبانه.
gave money to some, and sent them to procure women, and when they brought them before him, he ordered them to be punished; and in this way he effectively stopped such acts.

3 An account of Sultan Ahmad.

When Sultan Mahmud became a martyr and left no son behind him, I'timad Khan, in order to prevent the bursting out of the flames of disorder and disturbance, produced a boy of tender years by the

1 One MS. and the lith ed. have به بعضى which appears to me to be better, and has been adopted in the text-edition.

2 The actual words are بخوتیگرین وجیب سد ابی باب کرده بود, which translated literally, would be, had in the best way closed this door. The MSS. have خوئین, but the lith ed. has خوئین.

3 This is the heading in the MS. The lith. ed. has ذکر سلطنب احمد شاہ.

4 This is the account in the MSS. and in the lith ed. Firishtah, however, says that it was Rażul-Mulk, who produced the youth, who was a descendant of Ahmad Shah II. The Mirat-i-Sikandari (Bayley, pp. 454, 455) says, that after the death of Sultan Mahmud, the amirs inquired of I'timad Khan, who was fully acquainted with the late Sultan's domestic affairs, whether the latter had left a son behind him. On his answering in the negative, they inquired whether any of his widows was expecting a child. This also he answered in the negative. They then inquired, whether there was any relative of the Sultan, who was fit to succeed to the throne. He said there was a youth of the name of Ahmad Khan who was living in Ahmadabad. Rażul-Mulk was accordingly sent in a cart with very fast horses. He found Ahmad Khan buying some grain at a shop near his house, and recognising him, brought him at once to Mahmudabad. The account in the Tarih-i-Gujarat (pp. 49, 50) agrees, except that it says that the nobles wanted to know from I'timad Khan if the late Sultan had even left a daughter behind, so that they might place her on the throne. Here again the answer was in the negative. Then it became necessary to enquire about distant relations; so Rażul-ul-Mulk, one of the descendants of Ahmad Shah, the founder of Ahmadabad, who was five or six generations below him, and was a youth in his twelfth year, was brought forward.

It will be seen that there is considerable amount of divergence among the four historians, who were more or less contemporaneous with the events which they were describing. According to the author of the Mirat-i-Sikandari, whose father Shaikh Mahmud, commonly called Shaikh Mânjhu, was the manager of Saiyid Mubarak's affairs, the name of the youth, who was selected to be the Sultan, was Ahmad Khan, and Rażul-ul-Mulk was the name of the man who was sent to bring him from Ahmadabad. Firishtah appears to agree, though
name Raḍī-ul-mulk, describing him as a descendant of Sultān Ahmād, the founder of Aḥmadābād; and in concert with 1 Mirān Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī, and the other amīrs, who had escaped with their lives from the sword of the ungrateful Burhān, placed him on the throne of empire, and gave him the title of Aḥmad Shāh. They comforted the amīrs by confirming their jāgīrs. Iʿtmād Khān kept the affairs of the kingdom in his own hand, and left the newly chosen Sultān nothing but the name; and having obtained the whole power, kept him (confined) in his house.

When five years had passed in this way, Sultān Ahmād unble any longer to remain in this state got out of Aḥmadābād, and went to Maḥmundābād to Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī, who was one of the great amīrs. Mūsā Khān Fūlādī and Sādāt Khān and ʿĀlam Khān Lūdī and other men collected round him. 2 Shaḵkh Yūsuf also went and joined him. The Sultān conferred on him the title of Aʿẓam Humāyūn. Iʿtmād Khān, in concert with Iʿmād-ul-mulk, father of Chengīz Khān, and Ulugh Khān and Juhūjār Khān Ḥabshī and Iḵtiyār-ul-mulk and other amīrs of Gujrat with a part of artillery attacked Saiyid Mubārak. The latter although he had a smaller army than Iʿtmād Khān arrayed his troops to meet him in battle. When the battle began, a 3 cannon ball struck Saiyid Mubārak, and he was slain; and Sultān Ahmād was defeated. He wandered

1 One MS. omits the prefix Miːrān.
2 Firishtah calls him Aʿẓam Khān Mālwi.
3 Firishtah also says گلاره توبی, but the Cambridge History of India, page 344, says that Sayyid Mubārak was killed by an arrow.
about in distress for some days in the jungle; and then came and saw I'tmād Khān again. The latter confined him in his house, and did not permit anyone to approach him.

When I'tmād Khān’s power increased, 'Imād-ul-mulk in concert with Tātār Khān Ghūrf attacked his house with 1 great force; and placing their cannon in position, commenced a bombardment. I'tmād Khān unable to meet them fled towards 2 Pāl which is in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānir; and began to collect men from all sides. Then people intervened, and brought about a peace between him and 'Imād-ul-mulk. The districts of Bahroj and Chāmpānir and Nādōt and the other parganas between the rivers Mahindri and Narbada were allotted to 'Imād-ul-mulk as his jāgīr; and I'tmād Khān came back, and again took charge of the duties of the vakil of the Sultān; and endeavoured to guard Sultān Aḥmad as before; and they detached a body of fifteen hundred horsemen out of the personal jāgīrs of Sultān Aḥmad. Other men joined the Sultān and in spite of the fact that I'tmād Khān prevented men from mixing with him, a number of men 3 gathered round him, and for a short time he attained to some grandeur. He thought of getting rid of I'tmād Khān, and held a consultation with his confidants about slaying him. Sometimes, owing to his youthful inexperience he would strike his sword on a plantain tree and say "I have cut I'tmād Khān in two". When the latter became cognizant of these matters he forestalled the young Sultān, and one night put him to death and threw his corpse over the wall towards the river opposite to the house of Wajih-ul-mulk; and spread a report among men to the effect that the Sultān had gone to Wajih-ul-mulk's house at night to carry on an intrigue; and not being recognised, had been killed.

The period of his rule was eight years.

---

1 The actual words are بضر راست in some MSS.; M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted بطرف راست in the text-edition.
2 Firishtah also has Pāl, but the Cambridge History of India, page 344, has Hālol.
3 The MSS. have برأ وجمع شدند and the lith. ed has برأ وجمع شدند.
1 An account of Sultan Mużaffar, son of Sultan Mahμūd, son of Latif Khan.

At the end of the year 967 a.h., 1562 A.D., I’tmād Khān brought a boy by the name 2 Nānū before the assembly of the amirs of Gujrāt; and swore that he was the 3 son of Sultan Mahμūd. He said “that the boy’s mother 4 Jāriah was an inmate of the 6 special harem of the Sultan. When she became pregnant, the Sultan made her over to me, so that I may bring about her miscarriage. As her pregnancy had passed the fifth month, I conceived her in my house, and have looked after her up to this day”. As the throne of Gujrāt was vacant, Saiyid Mirān, the son of Saiyid Mūbarak Gujrātī took up the imperial crown in the assembly of the great and the noble, and 6 placed it on the head

1 This is the heading in the MS. In the lith. ed. the word سلطان is inserted before the word Sultan.

2 The name is ننο Nānū in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and appears to be ننο Tanū in the other MS. Firīštah does not give the name. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 155) calls him “Hubbo”, which he says in a note is the “familiar contraction of Hubbeb”. The Tarīkh-i-Gujrāt (p. 52) gives him the name of ننο Nathū. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, calls him Nathū.

3 The Tarīkh-i-Gujrāt (p. 52) tells a curious story about Nathū’s father having been a كولان or cowherd; and his mother having been taken prisoner by Sultan Mahμūd; that she was kept outside the harem of the Sultan, and before the latter could see her, and decide whether he would take her into the harem, she gave birth to Nathū. As the child was born almost under the shadow of the Sultan’s presence, it resulted in his having the insignia of royalty for a time.

If this story is correct, it is curious that the facts should not have been known to the amirs, and I’tmād Khan’s stories should have received any credence.

4 I do not know what جارية Jāriah is, or whether it is a proper name.

5 The word خاص occurs in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but is omitted from the other MS.

6 Firīštah lith. ed. does not mention the coronation; but says, somewhat inconsistently, that the amirs having no other alternative divided the kingdom among themselves, and became completely independent. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 155) says that the mother of the boy concealed her pregnancy till the fifth month, when the medicines given to her to produce an abortion had no effect, and the child was born, and was brought up privately. Witnesses were
of that child. He received the title of Mużaffar Shāh; and the amīrs offered congratulations and felicitations on his accession.

The duties of the vazārat continued to be entrusted to I’tmād Khān; and he received the title of Masnad-i-Ālī. The great amīrs having acquired independence in their jāqīrs did not allow anyone to interfere with them. Among them the district of Pattan as far as the pargana of 1 Kari came into the possession of Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān Fūlādī. In 2 Rādhanpūr and Tarwāra and Tahrād and Maujpūr, and some other parganas, Fath Khān Balūch was in possession. 3 The parganas, which were situated between the Sābarmatī and the Mahindrī were in the possession of I’tmād Khān, who gave a portion of them to other Gujratīs. The port of Sūrath and Nāgōt and Chāmpānīr were in the possession of Chengiz Khān son of Īmād-ul-mulk Sultānī. Rustam Khān who was the husband of Chengiz Khān’s sister held Bahārjī. Dūlqa and Dandūkā were allotted to Saiyid Mīrān son of Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī. Amin Khān Ghūrī seized the fort of Junāgarh, and Sūrath; and 4 kept himself aloof from the other amīrs of Gujrat.

procured to swear to these facts and the evidence being considered sufficient, the boy was crowned. The version of the Tārīkh-i-Gujarat has already been given. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, says that I’tmād Khān’s history was totally false, but as an heir had to be found, the boy he produced was accepted.

1 The name is یوسی in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is omitted in the other. Firishtah lith. ed. has قدی, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 156) has Kurry. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, has Kādī.

2 Firishtah agrees as to the first two names. He does not mention the third, and calls the fourth میرچپور Mūrchipūr. Col. Briggs calls them Radumpoor, Neriad, Tehrwaras and Moonjpoor. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, does not give the names, but says the whole of the north of Gujrat as far south as Kādī was in the possession of Mūsā Khān and Sher Khān and Fath Khān. The Tārīkh-i-Gujarat does not specify the jāqīrs of the different amīrs, but says they were all trying to extend their respective jāqīrs, and encroaching on that of I’tmād Khān; and the latter sent petitions to Akbar to invade Gujrat.

3 Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India, page 345, agree generally; but Firishtah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 156) call Roostoom Khan the nephew خواهر زاد of Chungiz Khan. The Cambridge History of India agrees with the Tabaqat in calling him his brother-in-law.

4 One MS. has نغاق instead of اتفاق.
I’tmād Khān kept Sulṭān Muẓaffar Nanū, 1 more or less in a state of imprisonment, in the palace of the Sulṭān. On the days of audience a masnad used to be spread for him, and having seated him on it, I’tmād Khān himself 2 sat behind him. The amirs attended to salute the Sulṭān. When some days had passed in this way, Chengiz Khān and 3 Shēr Khān Fūlādī arrived at Aḥmadābād to offer their condolences and congratulations to the Sulṭān. 4 When a year had passed in this way the Fūlādīs having found an opportunity, attacked Fatḥ Khān Balūch, who had parganas Tahrād and Tarwāra and Rādhanpūr and 5 Mūrwāra and Kākrēj as his jāgīr, and who on account of his proximity had hostility with them. He fought with them, was defeated, and went to I’tmād Khān and complained to him. I’tmād Khān was enraged at this and having collected troops attacked the Fūlādīs with a large and powerful force. The latter shut themselves up in the fort of Pattan, and commenced to show their weakness and repentance. I’tmād Khān did not accept their excuses; and went on vigorously with the siege. When the Fūlādī Afghāns were reduced to great straits, the young warriors among 6 them collected together, and going to Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān, said that as (I’tmād Khān) does not accept our humility, there is no other alternative but that we should fight with him, and if necessary surrender our lives. Five hundred of them then sallied out of the fort; and Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān with the men that they had—whose numbers did not amount to three thousand—also came out. I’tmād Khān arrayed the Gujrātī army, which exceeded thirty thousand horsemen. The Fūlādīs

1 The words are معدوس گوریا.
2 در پس سراهو, lit., behind his head.
3 One MS. omits the name of Shēr Khān Fūlādī, apparently by mistake, for the suffix Fūlādī, which belongs to Shēr Khān is appended to the name of Chengiz Khān. Firishtah has both names.
4 It is possible that something has been omitted here, for it was hardly necessary to mention the arrival of Chengiz Khān and Shēr Khān, unless it was meant to lead to something.
5 This may be the same as Manjū already mentioned. In the text-edition کاکونچہ has been adopted in place of کاکونچہ.
6 One MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have ابن جمعه, but the other MS. has ابن طاہرہ.
hurled themselves on I’tmād Khān’s special troops and drove them away. Ḥajjī Khān, a slave of Salīm Khān the son of Shēr Khān, who was one of the leaders of I’tmād Khān’s army stood aside without joining in the battle. I’tmād Khān was defeated and went back to Aḥmadābād. He endeavoured to seize Ḥajjī Khān. The latter, becoming aware of it, fled and joined the Fūlālis. They then sent a message to I’tmād Khān to the following effect: (As a half of parqāna Karī was the jāgīr of Ḥajjī Khān, and he has come and joined us, you should relinquish possession of it’) I’tmād Khān did not agree to this, and replied, “He was my servant. Although he has fled and gone away, why should I give up his jāgīr?” Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān then collected a force and came to the jāgīr of Ḥajjī Khān; and posted themselves in the town of Jūthānāh. I’tmād Khān again collected a force and came and met them. They stood opposing one another for a period of four months; and at last engaged in battle. I’tmād Khān was defeated; and went to Chengīz Khān at Bahrōj; and brought him to help and reinforce himself. The parties again met in the neighbourhood of Jūthānāh. After a great deal of talk, there was an amicable settlement. I’tmād Khān gave up possession of Ḥajjī Khān’s jāgīr; and went back and took up his quarters at Aḥmadābād.

Chengīz Khān went back to his own country; and began to aspire to independence. It became bruited about among men, that he had no wish to continue to be in allegiance, and no intention to act as a subject. He sent a message to I’tmād Khān to the following effect: “I am a khānāzād or slave of this threshold (i.e., of the Sultāns of Gujrāt); and have knowledge of every incident that takes place in the harem. It was known as a matter of certainty till today, that the martyred Sultān Māhmūd Shāh had no son; and in spite of that you have produced a boy before the people, describing him as the son of Sultān Māhmūd. And what is the meaning of this that he himself sits in the majlis, and his men guard that boy? And as long as he does not come no one can go to offer homage. If in fact the boy,

1 The name is written as جوینانه in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah. It is جوینانه in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, has Jotāna.
is the son of Sultan Mahmud, then he (I'tmad Khan) should like all
the other amirs and the special tribemen render homage; and when
the other amirs sit down in the majlis he should also sit down after
obtaining permission". I'tmad Khan wrote in reply: "I solemnly
swore on the day of the accession in the presence of the great men of the
city and the amirs, that this boy was the son of Sultan Mahmud;
and they relying on my words placed the imperial crown on his head,
and rendered homage to him. And as to what you have said about
my sitting in the majlis, it is known to everyone, 1 what my rank and
condition in the service of Sultan Mahmud was. You were only a
boy at that time. If your father 'Imad-ul-mulk Sultan had been alive,
his would have testified to the truth of what I am saying. This lord
and master of ours, the son of our martyr lord and master, by whose
accession the imperial throne has now acquired a new beauty and glory,
is your sovereign and the son of your sovereign. Your well being
consists in this that you do not turn your head from service and
allegiance to serve him, so that you may gather the fruit of your desire
from the tree of hope ".

And Sher Khan Fuladi having become aware of this correspondence
wrote a letter to Chengiz Khan to the following effect: "You should
for a few days draw your feet beneath the skirt of patience, and should
not abandon the path of gentleness, and should not unnecessarily
begin a show of hostility towards Masnad-i-'Ali (I'tmad Khan) ".
2 After some days Chengiz Khan, having struck the teeth of greed into
the town of Baroda, sent the following message: "Many men have
collected round me and this contemptible country, which is in my
possession, is not sufficient for them. As the reins of all affairs and
the loosening and tying of all matters are entrusted to the wisdom and
insight of Masnad-i-'Ali, he should think about it ". I'tmad Khan
wanted to entangle him in a dispute with the rulers of Burhanpur,
so that being engaged with them, he might not make any attempt

1 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have در جه مرتبت. I think the correct reading
should be در جه مرتبه, and I have adopted it.

2 Firishtah copies the Tabaqat almost word for word, but with reference
to Chengiz Khan's demand for additional territory, he says in so many words,
what indeed is implied in the Tabaqat, that he did not agree to Sher Khan's
suggestion.
against these parts. He accordingly sent the following reply, "The town of Nadarbār was always in the possession of the amirs of Gujrat. At the time when the martyr Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh was in the fort of Sāwal, in the company of Mirān Mubārak Shāh, he made a promise to the latter that if the great and holy God should ever place the reins of the government of the country of Gujrat in his grasp of power, he would make Nadarbār over to him as a reward. After that the martyr Sultān sat on the throne of the empire; and in order to fulfil his promise, which is the absolute duty of and is entirely encumbent on all great men, he gave the town of Nadarbār to Mirān Mubārak Shāh. Now that the Sultān has attained the rank of a martyr and Mirān Mubārak Shāh has also departed (from the world), it is advisable that you should march with your troops to the town of Nadarbār, and should with great quickness, in order to increase your revenue take possession of it, till in the course of time some better plan can be devised".

Chengiz Khān was duped, and commenced to collect troops. After a few days, he advanced to Bahrōj with a well-equipped army ready for action; and marching by successive stages, took possession of Nadarbār. Owing to his vanity, conceit and pride he advanced still further, till he reached the neighbourhood of the fort of 1 Tālnīr. It so happened that at this time news came that 2 Mirān Muḥammad Shāh son of Mirān Mubārak Shāh was coming to give him battle, in concert with Tufāl Khān and the Rāja of Māhūr. Chengiz Khān posted his army in a place which was broken and cut up by ravines; and on the side on which the ground was even, he strengthened his position by a line of carts fastened by chains. Muḥammad Shāh and Tufāl Khan arrayed their troops in a line in front of Chengiz Khān’s army and waited till sunset. As Chengiz Khān did not come

---

1 The lith. ed. of Firistaṭah has by mistake Thānsār; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 159) has Tālnīr, and the Cambridge History of India, page 346, has Thālnīr.

2 Firistaṭah and the Cambridge History of India agree, but the former calls Mirān Muḥammad Shāh Muḥammad Mirān Shāh; and the latter rather inadequately describes him as Muḥammad II. Tufāl Khān is called ruler of Berār by Firistaṭah; and is described as of Berar in the Cambridge History of India (p. 346). "The Rāja of Māhūr is not mentioned by either.
out, they encamped where they were. Chengiz Khan 1 owing to the bad luck due to his pride and malice, was so overwhelmed with fear and alarm that leaving all his troops and followers behind, he fled to Bahrój. Muḥammad Shāh seized much booty and pursued Chengiz Khan as far as Nadarbār, and again took possession of that pargana.

When Chengiz Khan arrived in the fort of Bahrój after his defeat, he began to repair the damage which his army had sustained; and having acquired new strength and vigour, from 2 the coming of Ibrāhīm Hussain Mīrzā and Shāh Mīrzā, descendants of Muḥammad Sulṭān Mīrzā, his own determination to punish Iʿtīmad Khan was revived 3 in his mind. In order to carry out this design, he collected troops, and advanced towards Aḥmadābād. He occupied the town of Barōda without any fighting. When he arrived at Maḥmūdābād he sent the following message to Iʿtīmad Khan, namely that "It is patent and evident to the world and to all its inhabitants that my defeat at Tālīnr was really due to your malice; for if 4 you had either come yourself to reinforce me or had sent a body of troops, the dust of flight would not at all have settled on the skirts of my honour. Now I am coming to Aḥmadābād in order to offer my congratulations and felicitations to the Sulṭān in person; and I know that if you are present in the city, some dispute or hostility is sure to occur. It is, therefore, desirable that you should go out of the city, and like all the other amīrs, take up your abode in your jāgīr, and make the arms of the Sulṭān strong in the government, so that he may exercise every act of dominion in his ancestral territory in any way that he may like".

1 Firishtah copies this almost literally, except that he says that Chengiz Khan fled بَيْنَ عَمَّيْنِ حَشْمِ خُرد. The Cambridge History of India (p. 346) says that he was attacked, defeated and fled, instead of fleeing ignominiously without being attacked at all.

2 Firishtah explains that the Mīrzās fled from Sambal, and came to Mālwa, and when Akbar's army advanced against them in 975 A.H., they having no other alternative came and joined Chengiz Khan.

3 Both MSS. have در خاطروش; but the lith. ed. has در خاطروش.

4 One MS. inserts و between أُکَرُ and بُكْرَمَ; but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not.
I’tmād Khān had commenced to equip his army even before the arrival of this message; and when it came, he knew what Chengiz Khān’s real object was. He raised the royal umbrella over the head of Mużaffar, and in concert with the Saiyids of Bukhāra and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and Malik Shārq and Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk left the city, and encamped in the neighbourhood of the town of Batūh. The next day they marched from there and halted at mauḍa’ 1 Kāvrī, which is situated on the bank of the Khārī nadi, and is six kārūns from Aḥmadābād. On the morning of the next day Chengiz Khān arrayed his troops, and came out of Maḥmūdābād, and advanced towards the battlefield. When he arrived at mauḍa’ Kāvrī, at the time of the morning meal, I’tmād Khān placed Sultān Mużaffar on a horse, and placing the royal umbrella over his head, advanced towards the battlefield, and the Saiyids and the Gujarati amirs and the Ḥabshi group took up their positions. When the two armies faced each other, and the frightened eyes of I’tmād Khān fell on Chengiz Khān’s army, as he had 2 formerly repeatedly heard of the courage and prowess of the Mīrzās, he imagined each one of those 3 brave men and bold warriors to be the captor of his sword, and took the way of flight before even a sword was drawn out of its scabbard, and fled towards Dūngarpūr without even going to Aḥmadābād. The other amirs also fled, after heaping a hundred 4 plaudits on I’tmād Khān. The Saiyids went to Dūlaq, and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk to Maḥmūdābad. Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and the others went towards Aḥmadābād, taking Mużaffar with them.

Chengiz Khān was pleased and delighted at gaining this victory, which was one of the favours of God; and halted at Batūh. Early on the following morning, Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and the other Ḥabshīs left Aḥmadābād by the Kālpūr gate, taking Sultān Mużaffar with them; and went towards Birpūr and Ma’mūrābād. When

---

1 M. Hidayat Ḥosain also has كاوری as the name of the mauḍa’ in the text-edition.
2 One MS. has سابق while the other and the lith. ed. have سابق.
3 One MS. has دلیاران instead of دلیاران.
4 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firinshah have آنمیزین. One would have thought that نگورین would be the right word.
Mużaffar was leaving Aḥmadābād, Chengiz Khān entered the place, and took up his abode at the mansion of Iʿtaḱ Khaṇ. Shēr Khān Fūādī on hearing this news in the neighbourhood in the town of Kari sent a message to Chengiz Khaṇ to the effect that all this country had been in the possession of Iʿtaḍ Khān to defray the expense of the Sultaṅ; and now that he alone had come to be in possession of it, it 1 was contrary to the custom of generosity and the rules of kindness; and he advanced with a large army towards Aḥmadābād. Chengiz Khān saw that it was not expedient, that he should at such a time be engaged in a dispute with Shēr Khaṇ. He, therefore, settled with the latter that whatever should be situated on the other side of the river Sābarmatī should belong to him. Owing to this some portions of Aḥmadābād, such as 2 ʿUsmānpur, Khānpūr and Kālūpur fell into Shēr Khān's share. Chengiz Khān held the Mirzās in great honour and regard owing to the excellent services, which they have rendered him.

As Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, son of Mīrān Mubārak Shāh had been emboldened by his first victory, and found the kingdom of Gujrat without a head, he considering the disputes and hostility among the amīrs to be a very great mercy, advanced with the object of conquering the country, and did not draw his reins till he came opposite to Aḥmadābād. Chengiz Khān in concert with the Mirzās, came out of the city with the object of giving battle. The Mīrān was defeated in the battle which took place and fled and went back to Asīr in great confusion, losing everything that he had with him.

1 As this victory was gained by the great exertions of the Mirzās, Chengiz Khan in order to please them, allotted some fertile and well

---

1 The sentence is rather clumsily worded, although its purport is clear enough. Shēr Khān did not think it right that Chengiz Khān should get hold of the whole of the territory, and he should have no part of it, but it is not quite clear what was remote from. Probably he wanted to appeal to Chengiz Khan's better nature; but in that case one would expect that he would wait for the result of that appeal, instead of marching at once at the head of a large army.

2 One MS. has ʿImādpūr, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishta have ʿUsmānpūr. The first MS. and the lith. ed. have Kālpūr after Khānpūr, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. of Firishta omit Khānpūr.
populated paraganas in surkâr Bahroj as their jâgîrs; and gave them permission to go there; so that they might entertain retainers and equip them. When they arrived in the estates appertaining to their jâgîrs, and low class people, and the people who were always in search of adventure collected round them, and as the revenues of their jâgîrs did not suffice for their entertainment, they found it necessary to occupy other estates without the permission of Chengiz Khân. 1 When this news reached the latter, he sent an army to attack them. They defeated that army and slew a number of the men; and advanced towards the territory of Burhânpûr, and after interfering in the affairs of that country they went to MâIwa. The details of the affairs of the Mirzâs have already been narrated in the history of His Majesty the Khalîfa-i-İlâhi.

In short, when Ulugh Khân and Jhuhjâr Khân went to the country of Kânthâ, which is the name given to the broken country along the bank of the river Mahindrî, taking Muzaффâr with them, and waited for a long time in the expectation, that perhaps I'tmâd Khân would come himself, or send his son Shêr Khân to take Muzaффâr away; but as there was no hint of any kind from him, they themselves took Sultân Muzaффâr to Dûngarpûr, and made him over to I'tmâd Khân. After some days they asked for some money from him to defray the expenses of their soldiers. I'tmâd Khân told them in reply that the yield or revenue of his jâgîr; such as it was, known to all; and also the amount of his expenditure; and besides the place where they were not

---

1 Firishtah goes into greater detail about the force sent by Chengiz Khân against the Mirzâs, and about the proceeding of the latter, after their victory, and also gives a reason for their retiring to Burhânpûr. According to him Chengiz Khân's army consisted of three or four thousand Habâhîs, and five or six thousand Gujratîs. The Mirzâs after defeating the army put a number of them to death, and pursuing the others captured a number of men, both Habâhîs and Gujratîs. The young and beardless among them they kept as personal attendants, and released the others who had beards, after treating them with great barbarity, putting arrows through their noses, and binding their arms behind them, and placing circular pieces of wood round their necks. As they did all this, and knew that Chengiz Khân would come in person to attack them, they went away towards Burhânpûr.

2 The name is Kânthâ in one MS, and in the lith. ed., and Kânâhî in the other MS. It is Kânth in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
a city, that he should be able to pay them after taking a loan from someone. Owing to this, Ulugh Khan and the other amirs were annoyed with I'timad Khan.

Chengiz Khan becoming aware of this, sent conciliatory letters to each one of them, and asked them to come to him. Ulugh Khan and Juhjjar Khan and Saif-ul-mulk and other Habhis advanced towards Ma'murabad without obtaining leave from I'timad Khan; and having met Ikhtiyar-ul-mulk Gujrati there, they all went forward towards Ahmadabad. When they arrived at the Kâkria tank or reservoir, which is close to the city, they halted at the garden of Sultan Mahmud to change their dresses. At that time Chengiz Khan came there in haste to welcome them; and met Ikhtiyar-ul-mulk, Ulugh Khan, Juhjjar Khan and other Habhis there. After they had finished making courteous enquiries about one another, Ulugh Khan and Juhjjar Khan said, "It is clear to the world and to all men that we are all slaves born and bred in the house of Sultan Mahmud. If one of us has been favoured by fortune more than the other, yet as regards that primary fact there is no difference amongst us; and it is right that it should be borne in mind and observed in all our interviews. The reason for this remark is that among the Sultan's slaves, some have been distinguished by advancement in the service, and they are now present in this assembly. Hereafter whenever any of us has to salute or see any other, it is to be hoped that he will not be prevented by chamberlains and ushers". Chengiz Khan with great show of politeness, accepted this statement; and taking the other amirs with him went to the city; and having caused some houses to be vacated, placed them at their disposal.

After some time, one day, a spy came to Ulugh Khan, and informed him that Chengiz Khan wanted to put him and Juhjjar Khan to death;

---

1 Firishtah agrees, but the Cambridge History of India, page 346, says that Ulugh Khan, whom it calls (Muhammad) Ulugh Khan and (Marjan) Juhjjar Khan, awaited help from I'timad Khan or from Sher Khan Fülâdi, but being disappointed joined Ikhtiyar-ul-Mulk and marched with him to Ahmadabad, thus omitting all mention of their visit to Dungarpur, and their making over of the Sultan to I'timad Khan there.

2 Both MSS. have but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have.
and he has settled, that on the following morning when you are careless, he will have you assassinated in the chaugān field. The test of the truth of this information is this, that if he goes tomorrow to the chaugān field near the Kākriā tank there will be no danger, for it is an extensive plain; and one can escape from it in all directions. But if they go to the field of Bahdar, which is inside the citadel, you may note with certainty that he will effect his purpose there. The spy had not yet finished speaking, when a messenger came from Chengiz Khān; 2 and after prayers (for the interlocutor’s well-being) said, “We (speaking apparently for his master) will go to the chaugān ground; will you also come early?” Ulugh Khān hearing this became anxious, and mounting his horse, went to the house of Saif-ul-mulk Habshi Sultānī (i.e., Saif-ul-mulk the Abyssinian slave of the Sultān). There 3 Juhujār Khān and Saiyid Badr Sultānī and Maḥaldār Khān and Khurshid Khān were sent for; and the matter was brought up for discussion. After much interchange of words, they all agreed, that they should forestall and kill Chengiz Khān.

Early the next morning, Ulugh Khān and Juhujār Khān mounted with their companions, and went to the darbār (palace) of Chengiz Khān. The latter came out mounted; and they all turned towards

---

1 The readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. differ slightly, and they are all difficult to understand. One MS. has قصه نست while the lith. ed. has قصه هست. The corresponding passage in Firishtah is خطأ نست. This is good sense and I have adopted it. But M. Hidayat Hosain has retained قصه نست in the text-edition.

2 There is difference in the readings here also. The MSS. have ام و بعد while the lith. ed. has امدا دما رسانيد كه. This latter reading is manifestly incorrect as the word كه should be changed to ؛ but otherwise it is somewhat better than the reading in the MSS.; but I have adopted the former, as it is found in both the MSS., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

3 These names are correctly given in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah lith. ed. has چهار خان, Jahāz Khān which is clearly a misprint for Juhujār Khān and سیدی بدر شامی instead of Saiyid Badr Sultānī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 162) has further changed Jahāz Khān to Hijaz Khan, but he does not mention the other man.

4 Firishtah gives some more details, from which it appears, that when Ulugh Khān and Jahāz Khān arrived Chengiz Khān’s soldiers and followers had not yet come, so a man had to be sent to him with their prayers and with the
the Bahdar chauqān field. After they had gone a part of the way, Ulugh Khān who was to the right of Chengiz Khān, made a sign to Juhjār Khān who was on his left side, that it was an opportunity that should not be lost. Juhjār Khān immediately struck Chengiz Khān with his sword in such a way 1 that it appeared as if his head had not at all been accompanying him. They then all galloped back to their houses and prepared to fight. Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk also joined with them and made ready. 2 Rustam Khān threw the body of Chengiz Khān on the back of an elephant and started towards Bahrōj, instead of taking it to his house in the city. The mob of the city then stretched their hands to plunder Chengiz Khān’s followers.

When it was known for certain that Rustam Khān had gone away towards Bahrōj, Ulugh Khān and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and Juhjār Khān and the other leaders went to the citadel which was known by the name Bahdar. They wrote a letter to I’tmād Khān, and informed him of what had happened and invited him to Aḩmadābād. On the same day Badr Khān and Muḥammad Khān, sons of Shēr Khān Fūlādī, came into the city in order to offer their congratulations; and brought presents of horses for every one (of the amirs). They (?) confirmed anew the distribution of the jagirs among the amirs, as Chengiz Khān had settled it.

The next day Shēr Khān Fūlādī sent his spies, and ascertained, 3 that none of the retainers of the amirs remained in the fort in Bahdar request that it would be better if he came quickly. Chengiz Khān had apparently been drinking, but he came out mounted, after putting on some light clothing.

---

1 The words که شرح پا یادکست گویا با داد همزمان نیود are somewhat fanciful and difficult to understand. M. Hidayat Hosain has introduced بارو بارو between گویا and همزمان. Firishtah’s language که شرح بیاکدست ازتن جدا شد is clear. As regards the complaint of Changiz Khān’s mother to Akbar about Juhjār Khān having killed her son, and Akbar’s punishment of Juhjār Khān by ordering him to be trampled under the feet of an elephant, see page 389 of vol. II of the translation. Juhjār Khān apparently did not plead right of self-defence, as he might well have done.

2 According to Firishtah, he was a nephew, sister’s son of Chengiz Khān, who was following the latter with his troops. The Cambridge History of India, page 347, calls him Chengiz Khān’s brother-in-law.

3 Somewhat contrary to this, the Cambridge History of India, page 347, says that Ulugh Khān and his partisans took possession of the citadel.
to guard it. Acting on this information on the 3rd night after the murder of Chengiz Khan, he sent Sadat Khan, who had been one of the nobles of Sher Khan, with three hundred men. They broke down the walls of the fort in the direction of Khānpur, and took possession of Bahdar. After some days I'tmād Khan arrived at Ahmadābād, bringing Muẓaffar with him. As the fort of Bahdar was in the possession of Sadat Khan, he took Muẓaffar to his own house; but he wrote a letter to Sher Khan on the subject of the evacuation of Bahdar. He told him that Bahdar had always been the residence of the Sultāns. Even if the Sultān did not happen to be in Ahmadābād, it was the duty of his servants and well-wishers, that they should guard the palace of their master; and should not occupy it themselves, or take possession of it. Now that the Sultān had come to the city, he should direct Sadat Khan to vacate it. Sher Khan acted according to his request, either because it was the only right thing to do, or because he was under certain obligations to I'tmād Khan; and vacated Bahdar. Sultān Muẓaffar then went and took up his abode in his own palace.

While these things were happening, scouts brought the news, that the Mīrzās had fled from Mālwa and were coming to Gujrāt; and that when they heard, while they were still on the way, that Chengiz Khan had been murdered, they became pleased and delighted; and turned towards Bahrōj and Sūrath, so that they might seize that ḍāba also. Ikhtiyyār-ul-mulk and Ulugh Khan went to the palace, and said that Bahrōj was at present without any master, and people were saying that the Mīrzās were advancing in that direction. It was right that all the amirs should collect their forces and march to Bahrōj, and take possession of that territory; and 1 in the carrying out of this intention should not give way to any hesitation or delay; for if Bahrōj went once into the possession of the Mīrzās, they would all have to pour out much of their heart's blood, before they would be able to recover it from them.

---

1 The MSS. appeared to be imperfect here. One has ...يام. The other is better; it has ...俄国... انصافاً اب لنصيغ وانصاراً. The lithed. ed. appears to have the best reading; it agrees with the second MS., but has لنصيغ instead of انصاراً, and وانصاراً instead of نصيغ. I have adopted this reading, but انصاراً has been retained in the text-edition.
I’tmād Khān sent a messenger to Shēr Khān; and asked his opinion. Shēr Khān also agreed to undertake the expedition. It was then agreed, that the entire army should be divided into three detachments. The first detachment headed by Ulugh Khān and the other Habshīs should go one stage in advance. When they would advance beyond their first station, I’tmād Khān and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and the other amīrs, who would command the second detachment, should encamp there. When the second detachment should advance from that station, the third detachment, which would be commanded by Shēr Khān Fūlādī and other amīrs, should take up its position there. Sādāt Bukhārī should remain in the position where he was. When, according to this agreement, Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk and the other Habshīs arrived at Māhmūdābād, I’tmād Khān ¹ did not go out of the city, and cancelled the previous agreement.

Ulugh Khān and his friends suspecting treachery on his part, from this conduct, said to each other, “We slew a (powerful) enemy of his, like Chengiz Khān, and he is now acting traitorously towards us. It is advisable that we should take possession of this territory (fief), and divide it among ourselves”. They confirmed this determination, and took possession of pargana Kanbāyet and Patlād and some other parganas. Men who had no jāqirs came from the city, and joined the service of Ulugh Khān. The latter said to Jhuhjār Khān, “Soldiers

¹ There are variations in the readings, and they are all more or less incorrect. One MS. has اعتماد خان بین دیو نرفت و فتح آن عزمت نمود; the other has اعتماد خان ز شهربین نرفت و فتح آن عزمت نمود; the lith. ed. agrees with the latter reading but substitutes صبه for صبح. It is needless to say that both and are utterly incorrect, and the correct word is صبح. Fīrastāh lith. ed. has it. His version is different, and I am quoting it, as it gives some reason for I’tmād Khān’s conduct. He says: اعتماد خان سوید - و از شهربین رفت فتحی عزمت نمود, which means I’tmād Khān became suspicious, and going out of the city cancelled the previous agreement. Col. Briggs’s (vol. IV, p. 164) version is that “Etimad Khan, with his accustomed cowardice, threw obstacles in the progress of the second corps, which he commanded, and refused to move”. The Cambridge History of India, page 347, also says: “I’timad Khan refused to leave the capital”.
have come to me from the capital, it is advisable that one of the\par
parganas of I’tmād Khān should be allotted for the payment of their\par
wages”. Juhjār Khān replied, “Give all the land that you wish to\par
give to these men to me; and whatever you expect from them, you\par
will get from me”. In the end there was contention and hostility\par
between them, on the score of the division of this territory.

I’tmād Khān receiving information of this deceived Juhjār\par
Khān by his artifice and trickery, and summoned him to join him.\par
As he went to I’tmād Khān, there was great infirmity and weakness\par
in the grandeur of the Habšī party. Ulugh Khān then went to\par
Shēr Khān Fūlādī; and Sādāt Bakhārī also joined the latter. As\par
Shēr Khān’s side became stronger, Sultān Muẓaffar also, availing himself\par
of an opportunity, came out one day through a window and with a few\par
of his immediate attendants went to Ulugh Khān at Ghīyāspūr, which\par
is near the town of Sārkhej. Ulugh Khān went to wait on Shēr Khān,\par
without seeing him. He told Shēr Khān, “Sultān Muẓaffar has,\par
without giving me previous intimation, come to my house; but I have\par
not yet seen him”. Shēr Khān said, “As a beloved guest has come,\par
you should go and carry out the rites of service”.

Early the next morning, a letter came from I’tmād Khān to\par
Shēr Khān, to the following effect: “As Nānū was not the son of the\par
Sultān, 2 I have repudiated him. And I have summoned the Mirzās,\par
so that I may make over the capital of Gujrāt to them”. After reading

---

1 There are some differences in the readings. The word before باید is omitted in one MS., but occurs in the other and in the lith. ed.; and the same word before نمود occurs in both MSS., but not in the lith. ed. I have inserted it.

2 Both the MSS. have بفریغته which is in the lith. ed. and in the corresponding passage in the lith. ed. of Firishtah is just as good.

3 The reading in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. is مظفر. This may have the meaning I have given it in the text, or it may mean, when I brought him forward. The context shows that the first is the correct meaning. Firishtah lith. ed. is more explicit. It is جوهر مظفر شاه معصوم شاه نبود - لبادا او را نبود نموده جهور آبادرا طلبدادام, i.e., as Muẓaffar was not the son of Shāh Maḥmūd Shāh III, I have driven him out, and have summoned the Mirzās.
this letter, Shehr Khan went to the house of Saiyid Hamid Bukhari, and enquired of him, as to what had been ascertained at the time of the accession. Saiyid Hamid and the other Saiyids said, "I'tmâd Khan swore on the Qurâân, that the boy was a son of Sultan Mahmud; and he has now written these words on account of his enmity". Shehr Khan rode back from the house of Saiyid Hâmîd, to that of Ulugh Khan; and with his bow in his hands rendered homage to Sultan Muazzafar, in the way in which a servant does homage to his master; and mounting him on a horse, brought him to his own house, in order to render homage to him there.

I'tmâd Khan summoned the Mirzâs from the country of Bahrôj. He sent detachments from their followers, and those of Ightiây-ulkulk every day to fight. Gradually the contention and hostility was much prolonged; and as I'tmâd Khan saw that nothing was affected, he sent a petition to His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Illahi; and begged him to come and conquer the country of Gujrât. As it happened, at that time which was the year 988 (1572 A.D.), His Majesty had come to Nagor; and had sent Mir Muhammed Atka, who was celebrated as Khan Kalan, with a large army of renowned amirs to conquer Sirâh. As the Khan Kalan was wounded by the ambassador of the Raja of Sirâh, the emperor himself, with good fortune and prosperity, advanced towards the Khan Kalan's army; and (from there) without any delay marched towards Gujrât. The particulars of this brief statement have been narrated in the history of the events of the reign of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Illahi.

In short, when the world-conquering standards arrived at Pattan Gujrât, Shehr Khan, who was at this time besieging Ahmadâbâd, lost the use of his hands and feet (i.e., became utterly bewildered), and fled; and Ibrâhîm Husain Mirzâ and his brothers went towards Baroda and Bahrôj. I'tmâd Khan and Mir Abû Turab and Ulugh Khan

---

1 M. Hidayat Hosain has سید حامد in the text-edition instead of Saiyid Hamid Bukhari as in the translation above.
2 Firishtah adds: and the Habhés.
3 He was actually wounded by one of the followers of the mission. See page 371 of vol. II of the translation.
4 Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Mirzâ Abû Turâb Shîrâzî. He is the author of the Târikh-i-Gujarat, which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross. His full
Habshi and Juhbjär Khān and Ikhṭiyār-ul-mulk, having determined on serving at the threshold, which was the abode of the angels, became enlisted in the band of the loyal servants. The kingdom of Gujrāt ended here, and became a part of the imperial dominions of His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī. Other incidents connected with Sultān Muẓaffar Khān and the Gujrātīs have been narrated in the auspicious history of His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī.

The period of the rule of Sultān Muẓaffar extended to thirteen years and some months.

SECTION VI. 2 THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF BANGĀLA.

It will not remain concealed from the minds of men of understanding, that the beginning of the appearance of Islām in the country of Bangāla was from (the time of) 3 Muḥammad Bakhtiyār who had been one of the great amirs of 4 Sultān Qutb-ud-din Aibak. After him the amirs of the Sultāns of Dehlī ruled one after another. Their histories have been narrated in the course of the history of the 5 Sultāns of Dehlī. When Malik Fakhr-ud-din who was the silāḥdār, trooper or armour-bearer, of Qadr Khān, the ruler of Bangāla as Viceroy of name appears to be Mir Abu Tirāb Wāli who belonged to the Salāmi Saiyids of Shirāz.

1 The correct date is given as the 14th Rajab, 980 A.H., in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The corresponding date according to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 165) is November 20th, 1572. The same date is also given in the Cambridge History of India, page 348.

2 This section which follows that about Mālwa in the MSS. is printed between those about Gujrāt and Sharqā in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has followed the sequence in the lith. ed. for the text, and the same has been adopted for the translation.

The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. In the lith. ed. it is طبقة از حكومات سلطانين بنكالله.

3 One MS. has Maḥmūd instead of Muḥammad.

4 The same MS. has by mistake سلطان قطب بگ Sultān Qutb Bēg.

5 Both MSS. have سلطانين طبقة دهلي. This is incorrect. If the word طبقة is at all inserted, it should be before سلطانين.
Muḥammad Tughluq Shāh, slew him, he gave himself 2 the name of Sultān. After him the kingdom of Bangāla became separated from the empire of Dehli, and the hand of the dominion of the Sultāns of Dehli did not reach the kings (of Bangāla); and they appropriated 3 the name of Sultān for themselves.

The beginning of the section about Bangāla has been made from Malik Fakhr-ud-dīn. 4 (The names of the various Sultāns are):—

---

1 One MS. has محمود, Maḥmūd.
2 One MS. has by mistake اسم نور; but the other and the lith. ed. have اسم 1.
3 One MS. has اسم the other has اسم; while the lith. ed. has اسم.
4 For the list of the kings of Bengal as given in the Cambridge History of India, see vol. III, page 695. According to it there were two kings in east Bengal with their capital at Sūnargāon in the Meghmā in the present district of Dacca; namely, Fakhr-ud-dīn Muhārak Shāh, 739 A.H., 1338 A.D. to 750 A.H., 1349 A.D.; and Iktiyār-ud-dīn Ghāzi Shāh, 750 A.H., 1349 A.D. to 753 A.H., 1352 A.D.; after which this kingdom was conquered by Ḥājī Shams-ud-dīn Ilyās Bhangaru, and incorporated with western Bengal. The kings of western Bengal begin with No. 2 of the lists given in the Ṭabaqāt. As regards the names and period Firishtah agrees about No. 1; but about No. 2 he has one year and five months. As regards No. 5 there is great divergence. One MS. and the lith. ed. have ten years, the other MS. has two years. Firishtah has nine years and some months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 335) has ten years; and the Cambridge History of India, page 266, also gives him ten years from 1396 A.H., when he is said to have peaceably succeeded his father to 1406 A.H., when he died. In the list of the kings of Bengal, on page 695, however, he is only given two years from 1410 to 1412 A.H. No. 7 is said to have reigned for three years according to a MS. and the lith. ed. and Firishtah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 336). The Cambridge History of India, page 266, says he was allowed to ascend the throne, but was a mere puppet and exercised no power; he died after a reign of little more than three years. His name is not, however, given in the lists on page 695, though another puppet, Shihāb-ud-dīn Bāyazid, who succeeded him, has his name in that list. No. 8 is called Rāja Kāns in one MS., and Rāja Kānsī in the other. The lith. eds. both of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah have Rāja Kāns. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 336) has Raja Kansa Poorby. The Cambridge History of India, page 266, calls him Raja Ganesh of Dinājpur, but says that he is called Raja Kāns by most Muslim historians; in the list on page 695 he is called Ganeśa of Bhaduriā (Kāns Narāyan). About No. 9 there is no difference in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., except that one MS. calls the father Kānsī and not Kāns. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Jīvaṅa the son of Kāns, who had the title of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn, and says that he ruled for seventeen years and some
months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 337) calls him Jeetmul entitled Julal-ood-deen and says he reigned for seventeen years. The Cambridge History of India, page 266, calls him Jatmali, who was raised to the throne under the title of Jalal-ud-din Muhammad and says he ruled for seventeen years. In the list on page 695, he is, however, called Jadu alias Jalal-ud-din Muhammad Shâh. About No. 10 there is no difference in the MS. and the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah the word Sultan is prefixed to the name of the father and the period of his reign is said to have been sixteen years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 338) calls him Ahmud Poorby and says he reigned for eighteen years. The Cambridge History of India, page 267 and also page 695, calls him Shams-ud-din Ahmad Shâh, and says he reigned for eleven years only from 1431 to 1442 A.D.

About No. 11 there is no difference in the MS., but the lith. ed. omits the word bin, son of, before Ahmad. Firishtah lith. ed. says Nasir-ud-din, a slave, who usurped the throne, reigned for seven days and according to another account for half a day. Col. Briggs agrees. The Cambridge History of India, page 267, calls him Nasir Khân, originally a slave, and later one of the principal officers of the State, who assumed the title of Nasir-ud-din Mahmûd and is said on page 267 to have reigned peacefully for seventeen years. In the list on page 695, he is said to have reigned from 1442 to 1460. About No. 12 there is no difference between the MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Sultan Nasir-ud-din Shâh Bangara and says he ruled for thirty-two years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 339) calls him Nasir Poorby, and says he reigned for two years. In the Cambridge History of India the Nasir-ud-din and the Nâsir Shâh of the Tabaqât and Firishtah are, apparently, made into one man. He is said on page 268 to have died in 1459, though in the list on page 695 he is said to have reigned from 1442 to 1460. As regards No. 13, one MS. calls him Bin Bârbak Shâh, but otherwise the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree. Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs (who, however, calls him Barbik Poorby) agree. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, calls him Rukn-ud-din Bârbak and says he succeeded his father in 1459 and died in 1474, and thus reigned for about fifteen years. On page 695 he is called Rukn-ud-din Bârbak Shâh and is said to have reigned from 1460 to 1474, or for about fourteen years. About No. 14 the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree; but the lith. ed. of Firishtah gives him seven years and six months, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 339) gives him between seven and eight years. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, calls him Shams-ud-din Yusuf, who reigned for seven years from 1474 to 1481. There is much difference in the periods of No. 15's reign; one MS. and the lith. ed. have half a day, while the other MS. has two half years and two half days. The meaning of which is difficult to find out. Firishtah lith. ed. gives him two months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 340) says he was deposed on the day he was raised to the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, also says that he was immediately deposed, as his intellect was deranged.

The name of No. 16 is omitted from one MS. I have given in the text what is written about him in the other MS. The lith. ed. calls him Fath, without any
prefix or suffix; and gives him seven years and five months. Firishta lith. ed. agrees with the lith. ed. of Ṭabaqāt in giving him a reign of seven years and five months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 340) calls him Futteh Poorby, and says he was murdered after a reign of seven years. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, says he reigned from 1481 to 1486 (i.e., for five years), when he was assassinated. As to No. 17 both the MSS. and the lith. ed. have the reading I have in the text. Firishta lith. ed. says Bārbak Shāh reigned according to one statement for eight months, and according to another for two and a half months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 341) calls him the Eunuch Shahzada, and says he reigned for two months. The Cambridge History of India calls him Bārbak the Eunuch, Sultan Shāhzāda in the list on page 696, and gives a rather long account of how he was killed on page 269, but does not mention the exact period of his reign. The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree as to No. 18, and say what I have translated in the text. Firishta calls him Malik Indil Ḥabshi who had the title of Firūz Shāh and says he ruled for three years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 344) calls him Mullik Andeel Feroze Poorby, and says he ruled for thirteen years, apparently from 886 A.H. to 899 A.H. The corresponding A.D. period 1401 to 1493 is apparently incorrect. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the year of his accession on page 269, but says he reigned for two years and died in 1489. In the list of the kings on pp. 695, 696, the years of his accession and death are 1486 and 1489 respectively.

As to No. 19, the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree but there are slight mistakes. Firishta lith. ed. calls him Shāh Māhmūd Shāh, and says he ruled for one year, but it also mentions a statement in the History of Ḩāji Muhammad Qandahārī, according to which he ruled merely in name under the guardianship of Ḥabīb Khān, a slave of Shāh Bārbak Shāh, at the end of which Ḥabīb Khān wanted to rule himself, but he was slain by Sīdī Badr Diwana, who also slew the infant king, and proclaimed himself as Sultan Muzaffar Shāh. Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India agree generally. The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree in saying what I have in the text in respect of No. 20. Firishta calls him Sīdī Badr Ḥabshi who had the title of Muzaffar Shāh, and says he reigned for three years and five months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 348) says he reigned for three years. The Cambridge History of India, page 270, also says he reigned for three years, and in the list of kings he is said to have reigned from 1490 to 1493 A.D. The MSS. and the lith. ed. also agree about No. 21. Firishta lith. ed. calls him Sharif Makkī, celebrated as Sultan Ṭallā-ud-dīn, and says he reigned for twenty-seven years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 348) agrees as to the period of his reign, but calls him Ala-ood-deen Poorby, II. The Cambridge History of India, page 696, calls him Sayyid Ṭallā-ud-dīn Sharif-i-Makki, and says he reigned from 1493 to 1518, i.e., for twenty-five years. His full title, as can be gathered from his coins, is given on page 270 and the period of his reign is mentioned there also as twenty-five years. Neither of the MSS. gives the period of Naṣīr Shāh’s reign. The lith. ed. calls him Naṣīr Shāh and gives him eleven days. Firishta lith. ed. calls him Shāh Naṣīr Shāh, and says he ascended the throne in 927 and died in 943, which would give him about sixteen years. Col. Briggs
Sultan Fakhr-ud-din, 1 two years and some months;
Sultan ‘Ala’-ud-din, one year and some months;
Sultan Shams-ud-din, sixteen years and some months;
Sultan Sikandar, son of Sultan Shams-ud-din, nine years and some months;
Sultan Ghiyas-ud-din, son of Sikandar, seven years;
Sultan Sultan-us-Salatin, ten (?) years;
Sultan Shams-ud-din, son of Sultan-us-Salatin, three years;
Raja Kans, 2 three years;
Sultan Jalal-ud-din, son of Kans, seventeen years;
Sultan Ahmad, son of Jalal-ud-din, sixteen years;
Sultan Nasir-ud-din, son of Ahmad, seven days;
Sultan Nasir Shah, two years;
Barbak Shah, seventeen years;
Yusuf Shah, seven years;
Sikandar Shah, half a day;
Fath-Shah, seven years and some months;
Barbak Shah, eunuch, two and a half months;
Firuz Shah, three years;
Mahmud Shah, son of Firuz, one year;
Muazzafar Habshi, three years and five months; *
‘Ala-ud-din, twenty-seven years;
Naasib Shah, son of ‘Ala-ud-din, eleven years.

(vol. IV, p. 251) calls him Nuseeb Poorby, and says he reigned from 1523 to 1538 A.D. or for a period of fifteen years. The Cambridge History of India calls him Nasir-ud-din Nusrat Shah and gives him a reign of fifteen years from 1518 to 1533. M. Hidayat Hosain has eleven years as the period of his reign in the text-edition, and this has been followed in the translation.

The list in the Tabaqat ends here, but Firishtah mentions four more Sultans, and the Cambridge History of India thirteen more, ending with Daud Khan Karan.

1 M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted 55 ملال as the period of the reign in the text-edition.

2 In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has ہفتہ ملال.
Malik Fakhr-ud-din was the silâḥdâr (armour bearer) of Qâdîr Khân. He treacherously slew his master, and attributed the name of the saltânat to himself. He sent one of his slaves by the name of Mukhlîs, with a well equipped army, to the frontier district of Bangâla (پرچمی یابگل). But Malik ‘Ali Mubârak, the pay master of Qâdîr

1 One MS. inserts Shâh after Fakhr-ud-din.
2 Firishtah describes in some detail the way in which Qâdîr Khân was murdered by his own soldiers at the instigation of Fakhr-ud-din; and Stewart, History of Bengal, 1813, page 81, follows him. According to Stewart, Fakher Addeen proclaimed his independence at Sunergong about the end of 740 or the beginning of 741, and this is confirmed by his coins which also show that he continued to reign in Sûnârgânî till 750 A.H. This agrees generally with the list of Bengal Kings on page 695 of the Cambridge History of India, according to which he reigned from 739 A.H. to 750 A.H. The Cambridge History of India, page 262, differs from the Tabaqât and from Firishtah and Stewart. According to it, Qâdîr Khân was not slain by or at the instigation of Fakhr-ud-din, as he died in 1339, and was succeeded by Sultân ‘Alâ-ud-dîn ‘Alî as the Cambridge History of India calls him or Sultân ‘Alâ-ud-dîn ‘Alî Shâh. It is doubtful whether Bahrâm Khân, who had been associated with Ghiyâs-ud-dîn Bahâdur in the government of Eastern Bengal and since the latter’s rebellion and death in 1330 was the sole governor of East Bengal, was or was not slain by Fakhr-ud-dîn; but it was after his death in 1336 that Fakhr-ud-dîn or Fakhr-ud-dîn Mubârak Shâh assumed the royal title at Sûnârgânî; but Qâdîr Khân did not die till 1339, i.e., three years later, at Lakhnauti.
3 According to Firishtah and Stewart he was sent to conquer Lakhnauti and the neighbouring districts.
4 Firishtah agrees as to Malik ‘Alî having defeated Mukhlîs, but he says nothing about his defeating Fakhr-ud-dîn and putting him to death. Stewart (pp. 82, 83) agrees with the Tabaqât, and says that Aly Mubârîck defeated Fakher Addeen, and put him to death in 743 A.H., 1342-43 A.D. This cannot, however, be correct, as there are coins struck by him up to 749 A.H. in existence.
5 According to Firishtah, he was taken prisoner in 741 A.H. by Malik Iliyâs, who assumed the title of Sultân Shams-ud-dîn, and was brought to Lakhnauti where he was hanged by the neck. This also cannot be correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 262, says that hostilities continued between Eastern and Western Bengal till 1349 A.D., when Fakhr-ud-dîn disappeared from the scene; but he was succeeded by his son Ikhtiyâr-ud-dîn Gharî Shâh at Sûnârgânî. This latter Sultân is not mentioned by Niẓâm-ud-dîn or Firishtah or Stewart; but his coins show that he reigned at Sûnârgânî from 750 to 763 A.H., 1349-1352 A.D. (See Bhattasali’s Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent
Khan's army, met him in battle, and slew him; and all his horses and other equipages which were with him fell into the victor's hands. As Sultan Faqhr-ud-din had only newly acquired his power, and had no faith in his followers, he could not attack Ali Mubarak. In the end Malik 'Ali Mubarak assumed the title of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din; and went and attacked Sultan Faqhr-ud-din; and in the year 941 A.H. having taken him prisoner alive, sentenced him to death. He then left a thana (military post) at Lakhnauti, and returned to the country of Bangala (probably Soñargón).

The period of Sultan Faqhr-ud-din's rule was two years and some months.

**An Account of the Reign of Sultan 'Ala'-ud-din.**

As he had put Sultan Faqhr-ud-din to death, he with great strength left a thana at Lakhnauti and advanced towards Bangala. 2 After

---

*Sultans of Bengal, 1922, pages 18, 19, and the Cambridge History of India, pp. 262, 685.* He is also mentioned by Edward Thomas, *The Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi*, 1871, pages 265, 266, and is included in Lane-Poole's list in *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, 1925, page 307.

1 The meaning is not clear. Firishtah and Stewart are of no help. The former merely copies the words of the Tabaqát, and the latter says nothing whatever about 'Ala-ud-din. It appears, however, from Bhattasali, page 15, and the Cambridge History of India, page 262, that 'Ala-ud-din at this time removed his capital to Pandūzah for strategic reasons. The dyār Bangala would therefore mean Pandūzah.

2 There is a good deal of difference in the readings in the MSS. and the lith. ed.; and they are all more or less incorrect. One MS. has حاجي البلاس علی ق که در لشکر لکهنوتی نامرد بویده، لشکرو بخود بار و موانع ساخته علاء الدین را کشته و خود را سلطان شمس الدین لقب گذاشته و جوی سلطان علاء الدین دیار لکهنوتی و بتکاله مصرف گردید the other MS. has حاجی البلاس علاء الدین ساخته، و خود را سلطان علاء الدین دیار لکهنوتی و بتکاله مصرف گردید instead of حاجی البلاس علی ق ساخته، and instead of خود را سلطان علاء الدین دیار لکهنوتی و بتکاله مصرف گردید instead of خود را سلطان علاء الدین دیار لکهنوتی و بتکاله مصرف گردید. The lith. ed. omits the words before لشکر لکهنوتی نامرد بویده, and has لشکر لکهنوتی نامرد بویده after لقب گذاشته; and then has لقب گذاشته, and then has لقب گذاشته instead of لقب گذاشته, and then has لقب گذاشته instead of لقب گذاشته. The reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah is somewhat different.
a few days, Malik Ḥājī Iliyās ʿAlāʾ, who had been nominated (for the office of Sultan) in the army of Lakhnauti, made that army friendly and united with him; and slew Sultan ʿAlāʾ-ud-dīn, and giving himself the title of Sultan Shams-ud-dīn Bhangara, took possession of the country of Lakhnauti and Bangāla. The period of the government of Sultan ʿAlāʾ-ud-dīn was one year and some months.

2 An account of Ḥājī Iliyās, who had the title of Sultan Shams-ud-dīn Bhangara.

When ʿAlāʾ-ud-dīn was slain and the whole country of Lakhnauti and Bangāla came into the possession of Iliyās, he in concert with the amirs gave himself the title of Sultan Shams-ud-dīn; and had public prayers read in his name. He made very great efforts in obtaining the good wishes of the people and in attracting the hearts of the soldiers.

After some time he equipped an army, and marched to 3 Jājnagar; and having obtained many large elephants from that country, returned.

I have adopted the reading in the first MS. changing گذاشت to گذاشت, and inserting the words سلطان علاء الدين گذاشت شد after گذاشت شد. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has generally followed the second MS. in the text-edition.

1 The relationship of Malik Ḥājī Iliyās with Sultan ʿAlāʾ-ud-dīn, and their antecedent as detailed in the Riyāzu-s-Salāṭīn are given on pages 19, 20 of Bhattasali's book. I do not think that Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah are correct in saying that Malik Ḥājī Iliyās gave himself the title of Sultan Shams-ud-dīn Bhangara. The last word was a nick name popularly given to him on account of his addiction to the preparation of hemp known as Bhang. According to Firishtah Ḥajpur opposite to Patna got its name from Ḥājī Iliyās.

2 The heading given in the text is that in the MSS. with the slight difference that the last word is داشته in one MS. and the other. The latter is correct. The heading in the lith. ed. is داشته داشhte داشته داشته داشته داشته داشته داشته داشته داشته داشته داشته داشت.  ذكر سلطان شمس الدين يهكر .

3 Neither the Riyāzu-s-Salāṭīn nor the Ṭabaqāt nor Firishtah attempts to identify this place. Bhattasali (pp. 24, 25) says, Sultan Shamsuddin "seems to have levied tribute from the kingdoms of Orissa and Tirhut", from which it appears that he identifies Jājnagar with Orissa. The Cambridge History of India, page 263, says "Iliyās is said to have invaded Jājnagar, as the Muslim historians styled the kingdom of Jājpūr in Orissa". There is no connected account of this kingdom anywhere in the Cambridge History of India, and it is only mentioned incidentally in this place, and in connection
to his own capital.  

1 For a period of thirteen years and some months, the Sulțāns of Dehli did not interfere with him in any way; and he with full and absolute authority, performed the duties of the saľṭanat. But on the 10th of Shawwāl, in the year 754 A.H., Sulṭān Firūz Shāh, son of Rajab advanced from Dehli towards Lakhnautī. Sulṭān with Sulṭān Hūshang's journey to acquire elephants on page 350 and the following pages, and in connection with Sulṭān Muhammad of the Deccan's invasion of Orissa in 1478 on page 417. In all these places the Musalman historians call the place Jānjagar; and the Cambridge History of India persists, so far as I can see, without any authority whatever in calling it Jājpur. Apart, however, from this question I think that the Jānjagar mentioned here does not mean Orissa at all, but Tipperah. Stewart, on page 83, has Tipperah in brackets after Jagenagur (Jānjagar). He gives no authority but Shums Addeen, with his capitals at Pandāūh and Sōnārgāon, is more likely to have invaded Tipperah, less than one hundred miles from Sōnārgāon than Orissa which was quite five hundred or six hundred miles off. It will be seen moreover that Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-dīn Balban pursued the rebel Tughrāl in the direction of Jānjagar through Lakhnautī and Sonargāon, see pages 109 and 110 of the first volume of the translation. The Jānjagar mentioned there cannot be identified with Orissa, but must be some place east of Sōnārgāon, and most probably Tipperah. In this connection see also note 1, page 104 of the English translation of the Riāṣu-s-Salāṭīn, where the translator says, that he was inclined to agree with Professor Blochmann, that there were two Jānjagars, one in Orissa and another towards Tipperah.

1 The Riāṣu-s-Salāṭīn (text-edition, p. 96) says بتدوير تا حدود و بثارات pāsārī madhāī meṭīnī ḍhāna testimony tāhā bākshā Shaddād and hence Firūz Shāh's attention was directed to Bangālā and he attempted to reconquer it.

2 One MS. omits by mistake the word سال 1315 years.

3 One MS. has سلطان دیروز شاه while the other MS., and the lith. ed. leave out the word بن. The first MS. is correct. Sulṭān Firūz Shāh was the son of Sūpāh-šāhī Rajab, brother of Sulṭān Ghīyās-ud-dīn Tughluq.

Bhattasali (p. 25) cannot understand how the Tabakat gives a detailed diary (as he calls it) of the expedition, when neither Shams-i-Siraj Afīf nor Zia-Barni the two contemporary historians go into details of dates. The account of the expedition as given in the Tabaqāt is translated on pages 244, 245 of the first volume of this work. Zia 'Barni's Tarīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī is not before me; but it appears from note 3, pages 100, 101, of Maulavi Abduł-Salaḥī's translation of the Riāṣu-s-Salāṭīn, that Zia 'Barni gives a full account of the expedition, and all facts mentioned in the Tabaqāt are to be found in it.
Shams-ud-din took shelter in the fort of 1 Ekdāla, and 2 left the whole country of Bangāla unoccupied (i.e., unguarded).

When Sultān Firūz heard, that Sultān Shams-ud-din had fortified himself in Ekdāla, he advanced from the road towards that place. When he arrived in its neighbourhood, Sultān Shams-ud-din sallied out of the fort, and engaged in a regular battle, and many were slain on both sides. Sultān Shams-ud-din fled, and again took shelter in Ekdāla. The large elephants, which he had brought from Jājnagar, fell into the hands of Sultān Firūz Shāh's men.

As the rains had commenced, and there was heavy rain, Sultān Firūz Shāh returned on the 1st of Rabī’-ul-āwwal to Dehli. After that in the year 755 A.H. Sultān Shams-ud-din sent a large quantity of tribute, such as might be fit for the 3 Sultān with his ambassadors, as homage to Firūz Shāh, and prayed for pardon. Sultān Firūz Shāh also, behaving with kindness conferred robes of honour on the ambassadors; and granted them permission to 4 depart.

Again about the end of the 5 year 759 A.H., Sultān Shams-ud-din sent Malik Tāj-ud-din to Dehli with much tribute; and Sultān Firūz

---

1 As to the position of Ekdāla, see the excellent note 2 on page 100 of the English translation of the Riāżu-s-Salāthn. Zia 'Barni says: "It is the name of a mouza close to Pandua; on one side of it is a river and on another a jungle". Shams-i-Siraj calls it "The isles of Ekdalah". I may note here that the name is transliterated in the Cambridge History of India, page 263, as Ikdāla. No Indian will, however, pronounce the name with an initial I.

2 The Riāżu-s-Salāthn (p. 100), however, says that Sultān Shamsu-d-din left his son with an army in the fort of Panduah... The son, however, was soon taken prisoner. According to the Riāž also there was a great battle on the day Firūz Shāh arrived near Ekdāla, after which the siege was continued for twenty-two days.

3 One MS. inserts مجلس before سلقمين. Firishtah lith. ed. also has لاقب مجلس بادشاھ. An stray.

4 One MS. has انصراف by mistake for انصراف.

5 The Riāżu-s-Salāthn has 758 A.H. 759 A.H. appears to be incorrect. Bhattasali (pp. 41–45) enters into a long disquisition on the subject, and comes to the conclusion that Sultan Shamesuddin died about the end of Zul-hijjah 758. The Cambridge History of India, page 263, discusses the question as to whether or not Firūz acknowledged the independence of Sultān Shams-ud-din. It comes to the conclusion that Firūz Shāh had to return without obtaining a formal declaration of Shams-ud-din's homage. It also says that the tributes
Shâh treated the ambassador with greater kindness than before; and after some days, sent 'Arab and Turkî horses with other fine presents for Sultân Shams-ud-din, with Malik Sâif-ud-din, the superintendent of the elephants. Malik Sâif-ud-din and Malik Tâj-ud-din had not yet passed through Behâr, when Sultân Shams-ud-din died. Malik Sâif-ud-din \(^1\) gave the horses to the amirs of Behâr, in accordance with the emperor's order; and \(^2\) Malik Sâif-ud-din himself went back to Dehli.

The period of the rule of Sultân Shams-ud-din was sixteen years and some months.

\(^3\) An account of the rule of Sultân Sikandar Shâh, son of Sultân Shams-ud-din.

When Sultân Shams-ud-din \(^4\) departed (this life), the amirs and the chiefs of the different groups, on the third day after his death, sent by Shams-ud-din in 755 A.H., 1354 A.D. and 758 A.H., 1358 A.D. were merely the customary exchanges of presents; but it should be noted in both instances that the presents or tributes were sent from Bengâl. It appears to me that the relations between the two rulers remained undefiant; and I cannot find any evidence in support of the statement made in the Cambridge History of India (p. 263) that "In December, 1356, Firûz formally recognised the independence of Bengal".

\(^1\) The Riyâ'ī-s-Salātīn (text-edition, p. 99) says: در موس مولافق سهابي, i.e., in lieu of the pay due to the imperial soldiers stationed in Behâr.

\(^2\) Both MSS. have Malik Tâj-ud-din instead of Malik Sâif-ud-din. This is incorrect.

\(^3\) There are slight differences in the heading. It is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other MS. it is simply ذكر سکندر شاه. The lith. ed. has the same heading as the first MS., with the exception that it omits the word شاه after سلطان سکندر.

\(^4\) One MS. has زجلت نمود instead of زجلت نمود. The relations between the rulers of Dehli and Bengal at this time are extremely obscure. The Riyâ'ī-s-Salātīn, the Tabaqât and Firishtah all begin abruptly by saying that Sultan Sikander considered it extremely important to conciliate Firuz Shâh, without saying anything about the relations between Sultan Shams-ud-din and Firuz Shâh, after the latter's first expedition to Bengâl. According to the Tarikh-i-Firuz Shâh by Shams-Sirâj Affî, the object of the second expedition was to reinstate Zafar Khân on the throne of Sûnârgâon, but that work is also silent about the relations between Firuz Shâh and Sultan Shams-ud-din, just before the latter's death. According to Bhattasali (p. 44) after the experi-
placed his eldest son on the throne of empire, giving him the title of Sikandar Shāh. He proclaimed the gospel of justice and beneficence, ences of his first expedition to Lakhnaūtī, Firoz Shah was in no mood again to interfere in the internal affairs of Bengal; but he had to take cognisance of the complaint of Zafar Khan, who arrived in Delhi in 758 A.H., as he was the latter’s liege lord; but he was, at least according to Bhattasali, apparently afraid of Sulţān Shams-ud-dīn; and it was not till the news of the latter’s death had come to Delhi, that he finally made up his mind, and began to prepare for marching against the unsuspecting Sikandar. Bhattasali (p. 48) goes on to say that, according to the Riyāz and Firishta, Sikandar was ignorant of the motive of Fīrūz Shāh in thus hurrying towards Bengal, even when Firoz reached Zafarabad (near Jaumpur). I do not consider this latter statement correct. Even immediately after his accession Sikandar knew that it was extremely important for him to conciliate Fīrūz Shāh. This is expressly mentioned in the Riyāz and the Ṭabaqāt and by Firishta. As to Sikandar’s not knowing the motive of Fīrūz Shāh’s march towards Bengal (Fīrūz was certainly not hurrying, for taking the dates given by Bhattasali himself, he commenced his preparations in 759 A.H., started in Muharram 760 A.H., and arrived in Jaunpūr about Jamādī-ul-’hīdā’ 760 A.H., and halted there for six months, and the siege of Ekdāla did not commence till Zī qa‘dā 760, and did not end till Jamādī-ul-’āwwal 761 A.H. This snail-like march contrasts very unfavourably with the first expedition, in the course of which Fīrūz Shāh reached Ekdāla in three days less than five months after leaving Delhi) he must have been both very ignorant and very dense. It is not quite correct to say that the Riyāz and Firishta say that Sikandar was ignorant of Fīrūz Shāh’s motive, even when the latter arrived at Zafarābād. The former says that he was مترصد or anxious, but that does not mean that he was ignorant. Firishta does not even say this.

The Cambridge History of India, page 263, gives a different view of the matter. According to it, in December 1356 A.D., as already noted, Fīrūz formally recognised the independence of Bengal, but apparently he intended to treat this recognition as so much waste paper. He accordingly as soon as the news of the death of Shams-ud-dīn reached him, ordered the gifts to the latter to be distributed among the nobles of Bihār, and recalled Saif-ud-dīn to assist in the preparation for an invasion of Bengal. I do not know what the authority for this statement is. None of the chroniclers or historians say so. But though Fīrūz Shāh wanted to brush aside his declaration of December 1356 A.D., he was apparently unable to do so, without a pretext; and this was furnished by the arrival of Zafar Khan.

It is unnecessary to labour this point further. I consider that Fīrūz Shāh thought that he was entitled to reannex Bengal to the empire of Delhi, and he made a second attempt to do so.
and occupied himself with the duties of the sultān. Know that seeking the pleasure of the heart of Sultān Firuz Shāh was of the greatest importance, he sent fifty elephants and various stuffs in the way of tribute to Sultān Firuz Shāh. In the meanwhile, the latter had advanced towards Lakhnauti in the year 760 A.H. with the object of conquering Bangāla. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Pandūa, Sultān Sikandar following the example of his father, fortified himself in his citadel of Ekdāla. As he had not the strength to oppose him (i.e., Firuz Shāh), he agreed to pay an annual tribute and turned the Sultān back. The latter was yet in the neighbourhood of Pandūa, when Sikandar sent thirty-seven elephants and many valuable things and various kinds of stuff to the Sultān, and prayed for the pardon of his offences. Then following the example of his father, he passed the whole of his life in pleasure and enjoyment. The period of his rule

1 The Riyāzu-s-Salāṭin and Firishtah agree. Stewart (p. 85) also agrees, but he says that Emperor Feroze found out that there was no probability of his being able to capture Akdāla. Bhattachari (pp. 50, 51) says Sultan Firōz returned discomfited and says, that he and not Sultan Sikandar sought for peace. It appears, however, that proposals for peace were sent by Sikandar's ministers, who took their master's silence to imply his consent to their being sent; and Firōz's ministers received them with great joy, and had no difficulty in persuading their masters to listen to them. Firōz, however, stipulated for the restoration of Sonargaon to Zafar Khan, but the latter did not dare to resume sovereignty in the dangerous proximity of Sikandar.

The Cambridge History of India, page 264, practically agrees with the above.

2 The Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah are silent about some very important incidents of the life of Sikandar. The Riyāzu-s-Salāṭin (p. 105) mentions them. One of these is the erection of the Adina Mosque in Panduah, which is perhaps the finest and most remarkable religious edifice in Bengal. Unfortunately it remained unfinished at the time of his death.

The second is the rebellion of Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn, who afterwards succeeded him. It is said that Sikandar had two wives, one of whom had seventeen sons, while Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn was the only son of the other. The latter, in the words of the Riyāzu-s-Salāṭin (text-edition, pp. 101–104) was در حسن خلق و جميع إهجاء برهنه برادران فائق و در أمر سلطنت و جهانداري النسب و الالي which may be translated as superior to all his brothers in the beauty of his morals and in all (good) qualities, and the fittest and most meritorious in the arts of sovereignty. His step-mother, however, complained to the Sultān against him, and suggested that he should either be put into prison, or deprived of his
was 1 nine years and some months.

2 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN GHIYĀS-UD-DĪN.3

4 When Sultān Sikandar died, the amirs and the chiefs of the different groups of the people gave the title of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn sight. The Sultān reproved her, and put the government in Ghiyāshu-d-dīn’s hands. The latter was, however, afraid of his step-mother’s machinations; and one day on the pretext of hunting escaped to Sunārgān. He collected an army there, and the Sultān marched to meet him. A battle took place at Goālpāra, which appears to be near Jafarganj in the Dacca district, and nearly opposite to the junction of the Ganges and Jambuṇā or Jamunā. Ghiyāshu-d-dīn is said to have given strict orders that Sultān Sikandar should be taken alive, but as it was decreed otherwise he was mortally wounded. Ghiyāshu-d-dīn hastened to the place, and took his father’s head in his lap, and tears trickled down his cheeks. Sikandar then opened his eyes and said “My life’s work is over, the kingdom is welcome to thee”.

1 This is not correct. He actually reigned from 758 A.H., 1357 A.D., to 795 A.H., 1393 A.D., or for thirty-six or thirty-seven years. Bhattasali (p. 72) is inclined to place his death in October 1393 A.D.

2 The heading is as I have in the text in the MSS. The lith. ed. adds بین سلطان سکندر after Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn.

3 Unlike the Muhammadan historians the Cambridge History of India, page 264, calls this Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn A’zam, and later A’zam. It appears to follow Bhattasali, who, on page 78, calls him Ghiasuddin A’zam Shah, and a few lines further down A’zam Shah. It is true that the full name of the Sultān on his coins was Ghiyās-ud-dīn Abul Muẓaffar A’zam Shāh, but I see no reason for calling him by any name other than Ghiyās-ud-dīn.

4 The account of this reign is even briefer in Firishtah, and what there is, is copied almost verbatim from the Ṭabaqāt. Notwithstanding the praise of the author of the Riyaż, Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn’s first act was to get the eyes of his seventeen brothers dug out, and by a refinement of cruelty to send them to their mother.

He is more pleasantly remembered as the correspondent of the illustrious poet Hāfiz of Shīrāz. The correspondence is said to have commenced in the following way. He had a very serious illness and when he had no hope of recovery, he directed that three of his concubines who were named respectively, the surā (the cypress), the gūl (the rose), and the lāla (the tulip), should perform the last bathing ceremony. The other inmates of the harem used to taunt the surā and her companions by the name of گُلَاسُ (ghassāla or corpse washer).
to his son and seated him on the throne in the place of his father. He also following the rule of his father and the custom of his grandfather passed the whole of his life in pleasure and enjoyment; and in the year 775 A.H. passed away from the narrow place of the body to the wide spaces of the spirit.

The period of his rule was seven years and some months.

After his recovery, when he was in a jovial mood the Sultan recited the line:

سافئ حديث سرو وکل ولا مبوود

None of the court poets could make another line to match it; so the Sultan sent it to Hafiz by a special messenger. The latter quickly sent the second line.

ابن بخت با ناند عمال مبرود

He also sent a whole ghazal (ode) beginning with these lines. The Sultan sent him many valuable presents, and invited him to his court; but Hafiz could not come. The word ghassān also means a morning draught, so the double entendre is extremely witty (vide Cambridge History of India, pp. 264, 265, and Riyāż, p. 109).

Another anecdote also shows the Sultan in a pleasing light. He is said to have wounded the only son of a widow while practising with his bow and arrow. The widow went and complained to Qāḍī Siraj-ud-din. The latter summoned the Sultan to appear before him. The officer sent to serve the summons could not get admission into the palace; but he used the device of calling the odhān. The Sultan ordered the man who had made this untimely call to be brought before him. When the man was brought to him, he produced the summons. The Sultan at once went with him, taking a short sword under his arm. When he appeared before the Qāḍī, the latter told him to satisfy the widow. The Sultan did so, and when on the Qāḍī’s asking the widow, she stated that she was quite satisfied, the Qāḍī rose from his seat, and seated the Sultan on the masnad. The Sultan then eulogized the Qāḍī, but producing the sword; said that if he had found the Qāḍī afraid to administer justice he would have cut off his head with it. The Qāḍī then produced a scourage which he had kept concealed under his masnad; and said that if he had found the Sultan unwilling to satisfy the widow, he would have sacrificed his back with it. As the Cambridge History of India (p. 265) says, “Bengal can boast of a prince more law abiding than Henry of Monmouth, and of a judge at least as firm as Gascoigne”.

1 This also is incorrect. He actually reigned from 795 A.H., 1393 A.D., to 813 A.H., 1410 A.D., or for seventeen or eighteen years. The Riyāż (p. 111) gives seven years and some months as the period of his reign, but adds that according to another account it lasted for sixteen years, five months and three days.

2 According to the Riyāż, page 111, he was slain by deceit and treachery by Rāja Kāns who was a zemindar of the neighbourhood.
An account of Sultan-us-salāṭīn.

When Sultan Ghiyās-ud-din departed (from the world), the amīrs raised his son on the throne of the empire, giving him the title of Sultan-us-salāṭīn. He was a merciful and patient and brave ruler; and went away in the year 795 from the waste place of this world to the populous country of the next life.

He reigned for ten years.

An account of Sultan Shams-ud-din.

As Sultan-us-salāṭīn went from the house of this world to the house of the after life, the amīrs and the chief men of the State gave the

1 That is the heading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the Riyāż, p. 111, he is called Saif-ud-din, who had the title of Sultanu-s-salāṭīn.

2 The account of this reign in the Riyāż, pages 111, 112, agrees generally with the text, but it says that, according to one account, his reign lasted for three years, seven months and five days and not ten days. Firishtah also agrees, but says the amīrs and vazīrs were amazed, where is probably a mistake for theSharīf (opposition to the Shara); and the Rāys of the country around never drew their heads from the circle of his obedience, and never made any delay or objection in paying the proper revenue. Firishtah also says in one place that he carried on the government for ten years, but in another place he says the period of his rule was seven years and some months. Col. Briggs's account (vol. IV, p. 335) agrees with that in the text, and not with that in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. According to Bhattasali (page 90) Saifuddin was king only in name. The real power seems to have passed to Raja Ganesh. He also comes to the conclusion after considering his coins and the synchronisms of the Chinese Annals, that his reign lasted only for one year and some months in 813 A.H., and the whole of 814 A.H. (p. 98).

According to the Cambridge History of India, page 266, he is said to have peacefully succeeded his father, to have had an obscure reign, to have been defeated in 1404 by Ganesh but to have continued to reign till his death in 1406.

3 The heading is as I have it in the text in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is ذکر برسالطان السلاطین يعني سلطان شمس الدين. Firishtah also calls the son and successor of Saif-ud-din, Hamzā Shāh or Sultan-us-salāṭīn, Sultan Shams-ud-din II. In the heading in the Riyāż, p. 112, he is also called Sultan Shamsu-d-din, son of Sultanu-s-salāṭīn; but it is stated a few lines further down that Shamsu-d-din was not the son but the adopted son of Sultanu-s-salāṭīn; and his name was Shahhbu-d-din and not Shamsu-d-din. It goes on to say that Rajah Kaṇā attacked and slew him and assumed the name of Sultan. It appears to be uncertain, as far as our present information goes, as to what the actual political
title of Sultān Shams-ud-din to his son; and placed him on the 1 throne of the empire. He also following the custom of his ancestors passed his whole life in pleasure; and in the year 790 A.H., he passed away.

The period of his reign was three years and some months.

2 An account of Rāja Kāns.

When Sultān Shams-ud-din died, a zamindār of the name of Kāns acquired power and dominion over the country of Bangāla. As the just and holy God 3 was kind to his son, the latter became a Musalmān and sat on the throne.

situation in Bengal was at the time, i.e., between 813 and 810 A.H.; but it appears that Shamsu-d-din or Shahābu-d-din was only a king in name and the entire authority was vested on Raja Ganeš or Kāns of Bhaduria. He appears, according to Bhattasali (p. 99), to have been supported on the throne by the Raja as harmless, and not likely to interfere with his own authority, and also to keep down the legitimate Iliyas Shahis. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, says that Saif-ud-din Hamza Shāh was succeeded by Shams-ud-din, who was permitted to ascend the throne but exercised no power; and died after a reign of little more than three years. He was succeeded by another puppet Shihāb-ud-din Bāyāzīd. In the list of the kings of Bengal on page 695 the name of Shams-ud-din does not appear at all; but Shihāb-ud-din Bāyāzīd succeeded him in 815, and appears to have reigned for two years. The two accounts contradict each other. The account on page 266 appears to be incorrect. Shamsu-d-din and Shahābu-d-din, which are two names given in the Riyāz, page 112, to the same man, have been given to two men, one of whom did not exist at all. It may be mentioned, however, that Lane-Poole has both Shams-al-din and Shihāb-al-din in his list on page 307.

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have اورنگ. but the other MS. has اورنگ. راجه کانس. In the lith. ed. it is simply دکر حکومت کانس.

2 The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other MS. it is راجہ کانس.

3 The readings are slightly different. The reading in the MS. is not very clear, but appears to be شاواو را کفايت کود; the meaning of which is not at all clear. The lith. ed. has very distinctly پس لو را کفايت کود. the meaning of which is also obscure. کفايت کود means to suffice, to serve, to do, also to spare. The meaning of the reading in the MSS. may be "undid his wickedness"; and that of the reading in the lith. ed., "was kind to his son"; but I am not sure of either of these.

The Tabaqat gives no information of as to the events of the reign of the Kāns or Ganeš; and of his attitude towards the Musalmāns. The Riyāz, p. 113, says he persecuted them, and murdered many of them, including many
The period of the power of Kâns was seven years.

learned and holy men, such as Shaikh Badrul Islâm, son of Shaikh M’uînu-d-dîn ‘Abbas. Then the saintly Nûr Qutbu-l-‘Alam wrote to Sultân Ibrahim Sharqî to come and invade Bengâl, and save the Musalmans of the country from the persecution of this cruel and inhuman kafîr. Ibrahim Sharqî accordingly invaded Bengal, and encamped at Firuzpur (i.e., Pandua). Kâns then went to the saint, and begged him to intercede in his favour so that Sultân Ibrahim might go back. The saint refused to do so, unless he consented to accept Islam; but his wife refused to allow him to do so. Upon this he brought his son, Jadû, who was then twelve years of age, and said, I have now become too old and have little to do with this world; but I have brought my son, and offer him as a proselyte to Islam. Then the saint took some pâns which he was chewing out of his mouth and put it into the boy’s mouth; and made him recite the creed of Musalman faith. After that he persuaded Sultân Ibrahim, much against his will, to go back to Jaumpur; where he died shortly after this. After his death Kâns again commenced his persecution of the Musalmans. He also tried to make Jadû a Hindu again, by passing him through a golden image of a cow, portions of which were afterwards given to Brahmins. He commenced to persecute and kill the servants and relations of Nûr Qutbu-l-‘Alam himself. He even put the son of the saint, who was named Shaikh Anwar, to death; but he himself died at the very time when Shaikh Anwar became a martyr (pp. 113-116).

The account given by Firishtah is entirely different. According to it although Râja Kâns never became a Musalman, he mixed much with, and had great love for the followers of the faith, so much so, that many believed him to have become a Musalman, and wanted to bury his dead body.

The account in the Riyâ’î has been accepted by historians in preference to that of Firishtah. It appears from Bhattasali’s account (pp. 117-122) that it is substantially correct; the only serious mistake in it, being the statement that Ganesh or Kâns resumed sovereign power after the death of Sultan Ibrahim Sharqî. As a matter of fact Sultan Ibrahim Sharqî died long after the death of Raja Ganesh, which took place in 821 A.H., 1418 A.D., which is the last coin of Danujamarddana Deva (title assumed by Ganesh after his second accession); and also of Mahendra Deva’s coins from Pandua and Chittagong. Mahendra Deva was the title assumed by Jadû or Jalaluddin, after his second accession, after the death of his father, and before his second conversion to Islam. Sultan Ibrahim Sharqî died in 840 A.H., 1436 A.D. It would appear that Ganesh resumed his power after the death of Nur-Kutab ‘Alam, when he began his second persecution of the Musalmans, and banished and afterwards put to death Nur-Kutab ‘Alam’s son Shaikh Anwar. After this he assumed the title of Danujamarddana Deva; and coins were struck by him in 829 A.H., in Chittagong, Sonargaon and Pandua, and in 821 A.H., in Pandua have been
1 An account of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn, son of Kāns.

As Kāns went to his original abode (i.e., I suppose hell), his 2 son, owing to his love of rule became a Musalmān, and assumed the name of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn. The people were contented and happy during his time; and at the end of the year 812 3 A.H. he passed away.

The period of his reign was seventeen years.

found. Coins of Mahendra Deva bearing the date 821 A.H., and struck at Pandua and Chittagong have also been found.

The Cambridge History of India (pp. 266, 267) agrees generally with Bhattasali; but it does not mention Danujamaruddāna Dēva or Mahendra Deva; and according to it Ganesh died in 817 A.H., 1414 A.D.; and Jadū or Jalāl-ud-dīn succeeded him in that year.

1 There are slight differences in the heading. The heading in the text is that in the lith. ed. One MS. has the same heading up to بن bin, but has left out the word Kāns by mistake. The other MS. has simply an account of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn.

2 Both MSS. omit the word بس- after بن bin. The lith. ed. has نين عشر و نامائی. Both are incorrect. He died in 834 or 835 A.H. Some account of him has been given in note 2, page 859 of the type-script. The Ṭabaqāt says: the people were contented and happy in his reign. The Riyāz, p. 118, gives a different account. According to it he converted many infidels to Islam, and forced the Brahmans who had partaken of portions of the golden image of the cow to eat beef. He became a disciple of Shaikh Zāhid, grandson of Nūr Qutbi, ‘Alam, and nephew of Shaikh Anwar. It is also said, of course, that people were happy and contented; and the population of Panduah became very large; and he erected a mosque, etc., in Gaur; and the re-population of Gaur commenced in his time.

Firishtah’s account is different. He gives him the name of Jaimal and says that he offered to abdicate in favour of his younger brother, if the chief men of the country objected to him, on the ground of his being a Musalmān; but they in an extremely tolerant way said, that religion did not in any way affect worldly affairs. According to Firishtah also he became the Nūshirwān of the age, i.e., the ideally just ruler.

Bhattasali (p. 112) says he became zealous Muhammadan, converted many to the Musalman Faith, recalled Shaikh Zahid from Sonargaon and showed him every respect. He also quotes Firishtah’s account; and it appears that the copy of Firishta from which he quoted gives Jeetmal as his Hindu name.

The Cambridge History of India, page 267, says: “He persecuted the Hindus, as his father had persecuted the Muslims.......and hosts of
1 An account of Sultān Ahmad, son of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn.

As the inevitable happened to Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn, the amirs Hindus are said to have been forcibly converted to Islam”. It also considers it probable that the present “numerical superiority of Muslims in Eastern Bengal is due to an immense wave of proselytisation, (which) must have swept over the country, and it is most probable that the period was the reign of Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad”.

It appears to me, however, that the numerical superiority of the Musalmāns in Eastern Bengal exists chiefly among Musalmāns of the lower classes; and low caste Hindūs (many of whom were untouchables) did not require much persuasion or persecution to accept a religion, according to which they might claim equality with the best.

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. Ahmad Shāh is substituted for Sultān Ahmad. As to the events of this reign Firishtah copies the Ṭabaqāt word for word, but unfortunately adds a few words of his own, which are totally opposed to the facts as given by the Riyāż. These words are: او لونیز نوری بدر بزرگورا نمونه بدارود دهدی کوشیده خالیق بسیار را بر کی انگم و احسان گردانید. Stewart (p. 96) agrees with Firishtah as to the impartial administration of justice by Ahmed Shah; and adds that both “the followers of Mohammed and the worshippers of idols vied in their attachment to his person”. He also says that during his reign Sultan Ibrahim of Joanpore invaded Bengal, and plundered several districts, and carried away many of the inhabitants as slaves. Ahmed Shah unable to contend with him sent an ambassador to Shah Rookh, the son of Timour at Herat. The latter wrote a letter to Sultan Ibrahim, threatening exemplary vengeance, if he did not immediately release the captives, and again molested the King of Bengal. After that Sultan Ibrahim never again invaded Bengal. An extract from Shah Rookh’s letter is given by Stewart, who says the letter is taken from Firishtah and adds that the circumstances of the embassy are also confirmed in the “Mutuli Assaeidine”, a very eloquent Persian history of Shah Rookh.

There is no mention of the letter in Firishtah lith. ed.; or in Col. Briggs’s history; and no mention of this invasion of Bengal by Sultān Ibrāhīm, in any other history.

The Riyāż, pages 118, 119, gives a very different account of Ahmad Shāh. He was very harsh tempered, tyrannical and blood-thirsty, and shed unrighteous blood; and used to cut open the bodies of pregnant women. When his barbarities reached an extreme point, two of his slaves Shādi Khān and Nāṣir Khān, who had attained to the rank of nobility, conspired together, and brought about his death.

Bhattasali’s account terminates with the history of Jalaluddin.

The Cambridge History of India says little is known of his reign, and then mentions the aggressions of Ibrāhīm Sharqī, and the remonstrance of Shāh-
bestowed the title of Sultān Ahmad on his son and made him the successor of his father. In the end of the year 830 A.H., he sought release from bodily restraints and joined the spiritual existence. The period of his reign was sixteen years.

4 An Account of Nāṣir the Slave.

5 When the throne of sovereignty remained unoccupied after the death of Sultān Ahmad, son of Jalāl-ud-din, a slave of his named Nāṣir placed his foot with great audacity on the throne of the empire, and commenced to issue all orders. The amirs and Malik of Sultān Ahmad put him to death; and raised one of the grandsons of Sultān Shams-ud-din Bhangara to be the ruler.

The period of his rule was seven days, and, according to another account, half a day.

6 An Account of Nāṣir Shah.

When Nāṣir Ghulām (the slave) was put to death, they found out one of the descendants of Sultān Shams-ud-din Bhangara, and placing him on the throne of the empire gave him the title of Nāṣir

rukh; and goes on to say that towards the end of his reign his tyranny, became unbearable; and he was put to death by Shādi Khān and Nāṣir Khān. Nāṣir Khān forestalled his fellow conspirator, and put him to death and assumed the sovereignty of Bengal (p. 267).

1 One MS. has قرار, by mistake, for خطاب.

2 Both MSS. have واخردن شنة; while the lith. ed. has دبر الرشنة. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed.

3 One MS. has خلاص, the other omits the word by mistake; while the lith. ed. has خلاص. I have accepted خلاص.

4 The reading in one MS. is as I have it in the text. In the other MS. Nāṣir-ud-din is substituted for Nāṣir. The lith. ed. has ذكر حكومت ناصر الدين an account of the rule of Nāṣir-ud-din.

5 The Riyās, Firishtah, Col. Briggs and Stewart all agree generally. The Cambridge History of India, page 267, contrary to all the other authorities, makes Nāṣir the slave and Nāṣir-ud-din Mahmūd one and the same person. Lane-Poole (p. 308) also has Nāṣir-al-din Mahmūd Shāh II, who was apparently the slave, and also the first Sultān of the house of Ilīgās (restored) apparently as one and the same person.

6 The heading in the text is the heading in both MSS. The lith. ed. inserts the word حكومت, rule, before Nāṣir Shāh.

7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have دادرنه, but the other MS. has دالية.
Shāh. All classes of men, common and noble, and great and small were happy and contented in the cradle of peace and safety. And in the end, in the year 862 A.H., he passed away.

The period of his reign was two years.

2 An account of Bārbak Shāh.

When Nāsīr Shāh died, the amīrs and the great men of the country seated Bārbak Shāh on the throne of sovereignty. In his time the residents of the city and the soldiery were in a state of contentment. He also passed his time in pleasure and enjoyment. When the period of his life and the days of his existence came to an end, in the year 879 A.H., he passed away.

1 Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. have two years. This is manifestly incorrect. The period from 830 A.H., the year of the death of Sultān Aḥmad to 862 A.H., the year of Nāsīr Shāh’s death is thirty-two years. The دو in the text is a mistake for سی و دو or 32. The accounts of this reign, as given in the Rīyāz and by Firishtah, Col. Briggs and Stewart generally agree with the text. The Rīyāz, page 120, adds that he erected some of the buildings, and the fort of Gaur. As to the length of his reign, he says that it was thirty-two years, but according to others did not exceed twenty-seven years. Stewart (p. 100) also says that he constructed the fortification round the city of Gour.

As to the Cambridge History of India, see note on page 416. According to it the period of his reign was seventeen years from 846 to 864 A.H., 1442 to 1460 A.D.

2 The heading in both MSS. is as I have in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word sultānāt before Bārbak Shāh. The Rīyāz (text-edition, p. 118) agrees generally as to the account of this reign, but adds مرد دانشمند ومتشريع يود. It appears from a note on page 120 of Salam’s translation of the Rīyāz that his full name was Ruknu-d-din Abūl Muhāhid Bārbak Shāh, that he reigned from 864 A.H., and that before that he was governor of south-west Bengal in 860 A.H. Firishtah copies the Ṭabaqāt as regards the early part of the account, but adds that he was the first sovereign of India who employed Abyssinians and raised them to high rank. Neither the Cambridge History of India nor Stewart has anything new about him; but both mention his employment of the Abyssinians. The Cambridge History of India (p. 288) says he reigned from 1459 to 1474 A.D., or for fifteen years.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have رحلت لمود; but the other MS. has شروط در مرحله پیمانی عالم نیستی کرد. This MS. is very imperfect here. The words quoted are taken from the latter part of the accounts of the reign of Yūsuf Shāh, the next Sultān, the earlier part of the account of whose reign is altogether omitted in it.
The period of his reign was \(^1\) seventeen years.

\(^2\) An account of Yūsuf Shāh.

After the death of Bārbak Shāh, the amīrs and the well-known men of the kingdom placed Yūsuf Shāh on the throne of government. He was a patient būdshāh and a well-wisher of his subjects, and of a virtuous disposition. He began to measure the stages to the world of non-existence (i.e., died) in the year 887 A.H.

The period of his sovereignty was seven years and six months.

\(^3\) An account of Sikandar Shāh.

\(^4\) After the death of Yūsuf Shāh, \(^5\) the amīrs and vazīrs placed

\(^1\) One MS. has ten years. The other has هفت سال و شش (omitting the word سال) which was the period of the reign of Yūsuf Shāh. The lith. ed. has seventeen years which is correct and which I have adopted.

\(^2\) One MS. omits the heading and the first part of the account of this reign, and joins the latter part on to the account of the reign of Bārbak Shāh. See note on page 416. The other MSs. have the heading which I have in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word حکومت before Yūsuf Shāh.

The account of this reign in the Ṭabaqāt appears to be copied from the Riyāz (text-edition, p. 119) which adds the virtues of being صاحب علم و رياضت, i.e., learned and abstemious, to those mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt, and explains خبر خواهد by adding the word خبر. His full name appears to have been Shams-ud-dīn Abul Muṣaffar Yūsuf Shāh; and he appears to have reigned from 870 A.H. According to Firishtah he was very strict in the observance of the law of the Prophet. Stewart (p. 101) says he was very strict about the administration of justice, and enjoined on all judges to act with the strictest impartiality. The Cambridge History of India (p. 268) calls him "a precision".

\(^3\) The heading in the MS. is as I have in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word sulṭanat before the name of Sikandar Shāh. The Riyāz (p. 121) calls Sikandar the son of Yūsuf Shāh but the other historians, except the Cambridge History of India (p. 268) which also says that he was Yūsuf's son, do not say so. Stewart (p. 101) says that Yusuf Shāh died without children, so the nobles raised a youth of the royal family to the throne. The Riyāz (p. 121) says that he was deposed on the very day on which he was placed on the throne. The Alln-Akbari gives him half a day. Firishtah mentions no period; and Stewart (p. 101) gives him two months.

\(^4\) One MS. and the lith. ed. have بعد از وفات. The other MS. omits the word ب."ال"

\(^5\) There are differences in the readings. One MS. has امرار و وزرايي تعمق نظر This I have adopted. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has the same
Sikandar Shāh on the throne of the empire without careful enquiries. As he did not possess the qualifications or the right of being invested with this high office, they removed him from it, and raised Fatḥ Shāh to the chieftainship.

The period of Sikandar Shāh’s reign was two and a half days.

4 An account of Fatḥ Shāh.

After the deposition of Sikandar Shāh, the amirs and the great men raised Fatḥ Shāh to the chieftainship and placed him on the throne of the empire. He was intelligent and wise; and placing the usages of ancient rulers and Sultāns in the forefront of his spirit, distributed the word. The other MS. has ˈaˈrmaː ˈwuzrābī ˈbədərəˈɾaˈɾa bədaʃənd. The lith. ed. has ˈaˈrmaː ˈwuzrābī ˈtamun ˈnəɾm. Word

1 Here again the readings are different. One MS. has قوین اسْتَحْقَاق نُقْلَد لابین عمَر ُخُطْيَر نُداَسَت which is manifestly incorrect, for عمَر. The other MS. omits the word استحِقَاق and substitutes عمَر for أُمر. The lith. ed. omits the word نُقْلَد. and has استحِقَاق

2 One MS. has by mistake بسرداری برداری برداشند.

3 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has نَمِّم رُوُز; half a day, in the text-edition.

4 Here again the heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text; but the lith. ed. inserts the word salānāt before the name of Fatḥ Shāh.

The Riyaż (p. 119) says he was another son of Yūsuf Shāh. Otherwise the Tabaqāt agrees with it. His full name was Jalāl-ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Fatḥ Shāh. He is said to have reigned from 887 to 896 A.H., but his coins and inscriptions show that he was already reigning in 886 A.H. Some of the coins of 886 were struck at Faridpur (now Faridpur town) which was named after him.

Firishtah says that Fatḥ Shāh punished with the scourge of justice the eunuchs and Ḥabshi slaves, who had become powerful and violent. So they went to the chief eunuch called the Sultān Shāhzhāda Bangālī, who was in charge of all the men who attended by turna (مرَدُم نوَتى); and also had the keys of all the palaces. It so happened that the eunuch Khān Jahān, the razīr and Malik Andil Ḥabshi, the Amīr-ul-umamā, were engaged in punishing the Rāys of the frontier, with a picked body of the army; so Sultān Shāhzhāda could carry out his nefarious purpose with impunity.

The Cambridge History of India, page 268, contrary to the Riyaż, says that Fath Shāh was a great uncle of Sikandar, and a son of Mahmūd which I suppose means Naṣīr-ul-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh.
favours to everyone in accordance with his condition and rank. In his time the doors of pleasure and enjoyment remained open in the faces of the people.

As there was a custom in the country of Bangālah, that five thousand paiks attended every night for watch and ward, and early in the morning, the bādshāḥ came out, and sat on the throne for a moment, and took their salute, and gave them permission to go away, when another body of paiks came into attendance.

On one occasion, the chief eunuch of Fah Shāh tempted the paiks with money and they slew the Sultān. Early the next morning the eunuch himself sat on the throne, and took the salute of the paiks. This event occurred in the year 896 A.H.

The period of the rule of Fah Shāh was seven years and five months.

They say that during some years, there was such a custom in Bangālah, that whoever slew a ruler, and sat on the throne, everyone became submissive and obedient to him.

1 An account of Bārbak Shāh.

As the wretched Khwājah Sarāf after murdering his master took the title of bādshāh, all the eunuchs, wherever they were, collected

---

1 The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word حکومت before Bārbak Shāh.

The Riyāq (p. 121) agrees generally, but says the eunuch styled himself Sultān Shāhzhāda. It goes on to say that he tried to destroy the powerful nobles. The most powerful of them, the Abyssinian Malik Andil, who was at the frontier wanted to come to the capital. Barbak also wanted to bring him there so that he might, by fraud and deceit, put him into prison. He therefore summoned him; and on Malik Andil’s coming made him swear on the Qurān that he would not injure him in any way. Malik Andil took the oath, with the reservation that he would not do so as long as Bārbak was on the throne. He then schemed to avenge the murder of his benefactor. He got into the palace, and found the eunuch asleep on the throne. On account of his oath he was unable to kill him; but the eunuch who was drunk rolled down. Malik Andil drew his sword, but was unable to kill the eunuch. After this there was a Homeric struggle between the two in the dark. In the end Malik Andil got others to join in the attack and the eunuch was killed.

Malik Andil then summoned the qādir and a council was held to select a suitable person to succeed to the throne. Fah Shāh had left a son who was
together round him; and he allured mean and low spirited men with wealth, and, strengthening their allegiance with false promises, assembled them round him. His pomp and strength increased day by day; but in the end the great amirs who had many retainers joined together; and on one occasion having united the paiks with themselves, slew him.

The period of his reign was two and a half months.

4 An account of Firuz Shâh.

When the eunuch who had the title of Bârbak Shâh was killed, the amirs and the well-known men raised Firuz Shâh to the chieftainship; and went to the widow of Fath Shâh. She said she had made a vow that the throne should belong to the person who should slay her husband’s murderer. Malik Andil at first declined to accept the crown, but was finally persuaded to do so (pp. 122-124).

Firishtah and Stewart and the Cambridge History of India follow the Riyâz generally; but the Cambridge History of India (p. 269), contrary to all the others, calls Malik Andil Indil Khân; I do not know the authority for doing so. He was certainly not a Khân but was a Malik. As to Andil or Indil, I know no Persian or Arabic word like either. There is a colloquial Bengali word Andil, which means much; but I do not know whether it has any connection with the name. In any case I prefer to follow the older historians, instead of accepting the new spelling.

1 One MS. has مسلم instead of منصر by mistake.

2 There are differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have اتفاق نموده نبیتی گروه باکتریا. The lith. ed. however has by mistake the word گروه کرده, which I have struck out. The other MS. has اتفاق نموده و موانع. The latter reading appears to be somewhat better, but as the other MS. and the lith. ed. both give the other, I have adopted it, with the slight correction I have mentioned. M. Hidayat Hosain has followed the second MS. in the text-edition.

3 M. Hidayat Hosain has دو ماة نيم روز or two months and half a day as the period of his reign in the text-edition.

4 The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word saltunat before the name Firuz Shâh.

The Tabaqat does not say that it was Malik Andil who assumed the title of Firuz Shâh.

It appears from the Riyâz (p. 125) that he took up his residence in Gaur, where he erected a mosque, a tower and a reservoir. He had done great deeds
ship. He was a merciful and benevolent king. When the number of
the days of his life were folded up (i.e., finished), he passed away by
natural death in the year 899 A.H. But another statement is that
the pāik watchmen killed him.

The period of his rule was three years.

1 An Account of Mahmūd Shāh.

When Firūz Shāh passed away, the amirs and the great men placed
his son on the throne of the empire, giving him the title of Sultān
Maḥmūd Shāh. He was a bādshāh endowed with the moral qualities of
the great.

as a general and an administrator; and he was respected and feared when he
ascended the throne. He was a just and efficient ruler, but his great fault
was his prodigality, and he lavished the treasures accumulated by the former
Sultāns on beggars and mendicants. As to his death, the Riyāż (p. 125) says
that the statement that he was killed by the pāiks appears to be more correct
than that he died a natural death. His full name appears from his coins to have
been Saifu-d-din Abul Muzaffar Firuz Shāh. His coins show that he reigned
from 893 A.H., to 895 A.H., and not during the three years ending in 897 A.H.,
as stated in the histories (p. 124).

Firashṭah and Stewart mention no new facts about him. According to the
Cambridge History of India, page 696, he reigned from 891 to 894 A.H.

1 The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. In the lith. ed. it is

The full name of Sultān Maḥmūd appears to have been Nāṣir-ud-din Abul
Muzaffar Maḥmūd Shāh. According to the Riyāż (p. 126) he was only a
Sultān in name. During the early months of his brief reign, an Abyssinian of
the name of Habah Khan usurped all the authority. The Sidi Badr Diwāna,
another Abyssinian, slew Habah Khan, and became the de facto ruler. After
some time, he got the sardārs of the pāiks to join him; and one night slew
Maḥmūd Shāh; and with the concurrence of the amirs and the officers of the
court, proclaimed himself Sultān under the title of Muzaffar Shāh.

The Riyāż (p. 126) also says, that according to the history of Haji
Muhammad Qandahari, Maḥmūd Shāh was the son of Fath Shāh, and not of
Malik Andil or Firūz Shāh. He had been brought up by Jashn Khan, a slave
of Bārbag Shāh, under the orders of Firuz Shāh; and after the latter’s death was
placed on the throne. The name Jashn Khan appears to be a copyist’s mistake
for Habah Khan.

Firashṭah agrees generally with the Riyāż. He gives the name of the slave
who brought Sultān Maḥmūd up as Habah Khan and not Jashn Khan.
A slave of the name of Saiyidi Muẓaffar Ḥabshi having got the sardārs and the paiks to combine with him, made Maḥmūd Shāh a martyr one night; and early the next morning ascended the throne of the empire, giving himself the title of Muẓaffar Shāh.

The period of the reign of Maḥmūd Shāh was one year.

1 An account of Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshi.

When Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshi took the place of the great by force and violence, darkness spread over the world. He was an audacious

---

1 I have adopted the reading in the lith. ed. Those in the MSS. are very imperfect. One has only Muẓaffar Shāh, and the other ٌذَكَرُ مَظْفَرُ حَبْشِي. His name according to his inscriptions and coins was Alau-d-din Abul Muẓaffar Shāh (Salam’s translation of Riāż, p. 128, note 2). From his coins it appears that he reigned from 896 to 899 A.H., i.e., from 1491 to 1494 A.H.

According to the Riāż (p. 127) Muẓaffar ascended the throne at Gaur. He was extremely audacious and blood-thirsty; and put many learned and pious men and nobles and the Rajahs to death. He appointed Syed Husain a Sharif of Meccca (who is called one of Muẓaffar’s sipāḥīs in the Ṭabaqāt) to be his minister, and made over to him all powers. Afterwards he added avarice to his other iniquities; and according to the advice of Syed Husain, he reduced the wages of his cavalry and infantry men; and also collected the revenue with great harshness. Then the great amīrs rebelled against him; and he shut himself up in the fort of Gaur. The siege lasted for four months; and Muẓaffar is said to have slain four thousand men, who had been seized and brought to him from time to time with his own hand. Then he came out of the fort, and a drawn battle took place between his men and the amīrs now headed by Syed Husain. The latter were victorious and Muẓaffar was slain. It is also stated, that according to Haji Muhammad Qandahari, one hundred and twenty thousand men, Musalmān and Hindūs were slain during this civil war. The Riāż (p. 128) then quotes from Ṭabaqāt, what is stated in the latter about the manner in which Muẓaffar was slain.

Firishtah and Stewart give no further information. The Cambridge History of India, page 270, calls the minister, who according to the Riāż was called Syed Husain, Sharif Māki, Saiyid ʿAlā-ud-din Husain, who belonged to a family which came from Tarmūz on the Oxus; and it also states that this man probably restrained Muẓaffar’s violence, while according to the Riāż and Firishtah the reduction in the pay of the soldiers, which was one of the causes of the rebellion, took place at his instance. It appears from what is stated in the account of the reign of Sultān ʿAlau-d-din, in the Riāż that the name of Sultān ʿAlau-d-din before his accession was Syed Husain Sharif Mākki, that his father Syed Ashrafal-Ḥusainī was probably Sherif of Meccca, but the family
and blood-thirsty man. He raised many learned and pious men to
the rank of martyrdom. In the end one of his soldiers, of the name of
‘Alā-ud-dīn, having made the sardārs and the paiks friendly and in
league with him, entered the seraglio one night with thirteen paiks,
and slew him. Early the next morning, he sat on the throne and gave
himself the title of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn.

The period of the reign of Muẓaffar Šāh Ḥabshi was three years
and five months.

1 An Account of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn.

Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn 2 was an intelligent and able man and was
a soldier. He showed favour to the amirs of old lineage; and he also
came from Tarmūz or Tarmāj in Tukostān. Sayyid Ḥusain and his brother
Sayyid Yūsuf came with their father to Bengal; and settled in Chandpur in
Raḍha, of western Bengal. According to Blochmann, however, this Chāndpūr
was really situated near ‘Alāipūr in the present district of Khūla. It appears
also that although Sayyid Husain adopted the title of ‘Alāuddīn Abul Muẓaffar
Husain Šāh, he was universally known as Husain Šāh; and that name is found
on various inscriptions on the edifices in Gaūr; and according to Blochmann
(J.A.S.B. for 1873, page 291) "the name of ‘Husain Šāh the good’ is still
remembered from the frontiers of Orissa to the Brahmaputra". The statement
in the Cambridge History of India (p. 270) about the original name of ‘Alā-ud-dīn
Husain Šāh being Sayyid ‘Alā-ud-dīn Husain appears to be incorrect.

1 The heading in one MS. and the lith. ed. is ذکر سلطان علاء الدين; in the
other it is only سلطان علاء الدين; I have retained the former.

2 The lith. ed. has the word یکن before Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn; but as both MSS.
omit it, I have also omitted it. The account of his reign in the Ţabaqāt is very
imperfect. According to the Riyāz (pp. 129–136), although he became a good
and great Sultān, his conduct does not appear to have been quite straightforward
before his accession. Although he was in the service of Sultān Muẓaffar he
always spoke to everyone of the latter's meanness and avarice. In this way
his own virtues and the vices of his master became known to everybody; so
when Muẓaffar was killed, the chiefs and the people readily consented to
his becoming his successor. Then the way in which he rewarded the people,
who raised him to the throne, was extremely objectionable. He allowed them
to plunder and ravage the city of Gaūr. Some days after his accession, he
ordered the men to cease plundering, and when they did not do so, he had
twelve thousand of them put to death. As a result of searching the houses
of the wealthy he collected much wealth including thirteen hundred golden
dishes.
raised his own special servants to high ranks and eminent positions. He removed the paiks from the duty of watch and ward, so that no injury might be caused to him by them. He summoned learned, great and pious men from different parts of the kingdom, and showed kindness to them. He made very great efforts and exertions for enriching and improving the condition of the country; and he allotted many villages for defraying the expenses of the alms houses, attached to the tomb of that leader of the wayfarers (in the path of the law), Shaikh Nūr Qūṭb ʿĀlam, may his soul be sanctified! He came every year from Ekdāla, which was the seat of his government to Pandūḥah, with the object of circumambulating the tomb, which was the recipient of illumination, of Shaikh Nūr.

Owing to the auspiciousness of his laudable morals, and pleasing virtues he performed the duties of sovereignty for long years; and all his life was passed in pleasure and enjoyment. And in the end in the year 929 A.H., he passed away by death from natural causes. The period of his reign was twenty-seven years and some months.

His evil deeds ceased after this. He removed the paiks from the work of watch and ward; and banished all the Habshis; and he employed Syeds, Mughals and Afghans in position of trust. He subjugated the Rajas of the country, and having conquered as far as Orissa levied tribute from the rulers of that country. He then invaded Assam; and conquered that country as far as Kāmrūp and Kāmtah (Kāmakahā (?)). He left his son there with a large army, and returned to Bengal. Afterwards when the rains commenced, the Rajas, who had fled to the mountains, returned; and his army was defeated, and his son was slain.

The Riyāṣ then mentions his charities and his religious endowments.

In the year 900 A.H., Sultān Ḥusain Sharqī on being defeated by Sikandar Lodi took refuge in Kahlgāon (Colgong), where he was received with honour and where he passed his remaining years.

Sultān ‘Alau-d-din died of natural causes in 927 A.H. The period of his reign was, according to different authorities, twenty-seven years, twenty-four years and twenty-nine years and five months. He had fourteen sons and one of them, Naṣrat Shāh, succeeded him.

Firshāth does not mention any fresh fact. Stewart (p. 110) says that Ala Addeen Hussein Shah came from the sandy deserts of Arabia to the fertile region of Bengal.

The Cambridge History of India also adds nothing to what is stated in the Riyāṣ. According to it his reign lasted for twenty-five years (p. 272). The words و و سباهی and a soldier, are omitted in the text-edition.
The Sultāns of Bangāla

1 An account of Naṣīb Shāh.

When Sultan 'Alā-ud-din passed away, the amirs and the great men of the time raised Naṣīb Shāh from amongst his eighteen sons to the chieftainship (i.e., to be the Sultān). He, trusting his brothers, conferred on each one of them, double of what their father had bestowed on them.

And when, in the year 932 A.H., His Majesty Firdūs Makāni Zahir-ud-din Muḥammad Bābar Bādshāh, having slain Sultān Ibrāhīm Lūdi, son of Sultān Sikandar Lūdi, took possession of the country of Dehli, the amirs and the heads of the various groups of Afgāns fled and came as suppliants to Naṣīb Shāh. After some days, Sultān Maḥmūd, brother of Sultān Ibrāhīm also came to him, as a suppliant. Naṣīb Shāh bestowed on all of them ǰāgīrs, as far as possible and depending on the exigencies of the time. He also prayed for the hand of the daughter of Sultān Ibrāhīm for himself.

In the year 939 A.H. he sent by the hand of the eunuch Malik Marjān to Sultān Bahādur Gujrātī, fine and beautiful presents, in

---

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. The lith. ed. has ذکر سلطنت نصب شاه, an account of the reign of Naṣīb Shāh. Both headings are incorrect. It appears that the correct name of the eldest son of 'Alā-ud-din Ḥusain Shah was Naṣīb Khān; and he assumed the title of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din Abul Muẓaffar Naṣrāt Shāh. The Riyāq, however, says that his name or title was Naṣrāt Shāh; and he was commonly known as Naṣīb Shāh.

2 The name is Nāṣir Shāh in one MS. and in the lith. ed. and Naṣīb Shāh in the other MS. I have adopted Naṣīb Shāh.

3 This was quite unusual for the age. The Riyāq (text, p. 136) says تَوَبرَت قَارْيَة كَمَا أَرَى بَيْنِيْهَا أَمَّةً اِبْنُ بَرَاءَ الَّذِيْنَ زَوَّرُوا نَعْمَهَا بتَحْكُمَ الْأَمْرِ نَشْرَتْ فَوْضَّحَهَا مَا كَانَ، which appears to me to be better than the other readings, and I have retained it.

4 The readings in the MSS. are و سوام گروه انگان و سوام گروه و انگان and and. The lith. ed. has و سوام گروه انگان, which appears to me to be better than the other readings, and I have retained it.

5 Here both the MSS. have نصب شاه, but the other MS. has باور ملتچئش شد.

6 As was usual under the circumstances he married her.

7 The reason of this embassy to Sultān Bahādur Shāh of Gujrāt which was sent in 939 A.H., is said in the Riyāq (pp. 137, 138) to have been a report that Humāyūn after his accession intended to conquer Bengal.
order to secure relation, attachment and friendship. Malik Marjān waited on Sultān Bahādur in the fort of Mandū and was honoured by the gift of a special robe of 1 honour. No account of the Bengālis has after this come under my eyes. Nasīb Shāh ruled for a period of eleven years. After him, Bangālah came within a short time into the possession of Shēr Khān. When His Majesty Jinnat Ashiānī came into Bangālah, in pursuit of Shēr Khān, Jahāngīr Quli Bēg ruled (the country) on behalf of him. Afterwards Shēr Khān slew Jahāngīr Quli Bēg, and took possession of the country, as has been mentioned in its place. Then Muḥammad Khān, one of the amīrs of Salīm Khān, son of Shēr Khān, governed the country for a time. After him, his son gave himself the title of Sultān Bahādur, and raised the standard of rule. The government of Bangālah and Behār was then held by Sulaimān Kararānī, one of the amīrs of Salīm Khān. He ruled independently for a period of 2 nine years, and also took possession of the

1 Niẓām-ud-dīn gives no account of the death of Nasīb Shāh. It appears from the Riyāż and other histories, that contrary to the mildness which he had shown in the beginning of his reign, he now indulged in evil deeds, and committed acts of oppression; so the eumuchs, one of whom he had threatened with punishment, combined together and killed him in the year 943 A.H. The period of his reign is variously given. The Riyāż (p. 138) says that he reigned for sixteen years, but according to some thirteen years, or less than that. Firishtah gives him sixteen years from 927 to 943 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 350–352) says he reigned from 930 A.H., 1523 A.D., to 945 A.H., 1538 A.D. i.e., for about fifteen years; but he says also that he had a reign of eighteen years. According to Stewart (pp. 114–117) he reigned for thirteen years 1521 A.D. to 1533-34 A.D. Lane-Poole (p. 308) gives him fourteen years from 925 A.H., 1518 A.D., to 939 A.H., 1532 A.D., and the Cambridge History of India (p. 696) fifteen years from 1518 to 1533 A.D.

2 There are differences as to the period of Sulaimān Kararānī’s rule. One MS. has seven years; the other has the word sāl, year without any number. The lith. ed. has one year. There is much diversity also in the other histories as to the period of his rule. The Riyāż (p. 153) says he ruled independently for sixteen years, and died in 981 A.H. Firishtah says he had the Khubā read in his own name, but called himself Ḥadrat A’lād, and sent presents to Akbar from time to time; and after reigning for about twenty-five years died in 981 A.H. Stewart (pp. 149, 150) says he reigned from 972 when he came from Behar to Bengal till his death in 981 A.H., affecting to hold his kingdom under Akbar. In the Cambridge History of India, the name of Sulaimān does not appear in the Index at all but in the list of the Kings of Bengal on page 696, he is shown as having reigned in 980 A.H. for some months only.
country of Orissa. Although he had not had the Khutba read in his
own name, still he assumed the title of Hadrat 'Alá. When he died,
his son 1 succeeded him; but his rule did not extend beyond thirteen
days. He was killed by the efforts (machinations) of his own relations.
The government was then allotted to his brother Dáud. He made
dying struggles for a period of two years, till he was defeated in the
year 982 a.h. by Kháń Kháńán, who was the commander-in-chief
of the army of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Iláhi; and the country of Bangálah was conquered. Afterwards in the year 984 a.h., he was
slain by Kháń Jahán, who after Kháń Kháńán had been honoured
with the government of Bangálah, as has been narrated in its own place.
And up to this day, which is the year 1002 Hiýri, the country of Bangálah and Ekdálá are in the possession of the servants of the
powerful empire.

SECTION VII. THE SECTION ABOUT THE SHARQI
SULTÁNS.

The Sharqui Sultáns 2 ruled in the country of Jaunpúr and the
neighbouring tracts from 3 the beginning of the year 784 a.h. to

---

1 His name is Bâyazíd.
2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have كردند, but the other MS. has كردن.
3 The lith. ed. is very incorrect. The MSS. agree; but whereas the total
period is said to be 97 years, the total of the different reigns come to over
one hundred and twelve years. I have compared the list with those given by Lane-
Poole, page 309, and by the Cambridge History of India, page 701. It
was somewhat difficult to find the latter list, for in the Index page 701, it is not
mentioned either against Jaunpur or against the Sharqi dynasty. Comparing
these lists with that in the text, I find that the names agree, except that the
fifth name is Mahmúd Sháh in the list in the text while it is Muhammad Sháh
in the other list; but the periods differ. No. 1, has sixteen years in the Tabaqat,
but only 6 in the other lists. The difference in the case of No. 2 is negligible.
Ibráhím, No. 3, who has forty years in the Tabaqat has forty-one years according
to the a.h. chronology and forty years according to the A.D. chronology in
Lane-Poole, while the Cambridge History of India gives him only 36 a.h. or
34 A.D. years. No. 4 who has twenty-one years in the Tabaqat, has 17 a.h.
years or 16 A.D. years according to Lane-Poole, and 22 years both a.h. and
A.D. according to the Cambridge History of India. No. 5, who has 5 years
according to the Tabaqat has 2 years according to the Lane-Poole and less than
the year 881 A.H., which was a period of ninety-seven years. (The rulers were):
- Sultan-Ush-sharq, Khwājah Jahān, sixteen years;
- Mubārak Shāh Sharqi, one year and some months;
- Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqi, forty years and some months;
- Sultan Maḥmūd, son of Ibrāhīm, twenty-one years and some months;
- Sultan Maḥmūd, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, five years;
- Sultan Husain, son of Maḥmūd, nineteen years;

1 An account of Sultan-Ush-sharq.

It is traditionally recorded that when the turn of the reign of Sultan Maḥmūd, son of Sultan 2 Muḥammad, son of Firūz Shāh came, he sent the eunuch, Malik Sarwar, on whom Sultan Muḥammad Shāh had conferred the title of Khwājah Jahān to the country of Jaumār, after bestowing on him the title of Sultan-Ush-sharq; and conferred the government of that country on him. When Sultan Maḥmūd lost his (power and) grandeur, Sultan-Ush-sharq became completely independent; and having punished the insurgents of parganas Köl and Itāwah, 3 Kamplah and Bahraich, brought all the territory from the

1 Year according to the Cambridge History of India. No. 6 has 19 years according to the Tabaqāt, but 18 years according to Lane-Poole from 863 to 881 A.H., when he fled to Bengal, and 22 A.H. years or 21 A.D. years according to the Cambridge History of India. It appears to me that it is impossible to have a correct list of the periods of the different reigns.

1 The heading in the MS. is as I have it in the text. In the lith. ed. the word سلطان الشرق is inserted before the text.

Firishtah says that the Sultan-Ush-sharq was sent to Jaumār and Behār and Tirhūt in Jamāt-ul-āwwal 726 A.H., and he died in 802 A.H.; and the period of his rule was six years. According to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 359) he was sent in 796 A.H., which reconciles the discrepancy. The dates in Col. Briggs's history agree with those given by Lane-Poole and the Cambridge History of India.

2 One MS. has Muḥammad which is correct. The other omits the words, "son of Sultan Muḥammad," while the lith. ed. has Maḥmūd instead of Muḥammad.

3 Written as كنیله in the MSS., and كنیله in the lithe ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Köl, Itāwah Bharāich and Kamplah, كنیله all in the Doáb.
direction of Dehli, as far as parganas Köl and Rāpri, and in the other direction as far as Behār and Tirhūt under his government. The country again attained a new grandeur. He again obtained elephants and other tributes which used to come every year from the country of Lakhnauti, but which had not come for some years owing to the weakness of the rulers (of Dehli). His greatness and grandeur made such an impression on the minds of the zamindārs (Hindu chieftains), that they without any demand used every year to send the tribute that had been fixed.

In the year 802 A.H., the marauding 1 Turk of death robbed the capital of the life of the Sultān-ush-sharq.

The period of his rule was sixteen years.

2 An account of Mubārak Shāh Sharqī.

When Sultān-ush-sharq died, and about the time when the affairs of the government of Dehli became more and more disordered; and the administration became disorganised, Malik Mubārak Qarnful, who was the adopted son of Sultān-ush-sharq, in concert with the amirs and sardārs gave himself the title of Mubārak Shāh, and raised the standard of government. The Khūṭba was read in his name in the country of Jaunpūr and in the other countries, which had been in the possession of Sultān-ush-sharq.

When the news that Sultān-ush-sharq had died, and Malik Mubārak Qarnful had assumed the title of Mubārak Shāh, reached Mallū Iqbal Khān, he in the year 3 803 A.H., collected a large army; and advanced towards Jaunpūr. On the way, he chastised the insur-

1 One MS. omits the word ترک.

2 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. The lith. ed. inserts the word مبارک شاه شرقی before سلطان.

3 The year is 803 A.H. in one MS. In the other it is مبارک شاه 803-4, which is absurd in meaning. The lith. ed. has مبارک شاه 804 A.H. The reading in the first MS. is correct. Firishtah has that year; further, the year 804 A.H. was crowded with too many events. An account of these events has been given on pages 283, 284 of vol. I of the translation of this work. Neither Firishtah nor the Cambridge History of India gives any additional facts.
gents of Itāwah and arrived at Kanauj. Mubāarak Shāh also 1 collected an army, and came forward to oppose him. As the river Ganges flowed between the two armies, they remained camped opposite each other for two months, and neither had the courage and boldness to place their foot on the field of bravery, and to cross the river. They retired each to their own country without risking a battle. After Mubāarak Shāh had arrived at Jaunpūr, news reached him that Sulṭān Maḥmūd had returned to Dehlī from Gujrat; and Mallū Iqbāl Khān was again advancing towards Kanauj, taking Sulṭān Maḥmūd with him. Immediately on hearing this news, he began to collect his army; but death did not give him time; and in the year 804 A.H., he accepted the summons of the just God.

The period of his rule was one year and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULṬĀN IBRĀHĪM SHARQĪ.

After the death of Mubāarak Shāh, the amirs of the Sharqī dominions placed his younger brother, to whom they gave the title of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, on the 2 seat of the government, and the throne of the empire. All classes of men had rest in his time in the cradle of peace and safety. The 3 learned and the great, who were in distress of mind from the disturbances in the world, turned their faces to Jaunpūr which became at that time the seat of peace; and that metropolis (that is, Jaunpūr) became, from the splendour of their advent, the city of learning. Some books and treatises, such as the 4 "Hāshīlah"—

---

1 The words are جمعيت نموده in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and incorrectly حمیت نموده in the other MS.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have اورنگ حکومت; the other MS. has حکومت. I have followed the reading in the first manuscript.

3 Firishtah amplifies and explains this by saying فضلائي سمالک هندوستان و دانشداان ایران و ترائی, i.e., the learned men of the country of India, and the wise men of Persia and Turkistan.

4 Firishtah gives some account of these books. They appear to have been all written by Qāḍī Shihāb-ud-dīn Jaunpūri, whose native place was Ghaznīn, and who had received his education in Daulatābād in the Deccan. Firishtah says that Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Sharqī held him with such honour that once when he was seriously ill, the Sulṭān went to make enquiries, and after making them fill a cup with water, and passing it round the head of the sick man, drank...
i-Hindi”, “the 1 Baahr-ul-Mawaj”, the “Fatawn-i-Ibrhimm Shahi”, the “Irshad” and others (were written in his name). As divine help was always attendant on that world-protecting baddshah, he had necessarily in the beginning of his reign carried off the prize in the 2 field of spirituality from all the sovereigns of Hindustan, in the matter of experience and knowledge of affairs.

In the beginning of his reign he collected an army, and advanced to destroy Sultan Mahmood and Malik Iqbal Khun, who had the thought of conquering Jaunpur in their heads. When the two armies encamped in front of each other, Sultan Mahmud, on the ground that Malik Iqbal Khun did not permit him to interfere at all in the affairs of the empire, and did not place before him, for his decision, the facts and circumstances of any administrative problems, went out from his own camp on the pretext of going out to hunt, and joined Sultan Ibrhim. 3 The latter owing to haughtiness and pride did not perform the duty which he owed to his salt, and delayed and procrastinated in making enquiries (about his health, etc.). Sultan Mahmud feeling aggrieved betook himself to Kanauj; and removing the thanadar of the place, who had been there from before the time of Mubarak Shah, and who was called 4 Amirzada’i-Harwi (Amirzada of Harat) took possession it off, praying to God, that every danger that might happen to him may ward off him, and should fall on himself. This was like Babar’s offering himself for the recovery of Humayun, but it was more beautiful, being quite disinterested. The Qadi also loved the Sultan so dearly that he died the same year as the Sultan, though according to another account, he died two years later.

1 One of the MSS. omits 15 or 16 lines from after the word البرجر المولج to the words رحصت جاکير نمود. They are, however, written further on.
2 The words actually used are مشمار معالي. I cannot find any meaning of مشمار which would suit the context.
3 Firishtah explains, that Sultan Mahmud had expected that Sultan Ibrhimm keeping before his eyes the rights and duties of hereditary salt and service, will either raise him to sovereignty, or giving him help, crush Iqbal Khan; but as Ibrhimm Sharq had tasted the joys of sovereignty, and his rule had not yet become quite firm, neither of Sultan Mahmud’s hopes were realised. For another version of these incidents, see page 284 of vol. I of the translation.
4 The word appears to be أمیرزاده هرودی in the MSS. The lithe ed. has أمیرزاده هرودی. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has أمیرزاده هرودی. I have adopted this.
of the place. On hearing this news, Sultan Ibrāhīm and Mallū, Iqbāl Khān went respectively to Jaunpūr and Dehli, leaving Kanauj to Sultan Maḥmūd. It has, however, come to my notice in some histories, that Sultan Maḥmūd actually went to Mubārak Shāh Sharqī; at this time the latter died, and Sultan Ibrāhīm succeeded him. God only knows the truth!

In the year 807 A.H., Mallū Iqbāl Khān again came to besiege Kanauj. Sultan Maḥmūd with a small number of his special retainers fortified himself, and behaved with bravery. Mallū returned to Dehli disappointed and unsuccessful. And when in the following year he was slain by Khīḍr Khān in the neighbourhood of Ajōdahan, as has been already mentioned, Sultan Maḥmūd came to Dehli, leaving 1 Malik Maḥmūd at Kanauj, and sat on the throne of his great ancestors. Sultan Ibrāhīm availing himself of this great opportunity, determined to conquer Kanauj in the year 809 A.H. Sultan Maḥmūd marched with the army of Dehli, in order to engage him. The two armies encamped facing each other on the banks of the Ganges; and after a few days went back without fighting to their own territories. When Sultan Maḥmūd arrived in Dehli, and gave permission to the amīrs to go back to their own jāġīrs, Sultan Ibrāhīm came back again, and laid siege to Kanauj. After the period of the siege had been protracted to four months, and no help or reinforcements arrived from Dehli, Malik Maḥmūd prayed for quarter, and surrendered Kanauj. Sultan Ibrāhīm made over Kanauj to Ikhtiyār Khān, and advanced to conquer Dehli. On the way Tātār Khān, son of Sārang Khān, and Malik 2 Marjān slave of Mallū Iqbāl Khān came from Dehli, and joined him. Sultan Ibrāhīm gaining greater power and strength marched towards Sanbal; and when he arrived there, Asad Khān Lūdī abandoned the place and fled. Sultan Ibrāhīm entrusted Sanbal

1 Called Malik Maḥmūd Tarmatī on page 287 of vol. 1 of the translation. He is also called ترماتي in Firishtah’s account of Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqī. It also appears from that account that Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqī passed the rainy season at Kanauj; and advanced towards Dehli in the month of Jamādī-ul-awwal, 810 A.H.

2 Called Malik Marhabā on page 288 of vol. 1 of the translation.
to 1 Tātār Khān, and continued his march towards Dehli. On the way he seized the town of Baran, and made it over to Malik Marjān.

When he arrived on the bank of the 2 Jamunā, his scouts brought the news, that Sulṭān Muẓaffar Gujrātī had arrived in Mālwa, and was coming to aid and reinforce Sulṭān Maḥmūd. Sulṭān Ibrāhīm surrendered the reins of bravery returned towards Jaumūr. Sulṭān Maḥmūd made over the government of Sanbal, in accordance with the ancient custom to Asad Khān ῥūḍī, and returned to Dehli.

In the 3 year 831 A.H., Sulṭān Ibrāhīm advanced to attack the fort of Bānānah. At this time Khiḍr Khān ruled in Dehli. He advanced from there to meet and destroy Sulṭān Ibrāhīm. After the two armies had met, the battle raged from morning to evening; and much slaughter and bloodshed occurred. On the following day a 4 peace was concluded, and Sulṭān Ibrāhīm returned to Jaumūr and Khiḍr Khān to Dehli.

In the year 837 A.H., Sulṭān Ibrāhīm was able to repair the damages and losses sustained by his army; and having set his mind at rest in respect of the insurgents in the various parts of his dominions, he determined to conquer Kālpī; and advanced with full force.

---

1 It would appear that the rule of Tātār Khān and Malik Marjān or Malik Marḥābā was of very brief duration. Sulṭān Maḥmūd marched to Sanbal and Baran. Tātār Khān fled to Kanauj; and the other, who offered some resistance, was slain. See page 288 of vol. I of the translation.

2 جوين in the text-edition.

3 There is a long interval of about twenty years here. During this time, Sulṭān Ibrāhīm was engaged for some time in an invasion of Bengal, at the request of the holy Shaikh Qūṭ-ul-ʿĀlām. He had to return from Bengal, as Rāja Gaṇāḥ persuaded the Shaikh afterwards to ask him to do so, on his promising to become a convert to Muhammadanism. This invasion is not mentioned by either Niẓām-ud-dīn or Firishtah in their accounts of the reign of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm.

Firishtah, however, mentions a projected invasion of Dehli in 816 A.H., from which, however, Sulṭān Ibrāhīm returned after some marches; and then according to Firishtah he occupied himself for some years in the society of Shaikhs and learned men, and in rebuilding and improving Jaumūr and in increasing the cultivation of land all over the province, so that Jaumūr was described by people as a second Dehli.

4 The words are گ کر گ کر or گ کر. I cannot find any meaning of گ کر or گ کر which would suit the context.
At this time news came that Sulṭān Hūsang Ghūrī had also determined upon the conquest of Kālpī. When the two bādshāhs arrived near each other, and a battle became a matter of today or tomorrow, the scouts brought the news, that Mubārak Shāh, son of Khādīr Khān, had collected an immense army, and intended to march from Dehli for the conquest of Jaumpūr. Sulṭān Ibrāhīm having lost all control of himself retired towards Jaumpūr. Sulṭān Hūshang took possession of Kālpī, without any dispute, and having had the Khutba read in his own name returned to Mandū.

In the year 840 A.H. a disease attacked Sulṭān Ibrāhīm’s person. Although physicians treated him, no improvement resulted; and in the end he accepted the summons of God.

The period of his rule was 1 forty years and some months and some days.

2 An account of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, son of Ibrāhīm Sharqī.

When Sulṭān Ibrāhīm surrendered the deposit of life, his eldest son Sulṭān Maḥmūd sat on the throne of Jāinpur and became the successor of his father. The gardens of the hopes of the people became refreshed and verdant with the abundance of the rain of his benefaction. The kingdom acquired a new grandeur and greatness; and the people received happiness and joy. After regulating the affairs of the army and the kingdom and the punishment of the insurgents and the turbulent people, he sent in the year 847 A.H., an eloquent ambassador with beautiful gifts and presents to Sulṭān Maḥmūd Kḥalji, and with the message 3 that “Naṣīr Khān Jahān, son of Qādir

---

1 The readings are slightly different. One MS. has the reading I have adopted in the text. The other has جهل سال و چند ماه بود, without any verb, while the lith. ed. has جهل سال و چند روز بود; this has been adopted by M. Hidayat Ḥossain in the text-edition.

2 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. In the lith. ed. the word saltanat is inserted before and the word Sharqī after the word Sulṭān Maḥmūd.

3 He is so called in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Fīrishtah, however, omits the word Jahān. The Cambridge History of India (p. 252) says that Naṣīr and before him his father Qādir had taken advantage of the disputes regarding the succession to the throne of Mālwa to declare their independence,
Khān, the ruler of Kālpī, had placed his foot outside the path of the law of the Prophet, and was following the path of heterodoxy, that he had destroyed the town of Shāhpūr, which was larger and more populous than Kālpī, had banished Musalmāns from their homes, and had made over Musalmān women to Kāfsars, and as from the time of Sultān Hūshang, of blessed memory, to the present day, the chain of attachment and the relations of affection had become strengthened between the two parties, it appeared obligatory on me under the behest of the Qāḍī ‘Agal (Reason), that I should reveal it to your justice-loving mind. If you permit it, I shall chastise him, and make the tenets and rites of the Muhammadan religion current in that country”.

Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī wrote in reply, “These matters had come to my hearing in the shape of false rumours; but that now your honourable self, the leader of Sultāns, has notified them to me, they have reached the standard of definite knowledge; and under these circumstances, 1 the destruction of that wicked person is incumbent on all bādshāhs. If my own forces were not engaged in chastising the rebels of Mēwāt, I would myself 2 have advanced to destroy him. Now that that asylum of sultānats has formed this resolution, may it be of good omen!”

The ambassador came back to Jaunpūr, and narrated what had happened. Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī was pleased in his mind; and sent twenty-nine elephants to Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, as a present.

and to assume the title of Nasīr Shāh and Qādir Shāh. Nasīr Shāh appears to have adopted some heretical practices; but I think the Cambridge History of India is wrong in assuming that Sultān Maḥmūd was entirely actuated by religious motives in his proceedings against him. It should be remembered that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī had attempted unsuccessfully to seize Kālpī, which had, however, been taken by Sultān Hūshang of Mālwa. Indeed a few lines later on, the Cambridge History of India (page 253) expresses a doubt as to whether Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī was impelled by ambition or by a just appreciation of the offences of which Nasīr had been guilty.

1 One MS. has by mistake دفع ای دفع اول خاطر جمع بادشاہان instead of دفع ای فاجر ب جمع بادشاہان.

2 There are slight variations in the readings. The MSS. have عازم میکردنده حازم میکردنده; while the lith. ed. has عازم میکردنده حازم میکردنده. I prefer عازم میکردنده حازم میکردنده.
He then collected his troops, and advanced towards Kalpi. Nasir Khan, becoming acquainted with this, submitted a report to Sultan Mahmud Khalji to the following purport: "Sultan Hushang Shâh of blessed memory bestowed this country on me. Now Sultan Mahmud Sharqi wishes to take possession of it with force and violence; and the defence of this faqir is obligatory on the (noble) spirit of the Sultan."

Sultan Mahmud Khalji, on becoming acquainted with the purport of this petition, wrote a letter couched in terms of sincerity and affection, and sent 'Ali Khan with it and with suitable presents to the Sharqi Sultan; and mentioned in it that "Nasir Khan, the ruler of Kalpi having the fear of God and that Lord of grandeur before his eyes, has become repentant; and has promised, that, having redressed and corrected what had happened, he would not again place his foot outside the path of the law of the Prophet; ¹ and in carrying out the behests of providence (Akhâm Sami'î) would permit no hesitation or dilatoriness. As Sultan Hushang, who has received the mercy of God, had bestowed that country on Qadir Khan, his successors are enlisted in the band of those who are faithful and obedient to me. We should, therefore, pardoning his former transgressions, forbear from further interference with his territory."

The reply to the letter and petition of 'Ali Khan (i.e., I suppose the letter of Sultan Mahmud Khalji sent by the hand of 'Ali Khan) had not yet arrived, when another petition of Nasir Khan came, to the effect that, "This faqir has borne the ring of sincere loyalty in his ear, and the burden of obedience on his shoulder (these were ancient marks of slavery) since the time of Sultan Hushang; and now Sultan Mahmud Sharqi has, on account of an old grudge and ancient enmity, invaded Kalpi, and seizing the country with pomp and power, has turned the faqir out of his native territory and has imprisoned Musalmân women". And in spite of the fact that Sultan Mahmud Sharqi had obtained permission to chastise Nasir Khan, still when the latter had made humble and pitiful supplications, (Sultan Mahmud

¹ The word is different in the MS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. has تقلد, the other has what looks like تقلل. The lith. ed. has النقاء. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has نفاذ.
Khalji) advanced on the 2nd Sha'bān of the year 840 A.H. towards Chandēri and Kālpī. At Chandēri Naṣīr Ḳhān came and waited on him. From Chandēri, the Sullān advanced towards Erij. Sullān Mahmūd Sharqī, hearing this news, immediately started for Kālpī to meet him. Sullān Mahmūd Ḳhalji sent a detachment to oppose the Jaunpūr army, and another detachment to plunder the rearguard of that army. The latter went and slew the men, who had been left behind in the camp; and looted whatever they could lay their hands upon. The detachment, that had been sent to confront the Jaunpūr army, stretched its hands in conflict and battle; and brave and useful men were killed on both sides. In the end, the two armies retired to their respective camps. On the following morning, Sullān Mahmūd sent 'Mād-ul-mulk to block the enemy's road. The latter becoming aware of this intention remained where they were, which was a strong and rugged and difficult position.

Sullān Mahmūd, becoming aware of the strength of the ground sent a detachment to plunder the environs of Kālpī, and it returned after taking much booty. When the rainy season came, a sort of peace was patched up; and the parties retraced their steps. Sullān Mahmūd Ḳhalji came to Chandēri; and Sullān Mahmūd Sharqī, taking advantage of the opportunity, sent troops to raid the country of Barhār, the residents of which were obedient to Sullān Mahmūd Ḳhalji. The latter sent a detachment, to help and reinforce the headman of the country of Barhār. As the detachment, which had been sent by Sullān Mahmūd Sharqī, was not sufficiently strong to meet it, the latter himself came and joined it.

After a few days, Sullān Mahmūd Sharqī sent a letter to the Shaikh-ul-Islām, Shaikh Jāīaldah, who was one of the great and holy men of the age, and towards whom Sullān Mahmūd Ḳhalji had right relations of reverence and faith, and whose remains are now buried under the dome of the tomb of the Sullāns of Mālwa at Mandū, to the following purport, viz., “Musalmāns on both sides have been slain,

---

1 Both MSS. have بِمَلَأَاتٍ; but the lith. ed. has بِمَلاَاتٍ, which appears to me to be more appropriate, and I have retained it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained بِمَلَأَاتٍ in the text-edition.

2 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has بِرَجَحَةٍ in the text-edition.
and it would be well if (your Holiness) would endeavour to effect concord and friendship (between the contending powers)”. The emissary of Sultan Mahmud Sharqi made this statement to Shaikh Jaialdah, that his master would at once make over the town of Ratah to Nasir Khan; and within four months after the return of Sultan Mahmud Khalji, he would also make over to Nasir Khan the town of Erij, and the whole of the country of Kulpı, which had come into his possession.

When Sultan Mahmud Sharqi’s emissary submitted this proposal to Shaikh Jaialdah, the latter sent him in the company of his own Khadjim, (servant or disciple), to Sultan Mahmud (Khalji); and also sent a letter containing much advice. Sultan Mahmud Khalji decided, that no peace could take place unless Kulpı was immediately handed over. But Nasir Khan, who had been driven out of his territory—considered that the recovery of Ratah would be a great boon; and submitted that as Sultan Mahmud Sharqi was making the promise in the presence of noble men and before Shaikh Jaialdah, it was certain that there would be no deviation from it. When Sultan Mahmud Khalji saw, that the man most interested in the matter was satisfied with this settlement, he sent for Sultan Mahmud Sharqi’s emissary into his presence and accepted his proposals, on the condition that after that date Sultan Mahmud Sharqi would not in any way interfere

---

1 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has اگر صحّح ذات ذات البیب توجہ فرمانید - بھین باشد The other has صحّح ذات البیب سعی فرمانید - بھین باشد which some words are evidently left out. The lith. ed. has اگر صحّح ذات البیب سعی فرمانید - بھین باشد. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has صحّح ذات البیب رود. The meaning is not quite clear, but I think the translation conveys the intended idea.

2 There are differences in readings here also. One MS. has قصیدہ ابراج و سائر بلاد کالبی. This appears to be correct and I have adopted it. The other MSS. have قصیدہ ابراج و جمر و سائر بلاد کالبی. The lith. ed. has قصیدہ ابراج و جمر و سائر بلاد کالبی. The corresponding line in the lith. ed. of Firishtah appears to be different and incorrect. It is بالفعل قصیدہ ابراج و کالبی کہ به تصرف سلطان شروقی دولامدو انعا نیز به تصرف خان خواهند گذاشت.

3 The name is transliterated as Erij in the Cambridge History of India (p. 253), but later on (pp. 355 and 364), it is printed as Erij.
with the descendants of Qādir Shāh, and more specially with Naṣīr Khān Jahān; and for the last time the footsteps of his soldiers should not reach this country; and after four months, he should make over Kālpī and the other towns to Naṣīr Khān Jahān. When the foundations of the peace became strengthened by the physical and spiritual attention of Shaikh Jāīlādāh, Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khālījī granted permission to the emissary of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Sharqī after bestowing rewards and favours on him to retire; and he himself cast the shadow of his favour on the residents of his capital of Mandū.

And Sulṭān Maḥmūd Sharqī also returned to Jaunpūr; and on his arrival there, bringing out the hand of lavishness and benevolence from the sleeve of generosity and liberality made all sections of the people, according to the difference of their ranks, fortunate and happy.

1 And when he had rested for some time at Jaunpūr, and his army had repaired the damages and losses which it had sustained he advanced towards the country of Chunār, and having plundered and devastated that country, made all the refractory people of that neighbourhood, food for the sword. He took possession of some parganas and towns, and left thānādārs there, and having made the necessary arrangements returned to Jaunpūr.

After some days he advanced into the country of Orissa with the object of Jihād (war of religion) and the intention of becoming a Ghāzī; and having plundered and devastated that country, and pulled down and destroyed idol temples, returned with triumph and victory; and in the year 862 A.H., (1458 A.D.), he was united with the divine mercy.

The period of his reign was 3 twenty-one years and some months.

---

1 Nizām-ud-dīn does not mention here that Maḥmūd Shāh Sharqī had two conflicts with Sulṭān Bahlūl Lūdī, first attack on Dehlī in 856 A.H., 1452 A.D., and second, an advance on Itāwah in 1457 A.D., for some account of which see pages 340–342 of vol. I of the translation.

2 It is چتپار in the text-edition.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have twenty-one years and some months, as I have it in the text. The other MS. has twenty years and some months.
AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÄN MAHMÜD SHÄH, SON OF MAHMÜD SHÄH.

When Sultän Mahmüd Sharqi passed away from amongst (men), the amirs and the pillars of the state raised Shähzâda Bhîkan Khân, who was his eldest son, on the throne of the empire; and gave him the title of Sultän Mahmüd Shäh. As he was unfit for the duties of a ruler, he perpetrated deeds which were improper for him. The amirs and the chief men of the country excused him from carrying on the government; and raised his brother Husain Khân to the position of power.

The time of his (i.e., Sultän Mahmüd Shäh’s) rule ² was about five months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÄN HUSAIN, SON OF MAHMÜD SHÄH.

As they excused Mahmûd Shäh his brother from the duties of government, they raised him to the seat of power, and made a proclamation of justice and equity. All the amirs and great men submitted to him and obeyed him. As the humā (a fabulous bird) of his noble spirit had the ambition of conquering various countries in its head, he collected three hundred thousand horsemen and fourteen hundred elephants, and advanced towards the country of Orissa. In the course of the march he subjected the country of Tirhût to various calamities; and levied tribute from the refractory people ⁴ of that

---

1 One MS. leaves out the word Sultän before Mahmûd Shäh. He is called Mahmûd Shäh in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. His correct title was Sultän Muḥammad Shäh according to Firishtah and according to the Cambridge History of India. The account of his five months' rule, as given here, is very vague and hazy. For a fuller and more vivid account see under Bahlūl Lūdî, pages 343–45 of vol. I of the translation.

2 The word is است, i.e., is, in the MS. and in the lith. ed. I have changed it to بود, was.

3 The account of the invasion of Orissa, and of the devastation of Tirhût on the way, as given by Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 255), agrees mainly with that in the text. The numbers of horsemen and elephants in Sultän Husain’s army appear to be exaggerated.

4 There are differences in the readings. One MS. has متوجه متوردةٔ خراجٍ گرفت, which is incorrect and meaningless. The other has از متوردةٔ ان ناحیهٔ خراجٍ گرفته. This is better, but should be changed to از متوردةٔ ان‌دیار ناحیهٔ خراجٍ گرفته and the lith. ed. has از متوردةٔ ان‌دیار ناحیهٔ خراج گرفته.
country and its environs. When he arrived in the country of Orissa, he sent detachments for plundering and ravaging the various parts of the country. The Rāy of Orissa, in great distress and helplessness, made his submission, and sending an agent to wait on the Sultān prayed for the pardon of his faults and offences; and sent thirty elephants and one hundred horses and much stuffs and other goods in the way of tribute. Sultān Ḥusain returned from that country to Jaunpūr crowned with victory and triumph.

1 In the year 870 A.H., he put the fort of Benāres, which had become dilapidated in the course of time, into repairs; and in the following year (871 A.H., 1466 A.D.) he sent some of his āmīrs to capture the fort of Gwāliar. When the siege was much prolonged, the Rāy of Gwāliar paid tribute; and became enlisted in the band of his tributaries.

In the year 878 A.H., 1473 A.D., he, at the instigation of his wife Malkah-i-Jahān, who was the daughter of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din, son of Muhammad Shāh, son of Farid Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, son of Ḧāfir Tāhir Shāh, raised the standard of departure with one hundred and forty thousand horsemen for a war with Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī and for the conquest of Dehlī. 2 Sultān Bahlūl sent an emissary to wait on Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, and sent him a message to the effect, that if he should advance to support and aid him, the country as far as the fort of Biānah should belong to him. A reply had not yet come from Mandū, when Sultān Husain seized a large part of the territory appertaining

ترجمة: 

1 This is the best reading, but requires the conjunction, و between تاجیح and انداز. I have accepted this reading, and inserted the conjunction.

M. Hidayat Ḥusain has instead of تاجیح in the text-edition.

1 Firishtah gives 871 A.H. as the year in which the fort of Benāres was repaired and the army was sent to capture Gwāliar. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 376) does not mention the repairs to the fort of Benāres, and gives 870 A.H., 1465 A.D., as the year of the invasion of Gwalior. The Cambridge History of India also does not mention the repairs of the fort of Benāres; and places the invasion of Gwalior in the year 1466 A.D. (p. 255).

2 The Cambridge History of India does not mention this appeal to Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī for help, but Firishtah does. The Cambridge History of India (p. 256), says that Bahlūl was obliged to make this humiliating proposal, as he could not get more than eighteen thousand horsemen to meet Sultān Husain’s large army. It also appears from what follows, that he came out of Dehlī to meet the enemy with only that small number of horsemen.
to Dehli. Sultan Bahlul, making humility and a piteous appeal the means of his safety, sent a message to Sultan Husain, that the country of Dehli would belong to the servants of the Sultan, if he would leave the country round Dehli for a distance of eighteen karohs in his possession; and he should be enlisted in the bands of the Sultan’s servants, and would remain in the post of the Darogyha of Dehli, on behalf of the latter. Sultan Husain, on account of his great pride and haughtiness, did not listen to these proposals, with the intention of consent and acceptance. In the end, Sultan Bahlul, relying on divine aid and assistance, came out of Dehli with eighteen thousand horsemen, and encamped in front of Sultan Husain’s army. As the river 1 Jamuna lay between the two armies, neither advanced to give battle. It so happened, however, that one day, Sultan 2 Husain’s soldiers had gone on a marauding excursion, and except for the commanders no one was left in the camp. Sultan Bahlul’s soldiers taking advantage of such an opportunity plunged their horses into the river 3 at the time of midday. Although this news was taken to Sultan Husain, he did not, owing to his haughtiness and pride, believe it, until Sultan Bahlul’s men stretched their hands to plunder the camp and seized its outskirts. In this way Sultan Husain was defeated without a battle; and Malkah-i-Jahan and all the inmates of the harem were seized. Sultan Bahlul having regard for the rights of the salt he had eaten, endeavoured to show all respect and honour to Malkah-i-Jahan, and having made necessary preparations, sent her to Sultan Husain.

When Malkah-i-Jahan joined the Sultan, she again 4 got into his kernel and skin; and again commenced to incite him; and in the

---

1 in the text-edition.
2 Firiahtah’s statement is just the opposite. He says شاه شرقی بتلخت ولادت رفتند. The Cambridge History of India (p. 256) says Husain Shâh was “accustomed to permit nearly the whole of his army to disperse for the purpose of plundering the rich villages of the Doab”.
3 The words are استوا. I cannot find any meaning of which quite suits the context. Firiahtah says در میں موسم تاسبقل از جابیکه پاباب بود i.e., in the very midst of the hot season at a place where there it could be forded.
4 Firiahtah uses the same words. I do not know their exact meaning, but I suppose it is either acquired great influence over him, or worried him by constant iteration.
following year induced him again to collect and equip his army to fight with Sulţān Bahlūl. When there was only a short distance between the two armies, Sulţān Bahlūl sent an emissary with the following message, "Would the Sulţān be pleased to pardon my offences; and leave me in my present condition; for I shall one day be of use to him".

As ¹ the pen of fate had so decreed, that greatness should pass away from the dynasty of the Sharqī Sulṭāns, Sulţān Ḥusain did not at all listen to his words. After the forces had been arrayed, defeat again fell on the Jaunpūr army. In the same way, on a second occasion, he came with a well-equipped army, but had to take to flight. On the ² fourth occasion things became so difficult for Sulţān Ḥusain, that he had to throw himself off his horse and run away. ³ These facts have been narrated with full particulars and details, in the section about the Sulţāns of Dehli.

On the ⁴ fourth occasion, Sulţān Bahlūl took Jaunpūr into his own possession, and established his son Bārbak Shāh there. Sulţān Husain had to content himself with a section of his territory, the revenues of which amounted only to five krors, and to pass his time there. Sulţān Bahlūl, acting in a spirit of generosity, did not interfere with him.

When Sulţān Bahlūl accepted the summons of the just God, and the office of the Sulţān was allotted to his son Sulţān Sikandar, Sulţān Ḥusain induced Bārbak Shāh to advance on Dehli and seize his father’s kingdom for himself. With this intention Bārbak Shāh advanced from Jaunpūr towards Dehli. Then a battle took place, and Bārbak Shāh fled back to Jaunpūr. He again equipped an army, and advanced

¹ There are differences in the readings. One MS. has قلم تقدیر بیشین رنگی بود. This appears to be correct and I have adopted it. The other MS. has بیشین رنگی بود, leaving out the words قلم تقدیر که دولت. The lith. ed. has تقدیر بیشین رنگی بود, the word تقدیر being used by mistake for قلم.
² The third occasion is not mentioned, or the fourth occasion in the text here is a mistake for the third.
³ See page 348 and the following pages of vol. I of the translation.
⁴ It is مہاراج in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. and in Firishtah; but a fourth occasion has already been mentioned in the previous paragraph.
to Dehli. When he fled a second time, Sultān Sikandar pursued him and took Jaumpūr out of his possession. As Sultān Ḥusain was the cause of all the confusion and disturbance, Sultān Sikandar went and attacked him; and after some fighting seized the territory which was in his possession. Sultān Ḥusain then fled, and found an asylum with the ruler of Bangālah. The term of his reign was 19 years. After his defeat, he was for some years 2 confined in the bounds of borrowed life, (which is a very figurative way of saying that he lived for some years). After that the Sharqi Empire came to an end. Six persons ruled for a period of 97 years and some months.

---

1 One MS. has by mistake for مٰرٰہم; and the other has for مستعار.
SECTION VIII. 1 THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF MĀLWA.

From the year 807 A.H. to the year 970 A.H., which is a period of one hundred and sixty-three years, there were eleven persons, who either themselves or through their deputies governed Mālwa.

2 Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī, 20 years;
Sultān Hūshang, son of Dilāwar Khān, 30 years;
Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Hūshang, one year and a few months;
Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji, 34 years;
Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, 20 years;
Sultān Našir-ud-dīn, son of Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, 11 years and 4 months;
Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Našir-ud-dīn, 20 years and six months and eleven days;
Sultān Bahādur Gujrātī, 16 years;
Mallū Qādir Shāh, 6 years;
Shūjā’ Khān, as Naib of Shēr Khān Afgān, 12 years;
Bāz Bahādūr Afgān, 16 years.

1 The Section about Mālwa is the heading used by the late Mr. B. De in his notes, but the editor has followed the text-edition in which M. Hidayat Ḥosain has للطبقة سلاطين مالوا. Regarding the sequence of various sections see note 2, page 414.

2 There are some variations and omissions in the lists in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. I have tried to get a correct list after comparing them.
It should not remain concealed that the country of Mālwa is an extensive territory. Great rulers have always been (reigned) in that country. Great Rājas and renowned Rāys like Rāja Bikramājit from the commencement of whose reign the Hindū era begins, and Rāja Bhōj and others, who were among the Rājas of Hindūstān, possessed great renown, by their rule of Mālwa. Islām first appeared in that country from the time of Sultān Maḥmūd Ghaznavī. Among the Sultāns of Dehli Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban acquired dominion over it; and after him till the time of Sultān Firūz Shāh it was in the possession of the Sultāns of Dehli.

Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī attained to the rule of the country from a time before the reign of Sultān Muḥammad, the son of Firūz, and

---

1 Firishtah copies the Ṭabaqāt in this place almost verbatim; but as regards Islām, he says: بعد از زمان سلطان محمد غزنوی کہ اسلام در فندرستان شائع شد از سلیمان دختر عیاث الرحمین بیان ملکت استیلا یافت. This is different from what is stated in the text, and is more correct historically. Islām certainly did not become known in Mālwa from the time of Sultān Maḥmūd. Of course if the expression در آن بلاد refers to Hindūstān and not to Mālwa, then there is nothing wrong with the text.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have میں بودند, میں بودند انہ, but the other MS. میں بودند.

3 One MS. omits the word Rāja. Bikramājit is of course a variant of the Vikramādiya. The era which dates from his accession commences 56 years before Christ.

4 The MSS. have داشتہ انہ, داشتہ انہ, and the lith. ed. has داشتہ انہ.

5 One MS. has پیدا شد, while the other has simply شد, and the lith. ed. has پیدا شد. The reading of the second manuscript has been followed by M. Hidayat Ḥossain in the text-edition.

6 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Firūz Shāh, but the other MS. has Sultān Muḥammad Firūz Shāh. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has Sultān Muḥammad, son of Firūz Shāh. This last statement is correct. The conquest of Mālwa took place in the reign of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Balban in 710 A.H., 1316 A.D.; and it became independent in the reign of Muḥammad, the son of Firūz Tughlaq, 789 A.H., 1389 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says, that the date of Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī’s appointment as governor is not precisely known; but he was certainly in Mālwa in 1392, and he was probably appointed by Firūz Shāh of Dehli who died in 1388. M. Hidayat Ḥossain has سلطان محمد فرخزاد in the text-edition.

7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Maḥmūd, while the other has Sultān Muḥammad, son of Firūz.
declared his independence. From that time the rulers of Mālwa ceased to own allegiance to the Sultāns of Dehli; and eleven persons ruled one after another till the time of His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Illāhī. The section about Mālwa, therefore, begins from the time of Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī. They say that Sultān Muḥammad son of Firūz Shāh granted favours to a body of men, who had accompanied him during his earlier expeditions; and had shown loyalty and sincerity. When he became Sultān he conferred four countries on four of them; and each of these four attained to sovereign power. (He) sent Zafar Khān, the son of Wajih-ul-mulk to Gujrāt, Khidr Khān to Mūlānān and Dibālpūr, Khwājah Sarwar Khwājah Jahān, to whom he granted the title of Malik-ush-sharq, to Jaunpūr, and Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī to Mālwa.

5 An account of Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī.

As in the year 6 809 A.H., Dilāwar Khān came to Mālwa, he brought the country into his possession, by the strength of his brave
arms and the power of his beneficent wisdom, and collected retainers
and servants and made all arrangements and shortened the hand of
encroachment of rebels from the environs and surroundings of that
country. When 1 Sulṭān Maḥmūd passed away, and the empire of
Dehli became enfeebled and heads of different bands appeared in
different parts of India, Dilāwar Khān also turned his head away from
allegiance to the lord of Dehli, and claimed to be independent; and in
the way of 2 Bāḏshāhs took upon himself the etiquette of sovereignty.
He passed many years with success and pleasure; and in the year
829 A.H., surrendered the deposit of his life. It has come to my notice
in some books that he was 3 poisoned at the instigation of his son Alp
Khān. The period of his rule was twenty years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULṬĀN HŪSHANG, SON OF DILĀWAR KHĀN.

Alp Khān, who was the son of Dilāwar Khān, became the successor
of the latter, and had the public prayer (Khuṭba) read in his name and
the coin struck in his name. He raised the royal umbrella over his
head and gave himself the title of Sulṭān Hūshang. The amirs and
the great men of that country rendered homage to him.

The affairs of the kingdom, and the foundations of power had
not yet been firmly fixed, when scouts brought the news, that Sulṭān
Muẓaffar Gujrātī had arrived at Ujjain; and 4 information had reached

also incorrect. The correct date is 789 A.H., 1387 A.D. The correct year of
his death is 808 A.H., 1405 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, gives
1406 as the year of Dilāvar Khān’s death.

1 One MS. and the text-edition have Sulṭān Muḥammad, which is incorrect.
See page 290 of vol. I of the translation.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says, “Dilāvar Khān never
assumed the style of royalty.” This is not correct according either of the
Ṭabaqāt or Firishtah. The latter is even more particular than the Ṭabaqāt.
He says:

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says definitely Alp Khān
“removed his father by poison.” Neither the Ṭabaqāt nor Firishtah says so
positively. See note 3, page 185.

4 The words باَر خُمْرِ رَسَيْدَة occur only in one MS. but neither in the other
MS. nor in the lith. ed.
him that Alp Khān had, ¹ for the sake of worldly power, administered poison to Dilāwar Khān; and had given himself the name of Hūshang Shāh. As there had been a bond of brotherly feelings between Dilāwar Khān and Sultān Muṣaffar, (the latter) ² had equipped an army, and was marching to Mālwa. In the beginning of the year 810 A.H., Sultān Muṣaffar encamped in the vicinity of Dhār. Sultān Hūshang came out of the fort, with the determination to give battle; and ³ the two armies engaged each other. In the end Hūshang fled, and took shelter in the fort. As he found that he did not possess the power to withstand (Sultān) Muṣaffar, he prayed for quarter; and came and waited on the Sultān. In the same majlis he and his nobles were placed under arrest, and made over to custodians. The Sultān then left his own brother ⁴ Naṣīr Khān, with a large force, in the fort of Dhār; and himself returned with victory and triumph to Gujrat.

As Naṣīr Khān, who was without any experience, in the very first year demanded from the raʿiyats rents which were beyond their power to pay, and otherwise ill-treated them. The Mālwa army seizing the opportunity after the departure of Sultān Muṣaffar had carried him out of Dhār by ⁵ Khwājahdār, and pursuing him caused injury

¹ The words با-osatu حكم دينوى occur in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but not in the other MS.

² The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says that the “avenging the death of his old friend” was merely a “pretext” for Muṣaffar’s invasion of Mālwa.

³ Firishtah says that Muṣaffar was wounded, and Hūshang was thrown from his horse; but they went on fighting, but victory or defeat does not depend on one’s exertions, and victory was allotted to Sultān Muṣaffar from the supernatural world.

⁴ He is called نصیر خان Naṣīr Khān in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., except in one place in the latter where he is called نصیر خان و نقیر خان Naṣīr Khān and Nuṣrat Khān. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Nuṣrat Khān, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 172) Noosrut Khan and in the Cambridge History of India, page 349, Nusrat Khān. He was called Naṣrat Khān in the History of Gujrat (see p. 186 and also note 1 on the same page).

⁵ The construction of the sentence is not very clear. The corresponding passage in the history of Sultān Muṣaffar Gujratī was وار زرا خواجه دار از دهار رهرب اروده راه گجراز نموند (text-edition p. 94). There I thought that the Khwājahdār was some kind of a palace official, who took him out of Dhār and showed him the way to Gujrat. Probably the word Khwājahdār here also has the same significance.
to such of his followers as fell behind. They left Dhār for fear of Sultan Muzaффar, erected buildings in the fort of Mandū, the strong bastions of which claimed rivalry with the celestial girdle or the Zodiac (and took up their residence there); and made Mūsā Khān, who was a cousin, uncle’s son, of Sultan Hūshang, their chief. After this news had reached Gujrāt, Hūshang Shāh sent a petition to Sultan Muzaффar to the effect, “That the lord and master of the people of the world was in the place of this faqīr’s father and uncle, and the words which certain self-interested people had spoken to him were, the great God knows, contrary to the truth. At this time it was being reported that the noblemen of Mālwa had acted with disrespect to Khān-i-Ā‘zam Naṣīr Khān; had made Mūsā Khān their leader and had taken possession of the country. If this faqīr was lifted up from the dust, and was placed in the bonds of gratitude, it was possible that the country should again come into his possession.”

Sultan Muzaффar having approved of this proposal, released him, after he had been in prison for one year, and began to show favours to him. He took engagements from him, and after arranging his affairs, granted permission to Shāhzāde Ḍāḥīm Shāh, in the year 821 A.H., to proceed to help and reinforce him; so that he might recover possession of Dhār and the neighbouring country from the rebellious amīrs, and make it over to him. Ḍāḥīm Shāh recovered the country from the amīrs, and made it over to him, and then returned to the capital city of Pattan.

After Sultan Hūshang had been in Dhār for some days, and a body of his special guards had collected round him, he sent a man to the fort of Mandū, and giving assurances of favour to the amīrs, summoned

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ہزار براہ کر ہے while the other MS. has ہزار براہ کر ہے; M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted the former in the text-edition.
2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have منطقہ البووج, but the other MS. has منطقہ العین.
3 The name is Naṣr Khān, here in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but in the other MS. it is Naṣr Khān. I have kept Naṣr Khān, as he has been so named in the earlier parts of this section.
4 Frishtah agrees. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says that Hūshang swore “on the Koran that he was guiltless of his father’s death”.
5 One MS. omits the words from جداز امراء از تصرف امراء to غدار.
them to his side. The amirs and the soldiers were anxious to join him, and were all pleased and delighted; but as they had taken their wives and children with them to the fort of Mandû, they could not join his service. Hûshang went with a small force to the town of 2 Mahêsar, and every day his men went forward to fight, but were wounded, and had to come back. As the fort of Mandû was very strong, Hûshang Shâh considered it advisable, that he should march away from that place, and take up a position in the centre of the town; and sending his men to the different towns and parganas, take possession of them. About this time, Malik Mughîth, who was the son of the aunt of Sultân Hûshang, had a consultation with Malik Khîrî who was celebrated as Miyân Aghâ and said, "Although Mûsa Khân is a young man of good breeding, and is a son of one of our aunts, yet Hûshang Shâh surpasses all his evils in manliness and intelligence and wisdom and patience; and this kingdom belongs to him by inheritance as well as acquisition; and besides in his childhood, he was brought up in the loving arms of my mother. It is advisable, therefore, that the reins of this government and rule should be placed in the grasp of his power." Miyân Aghâ praised the decision of Malik Mughîth; and they in concert came out one night from the fort of Mandû, and joined Sultân Hûshang. The latter gave Malik Mughîth a promise of being made his deputy; and this gave the latter great pleasure and delight.

Mûsa Khân on hearing this news cut the thread of hope by the scissors of despair; and became anxious about his safety. In the end, he sent a messenger to Malik Mughîth, with the request, that a place

1 No reason is given for this in the text or in Firishtah lith. ed.; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 173) says, they were unwilling to abandon their families; and the Cambridge History of India, page 350, says, "As their wives and families would be left exposed to Mûsâ’s wrath".

2 The name is مهسر in one MS., and also in the other, but is partly obliterated in it. It is مهسر in the lith. ed. and مهسر in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India, page 350, says that Hûshang marched to Mândû.

3 The nickname looks like مین in the MS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Miyân Khân and Miyân Aghâ in different places. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 174) calls him Meean Agha. The name is not given in the Cambridge History of India. مین in the text-edition.
might be allotted to him for his residence, so that he might surrender the fort of Mandū. After much discussion, a place was fixed for him; and he evacuated the fort and went away. Sultān Hūshang entered the fort of Mandū, and took up his abode in his capital. He conferred the title of Malik-ush-sharq on and entrusted the duties of the vazīrat to Malik Mughīth, and in all matters made him his deputy and representative.

In the year 813 A.H., 1410 A.D., Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī accepted the summons of God; and the government of the empire devolved upon Sultān Aḥmad, the son of Muḥammad Shāh the son of Sultān Muẓaffar. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān, sons of Sultān Muẓaffar raised the standard of revolt and hostility in the country of Bahrōj, and asked for help from Hūshang. The latter returning the rights acquired by Muẓaffar Shāh by the support he had given to him, and the aid given to him by Aḥmad Shāh, by enmity, turned towards the country of Gujrāt; and his ancient grudge induced him to advance into that country, and to destroy the rules of the government. Sultān Aḥmad advanced with a large army, and besieged Bahrōj immediately, on hearing the news. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān, frightened by the grandeur and power and awed by the immense number of Aḥmad Shāh’s troops, prayed for protection, and joined the latter. Hūshang turned back from the way, and returned to Dhār. The narrative of these transactions has been written in detail in the section about Gujrāt.

The sweats of shame and repentance had not yet dried up on the forehead of Hūshang, when he again attempted the same kind of nefarious deeds. For when in the year 816 A.H., 1413 A.D., he heard that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī had advanced to attack the Rāja of Jahlāwār, and was compelled to remain there, he at once collected his troops, and turned towards the country of Gujrāt. Sultān Aḥmad,

---

1 The readings in the MSS. are از خو سلطان و استیله و هبید و کنهر سیاہ احمد شاهی. The lith. ed. omits the two before هبید and کنهر. I have adopted the readings in the MSS., though I think that it would be better to omit the before کنهر.

2 Firīṣṭah agrees with the Ṭabaqāt about Hūshang’s first and second inroads into Gujrāt. As to the second, he calls the Rāja the Rāja of Jālwāra instead of that of Jahlāwār.
immediately on receiving this news, advanced to attack and destroy him. When they approached each other, and Hūshang got no help from the Rāja of Jhālāwār, he had no alternative left, and returned to his own country.

After his return petitions from the zamindars of Gujrát, and specially from the Rājas of Chāmpānīr, Nādōt and Īdar came one after another to him, to the effect, that on the first occasion there had been neglect and dilatoriness in their service to him, but this time there will be no minūtia left in their loyal devotion in his service. If the Sultān would turn towards Gujrát, they ¹ would send some guides to attend on him; and they would guide his army along a road in such a way, that Sultān Aḥmad would not know anything about his advance, up to the time of his arrival in the country of Gujrát. The indignity (of his repeated failures) being added to his former enmity induced ² Sultān Hūshang again to collect his troops and advance into Gujrát. In order to carry out this intention, he advanced in the year 821 A.H., 1418 A.D., with great pomp by way of Mahrāsa. It so happened, that at that time, Sultān Aḥmād was in the neighbourhood of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, attending to some matters connected with the government. When the news of Hūshang’s advance reached him, he considered that the extinguishing of the flame of the disturbance created by Hūshang should have precedence over all other matters; and he advanced to Mahrāsa with speed; and in spite of heavy rains he arrived there in a short time. When the spies of Sultān Hūshang gave him information of the arrival of Sultān Aḥmad, he was in great anxiety; and sent for the zamindārs, who by sending their petitions had raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion, into his presence; and reproached

¹ One MS. and the lith. ed. have فرسندم but the other MS. has فرسندم.
² As to the third expedition, Firishtah says that the petitions were sent by the Rājas of Jālwāra, of Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr, of Nādōt and Īdar, and not by the last two only as mentioned in the text. Firishtah also says that Sultān Aḥmad had gone to punish Naṣīr Khān Fārūqi, who with the help of fifteen thousand horsemen sent under Ghāznī Khān by Sultān Hūshang, was attempting to take away the fort of Thālnīr from his younger brother Malik Iftikhār, but on Sultān Aḥmad’s arrival at Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, Ghāznī Khān fled towards Mālwa, and Naṣīr Khān Fārūqi went away towards Astr. After this when he was at Sultānpūr, Sultān Aḥmad heard of Sultān Hūshang’s invasion.
them, and spoke unseemly words to them. In the end he returned scratching the back of his head by the same road by which he had come.

Sultān Aḥmad halted at Mahrāsa for some days, so that his army might join him. After the troops 1 had collected he advanced, in the month of Ṣafar, into the country of Mālwa; and by repeated marches arrived at and encamped in the neighbourhood of Kāliādah. Sultān Ḥūshang also advanced a few stages with the intention of engaging him. After the battle he fled and took shelter in the fort of Mandū. Sultān Aḥmad’s army 2 pursued him up to the gate of Mandū; and seized some of his elephants and soldiers. Sultān Aḥmad himself went as far as 3 Na‘lcha; and, halting there some days, sent detachments in different directions in the country. As the fort of Mandū was very strong, he was obliged to turn his reins towards Dhār. From that place he wanted to go to Ujjain, but as the rains had commenced the amirs and vazīrs represented to him, that the welfare of the state demanded that he should return that year to the capital of Gujrāt; and should punish the turbulent men, who had been the cause of the disturbance and rebellion, and teach them a lesson; and in the next year he should, with a mind freed from all anxieties, set about the conquest of Mālwa. Sultān Aḥmad agreeing to this proposal returned from Dhār, and cast to the shadow of his favour on the people of Gujrāt.

In the year 822 A.H., 1417 A.D., Sultān Ḥūshang conferred the title of Maḥmūd Khān on Malik Maḥmūd, the son of Malik Mughīth, on whose clear forehead the signs of nobility and knowledge of affairs were patent and bright; and made him 4 the partner of his father in 5 the administration of the government. Whenever he went anywhere, he left Malik Mughīth in the fort of Mandū, and took Maḥmūd Khān with him, so that he might attend to the affairs of state.

---

1 One MS. has by mistake استماع اجتياع instead of.

2 One MS. has by mistake تعالیف instead of.

3 Firishtah in his account of this expedition has instead of Na‘lcha Zafarābād only Na‘lcha. Otherwise his account agrees with that in the text.

4 The words با یدار are omitted in one MS.

5 The MSS. have در مهمات, and the lith. ed. has در مهمات, and the lith. ed. has. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has followed the lith. ed. in the text-edition.
In the year 825 A.H., 1421 A.D., Sultān Hūshang selected one thousand horsemen out of his army; and in the garb of merchants advanced towards Jājnagar. He took some silver gray and iron

Before describing Sultān Hūshang’s expedition to Jājnagar, Firishtah says, that Sultān Ahmad intended to invade and plunder Mālwa, but Sultān Hūshang becoming aware of this, sent eloquent ambassadors with many valuable presents, and Sultān Ahmad took the presents, and returned to Ahmadābād. He also says that in 823 A.H., 1420 A.D., Sultān Hūshang attacked the fort of Kehrīa which was on the boundary of Berār. Rāy Narsīng, the ruler of Kehrīa, met him with fifty thousand horsemen and foot soldiers, and fought a fierce battle, but was defeated and slain. Sultān Hūshang then besieged and took the fort of Sārangadha which belonged to Rāy Narsīng, and took the treasure and 84 great elephants which were in it, and reduced the son of Rāy Narsīng to be a suzerain and tributary to himself.

The following account of Sultān Hūshang’s expedition to Jājnagar, compared with the disjointed accounts of it previously given in the history of Ahmad Shāh of Gujrat (see pp. 204, 205, and note 2, p. 204), is more connected and consistent; but the expedition itself was curious in various ways. It is clear that merchants used to go from Mālwa and the neighbouring country to Jājnagar or Orissa with horses and other merchandise to barter them for elephants; for the account shows, that it was well known that the Rāy of Jājnagar was fond of horses of particular colour and that his subjects were likely to buy certain merchandise. It is difficult to say whether Hūshang intended to barter his horses and other merchandise for elephants like an honest merchant, or whether he intended from the beginning to plunder the Rāy of Jājnagar of some of his elephants, which at that time were considered to be a valuable instrument of war. Probably he had an undercurrent in his mind for looting the elephants from the beginning.

The account given by Firishtah agrees mainly with that in the text. The account in the Cambridge History of India, pages 350, 351, also agrees, although it calls the Orissa chief, the Rāja of “Jājpūr, the capital of Orissa”. It will be seen that both the Ġabāqāt and Firishtah call the place Jājnagar. In the previous incidental reference to this expedition on page 298, the Cambridge History of India, the expedition is designated Sultān Hūshang’s “famous raid into Orissa”, and no mention is made of either Jājnagar or Jājpūr. It will be remembered that Sultān Firūz Shāh had hunted elephants in Jājnagar. There is a Jājpūr in Orissa also, which is the headquarters of a civil division in the district of Cuttack, but as far as I know it is not mentioned anywhere in history.

There is some difference in the readings in the description of the horses. The MSS. have اسپان تقری ضرنگ, اسپان تقری ضرنگ, and the lith. ed. has اسپان تقری ضرنگ. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has اسپان تقری ضرنگ.
gray horses which the Rāy of Jājnagar was very fond of, and some other kinds of merchandise, which the people of that country took with pleasure. His object in taking this journey was this, that in exchange for the horses, and the other merchandise, he would select some elephants, and take (or buy) them. So that by means of their strength, he should be able to have his revenge against Ahmad Shāh. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Jājnagar, he sent a man to the Rāy, and gave him notice that a great merchant had come with the object of buying elephants and had brought with him many 1 silver gray and gray and white horses, and various linen and silk stuffs and 2 narmina. The Rāy enquired, "Why he has encamped at a distance from the city." The man whom Sultān Hūshang had sent replied, "He has many merchants with him and has encamped at a place where he found water and an open plain." The Rāy said, "I shall come to the caravan on such and such a date, let the horses be kept ready for my inspection on that day; and let the linen and silk goods be spread out on the ground, so that after inspecting them, I shall give in exchange for what I buy, elephants, if they want elephants, or money in cash if they want that." When the man who had been sent came back, Sultān Hūshang summoned the trusted men (among his followers) and took new engagements from them, that they should not act contrary to whatever he might order; and waited for the day (named by the Rāy).

When that day came the Rāy sent forty elephants to the caravan, in advance of himself, so that the merchants might please themselves (by inspecting them). He gave them notice that he was coming, and sent a message that they should expose their goods, and keep their horses ready. Sultān Hūshang sent back all the elephants, and spread out a part of the goods on the ground. At this time the Rāy

1 Here the horses are described in one MS. as نقرة وسر خنک, and in the other as نقرة وسر خنک, and in the lith. ed. as نقرة وسر خنک. Firishtah has نقرة وسر خنک and in the text-edition. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 178) has "horses of different colours; viz. bright bay, bright chestnut, and different shades of grey". M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted نقرة وسر خنک in the text-edition.

2 The MSS. have نومینه and the lith. ed. has زمنه. I cannot find the meaning of these words. Firishtah has no corresponding word. He has درگ爷 in the text-edition.
came to the caravan with five hundred men and inspected the various goods. As it was the rainy season, a dark cloud appeared, and drops of rain began to fall. The elephants hearing the sound of the thunder and frightened by the lightning began to run away. The goods which was spread out on the ground were spoiled under their feet. At this time a great noise rose from the caravan; and Sultān Hūshang in the manner of a merchant tore handfuls of hair from his head and beard, and said, “My merchandise has been damaged, I do not wish to live.” Then with his soldiers he mounted the horses which had been already made ready and attacked the Rāja’s troops. At the first onset the latter lost their firm foothold and the rule of their firmness and power was shattered. Some of the men were made food for the sword, and some fled. The Rāy himself was taken prisoner alive.

At this time Sultān Hūshang revealed his identity; and said, “I am Hūshang Shāh Ghūrū. I have come to this country for (obtaining) elephants.” The vazirs and amirs of Jāñagar sent an emissary to wait upon the Sultān with the message, that they were willing to agree to anything which the Sultān might wish. The Sultān sent the reply, “There was no idea of deceit or fraud in the purpose of my coming. I came to buy elephants. My merchandise has been damaged. I have seized the Rāja as a hostage, in exchange of whom I would take elephants.” The vazirs of Jāñagar sent 75 splendid elephants to him, and also made their excuses. Sultān Hūshang returned towards his own country taking the Rāy with him. When he passed the boundary of the Rāy’s territory he comforted him and tried to please his heart, and gave him permission to go back. When the Rāy arrived at his own capital he sent some more elephants to the Sultān.

On the way, information reached the Sultān, that Sultān Aḥmad had again invaded Mālwa and had besieged the fort of Mandū. When he arrived near the fort of Kehrla, he summoned the Rāy of Kehrla,

---

1 One MS. has by mistake, instead of "briliy", "briliy".
2 See note 1, page 475, from which it will appear that, according to Firishta, Sultān Hūshang attacked the Rāy of Kehrla before going on expedition to Jāñagar.
placed him in confinement, and took possession of the fort. He then advanced towards Mandu. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of that city, Sultān Aḥmad summoned his amirs and soldiers from the batteries, collected them together and prepared for battle. Sultān Hūshang entered the fort by the Tārāpūr gate and did not prepare for battle. But when Sultān Aḥmad saw that the capture of the fort was difficult, and in fact impossible, he rose from the foot of the fort, and prepared to plunder and devastate the country. He passed by Ujjain, and determined to seize Sārangpūr. Sultān Hūshang on becoming aware of this determination, managed to betake himself to the citadel of Sārangpūr by another route. He then sent a message to Sultān Aḥmad to the following effect; “As the rights of Musalmāns are mixed up in this, and you know yourself that the shedding of the blood of Musalmāns without any reason is fraught with great calamity; and in this case immense herds of them would perish, it is fitting that you should turn the bridle of your determination towards your own capital. ² The necessary tribute shall be sent soon after”.

Sultān Aḥmad’s mind becoming composed owing to the (promise of) peace, he evinced negligence and carelessness in the guarding of his troops, and in taking necessary precautions and care. Sultān Hūshang taking advantage of this opportunity made a night attack on the night of the 12th Muḥarram-ul-ḥarām in the year 826 A.H.

1 The word خون is omitted in one MS.
² It is not clear whether this last clause is part of the message. The verb خواهد فرشتد is in the third person, which would indicate that it is not.
³ For the account of this night attack, as given in the history of the reign of Sultān Aḥmad of Gujrāt, see pages 206, 207, and note 4 on page 206 and notes 1–3 on page 207. The account of the night attack as given here agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah, with the exception that in the text Rāy Sāmat is called the Rāja of Dundāh and the vulgar name of the place is given as Garī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 181, 182) gives the 14th (and not the 12th) Mohurrum, 826 A.H. (29th December, 1422) as the date of the night attack. Sāmat Rāy is designated Savant Ray, Raja of Dundooka, who was “afterwards known by the name of Kurry Raja”. He also says that Ahmud Shah captured “twenty elephants belonging to Sooltan Hooshung besides seven of those he had recently brought from Jajnuggur”. The Cambridge History of India passes over the night attack and the subsequent engagement.
Many people perished that night; among them Rāy Sāmat, the Rāy of the country of Dundāh, which now on the tongues and in the mouths of the (people) is called Kārī, was slain with five hundred Rājpūts, in the vicinity of the Sulṭān’s pavilion. Sulṭān Aḥmad came out of the camp with only one attendant, and stood on the open plain. Towards the morning men gathered round him, and about the time of the true dawn, which indeed was the dawn of the morning of good fortune, the Sulṭān fell upon Sulṭān Hūshang’s troops, and the battle of bloodshed and slaughter became so severe, that both the Bādshāh’s received wounds, and in the end Sulṭān Hūshang fled and took shelter in the citadel of Sārangpūr. Seven of the Jāṅ nagar elephants were seized by Sulṭān Aḥmad; and on the 4th of Rabī’-ul-ākhir of that year, Sulṭān Aḥmad turned towards Gujrāt with victory and triumph.

When Hūshang became aware of this he came out of the citadel of Sārangpūr with great pride and audacity and started in pursuit. Sulṭān Aḥmad turned round and confronted him. The flame of battle blazed up between the two armies, and at the first onset Sulṭān Hūshang put the army of Gujrāt into confusion. Sulṭān Aḥmad seeing this himself advanced into the battle-field, and fought so well that the breeze of victory and triumph began to blow upon the plumes of his standards. Hūshang again fled, and took shelter in the fort of Sārangpūr. Then Sulṭān Aḥmad returned to Gujrāt. It may be said that on the whole Sulṭān Hūshang was distinguished by bravery and high spirit, but he was not victorious in war; and in most of his battles, after much striving and struggle, he had to flee, and to soil the skirts of his courage with the dust of flight. When authentic information arrived that Sulṭān Aḥmad had passed over the boundary of Gujrāt, Hūshang went from Sārangpūr to the fort of Mandū. The same year after some days, he repaired the damage sustained by his army, and advanced to conquer the fort of Kākrūn; and seized it in the course of a short time. In the same year he again advanced to conquer Gwāliar, and by successive marches, took possession of the neighbouring territory. After a month and some days had passed, Sulṭān Mubārak Shāh, son of Khīżr Khān, marched with an army by way of Biyāna to aid the Rāy of Gwāliar. When this news reached Sulṭān Hūshang, he raised the siege, and advanced to meet the army.
up to the 1 river of Dhölpür. After some days a peace was ratified; and it was agreed that Hūshang should give up the idea of conquering Gwāliar. The two parties then sent presents to each other and returned to their respective capitals.

2 In the year 832 A.H., 1428 A.D., messengers swift-footed like the wind and desert-traversing scouts brought the news that Sultān Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanī, the ruler of the Deccan, had come with his troops, and was besieging the fort of Kehrla. When this news reached Hūshang Shāh, the humours of his spirit came to motion, and collecting a large army, he advanced to aid and succour the Rāy of Kehrla. Sultān Ahmad becoming aware of this abandoned the idea of the conquest of Kehrla; and retired towards his own country. Hūshang, at the instigation of the Rāy of Kehrla, pursued him for three stages. Sultān Aḥmad then incited by his high spirit and shame turned round and engaged him. Although in the first assault defeat had fallen on the army of Sultān Aḥmad, yet the latter coming out of ambush attacked the centre of Hūshang's army, and dispersed it. He fled towards Mandū; and the veiled one (his wife) with all the inmates of the harem fell into Sultān Aḥmad's hands. The latter followed the path of generosity, and after making necessary 3 preparations, sent them to Mandū, and sent five hundred horsemen with them to escort them. This incident has been described in detail in the section about the Sultān's of the Deccan.

In the year 4 835 A.H., 1431 A.D., Sultān Hūshang marched out of Mandū, with the determination to conquer Kālpī. When he arrived

---

1 The words are تا باب دروبلپور تا آب دروبلپور in one MS. and تا آب دروبلپور تا تالاب دروبلپور in the lith. ed. as far as the tank or reservoir of Dhölpūr. I have adopted تا آب دروبلپور تا آب دروبلپور as the correct reading.

2 Fīrīshtah's account contains greater details. The ruler of Kehrla is called the son of Narsingh Rāy and it is added that Sultān Hūshang came to his succour at his invitation. The way in which the battle was fought, and the way in which Sultān Ahmad captured the baggage of Hūshang's army, and the latter's wives and daughters, and treated them with great respect and hospitality, and sent them back are described in greater detail. The Cambridge History of India's account, page 351, also agrees, but Kehrla is written as Kherla.

3 One MS. inserts حرم و سلمان و between نموده and سلمان.

4 The account of Sultān Hūshang's expedition to Kālpī, as given by Fīrīshtah, agrees generally with that in the text, but he calls the former governor
near that place, news was brought to him that Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Sharqī was coming with an innumerable host from his capital also to conquer Kālpī. He considered the destruction of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm should be taken up in preference to the conquest of Kālpī, and advanced to give him battle. When the two armies approached each other, and a battle became a matter of today or tomorrow, Sulṭān Ibrāhīm’s scouts brought the news that Mubārak Shāh, Sulṭān of Delhi, availing himself of the opportunity was advancing on Jaunpūr. Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, giving up the rein of control, started towards Jaunpūr. Hūshang obtained possession of Kālpī without a contest, and had the public prayer read in his name. He remained there for some days, and placing the chain of gratitude on the shoulders of Qādir Khān, who was a former ruler of Kālpī, returned to Mālwa.

On the way he received petitions from the thānādārs, that turbulent tribes from the direction of the Jāṭa hills had come into his kingdom and had ravaged some villages and towns, and taken shelter in the reservoir of Bhīm. The description of this reservoir is as follows. In ancient times Bhīm had erected an embankment across the valley situated between (two) hills with chiselled stones. Its length and breadth were such that one bank was not visible from the other and its depth was unfathomable. Some days after this, even when they were on the way, ʿUṯmān Khān, Shāhzāda, sent horsemen near the pavilion of Ghaznī Khān Shāhzāda, who was his elder brother; of Kālpī, ‘ʿAbd-ul-Qādir, a servant of Mubārak Shāh of Dehli. Hūshang’s invasion of Kālpī is narrated in the Cambridge History of India, on page 252, in the history of the kingdom of Jaunpūr, and on page 352, in the history of Mālwa. In the former place the governor of Kālpī is called Sādir Khān, but in the latter he is called by his correct name Qādir Khān.

1 The name is جائیہ in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firashtah lith. ed. has جابیہ, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 185) has Jam hills. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has جائیہ Jāṭia in the text-edition.

2 The name is غزین خان Ghazni Khān here in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., though he was always غزین خان غزین خان Ghazī Khān, when it occurred in the section about the history of Gujrat. Firashtah has Ghazī Khān here also. Firashtah gives a detailed account of the seven sons of Sulṭān Hūshang. Of these three, viz., ʿUṯmān Khān, Fath Khān, and Ḥalbat Khān were united together, while ʿAlmād Khān, ʿUmar Khān and Abū Ishāq sided with Ghazni Khān. As to the disputes Firashtah’s account agrees generally with that in the text, but the
and the man seated on his horse abused Ghaznîn Kân, and spoke harsh and unbecoming words about him. Although the ushers and eunuchs forbade him, he would not desist. Then the eunuchs pelted him with stones, and drove him away from the vicinity of the pavilion. 'Uthmân Kân Shâhzâda then came to protect his servants and bastinaded the eunuchs. Becoming conscious of the impropriety of his conduct, however, he separated himself from the camp. He tempted the amîrs of evil destiny with false promises, and commenced to act traitorously. When all this reached the ears of the Sultân Hûshang, the fire of wrath flamed up in the oven of his heart. He consulted Malik Mughîth Khân Jahân. The latter told him, acts like this have been repeatedly perpetrated by the Shâhzâda, and have been pardoned. On the present occasion also the Sultân might overlook it, so that he might again join the camp. Sultân Hûshang overlooked the act as if by negligence; and Shâhzâda 'Uthmân Kân came back and joined the camp. When Sultân Hûshang spread the shadow of his clemency over the inhabitants of the town of Ujjain, one day he arranged a majlis of public audience, and summoned 'Uthmân Kân Shâhzâda with his two brothers, who were Fath Kân and Haïbat Kân into his presence, and stood them in the place of punishment; and after reprimanding them made the three of them over to custodians. Then after some days he ordered Malik Mughîth, that he should place them in confinement, take them with him to the fort of Mandû, and guard them there.

1 He then advanced to chastise and punish the turbulent men of Jâtha, and advancing by successive marches, broke down the embankment of the Bhîm reservoir and traversing a distance on wings of speed totally destroyed the refractory people. The Râja of the country

three refractory princes are there said to have been put in chains, and made over to Malik Mughîth. There are indications also of Sultân Hûshang's intentions of making Mahmûd Kân his heir; but Malik Mughîth always pretended that he had no desire to have the sovereignty for his son.

1 Firishtâh's account of the expedition against these men agrees with that in the text almost word for word; but he calls the Râja, the Râja of the Jabah or the Jabûs hill. He also says that among the prisoners there were many daughters and sons (of the Râja?). The references to these proceedings in Col. Briggs and in the Cambridge History of India are very brief.
at the foot of the Jātba hill fled on foot, and concealed himself in jungle; and his family and all his treasure and wealth fell into the Sultān’s hands; and the towns and cities were devastated. So many prisoners were taken, that they were beyond all count. The Sultān returned with victory and triumph and went to the fort of Hūshangābād and passed the rainy season there.

One day he went out with the intention of hunting. While he was out, a Badakhšānī ruby fell out of his head-dress. On the 3rd day after that a man who was going on foot brought it back to him. The Sultān gave him a reward of five hundred gold tankas; and in connection with this, he told the following anecdote: “One day a ruby fell out of the crown of Sultān Firūz Shāh; and a man who was passing brought it to him. Sultān Firūz Shāh gave him a reward of five hundred gold tankas; and said, ‘This is a sign of the setting of the sun of my grandeur’; and after some days he departed from this ephemeral world. I also know that the thread of my life has been twisted, and there are not more than a few breaths left.’” The men who were in the majlis, having offered prayers (for his health etc.), submitted that “On the day, on which Sultān Firūz said these words, his age had reached 90 years, while His Majesty the Sultān was yet in the prime of his life and success.” Hūshang said that “The number of one’s breaths can neither be increased nor diminished.” After some days he had an attack of diabetes, while he was still at Hūshangābād. When the Sultān saw the signs of his departure and marks of his demise, he started from Hūshangābād towards Mandū. On the way, he held a majlis of public audience, and he gave the seal ring of the kingdom to his true-born son Ghāznīn Khān in the presence of the amīra and his personal attendants and the commanders of the army; and declared him to be his heir. He held the latter’s hand

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 352, says that “at this time he founded the city of Hoshangābād on the Narbada;” but neither the Tabaqāt nor Firishṭah says so.

2 The word is جوهر and the Cambridge History of India, page 352, calls it his “jewelled crown”; but the Sultān would hardly have gone out hunting, with a jewelled crown on his head. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 183) calls it his tiara.

3 The name is بیل. The dictionary meaning is a morbid excess of urine, diabetes. Col. Briggs calls it an attack of stone (vol. IV, p. 186).
and placed him in charge of Maḥmūd Khān. The latter after carrying out the rites of homage, submitted, "As long as there would be remnant of life left in me, I shall not hold myself excused from loyal and devoted service." The Sultān then directed the amirs generally, that they should not soil the field of the kingdom by the dust of malice and hostility.

As the Sultān had, by the clarity of his perception, come to know, that Maḥmūd Khān intended that the office of the sovereign should be transferred to himself, he filled his ears with counsel and advice; and bringing the rights of the support and nurture, which he had received, to his recollection, said, "Sultān Ahmad Gujrāti is a monarch of great grandeur, and is a lord of the sword. He has always had the determination to conquer Mālwa, and is waiting for an opportune moment. If there is any neglect or dilatoriness in the organisation of the affairs of state, or in the supervision of the troops and subjects, or if there is any negligence in the carrying out of your duties towards Shāhzāda Ghaznūn Khān, his determination to conquer this kingdom will be strengthened; and your union will be changed to dissension."

At the next stage Shāhzāda Ghaznūn Khān sent Malik Maḥmūd Nāmi, who had the title of 'Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Maḥmūd Khān, and sent him the following message, "If you, the asylum of the vazārat, should strengthen the knot of allegiance by oaths, it would be the cause of my mind being greatly assured." Maḥmūd Khān accepted the request of the Shāhzāda, and confirmed his promise and engagements by oaths.

Some amirs, who wanted that Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān should succeed (to the throne), represented to the Sultān, through Khwājah Naṣr-ul-lah Dabīr, that as Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān was also a young man of good manners and a true son, it would be right and proper that he should be released from prison, and a part of the country of Mālwa should be allotted to him as his jāgīr. Sultān Hūshang said, "This has also appeared to be desirable in my mind, but if 1 I release

---

1 The MSS. have متنظر، متنظر. The lith. ed., has مرتب. I have retained this. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted متنظر in the text.

2 The MS. as well as the lith. ed. have only مجانریم, which does not make the meaning quite clear. Firishtah makes it clearer by adding the words
‘Uthmān Khān, the affairs of the kingdom would be in danger, and disorders and disturbances would take place.” When Ghaznīn Khān heard that some amirs had tried to procure the release of ‘Uthmān Khān, he again sent Malik Māhmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Māhmūd Khān, and represented to him, 1 that they should, in their presence, strengthen the lofty edifice of their agreement by oaths. Māhmūd Khān joined the Shāhzhāda while he was riding on the march, and again swore, that as long as the last remnant of life would be left to him, he would not abandon the side of the Shāhzhāda.

When the amirs became acquainted with all these affairs, Malik ‘Uthmān Jalāl, who was one of the great amirs, sent two reliable sardārīs with Malik Mubārak Ghāzī to wait on Māhmūd Khān. It so happened that Malik Māhmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk was yet in attendance on Māhmūd Khān, when the prayers of Malik Mubārak Ghāzī and those two amirs were brought to him. Māhmūd Khān left Malik Māhmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk in the pavilion, and himself came out and sat at the door, so that Malik Māhmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk 2 might hear

---

1 The readings are different, and not quite intelligible. One MS. has ک ہ در حضور بکدرگر قصر شامخ عہد را بقسم استحکام دهد. The other has کہ در حضور بکدرگر قصر شامخ عہد را بقسم استحکام دهد; while the lith. ed. has کہ در حضور بکدرگر قصر شامخ عہد را بقسم استحکام دہند. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has کہ اگر حضور قصر شامخ عہد را بقسم استحکام دند. None of the readings is quite satisfactory. I have adopted the reading of the first MS., which agrees with that in the lith. ed., except that in the latter has been changed my mistake to مصر. Even in this reading, however, the metaphor of calling the agreement a lofty edifice appears to be fantastic. In the reading in Firishtah there is no noun for the adjective شامخ to qualify; and it does not appear quite right that Ghaznīn Khān should call himself faqīr, in speaking to Māhmūd Khān. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has کہ در حضور بکدرگر قصر شامخ عہد را بقسم استحکام دند in the text-edition.

2 Instead of بشند has been adopted in the text-edition.
whatever would be said. When Malik Mubārak Ghāzi came with his two companions, and conveyed the prayers of Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl and Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān, Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl represented that, "The questions of the ʿsalṭanat and the vazīrat were under consideration; and when a vazīr like him was seated on the masnad, it was strange that in spite of the fact that 'Uthman Khān was adorned with liberality and courage and the qualities of administering impartial justice, and of protecting and helping the raʿiyats, it should be decided, that Ghaznīn Khān should be declared as the heir to the throne. Moreover 'Uthmān Khān has the relationship of a son-in-law to the Malik-ush-sharq (i.e., Malik Mughīth, father of Mahmūd Khān); and therefore his sons are also your (i.e., Mahmūd Khān's) sons. If infirmity had not prevailed over the Sultān, and if an error had not occurred in his righteousness, he would never have attempted to do such a thing. All the Khāns and amirs urge you, that paying (favourable) attention to the circumstances of 'Uthmān Khān you would not withdraw your hand of support from his head, for if the work of the sovereignty is transferred to 'Uthmān Khān, the kingdom would again acquire greatness and splendour." Mahmūd Khān replied, "A slave or servant is concerned only with slavery and service. As to authority or over-lording he knows. In the whole

1 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has加盟店 عثمان جال و شا زاد عثمان خان رسامان ولعبوروددشت. The other MS. inserts between رسامان and غفت, while the lith. ed. has رسامان غفت. I have adopted the first reading, but M. Ḥidayat Ḥosain has inserted between رسامان خان and غفت. According to lith. ed. of Firishtah also it was Malik 'Uthmān Khān Jalāl who was sent by the partisans of 'Uthmān Khān with Malik Mubārak Ghāzi, but the latter as in the text was the spokesman of the party. Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl is called Mullik Othman Julwany by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 187).

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah all say و در قوي تنوره راه نمی یاده, this appears to be incorrect. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt which has instead of قوي نصوصي; but M. Ḥidayat Ḥosain has retained قوي in the text-edition.

3 It is in both the MSS., the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I suppose the ام or he refers to the Sultān.
period of my service I have never strayed after what is beyond my province."

When Malik Mubārak Ghāzi obtained permission to leave, (Maḥmūd Khān) called Malik Maḥmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk outside, and said, "Go and report this to the Shāhzāda." Malik Maḥmūd went and narrated what had happened. The Shahzāda’s mind being now reassured about Maḥmūd Khān, was highly pleased.

After the amirs had become despondent of the life of Sultān Hūshang, Zafar Minjumla, who was the peshvā of Malik ‘Uthmān Jalāl, fled from the camp of Sultān Hūshang, with the intention of winning over the custodians of ‘Uthmān Khān, and arranging for the latter’s escape. When this news reached Maḥmūd Khān, he immediately acquainted Shāhzāda Ghaznī Khān of it, so that he might try to remedy what had happened. The Shāhzāda sent Malik Barkhūrdār, Malik Hasan and Shaikh Malik to seize Zafar Minjumla. Malik Barkhūrdār and Malik Hasan asked for horses, which should be fresh and strong. He ordered that fifty horses should be given to them from the royal stables. As the superintendent of the stables was a partisan of ‘Uthmān Khān Shāhzāda, he said in reply, "As long as the Sultān is alive, I shall not give a single horse without his express order;" and going to one of the chief eunuchs, who was also a partisan of ‘Uthmān Khān, repeated these words to him. The wretched Khwājah, supposing that these words would be the cause

2 One MS. has Malik Husain instead of Malik Hasan; and neither MS. has the between Malik Hasan and Shaikh Malik. The name of Shaikh Malik is omitted in the next sentence in the MSS. Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Hasan and Malik Barkhūrdār, and omits Shaikh Malik altogether. Col. Briggs says that Ghizny Khan “ordered a party of fifty men of the royal guards to overtake and bring back Zuffar Khan” (vol. IV, p. 187).
3 The word is ژو כ"א.
4 The words گنگر نمود - خواجه بی دولت ابی سعید را! are omitted in one MS. and in the lith. ed. The MSS. and the lith. ed. are very incorrect and imperfect here, and I am rather doubtful about the correct reading. As to the word خواجه بی دولت as an epithet of خواجه I do not know what it really means, but it may mean wretched, though why this epithet should be used I do not know.
of the Sultan's protest and anger, explained to the superintendent of
the stables to go near the place, where the Sultan was lying and to
repeat these words in a loud voice, so that they might reach the
Sultan's ears, and make an impression on his mind, that even while
he was still alive, Ghaznî Khan was stretching his hand to seize his
property. When the superintendent of the stables said these words
with vigor and emphasis, the Sultan in his unconsciousness, having
regained a little perception, said, "Where is my quiver?" and called
for the amirs.

The amirs, thinking that God forbid! that the Sultan should
have died; and Ghaznî Khan should have got hold of us by means
of this trick, and should destroy us, did not go to the Sultan ¹ except
Mahmûd Khan. When this news reached Ghaznî Khan a great fear
and awe fell upon his heart, and he fled and went to Kârân, which
was three stages from the camp. He sent Malik Mahmûd 'Umdat-ul-
mulk to wait on Mahmûd Khan with the following message, "All the
amirs have combined together to raise 'Uthmân Khan to the throne,
and I have no one to support me except yourself. As the Sultan
had called for his quiver, I thought that he might after arriving at
Mandû imprison me also, and place me beside my brothers." Mahmûd
Khan sent the following reply: "You have never done anything
contrary to the wishes of the Sultan. I shall explain to the Sultan,
the matter of your order about giving the horses, at the right moment."
Ghaznî Khan again sent Malik Mahmûd 'Umdat-ul-mulk, with the
following message: "Although you, the asylum of the vazârat, have
taken me by the hand, yet as I know that the eunuchs have com-
municated some displeasing words (about me) to the Sultan, fear has
overwhelmed me." Mahmûd Khan sent this message, "There is no
matter. Do you please return soon to the camp, for there is little
time, and the sun is about to set." He also wrote a letter in the
presence of Malik Mahmûd 'Umdat-ul-mulk and sent it to Malik
Mughîth to the following purport: "His Majesty the Sultan has

¹ The words Mahmûd Khan occur in the MS., and in the lith. ed. The meaning
is doubtful.

² The word is ِفصیح, or ِفصیح in the MS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah
lith. ed. also has ِفصیح.
declared Ghaznîn Khân to be his heir and successor; His Majesty’s illness has made him very weak, and those who are near him have given up all hope of his life. It is right that you should make every endeavour to guard Shâhzâda ‘Uthmân Khân.’

When Malik Mahmûd went and waited upon Ghaznîn Khân, and gave him Mahmûd Khân’s message, and described the purport of the letter, he was delighted and came back to the camp. When Malik Ançhâ, the paymaster of the forces, and the eunuchs, who were partisans of ‘Uthmân Khân, saw that there was a breath left in the Sulţân, they determined among themselves, that early next morning, they would place him in a palanquin without informing the amîrs and 2 Mahmûd Khân, and go with all speed to Mandû, and bringing Shâhzâda ‘Uthmân Khân out of prison place him on the throne. Mahmûd Khân having obtained information of the plan became watchful for the death of Hûshang. He ordered the palanquin to be placed on the ground there, and then 3 Ghaznîn Khân, under

---

1 The name is in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has ملك انجها خان جهان, ملك انجها in the lith. ed.

2 One MS. omits Mahmûd Khân. The other MS. has امراء معظمود خان. The lith. ed. has Mahmûd Khân.  

Firishtah lith. ed. has Mahmûd Khân. I have adopted the second reading, but it may be that the reading of the lith. ed. is correct, for there is no reason why the amîrs, who were in favour of ‘Uthmân Khân should be kept in ignorance of the plan. If this reading is correct, then the text would be the amîrs on the side of Mahmûd Khân instead of the amîrs and Mahmûd Khân.

3 There is some difference in the readings here also. The MSS. have یسرین خان بفرموده یسرین خان بفرموده معظمود خان while the lith. ed. has خان بفرموده معظمود خان.

Ghaznîn Khân was so much under the thumb of Mahmûd Khân, that it is quite possible that he should have acted under the orders of the other, and therefore the reading in the MS. which I have accepted is correct; though one would have thought, that whatever the actual relations of the two men might have been, Mahmûd Khân would have, outwardly at least, acted under the orders of Ghaznîn Khân and not vice versa.

Firishtah gives a slightly different account. He says that the Khân Jahân and the eunuchs started with the palanquin with the dying Sulţân in it. After they had gone some distance the Sulţân died. Mahmûd Khân obtaining information of this sent men, so that they might reprimand the eunuchs about their haste, and keep the palanquin there. The eunuchs explained that Hûshang had ordered that he should be carried to Mandû as quickly as possible, and they
the orders of Maḥmūd Khān had the royal pavilion fixed up, and occupied himself in putting the corpse into a shroud and coffin. Each one of the amīrs (apparently of the opposite faction) went to a secluded place and stayed there.

After the enshrouding of the corpse Maḥmūd Khān came out, and said in a loud voice, "Sultān Hūshang has died under Divine Dispensation; and has made Ghaznīn Khān his heir and successor. Whoever is with us should come and make his homage; and whoever is against us should separate himself from the camp, and should go about his own affairs." Maḥmūd Khān then kissed Ghaznīn Khān's hand, and having rendered him homage, wept much. Then the other amīrs one after another kissed Ghaznīn Khān's feet, and wept, crying Alas! Alas! When the accession of Ghaznīn Khān was confirmed by the homage of the amīrs and of the great men of the age, they took up the corpse of Sultān Hūshang and carried it towards the madrasa; and on the 9th Dhi-hijjah, 838 A.H., consigned it to the dust.

Verses:

Where are the kings of Jamshīd-like power,
From Hūshang and Jamshīd to Isfandiyār!
Faridūn and Kaīkhūsrū and Ī Jām Kū,

were only carrying out his orders. Ghaznīn Khān and Maḥmūd Khān did not give any reply, and the latter ordered the royal pavilion to be set up, and commenced to put the Sultān's corpse into the shroud and coffin.

1 I think this is the first time in this history, that the ceremony of the kissing of the hands is mentioned. Of course there are plenty of instances of kissing the feet and of kissing the ground near the Bādshāh's seat or feet. Here also the other amīrs kissed the feet while Maḥmūd Khān alone was privileged to kiss the hand.

2 Firishtah adds in Shādībād Mandū.

3 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 189) gives the Hijri date as the 9th Zeehuj, 835 and the corresponding A.D. date as 7th September, 1432. The correct date according to the Tabaqāt and Firishtah is 9th Dhi-hijjah, 838 A.H. The Cambridge History of India, page 352, gives July 6th, 1435, as the date of Sultān Hūshang's death. The correct A.D. date according to Sewell and Dikshit's Indian Calendar appears to be 7th September, 1435.

4 I cannot exactly find out what Jām Kū means.
Where are gone Shāpūr and Bahrām 1 Gūr.
They all rest their heads on brick and dust.
Happy he, who, save of good, sowed not seed!

A grand assemblage was convened in the palace of Sūltān Hūshang; and Malik Mughīth Kān Jahān and all the other amīrs rendered homage, and performed the ceremony of making thanks-offerings.

The period of Hūshang’s reign was thirty years. The date of his death (838 A.H.) can be found and understood from the words “Alas! Shāh Hūshang is no more.”

AN ACCOUNT OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF HŪSHANG SHĀH GHŪRĪ.

When Hūshang Shāh accepted the summons of the just God, on the 11th Dhi-hijjah, the amīrs, against their wishes, but by the exertion of Malik Mughīth, and the arrangements made by Maḥmūd Kān rendered homage anew to Ghaznīn Kān, who had been chosen by Hūshang. He distinguished each one of the amīrs by conferring on them robes of honour and titles, and assured them (of safety). 2 The great and well-known men of Mālwa were made happy by the grant of rewards and stipends. The city of Māndū received the name of Shāltābād, and the public prayers having been read, and the coins struck in the name of Ghaznīn Kān he received the title of 3 Sūltān Muḥammad Shāh. Every one who had a fief or a stipend anywhere had it confirmed and resettled. In short, although the amīrs had not been pleased with Ghaznīn Kān being made the Sūltān, yet owing to the excellence of the management and the skill of Malik Mughīth and Maḥmūd Kān, a new grandeur and splendour appeared in the administration. The people became the new Sūltān’s adherents, and an affection for him gained an ascendancy over the empire of men’s heart. He conferred the title of Masnad-i-ʿĀli Kān Jahān on

---

1 One MS. has كور, the other MS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have كور. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has كور. The name of Bahrām is so closely associated with كور or the wild ass which he hunted, that I have thought that the reading should be بُهِرْمَ كور. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has بُهِرْمَ كور in the text-edition.

2 One MS. inserts an و before مالک.

3 One MS. omits the word شاه.
Malik Mughīth, and kept the reins of the vazārat, as before, in his powerful grasp.

But as after some days he made attempts on the lives of his brothers, and shed unrighteous blood; and drew the pencil across the eyes of Nizām Kān, his nephew and son-in-law, and of the three sons of the latter, men's heart were filled with abhorrence of him, and hatred took the place of love in them. The blood of his murdered brother was necessarily not a good omen for him; and in a very short time the rule of the empire passed out of his dynasty. 1 Disturbances and rebellion, 2 which had fallen asleep in the country, awoke again; and refractory and turbulent men 3 raised the standard of violence, and the dust of disturbance and rebellion.

Couplet:

If evil thou hast done, hope not danger to escape,
For, it is right for nature to retaliate.

Among the others the Rājpūts of the country of 4 Hārūṭī placed their feet outside the circle of allegiance and raided a part of the kingdom. When this news reached Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, he nominated Kān Jāhān on the 11th of Rabi‘-ul-āwwal 839 A.H., to punish them and bestowing two elephants and a special robe of honour on him, started him on the expedition.

He placed the affairs of the soldiery and the ro`iyats on the shelf of oblivion, and contracted the habit of continual drinking. He always united and joined up the morning draughts with the evening draughts and vice versa. At last one day a number of the old wretches sent him a message through an inmate of his harem, to the effect,

---

1 One MS. has اشنوب instead of اشنوب.
2 One MS. has خواف شد instead of خواف شد.
3 One MS. has براکیشیئا instead of براکیشیئا.
4 The name is حاروئی in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has نادونی, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 192) has Nandote. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the rebellion here, or the expedition under Malik Mughlis to crush it, but later on after Mahmūd Kān had seized the palace, he is said, on page 353, “to have summoned his father, who was engaged in hostilities against the Hāra Rājpūts of Harāotī”.

Hārōutī cannot, however, be transliterated as Harāotī. It can be transliterated either as Hārūti or Hārautī. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has حادوتی Hādūti in the text.
that a crow of greed had laid an egg of pride in the brain of Maḥmūd Khān; and he was thinking, how he could remove the Sūltān out of the way and himself sit on the throne of empire. Sūltān Muḥammad made an agreement with those men, that before Maḥmūd Khān could carry this wicked wish from potentiality to actual facts, he himself should be removed out of the way. When this news reached Maḥmūd Khān, he said, "Praise be to God! that the breach of the agreement has not occurred from my side." He occupied himself in attending to his own affairs, and always collected troops and retainers. He went to wait on Sūltān Muḥammad with great caution and care. When the Sūltān observed the cautious ways of Maḥmūd Khān, it became the cause of increased anxiety and fear. One day, he seized Maḥmūd Khān's hand, and took him into the harem. He called his wife, who was a sister of Maḥmūd Khān, and said in her presence, "It is my hope that you will not do any harm to my life, and the affairs of the kingdom will be in your charge without any contention or hostility". Maḥmūd Khān said, "Perhaps the engagements and oaths have passed out of the Sūltān's mind that he brings such words on his tongue. If some malicious persons, for their own wicked purpose, have spoken words to him, he will in the end be abashed and ashamed. If there is any fear or apprehension of me in the mind of the Sūltān, I am now alone, and there is nothing to prevent it (my death).

Couplet:
If for loyalty you are, here are my heart and life,
If for enmity, here are the charger and my head.”

Sūltān Muḥammad then made his excuses; and the two men behaved with softness and flattery. But as the Sūltān was obsessed by his suspicions; words and gestures indicating his distrust appeared

1 The phrase is written in different ways. It is in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and is in the other. Firishtah, lith. ed. has "الله الحمد" in the text.--M. Hidayat Ḥosain has correctly "الله الحمد" in the text.

2 One MS. has "غفرونا" instead of "غفرنوا" which occurs in the other and in the lith. ed.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have "نا اعتبادي" but the other MSS. have "ما اعتبادي".
from him every moment. Maḥmūd Khān began to make great exertions and endeavours in gaining his objects. He tempted the Sultān’s cup-bearer with much gold, and had the Sultān killed by giving him poison in his wine. The tongue of the circumstances of Sultān Muḥammad thus victimised and done to death, began to sing in this tune; and the faithless time threw up this noise into the curve of the arch of the sky.

Couplets:

A few breaths, I said with pleasure, shall I take,
Alas! they were stopped on the path from my heart.
Alas! that at the table of the viands of life,
I, for a moment partook; and then they said “stop”.

When the amirs became cognisant of this, 1 Khwājah Naṣr-ullah, 2 Parniyānī and Malik Masir-ul-mulk, and Laṭīf Zakariyā and some other sardārs combined together, and bringing Shāhzāda Mas’ūd Khān, who was in his thirteenth year, out of the harem, placed him on the throne. They agreed among themselves, that they would remove Maḥmūd Khān out of the way by any means that they could. They sent Malik Bāyazīd Shaikhā to him, and told him, “Sultān Muḥammad Shāh has sent for you to come with great quickness; and wishes 3 to send you as an ambassador to Gujrāt.” As Maḥmūd Khān was aware of the death of Sultān Muḥammad he replied, “I have relinquished the duties of the vazārat, and wish to pass the remaining years of my life, as a sweeper of the tomb of Sultān Hūshang. But notwithstanding this determination of mine, as the marrow of my bones has been nourished by the beneficence of Hūshang Shāh,

---

1 The names are as I have them in the text in one MS. except that of Mashīr-ul-mulk, which is that of Shīr-ul-mulk. In the other the name is Malik Mashīr-ul-mulk; and in the lith. ed. Parniyānī is written as Harsānī; otherwise they agree with the first MS. Firishtāh lith. ed. has Khwājah Naṣr Ullah, qazi, and Mashīr ul-mulk and Laṭīf Ḏakariyā. The names are not given by Col. Briggs and in the Cambridge History of India. The former (vol. IV, p. 193) has, “The officers about the king’s person”, and the latter (page 353) “a faction among the nobles”.

2 M. Ḥidayat Ḥosain has دیر نبائی in the text.

3 The MSS. have رسولی, and the lith. ed. has رسولی. It is in the corresponding passage in the lith. ed. of Firishtāh. This would mean, wishes to send you on an embassy, and appears to be a better reading than the others.
if all the amirs would come to my house, then after discussing all differences of counsels, we would report to the Sultān whatever is determined upon, as appears to be right and proper.”

Malik Bāyazīd Shāikhā returned to the amirs, and informed them, that “Mahmūd Khān has not yet received the news of the Sultān’s death; if you will all go together to his house, he will go with you to the palace, and he can then be disposed off.” Acting on Bāyazīd Shāikhā’s words the amirs went to Mahmūd Khān. The latter had kept his men ready in concealed places. When the amirs entered, he asked, “Has the Sultān recovered his senses or is he still lying drunk?” The amirs knew what he was saying. After a moment his men came out of the chambers, and fell upon the amirs. They seized all of them and made them over to guards. As the lofty edifice of the remaining amirs, who were with Mas‘ūd Khān tottered under the blow of this news, they collected their troops, and made the retinue of the Sultān ready; and bringing the royal umbrella from the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, raised it over the head of Mas‘ūd Khān.

Mahmūd Khān on hearing this news mounted and advanced towards the palace, with the object of seizing both the Shāhžādas, and disposing off them. When he got near the palace both sides seized their arrows and spears, and the battle of slaughter and bloodshed lasted till night. When the lord of the stars (that is the sun) hid himself behind the veil of darkness, Shāhīzāda ‘Umar Khān got down from the fort and took the path of flight; and Mas‘ūd Khān took sanctuary with Shaikh Jāildah, who was one of the great (holy) men of the age. The amirs fled and betook themselves to the corners of safety. Mahmūd Khān remained in front of the palace till the morning, fully armed and ready for all emergencies. When the white light of morning appeared from the sea of the darkness of night,

---

1 One MS. has شقيق كنکاش, the other has شقيق و کنکاش, and the lith. ed. has شقيق و کنکاش. Firishtah lith. ed. has شقيق و کنکاش. The first reading is followed in the text-edition.

2 The word is نباه خانهها. The corresponding word in Firishtah lith. ed. is نباهها corners.

3 The meaning of this is not quite clear, but the same words occur in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
news was brought to him, that the palace was empty, and the enemies, each one of them, had hid themselves in corners.

Maḥmūd Ḵhān then entered the palace, and sent a swift messenger to summon his father Ḵhān J̱ahān. The latter arrived on the wings of speed. Maḥmūd Ḵhān assembled the amirs and Maliks and sent the following message to Ḵhān J̱ahān: 1 "The world cannot exist without a 2 ruler. If the throne of the empire remains unoccupied by the person of a sovereign, many disturbances are produced in the world from the womb of time, the suppression of which becomes difficult. The kingdom of M̱alwa has become extensive and refractory, and turbulent men have not yet wakened from sleep. Also the news has not yet reached the Sultāns of the surrounding countries. Otherwise they would have advanced towards us from all directions." Ḵhān J̱ahān sent the following reply: 3 "No one should attempt to assume 4 this exalted position, which is a twin brother of the rank of the Prophet, unless he is possessed of the qualities of exalted lineage and perfect generosity and bravery and justice and wisdom, (and unless this is the case) the affairs of the empire do not acquire grandeur and glory. Praise be to God! that my son has all those qualities, which a Sultān should possess. It behoves him (therefore) that at an auspicious moment, he should place his foot on the masnad of the sultānat, and seat himself on the throne of

---

1 The message does not contain a direct appeal to Malik Mughith to assume the sovereignty of M̱alwa, though it implies it. Firishtah lith. ed., however, says that Maḥmūd Ḵhān wrote to Ḵhān J̱ahān, that the sultānat belongs by right to you; and you should come quickly and seat yourself on the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, also says that Maḥmūd Ḵhān "offered the crown to his father", but the latter "declined the honour".

2 Both MSS. have incorrectly جهانبي, people of the world. The lith. ed. has the correct reading جهانبي a ruler. Firishtah in the corresponding passage also has جهانبي.

3 Ḵhān J̱ahān's message as given in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. appears to me to be incomplete. It appears to me that some word like كٴس should be inserted before متقلد, and some words like نباهت شد شد after متقلد; and the كٴس after او is changed to او. Firishtah lith. ed. omits the words from متقلد to نباهت; and then the sentence makes good sense.

4 One MS. and the lith. ed. have اٴ but the other MS. has اٴ. This latter appears to me to be better.
empire." When the messenger brought this message, all the amīrs and great men applauded this sentiment, and attested to the truth of the word. The astrologers, who knew the stars, were ordered that they should select an auspicious moment for the accession. All the amīrs and the wise men of the kingdom and the great men of the city kissed Maḥmūd Khān's hand, and congratulated him on his accession.

Couplet:

If one goes, another in his place doth come,
The world never without a bridegroom (ruler) is.

The period of the rule of Sūltān Muḥammad was one year and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SŪLTĀN MAḤMŪD KHALJI.

The narrators of the histories of the Sūltān have related, that on Monday 1 the 29th of the month of Shawwāl in the year 839 A.H., Sūltān Maḥmūd Khalji ascended the throne of the Khilāfat of Mālwa. His age at that time had attained to 34 years. In the whole of the country of Mālwa public prayers were read, and coins struck in his name. All the amīrs were gladdened with kindness and favour, and the stipends and rank of each were increased. A number of them were selected, and received titles. Among these Mashīr-ul-mulk had the title of Niẓ̄ām-ul-mulk conferred on him, and the reins of the vazārat were placed in his powerful hands. Malik Barkhūrdar received the title of Tāj Khān, and the office of the pay-master of the kingdom was entrusted to him. Khān Jahān received the title of Ā'zam Humāyūn; and an umbrella and white quiver, which were specially reserved for sūltāns, were bestowed on him; and it was also settled that the harems and equerries of Ā'zam Humāyūn should have staffs of gold and silver in their hands, and, whenever he should mount or dismount, should say in a loud voice: In the name of the benevolent and merciful God!, which in those days was the exclusive privilege of sūltāns.

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 196) gives the corresponding A.D. date as May 16th, 1435. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, gives 13th May, 1436, as the date of Maḥmūd Khalji's accession. According to Sewell and Dikshit's Indian Calendar the day and date appear to be Thursday, the 24th of August, 1435.
When the empire was firmly fixed on Sultan Mahmud, he devoted his energy to the support of learned and wise men; and whenever he heard of any person of great ability, he sent money to him, and summoned him. He also established colleges in his kingdom, and granted stipends to the learned men and to students, and kept them occupied with imparting and receiving knowledge and learning. In short, the country of Mâlwa in the period of his rule became an object of envy to Shîrâz and Samarqand.

As the work of the government was properly administered and all the affairs of the kingdom acquired order, 1 Malik Quth-ud-din Shaibani and 2 Malik Nasir-ud-din Dabir, and a number of the other Hushang Shahi amirs, owing to their envy, attempted to act treacherously in concert with 3 Malik Yusuf Qawâm. With the object of carrying out their intention, they placed a ladder one night, and climbed to the roof of a masjid which was adjacent to the palace of Mahmud Shah. From that place they came down to the courtyard of the palace, and were thinking what they should do next. At this time Mahmud Shah appeared there, and with very great bravery came out of the house with his quiver bound round him; and coming within bow-shot wounded some (of them). About this time 4 Nizam-ul-mulk and Malik 5 Mahmud Khidr arrived fully armed.

---

1 The suffix to the name is Shaibani in both MSS., but it is Sumnani in the lith. ed. and Rustani in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 197) has Sumnani.

2 He is called Malik Nasir-ul-din Dabir in one MS., and in the lith. ed. and Malik Nasir-ul-din Dabir in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Nasir-ul-din Dabir and Col. Briggs has Nuseer-ood-deen Joorjany. Is he the same man as Khwajah Nasir-ul-lah Parniyani mentioned on page 494 and in note 1 on the same page?

3 He is so called in both MSS. The lith. ed. calls him, evidently by mistake, Malik Yusuf Quam. Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Yusuf Qawam-ul-mulk. Col. Briggs does not mention him. The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of any of the conspirators.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Mashir-ul-mulk, who had the title of Nizam-ul-mulk.

5 Both MSS. call him what I have called him in the text. The lith. ed. erroneously inserts a between Malik Mahmud and Khidr. Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Muhammed Khidr.
from outside with a body of *silāhdārs*. The conspirators fled by the very route by which they had entered, and made their escape. One of them, however, who had been wounded by an arrow, could not descend by the ladder; and threw himself on the ground from the roof of the mosque. His leg was broken, and he was seized, and was taken (before the Sultān?); and he wrote down the names of all the men who were among the conspirators. Early next morning, they were all brought before the Sultān, and were punished.

But Ā’ẓam Humayūn begged for the 1 pardon of the offences of Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān, son of Hūshang Shāh, and Malik Yūsuf Qawām and 2 Malik Anēhhā and Malik Naṣīr-ud-dīn Dabīr, although they had had a full share in creating the disturbance; and selected the fort of Islāmābād for the Shāhzāda; and conferred the title of Qawām Khān and the fief of Bhīlsā on Malik Yūsuf Qawām; the fief of Hūshangābād on Malik Anēhhā; and the title of Naṣīr Khān, and the fief of Chandīrī by deputation (*Niyyābat*) to Malik Naṣīr-ud-dīn. They obtained leave to go to their *jāgīrs*. When Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān reached Islāmābād, he at once raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion. His forces began to increase day by day, and although Tāj Khān, who had been nominated to suppress them, sat down at the foot of the fort of Islāmābād, he was unable to effect any result. Aḥmad Khān sent out a detachment every day from the fort, and kept (the men at) the foot of the fort hotly engaged in battle. Tāj Khān sent a petition, and begged for reinforcements. About this time scouts brought the news to the Sultān that Malik Anēhhā, the feudatory of Hūshangābād, and Naṣīr Khān the feudatory of Chandīrī had raised the flag of hostility and the standard of revolt. Sultān Maḥmūd sent Ā’ẓam Humayūn Khān Jahān, to teach the rebels a lesson, and to arrange all the affairs of the country. When the latter arrived within two *karaḥs* of Islāmābād, Tāj Khān and the other *sardārs* hastened to meet him, and explained the true state of

---

1 The word is استعطاف in one MS. and استعطافī in the other. The lith. ed. has what looks like استعطاف. Firishtah lith. ed. has استعطاف. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted استعطافī in the text-edition.

2 He is not mentioned by Firishtah here, but later on in the distribution of fiefs he is called ملك جهاد in the lith. ed.; and Mullik Itihad by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 198).
things to him. On the second day, he started, and having occupied the environs of the fort, distributed the batteries. The next day he sent a number of wise men and Shaikhs to Aḥmad Khān, so that they might after filling his ears with the pearls of advice and the gems of precepts, warn him of the evil effects of a breach of agreements and engagements. Although the Shaikhs and learned men read the texts of persuasion and intimidation to him, his stony heart did not become affected. In reply to the sound precepts he gave equally rare replies, and having given permission to the kind-hearted preceptors sent them out of the fort. Qawām Khān also, acting in a spirit of hostility, sent some arms and other war-like materials to him from his own battery, and strengthened the foundations of amity by promises and engagements. When the siege was prolonged, one day one of the musicians gave poison to Aḥmad Khān in his wine; and throwing himself out of the citadel joined the camp of Aʿẓam Humāyūn; and the fort was captured. Aʿẓam Humāyūn after arranging matters there left one of his trusted men at that place, and marched towards Hūshangābād.

On the way Qawām Khān fled from Aʿẓam Humāyūn’s camp, and went away towards Bhilsā. Aʿẓam Humāyūn considered the overthrow of Malik Anchā to be of primary importance, and continued his advance to Hūshangābād. Malik Anchā, finding that he had not the strength to meet him, left all his equipage and other things, and went away towards the foothills of Gōndwāna. When the Gōnds knew that he had turned his face from his lord and master, they collected in large numbers and blocked his way; and killed all of them by pelting them with stones, and shooting them with arrows, and plundered all their goods and property. Aʿẓam Humāyūn on

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بندانا, but the other MS. has بندانا.
2 One MS. has كار مصامرة, the other omits كار, while the lith. ed. has كار مصامرة. Firiştah in the corresponding passage has كار مصامرة.
3 Firiştah makes this somewhat clearer by saying باختنی اعظم همارون یا بنابر مقدمه دیگر, i.e., either at the instigation of Aʿẓam Humāyūn or for some other reason; and adds زهر داده نکشته. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, says positively that Ahmad Khān was poisoned “at the instigation of Mughls.”
hearing this news was highly pleased and entered the fort of Hūshangābād. He arranged the affairs of that quarter in the best manner, and left one of his trusted men there; and advanced towards Chandērī, to chastise Naṣrat Khān.

When he arrived within two stages of Chandērī, Naṣrat Khān, finding himself weak and helpless, came out to meet him; and wanted 1 to cover up his misdeeds with grass. Ā’ẓam Humāyūn sent for the Saiyids and the learned and great men of the city, and collected them together, and asked each one of them to describe the behaviour and circumstances of Naṣrat Khān. Each one of them told a story, most of which were: that the crow of pride and vanity had laid an egg in his brain, so that marks of hostility and rebellion have made their appearance. Ā’ẓam Humāyūn transferred the government of Chandērī from Naṣrat Khān to 2 Malik-ul-umārā Ḥājī Kamāl; and advanced towards Bhilsā. Although he sent men of rank to Qawām Khān, and tried to guide him in the right path, it was productive of no good result. Qawām Khān got out of Bhilsā and fled. Ā’ẓam Humāyūn halted there for a few days, and after assuring his mind of the affairs of that country, turned his face towards the capital city of Shādiābād.

On the way news was brought to him, that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrāṭī was advancing with the object of conquering Mālwa; and had sent Shāhzhāda Mas’ūd Khān with a large army and twenty elephants 3 to attack him. Ā’ẓam Humāyūn started with rapidity, and passing the army of Sultān Aḥmad at a distance of six karōhs entered the fort of Mandū by the Tārāpūr gate. Maḥmūd Shāh was delighted at the arrival of his father, and performed the rites of offering thanks to God. He sent out detachments every day from the fort, and went on fighting hard. With great bravery and courage he wanted to sally out of the fort and engage in a drawn battle. But as the thorn of the hostility of the Hūshang Shāhī amirs had caught in his skirts,

---

1. The words are خس بیش سارد in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishta.

2. The name is as in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 213) Mullik Kaloo.

3. Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have بصر شما. Firishta lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has بصر شما.
and a sort of caution had taken possession of his mind, so that he considered those who were near him, in spite of the kindness with which he had treated them, to be his enemies. But having regard to their hostility and opposition, he stretched out his hands of generosity and benefactions from the sleeve of liberality and munificence, and kept all the men, even in the narrow and straitened circumstances of the siege, satisfied and contented. He also distributed grain from the (royal) granaries to faqīrs and poor men. On account of his great generosity, grain was cheaper in the fort than it was in Sultan Ahmad's camp. He established boarding houses for faqīrs and poor men, and gave them cooked and uncooked food. He also summoned to his service some amīrs such as Saiyid Ahmad and Şūfi Khān, son of 'Alā-ul-mulk, and Malik-ush-sharq, and Malik Muḥammad, son of Ahmad Şīlāh, and Malik Qāsim, and Hisām-ul-mulk Hāndērī who had an attitude of rebellion and hostility to

---

1 The MSS. have اعدام عدو خود and the lith. ed. has اعداء و عدو خود. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has اعداء عدو خود and the lith. ed. has اعداء و عدو خود. The necessity of the insertion of the words is not very clear.

2 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have اسودة و منعم but the other MS. has اسودة و بغم. Firishtah lith. ed. has only اسودة.

3 There is considerable difference in the names. There is no difference as regards the first name, but one MS. omits the و after it, which makes it doubtful whether Saiyid Ahmad and Şūfi Khān are two men or only one. There is also no و between Saiyid Ahmad and Şūfi Khān in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and the father's name is given there as 'Imād-ul-mulk and not 'Alā-ul-mulk. The name of Malik-ush-sharq occurs in the MS. but is omitted from the lith. ed., and is changed to Malik Sharf in the lith ed. of Firishtah. Malik Muḥammad has that name in one MS., but is called Malik Ahmad in the other and Malik Maḥmūd in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. His father who is called Ahmad Şīlāh in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. is called Ahmad Šīlāh-dār in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The name of Hisām-ul-mulk which is found in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. is changed to Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk and the suffix to his name is rather difficult to decipher but appears to be Handbārī. The names are not given by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 200) who describes them collectively as the "Malwa officers in Ahmad Shah's camp who were at all discontented." The Cambridge History of India (p. 353) refers to the chapter about Gujarāt for a detailed account of these transactions, but even there very few details are given, and there is no mention of any of the names.
Sultān Ahmad, by promising them gold and jāgīrs. Owing to these acts there was a certain amount of wickedness in Sultān Aḥmad’s affairs; and by the advice of some men who had come from the latter’s camp and had joined him, Sultān Maḥmūd intended to make a night attack. It so happened that 1 Qaisar Khān, the inkstand-bearer of Sultān Hūshang, 2 informed Sultān Aḥmad of this intention. So when Sultān Maḥmūd’s army came out from the fort, they found the men in the camp 3 ready, and all the paths closed. In the end, they pulled down a wall and the battle began. Up to the rising of the true dawn, it went on furiously from both sides; and a large number of men were wounded and killed. About the time of the rising of the sun, Maḥmūd Shāh retraced his steps, and went into the fort of Mandū.

After some days the scouts brought the news, that the inhabitants of Chandāri, and the troops in that neighbourhood had rebelled against Malik-ul-umarā Hāji Kamāl; and had made ʻUmr Khān, son of Sultān Hūshang their leader; and to 4 add to the guitar of music, Shāhzāda Maḥmūd Khān, son of Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī was advancing towards Sārangpūr with five thousand horsemen and thirty elephants. On hearing this news Sultān Maḥmūd held a consultation, and it was decided that Āzam Humāyūn who was, 5 the nursery of the empire, should occupy himself in the guarding and arranging of the fort, and Sultān Maḥmūd should himself come out of it, and taking up a position in the centre of the country arrange for its protection.

---

1 The name and description of this man is, as I have written them in the text, in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. But Firishtah lith. ed. has Naṣr Khān the daevādār of Sultān Hūshang, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 200) has “Noosrut Khan the officer he had lately been removed from Chundery.”

2 The word is خَاصَت in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has خَاصَت.

3 The word here also is خَاصَت in the MSS., in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

4 The words appear to be غَنْبِر A غَنْبِر is a kind of lute or guitar with a long neck. I do not know the meaning of the phrase, but it appears to be a proverbial saying to express “to add to the other difficulties.” Firishtah has no analogous phrase.

5 The word is دَوَّاَحَة in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but it is دَوَّاَحَة in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. According to the dictionary دَوَّاَحَة means a groove, a nursery, an orchard. دَوَّاَحَة in the text-edition.
In accordance with this intention (Sultān Maḥmūd) turned his face of determination in the direction of Sārangpūr; and sent Tāj Khān and Maņṣūr Khān in advance of himself. As Sultān Aḥmad had left Malik Ḥājī ‘Alī at the fort of Kanbal to guard the road and keep it open, Tāj Khān and Maņṣūr Khān, who had arrived there before Sultān Maḥmūd, fought with him. The latter fled and took the news to Sultān Aḥmad, that Sultān Maḥmūd had come out of the fort, and was marching towards Sārangpūr. Sultān Aḥmad sent a messenger to Sārangpūr (with the direction), that the Shāhzāda should, before the arrival of Sultān Maḥmūd, betake himself to Ujjain. After the arrival of the messenger Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān started from Sārangpūr, with great caution and vigilance, and came and waited upon Sultān Aḥmad at Ujjain.

1 Malik Isḥāq, the son of Quṭb-ul-mulk, the feudatory of Sārangpūr sent a petition to the Sultān; and asking for pardon for his guilt, wrote that Muḥammad Khān had left Sārangpūr, and had gone away to Ujjain on hearing the news of the advance; but Shāhzāda ‘Umr Khān had sent an army in advance of himself with the object of seizing Sārangpūr, and was himself following behind it. On becoming acquainted with the purport of the petition Sultān Maḥmūd was highly pleased; and drew the pen of pardon across the page of Malik Isḥāq’s offences; and sent Tāj Khān in advance of himself to Sārangpūr and he himself also advanced in that direction. When Tāj Khān arrived at Sārangpūr, he comforted and re-assured Malik Isḥāq and all the inhabitants and leaders of the bands of Sārangpūr of the Sultān’s rewards and favours. On the Sultān’s arrival after they had rendered homage, the Sultān conferred the title of Daulat Khān on Malik Isḥāq and bestowed on him a standard and a 2 tās and a gold embroidered qubā (robe), and ten thousand gold tankas in cash and doubled his stipend. He also bestowed on the heads of the different groups and the residents of the city some horses, and fifty thousand

1 The name is ملك اسحق in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is ملك اسحق in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have adopted ملك اسحق.

2 The dictionary gives cup, goblet, dish and brocade as meanings of tās. None of these meanings appears to be appropriate.
tankas to distribute among themselves. When he reached Sārangpur, the scouts brought the news that Shāhzāda 'Umr Khān had burnt down the town Bhilsā, and had arrived at the boundary of Sārangpur; and that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī had also come out of Ujjain with thirty thousand horsemen and three hundred elephants, and was advancing towards Sārangpur. Sultān Maḥmūd considered that it would be advisable to undertake the destruction of 'Umr Khān in the first instance, and commenced an advance at the end of the night.

When there was a distance of six kārōhs between the two armies, (he) sent a detachment as an advance guard, and they seized some prisoners from whom a knowledge of the condition of the enemy's army could be obtained, and brought them to the Sultān who made an enquiry from them of the state of 'Umr Khān's army. He sent Nizām-ul-mulk and 1 Malik Aḥmad Šīlāḥ, and a number of others, so that they might reconnoitre the jungle and the roads. He arranged the army in four detachments, and advanced early in the morning to attack 'Umr Khān. The latter also becoming aware of Sultān Maḥmūd's advance hastened to meet him; and having arranged his troops sent them to confront him. But he himself took up a position 2 on the top of a hill and there remained in ambush waiting for an opportunity. It so happened, however, that some one brought the information to Sultān Maḥmūd that 'Umr Khān was hiding in ambush with some troops on the top of a hill. Sultān Maḥmūd with a well-equipped force advanced towards him. 'Umr Khān said to the 3 soldiers who were with him: "It would be a reflection on their good name to fly from the son of a servant; and it is better to be slain than to baulk behind." He then fell upon Sultān Maḥmūd's army with the men who were united with him; but was taken prisoner, and was put to death by the Sultān's order. His head was placed on the top of a lance and was shown to the army of Chandīrī. The leaders and commanders of that army were amazed and thunder-

1 The name is Malik Ahmad Šīlāḥdār in Firishtah. See note 3 on page 592, where also the name is Malik Aḥmad Šīlāḥ in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, but Aḥmad Šīlāḥdār in Firishtah.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. has بسر کوے instead of بسر کوے; this is better: but as the MSS., and the lith. ed. have I have retained it.

3 One MS. has بسپھائي but the other and the lith. ed. have بسپھائي.
struck; and sent the following message, "Please cease the 1 battle for this day; so that early next morning, we may wait on you and render homage to you anew." On this agreement, both the armies encamped for the night. (But) when night came on, the Chandéri army retired towards its own country; and when it arrived at Chandéri, the amirs joined together, and placed Malik Sulaimän, son of 2 Malik Shēr-ul-mulk Ghūrī, who had been the nāib of 'Umr Khān, giving him the title of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn.

Sultān Maḥmūd detached an army for crushing him, and advanced himself to fight with Sultān Aḥmad. But the two armies had not yet met each other, when some of 3 the pious men in the army of Sultān Aḥmad saw His Holiness the last of the Prophet, on whom be the benediction and salutation!, in a dream, as declaring that, "A calamity has descended from the sky, tell Sultān Aḥmad, that he should carry the goods of his safety out of this country." When they informed Sultān Aḥmad of this dream, he did not put much faith in it. (But) within the next two or three days a pestilence appeared in his army, so that the soldiers had no time even for digging the graves. Sultān Aḥmad now having no alternative, went back to Gujrāt by way of Āṣhta; but he gave a promise to Shāhzāda Masʿūd Khān that he would seize the country in the course of the next year, and would deliver it over to him.

Sultān Maḥmūd then went to the fort of Mandū, and having, within the course of seventeen days, re-equipped his army advanced to quench the flame (of rebellion) in Chandéri. When he arrived there Malik Sulaimān came out of the citadel with the amirs, and made brave efforts; but as they had not the requisite strength, they fled,

---

1 The words ں ں ں ں ں occur in one MS., but not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have inserted them as they make the meaning complete. The words ں ں ں ں ں ں ں are in one MS., and in the lith. ed., but in the other MS. they are ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں . I consider this is better and have adopted it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں in the text-edition.

2 Firishtah calls him Malik Mashir-ul-mulk who was the nāib and a near relative of Sultānžāda 'Umr Khān. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں in the text-edition.

3 Firishtah lith. ed. has ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں , instead of ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں ں .
and again taking shelter in the citadel fortified themselves in it. But Malik Sulaimān died there quite suddenly.

The *amirs* selected another to be their leader and, making the necessary preparations for carrying on the warfare, came out of the citadel. They fought, but again had to flee and take shelter in the fort. When the period of the siege had extended to 1 eight months, Sultān Mahmūd 2 took advantage of an opportunity; and 3 one night climbed over the wall of the fort; and after him other brave men did so; and the citadel was seized; and a large number became food for the sword. But one party fled and 4 fortified themselves in a fort, which was situated on the top of a hill. After some days Ḫān (of) Kālpī obtained quarter, and brought them down from the fort. Sultān Mahmūd having arranged the affairs of that territory in the best way, and having allotted Chandīrī as a *jāghir* to Malik Muẓaffar Ḫān, intended to return. But his scouts brought the news that Dūṅgar Sēn had come from the fort of 5 Gwāliar; and had besieged the 6 city of Narwar. In spite of the fact, that his army

1 The period is eight months in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishta, and in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 204). It is seven months in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*, and in the Cambridge History of India.

2 The word is *انتظار* in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishta. It is *انتظاه* in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. The dictionary meaning of *انتظاه* is act of rising, getting up; another word *انتظاه* means watching for, finding an opportunity. I think *انتظار* is more appropriate than *انتظاه* and this is adopted by M. Ḥidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition.

3 One MS. has *بسح* instead of *شبيِح*. This appears to be a mistake.

4 There are some variations in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have *منسَح بن شهداء*; the other has *منسَح بن شهداء*; and further on one MS. and the lith. ed. have *عسيعيل بن كالي ناجمَات رأ امانَ ورَنْة*; while the other has *عسيعيل بن كالي ناجمَات امانَ ورَنْة*.

5 I have accepted *منسَح بن شهداء* and *عسيعيل بن كالي ناجمَات امانَ ورَنْة*. As to the other difference there is apparently not much to choose. I have adopted the readings of the first MS. and the lith. ed. In the text-edition M. Ḥidayat Ḥosain has *آن جماعت ان جماعت* instead of *آن جماعت ان جماعت*. Firishta gives the conditions on which quarter was granted.

6 Gwāliar is spelt *گویلیار* in both MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but on previous occasions it was spelt as *گوَلْیَار*, and is so spelt here also in Firishta.

The name is 5 *شهر نور* the new city, in one MS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishta. It is 6 *شهر نور* the city of Narwar in the other MS., and *شهر نور* the city of Nūr or
was, owing to its being the rainy season and the long period of the siege, in much distress, Mahmūd Shāh advanced towards Gwalior by successive rapid marches. When leaving his own territory, he arrived near Gwalior, he commenced to plunder and ravage the country. A body of Rājpūts came out of the fort, and engaged in a battle; but as they had not the strength to withstand the assaults of Mahmūd Shāh’s army they fled, and entered into the aperture of the fort. Dūngar Sēn on hearing this news decided on a retreat and raised the siege, and fled to Gwalior. As Mahmūd’s object was to release Narwar from the siege, he did not occupy himself with besieging Gwalior and returned to Shādiābād.

In the year 843 A.H., (1439 A.D.), he commenced the erection of the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, and the completion of the Jāma’ Masjid of Hūshang Shāh, which is situated near the Rām Sarāī gate, and

Naur in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, though later on, it is in it also.
Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205) has Nurwar. The Cambridge History of India, page 354, has “a town named Shahr-i-Nau, not now traceable”. The evidence in support of the reading Shahr-i-Nau appears to be good, but I think or the city of Narwar is the correct reading. Narwar is situated on the river Sind opposite to Jhānsi, and would be on the way from Gwalior. The Cambridge History of India (p. 354) calls Dūngar Sēn “Dongar Singh the Tūnwar of Gwalior.” The name is Dūngar Sēn in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and also in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah, but Col. Briggs has Dongar Sing. After Timūr’s invasion, Gwalior according to the Cambridge History of India, page 241, was held by the Tonwar Rājpūts, but the name of Tonwar does not appear in the list of the Rajpoot royal races given on page 63 of Tod’s Rajasthan, vol. I, the nearest approach to that name being the Tuars, which appears in the lists by the Kheechie Bard, and by the author (Col. Tod). It is true that the Imperial Gazetteer of India, vol. XII, page 441, agrees with the Cambridge History of India in saying that “After Timur’s invasion Gwalior was seized by the Tonwar Rājpūts.” But Tonwar is spelt there as it indeed is on page 241 of the Cambridge History with the short a and not with the long a as on page 354. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has in the text-edition.

1 The MSS. have, and the ed. has . Fīrishtah lith. ed. has . This appears to be the correct reading and I have accepted it.

2 The MSS. and the ed. and the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah all have .

3 The name of the gate is variously given. One MS. has , Rām Sarāī gate. Another has what looks like the Hārasūl gate.
had two hundred and thirty cupolas, and three hundred and eighty
1 pillars (minarets?); and these were completed in a short time.

In the year 2 845 A.H., petitions from the amirs of Mewāt, and
the great and holy men of the metropolitan city of Dehli came in,
rapid succession, to the effect, that Sulṭān Muḥammad (son of Mubārak
Shāh) was unable properly to discharge the high and onerous duties
of sovereignty; and consequently the hands of the oppressors and of
turbulent men had come out of the sleeve of tyranny and oppression;
and there was nothing left of peace and quietness, except in name
and a story. As the tailor of faith and providence had sewn the
robe of sovereignty on the elegant stature of that asylum of
sovereignty, the generality of the residents of this country wish, that
they should place the collar of allegiance to him on their neck of submis-

sion and subjection with willingness and alacrity. In the latter part of
the year, Sulṭān Maḥmūd advanced towards Dehli with a well-equipped
army. In the neighbourhood of the town of Hindau, Yūsuf Khān
Hindauni waited on him. When he encamped in the village of 3 Panna,
Sulṭān Aḥmad took up a position with Tughlaqābād at his rear. The

while the lith. ed. has درواژه رامولی، Firishtah lith. ed. has درواژه رامولی، and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205) has the Rampoora gate.

1 The MSS., and the lith. ed. have استوانه، which according to the dictionary means a cylinder. The lith. ed. has ستون a pillar. The mosque according to
Firishtah lith. ed. has two hundred and eight isteqānas; and according to
Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205), "two hundred and thirty minarets and two hundred
and sixty arches."

2 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have 845 A.H., but Firishtah lith. ed.
has 844 A.H., and Col. Briggs has 844 A.H., 1440 A.D. The Cambridge History
of India, page 354, also has 1440 A.D. For an account of these transactions,
as given in the history of Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh of Dehli, see page 271 of
vol. I, Persian text, and pages 327, 328 of vol. I, English translation of this work.
The Dehli Sulṭān is here called Sulṭān Maḥmūd Mubārak Shāh in one MS.,
and in the lith. ed., and Sulṭān Muḥammad Mubārak Shāh in the other MSS.,
and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, though in the Dehli section he was called Sulṭān
Muḥammad Shāh. He was the adopted son of Mubārak Shāh and the correct
reading here should be Muhammad Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, The Cambridge
History of India, page 354, calls him "Sayyid, Muhammad Shāh."

3 One MS. has تبة Tabta, while the other has what looks like پلندہ Patna.
next day Sultān Maḥmūd divided his army into three detachments. He placed two of them under the commands of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, and of 1 Ghaznīn Khān who had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; and sent them against Sultān Muḥammad’s army; and kept the third force of selected soldiers with himself. 2 Sultān Muḥammad sent out Malik Bahlūl Lūdī and Saiyid Khān and Daryā Khān and Quṭb Khān and other commanders, and engaged them in battle. Up to nightfall, brave men experienced in warfare stepped out from both sides and gave proofs of their courage and bravery. In the end both parties sounded the drum of retreat and took up their positions in their original stations.

3 It so happened that on that very night Sultān Maḥmūd saw in a dream, that some audacious low men had risen in revolt in the fort of Mandū, and had brought the royal umbrella from the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, and raised it over the head of a man of obscure descent. In the morning there were signs of anxiety and 4 distress in him. At this time Sultān Muḥammad sent emissaries, and struck at the door of peace. Sultān Maḥmūd immediately agreed to a pacific settlement, and started on the journey back to Mālwa. On the way, news came to him, that as it had happened, on that very night a mob of the common people had raised the dust of disorder and disturbance in Mandū, but it had been quelled by the exertions and

1 He is called Qadm Khān in one MS. and Ghaznīn Khān in the other and Naṣrat Khān in the lith. ed. Qadm Khān seems to be the correct reading, see note 4, page 327, vol. I, English translation of this work, and I have adopted it.

2 One MS. has by mistake Sultān Maḥmūd.

3 Firīshṭāḥ agrees mainly as to the three versions of the reason of Sultān Maḥmūd’s return to Mālwa, though the lith. ed. says that he saw the revolt in the fort of Mandū in an واقعة, happening and not in a dream. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 206) says that he saw it in a dream. But the Cambridge History of India, page 354, says that Maḥmūd readily accepted Muhammad Shāh’s proposed terms of peace, as he "had learnt that during his absence the mob had risen in Māndū, removed the gilded umbrella from the tomb of Hūshang, and raised it over the head of a pretender." It has thus converted what Sultān Maḥmūd saw in a dream into a series of actual events.

4 The MSS. have تَرَّدَدَ وَ بَسَمَةَ وَ بُسَمَّةَ after while the lith. ed. has no similar words. Firīshṭāḥ in the corresponding passage has بَسَمَةَ, and I have adopted it. M. Hidayat Ḥossain has بَسَمَة in the text-edition.
management of Ā'zam Humāyūn. It has, however, come under my notice that it appears in some history that news was conveyed to Sultān Maḥmūd, that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī was about to invade Mālwa; and for this reason Sultān Maḥmūd came back. This version appears to be the most correct.

In short, Sultān Maḥmūd arrived in Shādiābād on the 1st of Muḥarram 846 A.H.; and made the deserving men there partake of his gifts and benefactions. In the same year he laid out a garden in the land appertaining to the town of Na'īcha; and built a dome and a few great palaces in it; and remained for some time in Shādiābād.

2 After a short time he repaired the casualties and the damages sustained by his army; and marched out towards Chitōr with the determination of chastising the Rājpūts. 3 At this time, 4 news was brought to the Sultān of the arrogance of Naṣīr, 5 son of 'Abd-ul-qādir, the governor of Kālpī, who had assumed the title of Naṣīr Shāh, and had declared his independence; and letters had come from both the great men and the ordinary inhabitants of the country, that he had placed his foot outside the straight and strong path of the law of the Prophet, and was struggling on the path of heresy and oppression; and (they) were crying for justice from his oppression and tyranny. Sultān Maḥmūd placed the destruction of Naṣīr Shāh in the forefront of his energies; and 6 advanced towards Kālpī.

---

1 The name of the month is left out in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but is given as Muḥarram in the lith. ed. of the Tābaqāt. Of course the first day of Muḥarram is also the first day of the year. The year is 846 A.H., in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but is 845 A.H., in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and 845 A.H., 1441 A.D., in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 297).

2 One MS. has instead of what I have in the text, which is the reading of the other MSS. and the lith. ed.

3 The sentence is long and rather clumsily worded.

4 The word خبر is omitted in one MS., and in the lith. ed.

5 The word لد after نصر is omitted in the MSS. and the text-edition. It is in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and as it is required to make sense I have inserted it.

6 One MS. has instead of which occurs in the other and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, by mistake مقومه سواء اعظم بازارت كنابي كشت, which is عماري كنابي كشت, which occurs in the other and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, by mistake مقومه سواء اعظم بازارت كنابي كشت, which is عماري كنابي كشت.
Naṣir 1 (son of) ‘Abd-ul-qādir, having received information of the advance of Sultān Maḥmūd, sent 2 ‘Ali Khān, his uncle, with many beautiful things and presents and various kinds of tributes, and submitted a representation to the effect, that “Whatever they have said in respect of me, is entirely false and a fabrication; and in order to decide this matter, if you will send truthful men and will find out the truth, you can mete out any punishment that I may deserve if even a small part of it be proved to be true.” Sultān Maḥmūd 3 did not grant an audience to the emissary for some days; and advanced stage after stage. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, he, at the suggestion of Ā’zam Humāyūn and other chief men of the state, drew the pen of forgiveness across the 4 page of Naṣir’s offences, granted permission to his emissary to make his kūrnīsh, accepted his tribute, and sending him letters containing counsel and precepts gave permission to ‘Ali Khān to go back; and turned towards the country of Chitūr.

When he crossed the 5 river of Bhim, he sent detachments every day in different directions in the country of Chitūr and devastated it and plundered and took the people prisoners, and pulling down idol temples, laid the foundations of mosques. He halted for three or four days at each stage. When he encamped at Kūnbhāmir, which is one of the greatest forts of that country, and is famous for its strength in the whole country of 6 Hindūstān, there the vakil of Rāy Kūnbhā, who was named Dēbā, fortified himself, and sent out troops

---

1 Here also the man is named نصیر عبد الغافر ولد بن or نصیر عبد الغافر ولد ابن and the word the word the word is omitted in the MSS., the lith. ed., and the text-edition.
2 One MS. has خالی خالی خالی خالی خالی خالی خالی خالی خالی خالی خالی Xāli instead of خالی خالی خالی Khān’s معلم or tutor and not his uncle.
3 One MS. has بار ناداء instead of ناداء.
4 The word مغعدة is only in one MS. before the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but I have inserted it, as it is required to make the metaphor complete.
5 Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah call it the حرفی Bāmī or Bāmī. There was a حرفی mentioned before, see page 481; but it cannot be identical with حرفی mentioned before, see page 481; but it cannot be identical with حرفی or Bāmī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 208) calls it the Būnas river.
6 Both MSS. have برقی اینجا and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have درنگیا. This is better, and I have adopted it. It would appear that according to the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah it was the fort of Kūnbhāmir itself that Dēbā Rāy fortified himself in; but according to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 208)
to carry on skirmishes. It so happened, that they had built a grand
temple opposite to the fort, and had drawn a line of fortifications
round it, and had stored provisions and war materials in it. Sultan
Mahmud directed his energies to the capture of the fortifications round
the temple, and seized them in the course of a week. A large number
of Rajputs became food for the sword, and others were plundered
and taken prisoners. Sultan Mahmud ordered that the buildings
appertaining to the temple should be filled with firewood and set on
fire, and he poured water and vineger over the walls; and in the
winking of an eye, those grand edifices, which had taken so many
years to erect, were rent asunder and crumbled down. The idols
were also broken up, and given to the butchers (Col. Briggs adds
"of the camp"), so that they might use them as weights for their scales
for the sale of meat. The largest idol which had been fashioned in
the shape of a sheep, was converted into lime, and given with the

it was, "one of the forts in the Koombulmere district." And he calls its
defendant Beny Ray. The Cambridge History of India, page 355, is delightfully
vague here, and says "he captured a fort and destroyed a temple, and advanced
to Chitor." It is curious that there is no mention of these incidents in Tod's
Rajasthan. On the other hand Tod (vol. I, p. 222) says that in S. 1496 A.D. (1440
A.D.), the kings of Malwa and Guzerat "at the head of powerful armies, invaded
Mewar. Koombho met them on the plains of Malwa bordering on his own state,
and at the head of one hundred thousand horse and foot and fourteen hundred
elephants, gave them an entire defeat, carrying captive to Cheetore Mahmood
the Khilji sovereign of Malwa." We have no mention of this victory in either
the Tabaqat or in Firishtah, but according to Col. Tod, Abul Fuzil mentions
it, and dilates on Koombho's greatness of soul in setting his enemy at liberty,
not only without ransom but with gifts. Col. Tod, also says that Mahmood
was confined for six months in Chetooore, that Rana Sanga's son gave Baber the
crown of the Malwa king, one of the trophies of the conquest, and finally that
there is a more durable record of the victory in the inscription on the triumphal
pillar of Chetooore, of which Koombho laid the foundation eleven years after the
event, and which was completed in ten years.

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have و سركه آپ , while the other MS. has و سركه آپ ;
but Firishtah lith. ed. has و سرد آپ . He, however, agrees with the Tabaqat
in saying that water was poured over the wall, but Col. Briggs says that cold
water was thrown on the stone images.

2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 209, footnote) says probably the figure was
one of a bull, for, as he says, there is no other instance of the image of a sheep
or a ram being treated as an object of worship by the Hindus.
pān leaf to the Rājpūts, so that they should have to eat of the object of their worship.

After he had done all this, he turned the bridle of his determination towards Chitōr; and after his arrival in that quarter, he seized, after some fighting, a fort, which was situated at the foot of the Chitōr hill; and slew a number of Rājpūts there. He was, after this, engaged in preparations for the siege of Chitōr, when the scouts brought the news, that Kōnbhā himself was not in the fort, but had on that day come out of it, and had gone away in the direction of the foot hills, which were situated in that neighbourhood. The Sultan started in pursuit of him; and sent several detachments separately in different directions after him. It so happened, that one of these encountered Kōnbhā, and a great battle took place, in which Kōnbhā was defeated; and entered the fort of Chitōr. Sultan Mahmūd detached one army to besiege the fort; and himself took up a position in the centre of the country, and sent detachments every day for ravaging, and laying the country waste.

He then summoned Ā’zam Humāyūn Khān Jahān, so that he might take possession of the country belonging to the Rājpūts, which was situated round about Shādīābād. When Ā’zam Humāyūn arrived at Mandisōr, he fell ill; and surrendered the deposit of life. Sultan Mahmūd on receiving this news became extremely disconsolate and sorrowful. He wept much, and in his great grief and distress wounded his face. On arrival in the fort of Mandisōr, he sent the body of his father to Shādīābād; and made Tāj Khān, who was the pay-master of the army, its commander; and returned to his own camp.

As the rainy season had now arrived, the Sultan resolved, that he should select an elevated position, and take up his quarters there; and after the end of the rains again go on with the siege of Chitōr. On the night of the 25th of Dḥī-Ḥijjah, 846 A.H. (April 24th, 1443 A.D.)

1 The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree, but FIRISHTAH says Kī Ḍrāṭaṭrāv, Maʿṣūr waqāع ʿamst ṭaṣṣṭrāf Shūd, i.e., so that he might occupy the part of the country of Jaitōr, which was situated around Mandisōr. The Cambridge History of India (p. 355) does not say that Sultan Mahmūd asked his father to occupy the country round Mandisor, but that the latter led an expedition against that place, and there fell ill and died.
Kōnbhā made a night attack with ten thousand cavalry and six thousand infantry, but Sulṭān Maḥmūd had arranged for the protection of his camp with such care and vigilance that he was unable to do anything; and a large number of 1 Rājpūts were slain. The next night Sulṭān Maḥmūd made a night attack on the army of Kōnbhā, with an army in battle array. Kōnbhā was wounded, and fled towards Chitōr; and many Rājpūts became food for the sword, and much booty fell into the hands of 2 the followers of Maḥmūd. The latter carried out the rites of offering thanks to God, and deferring the capture of the fort of Chitōr to the next year returned to his capital of Shādiābād for protection and safety.

Towards the end of Dhi-hijjah of the same year, he planned the erection of a college, and a minaret 3 seven stories high, in front of the Hūshang Shāhī Jāma’ Mosque.

In the year 4 849 A.H., an ambassador came from Sulṭān Maḥmūd son of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Sharqī, the ruler of Jaipur, with gifts and presents of rare excellence; and after placing them before the Sulṭān gave a verbal message to the following effect, "Naṣīr, 5 son of 'Abd-ul-qādir the governor of Kālpī, has turned his face from the strict path of the law of the Prophet, has adopted the ways of heresy and heterodoxy, has given up the practice of fasting and prayer, and has made over Musalāmān women to Hindū Nāyikās so that they might teach them the art of dancing. As the governors of Kālpī have from the time of Sulṭān Hūshang, been nominees of the rulers of Mālwa, it is right and proper, that I should in the first instance reveal all

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have راجبیت سیاہ, but the other MS. has راجبیت سیاہ.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بدست معسومدیان, but the other MS. has بدست لشکر سلطان معصوم.

3 The words are منار هفت منظر. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 210) has translated it "a beautiful pillar seven stories high." I have found that the dictionary gives face, aspect, a lofty building, tower, and palace among the meanings of منظر, but none of these is quite appropriate. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has instead of منار منظر in the text-edition.

4 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have 849 A.H., but Firishtah and Col. Briggs have 847 A.H., and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 210) has 1444 A.D.

5 One MS. omits the word لب.
his circumstances to your right-thinking mind; but if you should not have the leisure to punish and chastise him, you may indicate the fact to me, so that I may chastise him in a way, that may be deterrent to others." Sultan Mahmud said in reply, "The greater part of my army has gone to punish the rebels of Mandisir, and as you have placed the defence of the faith in the forefront of your energies, may your undertaking be of good omen; and it has my approval." In the same majlis he bestowed a robe of honour, and the usual money, which had become customary in that age and which had been paid to ambassadors, on the ambassador of Sultan Mahmud Sharqi, and granted him permission to return.

When the ambassador arrived at Jaunpûr, and reported (Sultan Mahmud Khalji's) reply, Sultan Mahmud, on account of his great pleasure and joy, sent twenty elephants as a final present to the Sultan. He then advanced towards Kalpi with a well-equipped army, and expelled Nasir (son of) 'Abd-ul-qâdir from that country.

And Nasir (son of) 'Abd-ul-qâdir sent a petition to Mahmud Shâh to the following purport, "I have been obedient and submissive to your well wishers from the time of Hushang Shâh to this day. Now Sultan Mahmud Sharqi has, with violence and tyranny, seized this faqir's territory. As you have always been my protector, now also knowing your high threshold to be the altar of my hopes, I have turned (my face) towards the country of Chanderi." Sultan Mahmud sent 'Ali Khân with elegant things and presents to Sultan Mahmud.
Sharqi; and begged him that "As Naṣir Khān, son of ʿAbd-ul-qādir, has, through your exertions and activities, repented of his evil acts, and has adopted the path of the law of the Prophet; and as he has from the time of the fortunate Sultān Hūshang been under our protection, it is hoped, that accepting and taking into consideration the purport of the text, 'that one who has repented of his sin is as if he had not sinned at all', he would draw the pen of forgiveness over his offences; and would deliver his country back to him." After the arrival of ʿAlī Khān, Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqi did not give any distinct reply, and passed the time by saying "may be and perhaps."

Maḥmūd Shāh Khaljī owing to his sense of honour and manliness, considered the protection of Naṣir (son of) ʿAbd-ul-qādir incumbent on his spirits, and started on the 1 2nd Shawwāl 848, towards Chandīri; and in the neighbourhood of that place 2 Naṣir Khān came and rendered him 3 homage; and 4 (Sultān Maḥmūd then) immediately advanced towards Erij and Bhāndīr. When this news reached Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqi, he came out of the city, and encamped in the territory of Erij; and having seized Mubārak Khān, son of Junaid Khān, who was the hereditary ruler of that place, took him along with him. Starting from that place he encamped in the broken ground near the river Jamunā, to which there was only a narrow

1 The corresponding A.D. date is given by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 212) as January 8th, 1445 A.D., while the Cambridge History of India, page 355, gives January 12th, 1445, as the date on which Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī commenced his march towards Chandīri.

2 He is called Naṣir Shāh in this place in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but more correctly Naṣir Khān in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. M. Hidayat Hosain has Naṣir Shāh in the text-edition.

3 The words ملاکمتم نموس and ملاقات کردن occur in one MS. after ملاکمتم نموس but not in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

4 The words from چون لا تروق to occur in the MS., but are omitted from the lith. ed. There are slight differences in the MS. also; the initial چ of omitted in one and the name of the second place is differently spelt in the two MSS. In one it is بندیر, which I suppose is Bhāndīr, though there is no dot below the first letter, while in the other it is written as بندیر, which is probably Bhadmīr. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is بندیر, Thāndīr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 212) has Bhandere. The Cambridge History of India mentions Erij, but not Bhāndīr.
passage, and where a hostile army could not come up to him; and strengthened the position by the erection of works round it. Mahmūd Shāh leaving him alone there advanced towards Kālpī; and Mahmūd Shāh Sharqī becoming impatient also marched towards that place. At this time the warriors of the Khalji army attacked his base, and took an immense quantity of booty. Upon this he turned round with a body of his men, and engaged in a battle; and the fight and slaughter continued till the evening. After the lord of the stars (the sun) had set, the two armies returned to their original stations, and remained there. After two or three days, as the rainy season had already made its approach, Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī returned to Fathābād after plundering and ravaging some villages appertaining to Kālpī. He planned the erection there of a palace seven stories high.

The ra’iyats and inhabitants of the town of Erij complained of the oppression and tyranny of Mubārak Khān, son of Junāid Khān. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī sent Malik-ush-sharq Muẓaffar Ibrāhīm, the governor of Chandīrī, with a large army to Erij. When he arrived in the neighbourhood, news came that Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī had sent Malik Kālū to attack and destroy him, and had reached the village of Rātah. Malik Muẓaffar Ibrāhīm also turned to Rātah and after they had met Malik Kālū fled. The inhabitants of Rātah came and saw Muẓaffar Ibrāhīm; 2 he seized them all, and sent them to Chandīrī; and again advanced towards Erij. He learnt on the way that Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī had sent the major portion of his army to make a raid on the territory of Barhār, the Rāy whereof was a dependant of Mahmūd Shāh Khaljī. Malik Muẓaffar considered the guarding of his (master’s) dominions must have precedence over the conquest of Erij, and advanced in that direction; and the Sharqī army, hearing

1 The name is written as رائت and رائته in the MS., and رائته in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 213) calls it Rohut. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the place, or the incidents connected with it.

2 It is not at all clear why he did so. Firishtah does not mention the incident.

3 The place is called Barhār in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Parbād in the other MS. It is not mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted Parhārah in the text-edition.
the news, turned back, and went to the town of Rātah. As the war was being prolonged, and Musalmāns belonging to both sides were being wounded and slain, ¹ Shaikh Jālāldah, who was one of the great men of the age, and was famous for revelations and miraculous acts, wrote and sent, with the concurrence of Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī, a letter to Mahmūd Shāh Khaljī, on the subject of a peace; and by the exertions of His Holiness the Shaikh, the peace was effected in this way; that Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī should at once make over the towns of Rātah and Mahōbah to Naṣīr Khān; and when four months should have elapsed after the return of Mahmūd Shāh Khalji, he should deliver to him the territory of Kālpī also. The period of four months was mentioned for this reason, that in that time, the truth about his religion and creed would be disclosed; and on this agreement Mahmūd Shāh Khalji returned to Shādiābād.

In the ² year 848 A.H., the Sultan planned the establishment of a hospital, and he created an endowment, by the gift of some villages, for paying the charges of medicines and all the other things required for the sick. He also appointed Maulānā Faḍl-ul-lah hakīm (physician), who had the title of Malik-ul-hukamā' for observing the condition of the sick and the insane.

On the ⁵ 20th of Rajb-ul-murajjab in the year 950 A.H., (Sultan Mahmūd) advanced with the object of capturing the fort of Mandalgarh.

¹ The name is written as جایلہ in the MS. and as جاپلہ in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and جایلہ in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 213) calls him Sheikh Chand of Mālwa.

² Firishtah lith. ed. gives 849 A.H., as the year of the foundation of the hospital. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 214) gives 1445 A.D., as the corresponding year of the Christian era.

³ This is one of the earliest mentions of the establishment of a hospital; and it certainly, as far as I know, is the earliest mention of a hospital for mental diseases. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 214) gives a description of the hospital, and mentions "apartments for maniacs"; but the Cambridge History of India, page 356, only incidentally mentions the building of the hospital.

⁴ The MSS. are incorrect here. One has مرئ و جاندین, and the other مرئ و مجانین. The lith. eds. of both the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah have the correct reading.

⁵ Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 214) gives September 11th, 1446 A.D., as the corresponding date. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, says Mahmūd Khaljī invaded the Rānā's dominion in October, 1446 A.D.
When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Ranthambhôr, he transferred the command of it from Bahîr Khân to Malik Saif-ud-dîn; and marching by successive stages encamped on the bank of the river Benâres. As Ray Kônßhâ did not possess the strength to meet him, he fortified himself in the fort of Mandalgarh; and on the 2nd and 3rd day, the Râjpûts sallied out of the fort, and exerted themselves bravely. But in the end, they came in with weakness and humility; and agreed to pay tribute. Sultan Khalji, owing to the exigencies of the time, agreed to a peace, and returned (to his own dominions).

In a short time, having newly equipped his army, he advanced with the object of capturing the fort of Biyâna. When he arrived within two farsangs of that place, Saiyid Muḥammad Khân, the governor of the place, sent his son Aûhad Khân to wait on him; and sent one hundred horses, and one lakh of tankas in cash as tribute. Muḥammad Shâh having honoured him with a special robe of honour, gave him permission to go back. He also sent a gold embroidered qabâ (robe) and a head-dress decorated with gems, a gold belt and horses with saddles and bridles adorned with gold for Muḥammad Khân himself. The latter put on the qabâ, and opened his mouth in praise of Muḥammad Shâh, and had the public prayer read and the coins struck in his name. The Sultan on hearing this news returned from the place where he was. On the way he captured the town of Alhanpûr which is situated near Ranthambhôr. He next sent eight thousand

1 He is called Muḥammad Khân in one MS. In the other he is called Muḥammad Khân in one place and Muḥammad Khân in the other. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah call him Muhammad Khân.

2 It appears from Firishtah that he did so by removing the name of the Bâdshâh of Dehli. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, says Muhammad Khân substituted the name of Muḥammad Khalji for that of 'Alam Shâh of Dehli. As a matter of fact, the Sultan of Dehli at this time was Sultan 'Alâ-ud-dîn, who was succeeded by Bahlûl Lûdî, and no 'Alam Shâh reigned in Dehli at that time.

3 The name of the town is variously given. The MSS. have Alhanpûr, and the lith. ed. has Pahtûr, while the lith. ed. of Firishtah has Nûwar. Col. Briggs has the fort (not the town) of Anundpoor, and the Cambridge History of India, page 356, cuts the Gordian knot by calling it "a minor fortress."

4 Under Tâj Khân, according to Firishtah, Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India.
horsemen and twenty-five elephants, with the object of capturing the fort of Chitōr; and after taking one lakh and five and twenty thousand tankas from the Rāja of Kōtah in the way of tribute returned to Shādiābād.

In the year 854 A.H., 1450 A.D., 1 Gangdās, the Rāja of the fort of Chāmpānūr sent him tribute, and submitted that, "Sūlṭān Muḥammad, son of Sūlṭān ᴡḥmad, is besieging the hill of Chāmpānūr; as this slave has always carried his prayers to Your Majesty, he now hopes for aid and support." Sūlṭān Maḥmūd turned his attention to give him help. On the way news came that 2 Sūlṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn, son of Sūlṭān Muḥammad Gujrātī, had come towards Īdar, with the object of demanding tribute from the Rāja of that place. Sūlṭān Maḥmūd considering him to be weak, started towards 4 Bārāsīnār. On hearing this news Sūlṭān Muḥammad, as his baggage animals had become lame and disabled, burnt his tents and other equipages

---

1 He is called Kāndās in the MS. and in the ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 215) calls him Gungadas. The Cambridge History of India which, on page 301, in the chapter about the history of Gujarāt, had Gangādās, calls him here, on page 356, Kanak Dās.

2 He is called Sūlṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn Muḥammad Gujrātī in one MS. and in the ed., but the other MS. has Sūlṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn son of Sūlṭān Muḥammad Gujrātī. Firishtah ed. has Sūlṭān Muḥammad Shāh Gujrātī. Sūlṭān Muḥammad Shāh died soon after the invasion of Sūlṭān Maḥmūd Khaljī; and Sūlṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn succeeded him. This is probably the reason of the confusion in the names of the Sūlṭān.

3 There is some difference in the readings here. One MS. has what looks like خُوْرِد مُصْعِب. The other has ضَعِيف. It is omitted in the ed. Firishtah has عَاجِز و ضَعِيف. It is rather far-fetched, but the reading may be اِنَّ خُورِد مُصْعِب. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has اِنَّ خُورِد مُصْعِب, which seems more appropriate.

4 The name is changed in one MS., and بْاْرْ اْسْمِيْر in the other and in the ed. Firishtah ed. has what looks like مَار اِسْمِيْر. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions this place. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has بْاْرْ اْسْمِيْر in the text-edition.

5 The MSS. and the ed. have پَاْرْ وْاْمْي بْاْرْکَش. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has پَاْرْ وْاْمْي بْاْرْکَش. This appears to me to be correct, and I have adopted it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has پَاْرْ وْاْمْي بْاْرْکَش in the text-edition.
and retired towards Aḥmadābād. When Sultān Maḥmūd received this information, he also turned back from the way, and encamped on the bank of the Mahindri. Gangdās came to him at this place, bringing with him thirteen lakhs of tankas in cash, and some horses in the way of tribute. Sultān Maḥmūd bestowed on him a gold embroidered robe (qabā) in the same majlis; and gave him permission to go back; and himself returned to his capital of Shādiābād. On the way, he gave permission to Rāy Bir, Rāja of Īdar, to go back, after bestowing on him, as a reward, five elephants and twenty-one horses and three lakhs of tankas in cash. He remained for a time at Shādiābād and occupied himself with the affairs of his dominions and army.

In the year 855 A.H., (1451 A.D.), he advanced with more than one hundred thousand horses to conquer Gujrāt and having passed 1 Ghāṭī Bawāli, besieged the town of Sultānpūr. Malik 'Alā-ud-dīn Suhrāb, who was the deputy of 2 Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn for some days sallied out of the fort and fought bravely. (But) when he 3 became hopeless of receiving any reinforcement he begged for quarter and joined Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter sent his family and 4 children to the fort of Mandū; and made him swear that he would never turn his face from his master. He then gave him the title of Mubāriz Khān, and made him the commander of the army; and advanced towards Aḥmadābād. On the way news came that 5 Sultān Muḥammad had surrendered the deposit of his life; and his son Qutb-ud-dīn had taken his place. Sultān Maḥmūd, in spite of the fact that his object was the destruction of the mansion of Sultān Muḥammad’s government, owing to his great humanity, assumed

---

1 The name is written as گهالی بولی in the MSS., and as کهالی نوؤلی in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has کهالی نوؤلی. I have not been able to find the name elsewhere. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted کهالی بولی in the text-edition.

2 But see below where it will be seen that Sultān Muḥammad was yet alive.

3 گشت in one MS., and in the lith ed.; but شد in the other MS.

4 ئیائلا او اطفلوش را in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and ئیائلا او را in the other MS.

5 One MS. inserts بن سلطان محمد احمد Sultan Mohammad, while the other quite erroneously substitutes Sultan Mohammad for Sultan Mohammad.
mourning; and in accordance with a custom of the time distributed pān and Sharbat (betel and sweet drinks) to the amīrs and learned men in his army. He also wrote a letter to Sulṭān Qūṭb-ud-din, offering him condolences on his father’s death, and congratulations on his accession. At the same time, however, he laid waste the town of Barōda, and left no stone unturned in the matter of plundering and seizing the inhabitants. He made prisoners of some thousands of Musalmāns and Kāfirs; and after halting for some days in that town, advanced towards Aḥmadābād.

At this time, Malik ‘Alā-ud-din Suhrāb, who had been waiting, for a time and opportunity, fled and went to Sulṭān Qūṭb-ud-din. It would appear, that when he took the oath, and engaged that he would not be false to the salt of his master, he had his old (original) master in his mind; and owing to his great regard for his salt had abandoned his family and children. Sulṭān Maḥmūd marched by successive stages, and encamped at 2 Kaparbanj, which was situated at a distance of 25 karōhs from Aḥmadābād. Sulṭān Qūṭb-ud-din halted at the village of Khānpūr, which was three karōhs from Kaparbanj. For some days the two Bādshāhs confronted each other; and on the night of 3 the last day of Ṣafar in the afore-mentioned year, Sulṭān Maḥmūd mounted his horse with the determination of making a night attack, and came out of his camp. But he missed the way, and remained all night seated on his horse in an open plain. Early in the morning he placed the army of Sārangpūr on his right wing, and entrusted the command of it to his eldest son Ghiyāth-ud-din; and nominated the amīrs of Chandērī to the left wing and arrayed it under the command of 4 Qadam Khān, who was his younger son.

1 There are differences in the readings here. The MSS. have, with slight variations, the reading I have adopted; the lith. ed. has a very imperfect reading.

2 सौकर्क, Sarkaj in the text-edition.

3 The date is सल्लू चैंफर in the MSS. and in the lith. eds., both of the Tabaqāt and Firishtah. सल्लू as applied to a month means towards the close of, and in respect of a particular day means the last day. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 217) gives the 1st of Suffur, 856, as the date of the proposed night attack and gives the 10th of February, 1453, as the corresponding date of the Christian era. Both the date and the year of the Hijri era and consequently the date and the year of the Christian era are incorrect.

4 تومنی خان in the text-edition.
He placed himself in the centre of the army and commenced the battle. Sultan Quṭb-ud-din also placing the army of Gujrat in battle array advanced to the (battle-) field. The vanguard of Sultan Quṭb-ud-din's army fled before the vanguard of Sultan Mahmūd's army, and joined Sultan Quṭb-ud-din. Muẓaffar Khān, who was one of the great amirs of Chandērī, separated himself from the left wing of Sultan Mahmūd's army, and attacked the right wing of Sultan Quṭb-ud-din's army; and its soldiers being unable to withstand the attack turned their faces in flight. Muẓaffar Khān pursued them as far as Sultan Quṭb-ud-din's camp; and his men stretching their hands to plunder and ravage entered the treasury in the camp, and loading all their elephants with treasure sent them at once to their own camp. When the elephants returned, and they wanted to lead and send them a second time, they heard that a detachment of Sultan Quṭb-ud-din's army finding Shāhzāda 1 Qadam Khān's troops to be weak and in distress had attacked them, and as they were unable to withstand them, they carried away their lives 2 on one foot (i.e., with much difficulty). Muẓaffar Khān withdrawing his hand from plunder went into a corner. Sultan Mahmūd was amazed at seeing his army dispersed and his left wing routed, and stood with two hundred horsemen on the field of bravery, and acting as an expert archer, as long as he had any arrows left in his quiver, gave proof of his great courage. At this time Sultan Quṭb-ud-din came out of the corner, in which he was concealed, with a detachment in battle array and confronted Sultan Mahmūd. The latter having exerted himself to the utmost retired to his camp, with (only) thirteen men. Sultan Quṭb-ud-din considered this victory a great gift of God, and did not engage in pursuit. Eighty-one elephants and an immense quantity of booty fell into his hands.

Sultan Mahmūd remained on horseback in his place till nightfall. When five or six thousand horsemen had collected round him, he started for Mandū at midnight. On the way, his army was badly harassed by kōlis and bhils. Sultan Mahmūd did not, from the time of the rising of the sun of his greatness and up to the end of the period

---

1. in the text-edition.
2. The MSS. have تک پا and the lith. ed. has تک پا; تک پا of course means one foot.
of his reign, suffer any defeat, except this. When he arrived at Mandû, and the damages sustained by his army had been repaired, he appointed Sulṭân Ghiyâth-ud-din, who was his true-born son to raid the town of Sûrat, which had been founded on the bank of the Tápti, and was one of the famous ports of Gujrât. Sulṭân Ghiyâth-ud-din returned after having ravaged a number of places pertaining to Sûrat. It so happened that (at this time) 2 information of the deceit and treachery and hostilities of Nizâm-ul-mulk, the vazîr, and his sons, reached Sulṭân Maḥmûd; and by his order they were punished.

In the year 857 A.H., 1453 A.D., Sulṭân Maḥmûd confirmed his determination to conquer the country of Mârwâr; but as he was not assured in his mind from the side of Sulṭân Quṭb-ud-din, he thought it advisable that he should, in the first instance, conclude a treaty with the latter; and after that undertake the conquest of Kônghâ's dominions. He kept this hidden in his mind, and gave orders for the equipment of his army; and went from Shâdiâbâd to the town of Dhâr. He sent Tâj K̲hān from that place with a well-equipped army to the border of Gujrât, so that he might introduce the matter of the treaty. Tâj K̲hān wrote letters to the vazîrs of Sulṭân Quṭb-ud-din; and sending them by the hands of eloquent emissaries, conveyed the message, that disputes and hostility between the two sides were a cause of injury to the people; and peace and amity the cause of safety and prosperity. After much discussion Sulṭân Quṭb-ud-din expressed his consent to a treaty of peace, and great and pious men from both sides having intervened, strengthened the treaty by engagements and oaths. It was settled, that the Quṭbî army should plunder and ravage such parts of Kônghâ's dominions as were contiguous to Gujrât, and Maḥmûd Shâh should take possession of the country of Mêwâr and Ajmîr and all the neighbouring countries; and whenever necessary either of the parties should not refuse to aid and help the other.

---

1 Firishtah lith. ed. agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 218) says that "Gheias-ood-deen, with the right wing of the army, fled to Surat, where he plundered the country" etc.

2 The word خدیرو بحسب اتفاق میکسب appears to be required after خدیرو, but does not appear either in the MSS., or in the lith. ed. It is in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and I have inserted it in the text.
In the year 858 A.H., 1454 A.D., Sultan Mahmūd advanced to punish the rebellious Rājpūts, who had raised the standard of recusancy and revolt in the territories of Hārauti; and made many Rājpūts in the town of 2 Mahōli food for the sword; and having seized their children and families sent them to Mandū. From that place he advanced towards Biyāna; and when he arrived near it, and as Dāūd Khān, the governor of Biyāna sent much tribute, and came in the way of loyalty and sincerity, he left the territory in his possession. He also, by his excellent exertions, changed a 3 dispute, which had existed between Yūsuf Khān Hindauñi and the governor of Biyāna, into friendship and attachment. At the time of his return, he left the government of the forts of Rambhōr and Hārauti in the charge of Qadam Khān who had the title of 4 Sultan ‘Alā-ud-din; and spread the shadow of peace and hope on the residents of Shādiābād.

In the course of the same year, Sikandar Khān and Jalāl Khān Bukhāri, who were among the great amirs of Sultan ‘Alā-ud-din Bahmanī Dakinī, sent petitions and incited Sultan Mahmud to seize the fort of Māhūr, which was one of the great forts of Berār. The Sultan advanced towards Māhūr 5 by way of Hūshangābād. Sikandar Khān came and waited on him in the neighbourhood of

---

1 The name is written as هادوئي in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is written as هاروئي. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 219) has Kerowly. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, does not give the name of the country, but calls the people the "Hāra Rājpūts".

2 The town is called مربوئي مبوي in the MS., and مبوي in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has مبوي Mahōti. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the name.

3 The word which I have translated as "dispute" is written in the MS. as نفazi, and in the lith. ed. it is نفازي, and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is نفازي. None of these words have any meaning in the dictionary which is quite appropriate. I believe "dispute", "railing at", than the "dandyng words", which is the meaning of نفازي as the nearest. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained نفازي in the text-edition.

4 Both MSS. have Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din. This is incorrect. Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din was the title of the elder son. Qadam Khān’s title was ‘Alā-ud-din. Firishtah lith. ed. has داير خاين Fidāl Khān instead of Qadam Khān; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 219) has Fidy Khan.

5 The MSS. have فدهملا فدهملا باد instead of فدهملا فدهملا باد.
Mahmūdābād. When he laid siege to Māhūr, Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn came with an army, as numerous as the stars and as splendid as the sky, to aid the besieged garrison. Sultān Mahmūd finding that he had not the strength to meet him turned back. The pen, perfumed with musk, has narrated these incidents clearly and in detail, in the section about the Bahmani Sultāns.

At the time of his return news came from the 1 enemies, that Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr, had invaded the country of Baklāna which is situated between Gujrat and the Deccan, and owed fealty and allegiance to Mahmūd Shāh. The latter, considering it incumbent on his spirit to protect and favour the ruler of the country, turned the reins of his determination in the direction of Baklāna; and sent Iqbal Khān and Yūsuf Khān in advance of himself. Mubārak Khān came with a large army to oppose, but fled after a massacre. Sultān Mahmūd returned to Shādīābād, after raiding some villages and towns in the territory of Asīr.

In the year 858 A.H., news was brought to Sultān Mahmūd, that the son of Rāy Bābū, the Rāja of Baklāna, wanted to come to him; but Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr had invaded his country, and was laying it waste, and was preventing him from coming. Sultān Mahmūd sent Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn on wings of speed to put him (Mubārak Khān) down. When the news reached the latter, he turned back and went to his own country. A son of Bābū came with much tribute, and received favours; and having obtained permission to return, went back proud and happy to his own country; and Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn went towards Rantambhūr.

About this time, the Sultān advanced towards Chitōr. Kōnbhā met him in the way of affability and gentleness, and sent a quantity of 2 coined gold and silver as tribute. As the coins bore Kōnbhā’s

---

1 The word is متردد in one MS, and in the lith. ed.; and متردد in the other MS. The only meaning of متردد that can at all apply is enemies, but even that is not appropriate. متردد cannot be found in the dictionary. Firishṭah leaves out the words از متردد in the corresponding passage; and gives the full name of Mubārak Khān as Mirān Mubārak Shāh Fārūqi.

2 One MS. has زر و نقره مسکوک پيشکش فرسند. The other has زر و نقره مسکوک پيشکش فرسند. Both these readings are partly incorrect. The reading in the lith. ed. appears to be correct and I have retained it.
stamp, they became the cause of an increase of Maḥmūd's wrath; and 1 he returned them; and his men stretched their hands in the way of plunder and rapine; and did not leave a vestige of cultivation and population. He also appointed Mansūr-ul-mulk to lay waste the country of Mandisōr. And with the object of leaving thānadārs there, he wanted to found a town of the name of Khaljpūr in the centre of the country. On hearing this, Kōnbha came in a state of distress and humility and sent a message to the Sultan, that he was prepared to send any amount of tribute that the latter might demand, and after that would never transgress the path of devotion and loyalty on the condition that the Sultan would abandon the project of building Khaljpūr. As the rains were approaching, Sultan Maḥmūd took as much tribute as pleased his heart, and turned towards Shādiābād. After remaining there for a time, he again advanced in the year 859 A.H., 1454 A.D., with the object of conquering the country of Mandisōr. On arriving in that neighbourhood, he sent detachments in different directions, and himself took up a position in the centre of the country. Every day news of a fresh victory came to him, and he performed the rites of offering thanks to God.

It so happened that one day a petition came from a detachment, which had been sent in the direction of Hārauti, to the purport that, the beginning of the rising of the sun of Islām in the country of Hindūstān was from the horizon of Ajmir, and His Holiness the most learned of the sects 2 Shaikh Mu'in-ud-din Hasan Sanjari was at rest in that place; and now as it had come into the possession of the Kāfirs, there was no vestige left there of Islām or Musalmāns. As the purport of this petition was received, Sultan Maḥmūd turned in the direction of Ajmir that very day; and after successive marches,

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 221) says in a note that Chittoor was never subjugated by the kings of either Guzerat or Malwa; and therefore Sooltan Mahmood did not return the tribute, because the coins bore Koombho's stamp, but because he did not consider it to be large enough. It appears to me that Sultan Mahomud did not admit the independence of Rānā Kōnbhā, who was paying tribute off and on; and, therefore, resented the fact that the tribute sent contained coins which bore the Rānā's stamp; and he was probably also dissatisfied with the amount of the tribute.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 357, calls him Shaikh Mu'in-ud-din Chishti.
encamped opposite the tomb, which was the receptacle of light, and asked for help from the spirit of the Khwājah, may his tomb be sanctified! (He then) ordered the bakhsūshi (pay-master) of the army, that he should, in concert with the amīrs, reconnoitre round the fort and distribute the batteries. At this time 1 Gajādhar, who was the commander of the garrison, sallied out with a body of renowned Rājpūts to give battle. He was, however, unable to withstand the assaults of Maḥmūd’s troops, and retired again into the fort. After that bloody skirmishes were carried on for four days. On the 5th day, Gajādhar again came out with all his troops, and was slain in the full swing of the fight. A body of Maḥmūd Shāh’s soldiers, being mixed with those who were fleeing, got inside the gates; and the conquest of the fort fell to the lot of the Musalmāns. In every lane there lay heaps of Rājpūts that had been slain. Sultān Maḥmūd, having carried out the rites of offering his thanks to God, attained to the honour of circumambulating the grave of the great saint; and made plans for the erection of a grand mosque. He conferred the title of Saif Khān on Khwājah Na’mat-ul-lah, and entrusted the rule of the fort to his charge. He made the attendants of that holy place happy by bestowing rewards and stipends on them; and then returning towards the fort of Mandaigarh, encamped after successive marches on the bank of the river Banās. He nominated amīrs to different points round the fort. Kōnbeh also sent out his army from the fort dividing it into three detachments. The division, which confronted Tāj Khān, and that which was opposed to ‘Ali Khān, fought with arrows and lances and there was 2 a great battle; and a large number of Maḥmūd

---

1 The name is written as کجدادر, Kajādhar, in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed.; and as Gajādhar in the lith. ed. of Firiāhtah. This latter is of course correct. Gajādhar is a corruption of Sanskrit Gaḍādhara, i.e., one who bears the mace. Col. Briggs has got Gungadhur Ray, which may be derived from Gaṇḍādhara—a name of Śiva—meaning one who carries the goddess or river Gaṅgā. The Cambridge History of India, page 357, has Gaṇānhar, which has no meaning at all. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained کجدادر in the text-edition.

2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 223, footnote) suggests that this was the battle which was commemorated as a great victory obtained by Rana Koombho over Sooltan Mahmood on the superb column which the former erected; but there is very little similarity between this battle and the victory claimed.
Shāh’s troops were slain, while an innumerable host of Rājpūts became food for the sword. When the sovereign of the stars turned his face from the arch of the fourth heaven towards his private chamber (i.e., the sunset), the two parties took up their quarters in their respective stations. In the morning, the amīrs and vazīrs collected in the royal pavilion, and submitted that as during that year the troops had been fighting repeated campaigns and the rainy season was near, it would be fitting and proper, if he would rest and repose for a few days in the capital city of Shādīlābād, in order to repair the damage and injury to the army; and make after the rains, with a fully equipped army, a king-like attempt to capture the fort. Sultān Maḥmūd returned and rested for some days.

On the 26th Muḥarram 861 A.H., 23rd December, 1456, the Sultān marched with a great army to capture the fort of Mandalgarh. In the neighbourhood of Mēwār, the armies of Nāgūr and Ajmīr and Hārault came and joined him. From that place they marched together to besiege Mandalgarh. On the way, wherever they saw a

by the Rājpūts. According to the Rājpūt Annals, the victory took place in 1440 A.D., while the date of this battle was 1455 or 1456, 15 or 16 years later; while to take one of the incidents, Sultān Maḥmūd was said to have been taken prisoner, and kept in confinement for six months, and then released; see note 6, pages 512, 513. There is no mention of this in the Musalmān histories; and it is scarcely possible that such a thing should have occurred without being noted.

The Cambridge History of India, page 357, does not mention this battle at all, and the account given by it is entirely different. According to it, “the siege was opened and the approaches carried up to the walls. On October 19th, 1457, the place was carried by assault, with great slaughter, etc., etc.” There is no mention of Rānā Kōnbhā and of his army; and instead of the retreat mentioned by Niẓām-ud-dīn and Fīrishtāh, we have Sultān Maḥmūd advancing towards Chitor, and sending columns in different directions to harass the Rājpūts and to reduce them to subjection. Later on, however, on page 361, when giving a summary of the qualities and achievements of Sultān Maḥmūd it says “The more famous column of victory at Chitor is said to commemorate victories over Maḥmūd of Gujarāt and Maḥmūd of Mālwa. If this is so it, ‘like some tall bully lifts its head and lies’. ”

1 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Fīrishtāh have the arch of the fourth heaven or sky, and I have accordingly adopted it; but the reading in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, which has the same meaning, sounds very well, and I had a mind to retain it.
temple, they razed it to the ground. On their arrival at their destination, he gave orders to cut down all the trees from the roots and having pulled down all structures, left no trace of cultivation or population. Then they commenced the siege, and carrying the batteries beyond the ditches, took them close to the wall of the fort. In a short time, the citadel was captured by the help of Divine Providence. A large number of men were taken prisoners, or 1 were slain. The Rājpūts took shelter in a second fort, which was situated on the top of a hill, and felt proud of its strength and protection. But as the water of the reservoirs above the fort had failed owing to the concussion of the cannon, and the water, which had been stored in the first fort, had fallen into the hands of Ṭahṣīl Shāh’s troops; owing to the want of water cries of weeping and anguish rose from all sides, and the garrison crying “thirsty”, “thirsty”, begged for quarter; and agreed to pay a sum of ten lakhs of tankas as tribute; and coming out 2 with an assurance of safety, surrendered the fort. This great victory appeared on the stage of events, on the 3 1st Dhī-hijjah in the year 871 A.H. Sultān Ṭahṣīl performed the rites of offering praise and thanks to God in a spirit of great humility and submission; and entering the fort on the following day, demolished the idol temple, and used the materials for the construction of a Jāma’ Mosque. He appointed a Qāḍī (judge), a Muftī (judge or one who issues fatwa or decisions), a Muḥtasib or censor of public morals, a Khaṭīb or a reader of prayers, and a Muqaddam or one who calls worshippers to perform the Namāz at fixed hours; and having arranged the affairs of that neighbourhood in the best way, advanced on the 4 15th Muḥarram in the year 862 A.H., in the direction of Chitār.

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have قتيل, while the other MS. has قتيل.
2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have باطل, while the other MS. has باطل below.
3 Firishtah lith. ed. has the 25th Dhī-hijjah 862 A.H., as the date of the victory, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 224) has Zeehuj 20, 861 A.H., 8th November, 1457.
4 Both MSS. have 15th Muḥarram 862 A.H., while the lith. ed. has 15th Muḥarram-ul-ḥārām in the year 892, which is manifestly incorrect, as to the year. Firishtah lith. ed. has 15th Muḥarram, 863 A.H., and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 224) has 16th Moḥurrum, A.H. 862, December 4th, 1457.
When he arrived in that neighbourhood, he sent Shāhzāda Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din to raid and ravage the countries of Kilwārah and Dilwārah. The Shāhzāda laid the country waste, captured many prisoners, and returned under the wings of help and safety. After some days Shāhzāda Qadam Khān and Tāj Khān were nominated to attempt the capture of the fort of Būndi. When the Shāhzāda arrived in the vicinity of the fort, the Rājpūts came out of it and commenced a fight. They exerted themselves to the best of their ability, but being in the end routed, became food for the sword; and a number of them having thrown themselves into the ditch were taken prisoners. On the first day of the attack they captured the fort by the strength of their arms, and their bravery and courage. The Shāhzāda having offered thanks for this great gift in the best way, left one of his trusted chiefs in that place; and with victory and triumph, returned to the capital city of Shādiabād in the foot steps of his father and patron.

In the year 863 a.h., 1458 A.D., (the Sultān) again mounted to punish and chastise the Rājpūts. When he encamped in the village of Ahār, he appointed Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din and Qadam Khān to raid the countries of Kilwārah and Dilwārah. They ravaged that country, and also raided the country round Kūnbhalmir. When they waited on their father, and Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din dilated on the praise of that fort, Sultān Mahmūd advanced the next day towards it. On the way he demolished temples and traversed the different stages. When he encamped in the vicinity of Kūnbhalmir, he mounted his horse one day, and went to the top of a hill which was situated on its eastern side, and reconnoitred the city. He then declared that the

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Kilwārah and Dilwārah, while the other MS. has Kilwārah and Malwārah.
2 The text-edition has دهد خان. بناديب و گو شمال راجپنبل سواری نمود و جهان بناديب كلواز با گل وارد نامزد نمود و بموقع اهار نمود آمد and has instead بناديب كلواز گل وارد نامزد نمود و بموقع اهار نمود آمد, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 225) has the town of Dhar.
3 One MS. omits the words بناديب بناديب كلواز با گل وارد نامزد نمود and has instead بناديب كلواز گل وارد نامزد نمود and then as in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firistah.
4 One MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firistah have بموقع اهار, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 225) has the town of Dhar.
5 The name is variously written as Qadam Khān, Fidāi Khān, and Fidwi Khān.
capture of the fort would not be possible without a siege lasting some years. The next day he started from that place and advanced towards Dungarpur. When he encamped on the bank of the Dungarpur reservoir, 1 Ray Syām Dās, the Ṛāja of the place fled, and took shelter in the foot-hills; and coming out again from that place in great humility and distress gave a tribute of two lakhs of tankas and twenty-one horses. The Sūltān then returned to his capital of Shādiābād.

In Muḥarram 866 A.H., September 1461 A.D., he advanced by rapid stages to conquer the country of the Deccan at the instigation of 2 Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk Ghūrī. 3 When he crossed the river Narbada, the scouts brought the news, that Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr, had surrendered the deposit of his life. And Ghāzi Khān, his son, who bore the title of ‘Ādil Khān, had taken his place. In the beginning of his rule he had stretched out his hands of 4 tyranny from the sleeve of oppression, had unjustly ordered 5 Saiyid Kamāl-ud-din and Saiyid Sūltān to be slain, and had laid waste the houses of the victims. After some days their brother named Saiyid Jalāl-ud-din came to Sūltān Maḥmūd praying for justice. The latter, in order to help him, determined to chastise ‘Ādil Khān, and with this intention marched towards Asīr. ‘Ādil Khān in his helplessness and humility sent one of the grandsons (descendants) of Qūṭb ‘Ālam

1 He is called Ray Syām Dās in one MS. and Ray Sām Dās in the other, and Sāmī Dās in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Ray Sām Dās, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 225) has Sham Das. I have adopted Syām Das, as it is nearest to the Sanskrit name.
2 Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree; see also page 87 in the account of Niẓām Shāh Bahmani, from which it would appear, that the invasion was at the instigation of Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk Ghūrī; but the Cambridge History of India, page 357, says that Humāyūn Shāh caused Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk Ghūrī to be assassinated; and it was at the instance of his family, who escaped to Māndū, that Sūltān Maḥmūd Khaljī invaded the Deccan.
3 The Cambridge History of India, page 358, dismisses the matter of the advance on Asīr, with the rather inadequate and misleading statement, “composed a recent quarrel with ‘Ādil Khān II of Khāndesh.”
4 Both MSS. have لم, but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have تم.
5 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 225, 226) has “Syud Kumal and Syud Sooltan, two of the most respectable and holy persons of the age,” but I cannot find his authority for doing so.
Shaikh Farid-ud-din Mas'ud Shakarganj to wait on him, and sending some tribute, prayed for the pardon of his offences. As Sultan Mahmud knew that the arrow of the plan of no conqueror of forts had ever reached the battlefields of the strong bastions of Asir; and besides the real object of this expedition was the conquest of the Deccan, he drew the pen of forgiveness over the volume of 'Adil Khan's offences; and having given him some advice, turned towards the country of Berar and Elichpuri.

On his arrival in the town of Balapur, his scouts brought the news that the vazirs of Nizam Shah had summoned and collected the troops from the different frontiers; and having drawn two crores of tankas from the treasury, had disbursed it, in the way of help to their expenses, to the amirs and the commanders; and they had come out of the city of Bidar with a large army and one hundred and fifty elephants of mountain-like size; and were waiting for the appearance of secret hidden in the providence of God, may His greatness be glorified! Sultan Mahmud, on hearing this news, put his troops in order, and by repeated marches arrived within three farsangs of Nizam Shah. 2 The vazirs placed the eight year old Nizam Shah

---

1 The eight years old son of the tyrant Humayun Shah, who had in the meantime succeeded him.

2 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. has وزراء نظام شاه هشت سال را سوار کردن, while the other has وزراء نظام شاه را سوار کردن and the lith. ed. has the same reading as the first MS., with the difference that it has وزراء instead of وزراء. I have adopted the reading of the first MS. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 226) says that the young king was placed on an elephant; but the use of the word عتان bridle, shows that this is not correct. The account of the battle as given in the Cambridge History of India, page 358, is somewhat misleading. It is said there that, "when the two armies met, that of the Deccan got some slight advantage, but the precipitate action of a slave named Sikandar Khan, who had charge of the person of the child king, decided the fate of the day." As a matter of fact the Deccan army gained a decisive victory and the Malwa army fled and was pursued for two karbobs, and Sultan Mahmud's camp was plundered; and the fate of the day was not decided by the precipitate action of the person in charge of the child king; but as so often happened in other battles, was due to the victorious troops having dispersed in search of plunder, and Sultan Mahmud coming out of ambush with a body of fresh troops at the psychological moment. The person who took away the young king towards Bidar was not, according to the Tabaqat and Firishtah, Sikandar
on a horse; and raising the royal umbrella over his head placed the bridle of the horse in the hand of Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk. The command of the left wing was entrusted to Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, and of the right wing to Khwājah Mahmūd Gilānī, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār. When the two Bādshāhs arrived in front of each other Malik-ut-tujjār acting with great quickness fell on the left wing of Sulṭān Mahmūd’s army; and both Mahābat Khān, the governor of Chandāri, and Zahir-ul-mulk, the vāzīr, who were the commanders of it were slain; and a great defeat fell on the Mandū army, so that it was pursued to a distance of two karōhs; and Sulṭān Mahmūd’s camp was plundered.

At this time Sulṭān Mahmūd, who had betaken himself to a corner, and was waiting for an opportunity (saw that) most of the Dakīnīs were engaged in plundering, and Nizām-ul-mulk was standing with only a few men round him, appeared with twelve thousand horsemen from behind Nizām Shāh’s army. Khwājah Jahān Turk, who was the leader of the centre of the army, turned round; and seizing the bridle of Nizām Shāh’s horse turned towards the city of Bīdar. The tables were now turned; and the men who had gone away in search of plunder were deprived of the beautiful capital of their lives.

Malka-i-Jahān, the mother of Nizām Shāh, having suspicion of deceit and treachery, left Mallū Khān to guard the city of Bīdar, and went away herself to Firūzābād, taking her son with her. From that place she sent a letter to Sulṭān Mahmūd Gujrātī, and asked for his help and reinforcements. And Sulṭān Mahmūd followed on and besieged Bīdar. When the people having run away gathered round Nizām Shāh at Firūzābād, and the news was received that Sulṭān Mahmūd Gujrātī, who had determined to help Nizām Shāh with a huge army, would be soon-arriving; Sulṭān Mahmūd, having held a consultation, decided in the end, that as the air had become hot, and the month of Ramaḍān had drawn near, it would be best and

Khān, but Khwājah Jahān Turk. It is true that in the letter, which Nizām Shāh or his mother or his ministers wrote to Sulṭān Mahmūd Gujrātī they said that Sikandar Khān and Khwājah Jahān carried him off to Bīdar; but not till an arrow from Sulṭān Mahmūd’s army hit the elephant on which Sikandar Khān was riding, and the animal became unruly, so that Sikandar Khān’s action can scarcely be described as precipitate (see note 1, pp. 87–89).
most proper, that he should defer the conquest of the country till the next year, and should then return, and with this pretext, he started on the following day for his own territory.

Again in the year 867 A.H., 1462 A.D., as he had the conquest of the Deccan in his mind, he again equipped his army, and encamped at Naṣratābād Na’lcha; and he was still there, when a petition of Shīrāz-ul-mulk the thānadār of the fort of Kehrīa arrived with the information, that Nizām Shāh Dakīnī had sent Nizām-ul-mulk with a large army to attack the thāna of Kehrīa; and on the way news came that Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, having arrived, had attacked the fort of Kehrīa; and also that when Nizām-ul-mulk had arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort, Sirāj-ul-mulk was intoxicated, and had no notice of what was happening; but his son came out of the fort, and after putting up some fight fled. Nizām-ul-mulk, owing to his great pride and haughtiness, did not occupy himself in arranging the affairs of the place. Sultān Maḥmūd, on receiving this news, sent Maqābūl Kháñ with four thousand horsemen in the direction of the fort; and himself advanced towards Daulatābād to have his revenge. On the way, the adherents of the Rāy Sirkaja and the vakils (representatives) of the Rāy of Jānjagar brought five hundred and thirty elephants as tribute. Sultān Maḥmūd bestowed robes of honour and rewards on them, and gave them permission to return. When he encamped in the village of Khalīfa-ābād, one of the servants

1 Both the MSS. have نصرت آباد نماچه, but the lith. ed. has only تعلیمه, while Firishtah lith. ed. has تعلیمه. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) has Nałcha. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the incidents connected with Kehrīa.

2 This is the version of Nizām-ul-mulk’s proceedings in the Tabaqāt, both in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah has a different account. According to him, Nizām-ul-mulk entered the fort with the troops which were fleeing, and took possession of it, but was murdered the same day by some Rājpūt foot soldiers. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) makes the matter clearer, by saying that “the place had fallen into the hands of Nizam-ool-Moolk; but that he, having exercised excessive tyranny towards the inhabitants had been put to death by a party of Rajpoot infantry.” The Cambridge History of India, page 359, mentions the fact of Nizām-ul-mulk’s occupation of Kehrīa but does not mention his death.

3 The word is written سرکچه in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) has Surgooja.
of the Amir-ul-mu'minin (the amir of the Musalmâns) Mustanjad Billâh Yusuf bin 'Abbâsî brought for him a mandate conferring imperial rule, under a robe of chieftainship from Egypt. In his great joy and delight he carried out the rites of welcoming the servants of the Khalîfa, treated them with great honour, and bestowed on them horses with jewelled saddles and bridles and embroidered robes of honour.

When he arrived on the frontier of Daulatâbâd (they) informed him that Sultan Mahmûd Gujrâti had come out of his capital and was advancing towards the place. Sultan Mahmûd advanced towards the fort of Mâlkânda; and having raided and ravaged some villages and hamlets returned to his capital of Shâdîâbâd by way of Gôndwâra. He rested there for some days; and sent some troops under the command of Maqûbil Khân in Rabî'-ul-âwwal in the year 871 A.H., to plunder and ravage the town of Elichpûr. When they plundered the city after occupying the surrounding country, the governor of the place after a part of the night had passed, collected his neighbours such as Qâdi Khân and Pir Khân, and with fifteen hundred horsemen and innumerable foot soldiers came out to fight. When Maqûbil Khân got this news, he despatched the booty and other goods and his equipments with one body of troops and he selected and kept the most useful men with him, and appointed some detachments

1 Col. Briggs says in a note in vol. IV, page 229, of his History, "I am not aware of any town in Berar bearing this name; and the Telooogoo termination, condo, renders it likely to be an error of transcribers. It may be in Mulkapoor which lies in the direct route of the King's retreat."

2 One MS. substitutes مانکن for بناخت.

3 The reading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. appear to be incorrect. The MSS. have برامي چندداول، برائے چندداول برائے چندداول جمعي چند برائے جنگ برائے چندوئي. The reading in Firishtah is جمی چند برائے چندوئی. This appears to be the correct reading, and I have adopted it. As to the incidents connected with Elichpûr, Firishtah agrees generally, with the exception pointed out in the preceding note. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 229) quotes an account of the incidents from what he calls "the best authenticated history I have seen", without, however, giving its name. It agrees generally with the Tabaqat and Firishtah. In this account, however, it is stated distinctly what is perhaps implied in the other accounts, viz., "The enemy, as he anticipated, attacked the army for the sake of plundering the camp-equipage, etc.; and at the very
for engaging in a battle; and himself remained in ambush. When
the two parties engaged each other Maqbūl Khan came out of ambush,
and Ghāzī Khān fled towards Elichpūr. Maqbūl Khān pursued him
to the gate of the city. On the way twenty of the notable leaders
were slain and thirty were taken prisoners. Maqbūl Khān returned
from that place victorious and triumphant to Maḥmūdābād (i.e.,
Kehrla).

In Jamādi-ul-āwwal 871 A.H., January 1467 A.D., the ruler of
the Deccan sent a man of the name of 1 Qādī Shaikhān to the capital
city of Shādiābād for effecting a treaty of peace; and after much
interchange of views peace was concluded on these 2 terms: that
the ruler of the Deccan should leave the country of Berār as far as
Elichpūr in the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd; and the latter should
not henceforward cause any damage to the country of the Deccan.
A treaty of peace was written containing these terms and received
the agreement of the amīrs and great men and divines of the kingdom.
In the month of Jamādi-ul-ākhir in the aforementioned year, a robe
of honour and the usual remuneration was bestowed on the ambassador
Shaikhān; and 3 Mashir-ul-mulk was sent with him so that the treaty
and the agreement might be confirmed in the presence of each other.

moment they expected to be crowned with victory, Mukbool Khan charging
with his cavalry on the rear of the assailants gave them a total defeat."

1 The name is Qādī Shaikhān in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Qādī Shaikhān in the other MS. It is not mentioned by Firishtah, who says the rulers of the Deccan and Mālwa sent their emissaries to meet together and does not mention the names of those emissaries.

2 The terms are slightly different according to Firishtah lith. ed., which says that the ruler of the Deccan should leave Sultān Maḥmūd in possession as far as Elichpūr and of the country of Gōndwāra and Bagālī, as far as Kehrla; and Sultān Maḥmūd should cause no injury to the country of the Deccan. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 230) says that "it was agreed, according to some histo-
rians, that Kehrla should be retained by Malwa, and that it should be considered as the southern limit of the kingdom; while others have asserted, that Elichpūr was ceded to Malwa on condition of the King refraining from invading the Deccan in future." The Cambridge History of India, page 359, says that Maḥmūd's possession of Kehrla was confirmed, but the integrity of Berār, with that exception, was maintained.

3 The name is Mashir-ul-mulk and Shēr-ul-mulk in the MSS. and Sharf-ul-mulk in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned anywhere else. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ّشیر المک in the text-edition.
After some days Sulṭān Maḥmūd ordered that the accounts of the offices should be kept according to lunar dates, and these dates should be written instead of the solar dates; and from the year 871 A.H. the lunar dates were entered in the accounts of all offices.

In the month of Rabi‘-ul-āwwal of the aforementioned year, 1 Shaikh Nūr-ud-dīn, who was one of the most learned men of the age arrived in the neighbourhood of Mandū. Sulṭān Maḥmūd went as far as the Haul-i-rānī, the rānī’s tank or reservoir, to meet him; and they embraced each other at the heads of their horses, and the Sulṭān showed him great honour and respect.

In Dhi-ḥijjah of the aforesaid year Maulānā ‘Imād, an emissary of Saiyid Muḥammad Nūr Baḫšh came and waited on Sulṭān Maḥmūd. He brought the patched garb of the Shaikh as a gift of good omen. The Sulṭān considered the arrival of the garb a sign of good fortune, and welcomed the arrival of Maulānā ‘Imād-ud-dīn with gratitude; and owing to his great pleasure and happiness kissed the 2 garb, and opening his hand of liberality and lavishness, made all the learned men and Shaikhs and honoured men of the country, who were present in the assembly, delighted and fortunate.

In the month of Muḥarram 872 A.H., August 1467, 3 swift messengers, who could race with the wind, brought to the notice of

1 The name is Shaikh Nūr-ud-dīn in the MSS., and also in the lith. ed., and the place of his arrival is Mandū, in one MS. and mandor in the other; while it is Mandisor in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls the man Shaikh ‘Alā-ud-dīn and the place of his arrival, the neighbourhood of Shādiābād Mandū.

2 One MS. has خروخه را پیشیده instead of خروخه را پیشیده by mistake. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has, however, retained خروخه را پیشیده in the text-edition.

3 Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally, but the Cambridge History of India, page 359, says that Muhammad III of the Deccan tampered with the loyalty of Maqbūl Khān, and the latter surrendered the fortress to the son of the Raja when Maḥmūd had imprisoned; and it also calls Tāj Khān and Ahmad Khān Maḥmūd’s sons. I cannot find any authority for these statements. In the genealogy of the kings of Mālwa, on page 713 of the History, Ghiyās-ud-dīn is shown as the only son of Sulṭān Maḥmūd I, though we know that there was at least one other son, Qadam Khān or Fidāī Khān, also known as Sulṭān ‘Alā-ud-dīn. It may be that the name of the only son of Sulṭān Maḥmūd,
the Sultān, that Maqbūl Khān, of perverted destiny, had ravaged the town of Maḥmūdābād, which is now celebrated as Kehrla, and had applied to the ruler of the Deccan for protection; and had also made over some elephants, which had for administrative purposes been kept with him to the Rāyzāda of Kehrla; and the latter had taken possession of the town; and had put all Musalmāns, who had been residing in the fort, to death. He had also made a tribe of Gōnds join him, and had by their help closed up all roads. Immediately on hearing this news, Sultān sent Tāj Khān and Aḥmad Khān to put down this rebellion; and he himself also encamped at N'alcha on the 20th Rabī'-ul-akhir of the aforementioned year; and after a few days he started towards Maḥmūdābād. News reached him on the way that Tāj Khān and Aḥmad Khān had reached that place on the 1 Dussehra day, which is a great day of the Brahmins, after making a forced march of seventy karōhs. When they were informed that the Rāyzāda was at his meal, Tāj Khān said, "It is not the act of a brave man to attack an enemy, when he is unaware of his danger." He therefore stopped his horse there, and sent a man to the Rāyzāda and gave him notice. The latter withdrew his hand from his food, and took up his arms and with his men came out to give battle. Such great exertions were made by the two parties, that nothing greater can be imagined. In the end most of the Rāyzāda's men became food for the sword; and he himself fled with head and feet bare; and sought the protection of the Gōnds. The elephants which had been with Maqbūl Khān and other booty and the town of Maḥmūdābād again came into Sultān Maḥmūd's possession. When the report of Tāj Khān reached Sultān Maḥmūd he was extremely delighted. He appointed Malik-ul-umarā Malik Dāūd to chastise the tribe who had given shelter to the Rāyzāda. When this news reached them, they sent the Rāyzāda under confinement to Tāj Khān.

After the victory Sultān Maḥmūd marched towards Maḥmūdābād; and encamped on the 6th of Rajab-ul-murajjab, in the town of Sārangpūr. At that place, after a few days Khwājah Jamāl-ud-dīn

---

who became a ruler of Mālwa is given in the genealogy; but the names of five sons of Ḥushang Shāh, none of whom ascended the throne, are given.

---

1 One MS. has, by mistake, ٨١٥١.
Astrābādī came as an ambassador from the honoured 1 Mirzā Abū Sa’id with fine presents and gifts. Sultān Maḩmūd was very pleased and delighted on his arrival, and made him happy with royal favours, and gave him permission to return. He also sent various 2 presents of the articles of Hindūstān, such as different kinds of silk and linen fabrics, and some 3 slave girls skilled in dancing and singing, and some elephants and some eunuchs and a few Shārīks and talking Tūfīs (parrots) and some ‘Arab horses in charge of Shaikhzāda ‘Alā-ud-din in company with Khwājah Jamāl-ud-din. The Sultān then remained (for some time) in Shādiābād.

In the year 873 A.H., 1468 A.D., a petition came from Ghāzī Khān, to the effect that the zamindārs of Kachwārah had placed their feet outside the high road of allegiance. Immediately on its arrival, Sultān Maḩmūd taking the difficulties of the entrances and exits from the country into his consideration, planned the erection of a fortress in the centre of the country, which was completed in the course of six days. It received the name of Jalālpūr and 4 Mirzā Khān was placed in charge of it.

On the 8th Sha‘bān of the aforementioned year 5 Shaikh

---

1 Ruler of Transoxiana, third in descent from Timūr, and grandfather of Bābar.

2 One MS. inserts نعفهلا after صوخت.

3 One MS. has جند نیز و گوندگه، the other has جند کنیز خاص جند کنیز خاص و گوندگه. The first is the correct reading, and I have adopted it. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 232) says that “dancing women, and singers mounted on elephants superbly caparisoned, together with a number of Indian and Abyssinian slaves for the seraglio.” He calls the shārīk, meinas, but this is not correct. The dictionary describes shārīk as a species of talking bird, a grackle, a nightingale. In Bengalī sūk and sārē are said to be two kinds of talking birds, the former being supposed to be the male and the latter the female; and as far as I know the shārīk is a variant of sārī; the fāşi being the sūk or parrot. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the presents, but otherwise generally agrees with the text.

4 The name is میتر خان in one MS., and in the lith. ed. It is میتر خان in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and Meer Khan in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 233). The name is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has میتر خان in the text-edition.

5 The name is Shaikh Muhammad Farmali in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and the Cambridge History of India have Shaikhzāda Muhammad Qarmali (p. 360).
Muḥammad Farmālī and Kapūr Chand, son of the Rāja of Gwāliar came as ambassadors of Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī, the Bādshāh of Dehli, and waited upon the Sultān Maḥmūd, in the neighbourhood of Fatḥābād; and offered the presents which they had brought. They also submitted the following by word of mouth; “Sultān Ḥusain Sharqī does not keep his hand from me. If his Majesty the Sultān comes to the neighbourhood of Dehli to help and reinforce me, and removes from me the disturbance created by him, I shall make over the fortress of Biyāna with its dependencies as tribute at the time of his return; and whenever the Sultān would advance in this direction I shall send six thousand horsemen, with necessary equipments, to wait on, and accompany him.” Sultān Maḥmūd said, “Whenever Sultān Ḥusain should advance towards Dehli, I shall with great rapidity betake myself to you and support you.” Upon this agreement he conferred great favours on the ambassadors, and bestowed on them valuable robes of honour, and bade them farewell.

On the following day he started from that place, and advanced towards his capital of Shādiābād. As the air was extremely hot on the road, his health fell out of 1 equability and his illness became greater day by day, till on the 19th Dhi-q’adah in the year 873 A.H., 2 May 26th 1569, he passed away in the country of Kachwārah from the waste country of the world to the happy land of the after life. The period of his reign was thirty-four years.

Couplet:

Although with grandeur to the sky he lifts the throne,
To the 3 grandeur of the burial, at last, he carries his all.

1 The readings in the MSS. are از حعد اعتدال and in the lith. ed. از حعد اعتدال أبأ. I have adopted the first reading, while in the text-edition it is از حعد اعتدال.

2 The Cambridge History of India (p. 360) gives June 1st 1469 as the date of the death. Firishtah agrees with the Tabaqāt in saying that the Sultān died in the country of Kachwārah; but the Cambridge History of India, page 360, says he expired shortly after his arrival at Mandū, or as it always wrongly calls it Māndū.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بیا لعبد, but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has بیا لعبد, which would of course mean to the well or pit of the burial; this last has been adopted in the text-edition.
The similarity between the age of Sultan Mahmud at the time of his accession with the period of his reign is not without a certain singularity and curiosity. His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunction, Amir Timur Gurghan also ascended the throne of the empire as a matter of permanence in his 36th year, and the period of his reign was also 36 years; and after his death 36 of his sons and grandsons were living and in their places.

2 An account of Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din, son of Sultan Mahmud Khalji.

When Sultan Mahmud Khalji passed away, his eldest son Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din sat on the throne of the empire; and putting out the hand of liberality and lavishness from the sleeve of generosity and beneficence, made all the sections of the people satisfied and grateful. He distributed the gold, which had been scattered over his umbrella, among men of culture and other deserving people. He confirmed the territory of Ranthambhor which have been already allotted to him, to his younger brother, who bore the title of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din and was known as Qadam Khan. He, in order to please him, also bestowed on him certain other parganas, which had been in his

---

1 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has حي قائم برودند and another has حي و قائم مقام بروده اند. Firishtah lith. ed. has no corresponding passage. The second reading has been adopted in the text-edition.

2 There are differences in the heading also. One MS. has what I have got in the text, the other has ذکر سلطان غیاث الدين خلیجی, while the lith. ed. has only ذکر سلطان غیاث الدين خلیجی.

3 Firishtah has, he made Fidi Khan, his brother, happy by conferring on him "Shahr-i-Nau, and certain other parganas, which he had in his possession in the time of Sultan Mahmud Khalji; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 236) calls the brother Fidwi Khan, but agrees with the Tabaqat in saying that Ranthunbore was conferred on him, to be held in perpetuity. The Cambridge History of India, page 361, says that "his next brother Taj Khan was confirmed in his fiefs, and received the title of 'Ala-ud-din, and his younger brother Fidai Khan was permitted to retain Ranthambhor and other districts." Neither the Tabaqat nor Firishtah mention Taj Khan as a son of Sultan Mahmud Khalji; and they say that Qadam Khan or Fidi Khan had the title of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din.
possession in the time of Sulṭān Maḥmūd. He made Shāhzāda ‘Abd-ul-qādir his heir, after conferring on him the title of ¹ Nāṣir Shāh; and entrusted the duties of the vazārat to him. He conferred on him the umbrella and palanquin and polished still-ball as ensigns of royalty; and a jāgīr of twelve thousand horsemen. He also gave orders to the Khāns and amīrs, that they should go every morning to salute him, and come to the palace in attendance at his stirrups. When he had finished the festivities and rites of the accession, he sent for the amīrs one day, and said, "As I have spent 34 years at the stirrups of my father in labours and expedition, it now comes to my mind, that I should endeavour to guard what has come to me from my father, and should not give myself the trouble to acquire more; and should open the ² door of peace and rest, and pleasure and enjoyment on me, and those depending on me. It is better to keep the territories in ³ peace and quiet, than to strike one's hand on those of others." He commenced to endeavour to collect musicians; and they came to his threshold from all directions. He filled his seraglio with ⁴ beautiful slave girls and daughters of Rājas and zamīndārs; and in this matter made very great exertions. He taught an art and a profession to each of the beautiful girls; and taking their fitness into consideration, taught some the arts of dancing and singing; and others those of reading and recitation and playing on the flute; and a small number the art of wrestling. He had five hundred Abyssinian slave

¹ Firishtah and Col. Briggs say that the title of Sooltan Nasir-oood-Deen was conferred by Gheias-oood-Deen on his eldest son, and he was made heir-apparent and vazir. The Cambridge History of India, page 362, says that Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-din "associated him with himself in the business of government." It appears, however, more correct to say that the Sulṭān left the government entirely in his hands.

² One MS. has امانتش, incorrectly, for اشترت. The other has Almas and Asabish, before عشترت. This appears to me to be better than either of the two other readings, and has been adopted as correct.

³ One MS. has په instead of دست زند, and both MSS. have په instead of دست زند; in the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted the first reading.

⁴ One MS. and the lith. ed. have گنیریان Maḥṣul Jamal, while the other MS. has گنیریا Maḥṣul Jamal.
girls dressed in male attire, and arming them with swords and shields gave them the name of the Ḥabīwāsh band. He also called five hundred Turkī slave girls in the Turkī dress as the Mughul band. He also trained five hundred slave girls, who were distinguished for the strength of their genius and the keenness of their intelligence, in various kinds of learning; and he had one of them join him every day at his meals. He selected a number of them, and entrusted various affairs of state, such as the office of demands, and the watching of receipts and expenditure of the country, and the supervision of various factories, to them.

1 He also established a market in his harem, so that whatever went to the market of the city for sale was also sold there. Altogether sixteen thousand slave girls were collected in his harem; and 2 each one of them had every day two silver tankas and two mans of grain; and in equalising this allowance he acted with the greatest meticulousness, so that Rānī Khūrshid who was the highest of the members of the seraglio and had great love for him, and great authority in all affairs, also had two mans of grain by lawful weight and two tankas. He had also ordered a servant that he should place every day cooked food at the mouths of the holes of mice and rats. He had also ordered his officers, that when he offered thanks for the gifts of the great and holy God, and when the benefits, which the great God had showered on him, came before eyes, they should give fifty tankas by way of thanks-offering to deserving men; and 3 should not suspend it during

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 362, says, “A replica in miniature of the great bazar in the city was erected within the precincts of the palace, and was filled with the artists, artisans and craftswomen of the harem.” This does not convey the meaning of the statement in the text.

2 Firishtah agrees, but he adds غیر سرداران و منصبداران, i.e., except sardārs (chiefs), and mansabdārs; but this does not agree with Ṭabaqāt according to which even Rānī Khūrshid had the usual allowance. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 236) gives each of them “two seers of grain and two tankas of copper.” The Cambridge History of India does not give the exact amount paid to each woman, but adds (p. 362), that “the king himself regulated with meticulous nicety the pay and allowance of all, even to the quantities of grain, fodder, and meat allotted to the various animals employed or domesticated” in the harem.

3 The reading is doubtful and the meaning is obscure. The readings in MSS. are جواهر معطل ندادرد and بچواب معطل ندادرد which are clearly incorrect.

6
sleep. 1 He also ordered that to each person young or old to whom he might speak anything outside, they should give one thousand tankus in the shape of a reward. Most of his time was passed in pleasure and enjoyment. After a watch of the night had passed, he girded the belt of service, in the middle of his life, and occupied himself with the ceremonies of worship; and rubbed his forehead in the dust of humility and poverty; and entering by the door of humility begged for the grant of his object and desires from the great and holy God.

He had given an order to one who was near him, that he should bring to his notice at a fitting place, whatever might take place in his kingdom, and any petition that might come from any frontiers (of his kingdom). If in any affair of the country, there was doubt among the vazīrs they used to write a statement of the facts and send it to the palace, and he wrote a fitting reply and sent it to them. It is stated that Sulṭān Bahlūl Lūdī the Bādhshāh of Dehlī raided the 2 town of Alhanpur, which appertained to the Sulṭāns of Mālwa; and great injury was done to the residents of the town. No one could place his foot of daring forward and bring this matter to the notice of Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din. In the end by the advice and counsel of the vazīrs, Hasan took advantage of an opportunity one day, and reported that Sulṭān Bahlūl used to send every year the whole of the profits, in the form of tribute and salāmī (bonus) to the fortunate Sulṭān Mahmūd Shāh; and it was now being heard that he had committed an act of audacity, and his troops had stretched the arm of plunder and rapine to the town of 3 Alhanpur. On hearing this news, he immediately sent an order to Shēr Khān, son of Muẓaffar Khān,

The lith. ed. has و بِخَرَابٍ مَعْطَل نَدارَند. This seems to be the correct reading, and has been adopted. M. Hidayat Ťosain, however, has retained the first reading.

1 The meaning of the payment of this large reward is not clear. It is not clear also what is meant by در بَیْرَون. Does it mean outside the harem?

2 Both MSS. have قصبة البَئِر, but the lith. ed. has قصبة البَنَر. Firishtah lith. ed. has in the corresponding passage قصبة البَنَر. Col. Briggs has Runthunbhore, and the Cambridge History of India, page 361, has Pālampur near Ranthambhor. The fact that Sulṭān Ghiyās-ud-din did not attack Bahlūl Lodī when the latter invaded Mālwa, but ordered Sher Khān to do so is given in the Cambridge History of India, as an illustration of his being averse to war. I think it was due to his laziness and inertia.

3 Here also the MSS. have البَنَر.
the ruler of Chandērī, that he should take the armies of Bhilsa and Sānrangpūr with him, and proceed to chastise Sultān Bahīlūl. After receiving the order, Shēr Khān collected his troops, and advanced towards Biyāna. As Sultān Bahīlūl saw that he did not possess the strength to meet Shēr Khān, he abandoned Biyāna, and went to Dehli. Shēr Khān pursued him, and advanced towards Dehli. Sultān Bahīlūl then, by offering terms of peace and making presents, turned him back and the latter then rebuilt 1 Alhanpūr and then came back to Chandērī. They narrate that every night he placed some gold mūhurs under his pillow, and every morning he gave them away to deserving people. 2 He had ordered seventy slave girls, who had memorised the holy Qurān, that at the time when he changed his clothes they would finish the Qurān and 3 blow their breath on the garment. In respect of the beauty of his belief and simplicity, they narrate that one day a man brought to him a hoof of an ass, and said, “This is a hoof of the ass of Jesus.” He ordered that they should bestow on the man fifty thousand tankas, and he bought the hoof. To make the story short, three other men, who brought three other hoofs also sold each of them for a similar sum. It so happened that another man also brought one in, and the Sultān gave orders for giving fifty thousand tankas to him. One of the attendants of His Majesty said, “Perhaps the ass of Jesus had five legs, so that such a sum is being paid for the fifth hoof.” The Sultān said that perhaps this man is telling the truth, while one of the others may have brought a wrong

1 See notes 2 and 3 on page 546. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 238) calls the place Lallpore. The year of Bahīlūl Lūdī’s invasion is not given in the Tabaqāt. Firishtah says it was in 889 A.H., while Col. Briggs has 887 A.H., and 1482 A.D., as the year (vol. IV, p. 237).

2 This is mentioned by Firishtah also, but he says that there were one thousand and not seventy slave girls who had memorised the Qurān and they recited it together when he changed his clothes.

3 This means that each of the slave girls used to blow on the garment after reciting three-sevenths of each pārah of the Qurān (the Qurān being divided into thirty pārahs or parts) in order to render the garments of the king pure, blessed or holy.

4 This story is mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, see page 363, but while the Musalman historian mentions it as an illustration of the Sultān’s حسن اعتقاد و سادة لوجی, the English historian calls him the “crowned fool”. 
hoof. He had also ordered those who were near him, that when he was engaged in pleasure, or was occupied in talking with worldly people, they should bring a piece of cloth before him to which he gave the name of a shroud; and he, taking alarm, would perform his ablutions anew, and having prayed for pardon again occupy himself in worship. He had also told the members of his harem with great emphasis, that they should wake him up for the night prayer; and (if necessary) dash water on his face. If it so happened that his sleep was heavy, they pulled him out by force and wakened him. And if he was engaged in any festive function, and did not rise on receiving one or two intimations, they, according to his orders, caught his hands, and lifted him up. People never said a word in his majlis, which was contrary to the law of the Prophet or which would cause pain. And he never saw (partook of) any intoxicating drinks. One day they had made an electuary for him, and had spent a lakh of tankus on it. He ordered that they should tell him the name of the ingredients, and it then appeared that there were three hundred and odd drugs in one diram of nutmeg. The Sultān said, "This electuary cannot be used by me," and ordered that it should be converted into a morsel of fire. Someone said, "Let it be bestowed on someone else." He said, "Alas! that I should prescribe for another, what I do not consider right for myself."

2 At one time one of the neighbours of Shaikh Maḥmūd Naʿmān, who was one of the companions of the Sultān, came to him from Dehlī; and said, "I have come remembering the promises and gifts of the Sultān, so that by your intervention, I may get from him the wherewithal for the marriage of my daughter." The Shaikh said, "I am prepared to pay myself the amount you require." He replied "I will not take it from you, I wish that I may partake of the gifts of the Sultān, and my respectability may thereby be increased. The

---

1 The matter of the electuary is mentioned by Firishtah and his account agrees with that in the text.

2 This is preceded in the lith. ed. by the words حكاية غريبة, a strange story; but these words are not found in either MS. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, gives this story also, but omits most of the particulars. The man is described as a beggar from Dehlī, but the reason of his journey is not mentioned, nor is Shaikh Maḥmūd Naʿmān, who engineered the fraud.
Shaikh insisted, but the other did not agree. At last the Shaikh said, “I recommend those who come to me on the ground of the greatness of their ancestors, or on their own excellences. You do not possess either of these qualifications. With what qualities shall I praise you? ” The man replied, “I have brought myself to you, you act according to your own intelligence and wisdom.” The Shaikh took the man with him to the audience hall of the Sulṭān; and he told him to take a handful of the wheat which the men were weighing there for the faqirs. When the Shaikh met the Sulṭān, that man was also behind him. The Sulṭān said, “Who is this man?” He replied, “This man has memorised the holy Qurān. He has brought a handful of wheat as a present, on each grain of which he has finished the Qurān.” The Sulṭān said, “Why did you bring him here? I should have gone to him.” The Shaikh said, “He does not possess such a position or qualifications, that the Sulṭān should go to him.” The Sulṭān said, “If he is not fit for it, his present is priceless.” As the Sulṭān insisted, the Shaikh settled that the man should bring his presents to the Jāma’ Mosque on the following Friday. When they had finished their prayers, the Sulṭān ordered that the man should mount the pulpit, and throw the grains of wheat in the lap of the Sulṭān’s skirt, and the Sulṭān favoured him with a variety of gifts.

1 They have narrated, that one day the Sulṭān said to his intimates, “I have collected some thousands of beautiful women in my harem; but I have not yet found a person such as my heart desires.” Of the men who were present one said, “Perhaps the men who were employed in this service were not perfect in discerning a beautiful person. If this slave is employed in this work, it is likely that he should find a person, that may be agreeable to the Sulṭān.” The Sulṭān said, “What do you consider a beautiful person?” He said, “It is one, each part of whose person, which comes to the beholder's sight, deprives the latter of the desire to see any other part; for instance if he sees her figure, he becomes so fascinated with her, that he has no desire to see her face.” The Sulṭān was pleased with

1 This is also preceded by the word حكايات, story, in the lith. ed., but the word is omitted in both MSS. This story is also narrated by Firishthah; but it does not appear to be mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.
this judgment of his about a woman's beauty. The man then took leave of the Sultān and went round the country. But although he cast his eyes over all the world, he did not find what he wanted. However he arrived at a place, where he saw a young woman, who went walking gracefully. Her gait and figure enchanted him. When taking great care he cast his eyes on her beautiful face, he found something much better than what he wanted. He remained there for some days and, by such trickery as he knew, took her along; and placing her in the service of the Sultān made him happy. He told the Sultān that he had bought her for so many thousands dirams.

After some days, the father and mother of the young woman became acquainted with this matter; and knew that a man, who had stayed in the village for some time, had taken away their daughter. Having sought a clue to his name and country, they came to the Sultān praying for justice. They happened to meet him at the crossing of two roads and begged for justice. The Sultān knew that they were complaining about that particular young lady. He did not take a single step from the place where he was; and ordered that men learned in the law should be directed to attend there. Then he asked them to pass on him the sentence directed by the law of the Prophet. The complainants, on becoming acquainted with the truth of the matter, submitted that their complaint was for this reason that that man had taken away their daughter. As she had now become an inmate of the harem of Sultān, it was a matter of honour and happiness to them, more specially as she had become a Musalman, and had left their faith; and they were now pleased and satisfied.

Then the Sultān told the learned men, the woman has now become my lawful wife; but for the time that has passed, you should carry out in respect of me whatever might be the order of the law. If I deserve to be put to death, I shall hold you absolved for causing my death. The learned men said that whatever is done without knowledge is pardoned in the law; and is absolved by penitence. In spite of this decision, the Sultān was repentant about this; and forbade his servants to seek for and produce any women.

1 In the year 887 A.H., 1482 A.D., there was a conjunction of

1 These conjunctions are mentioned by Firishtah also. He, however, says distinctly that he took the account from the Tabaqāt, and also says that
planets; that is Saturn and Jupiter became contiguous and near to each other in degree and minute in the sign of Syripio, and the five stars were also collected in one sign of the Zodiac. The evil caused by these conjunctions appeared in most countries; and specially in Khalji territories there was much disturbance, as will clearly be seen from the account of Nasir Shah.

In the year 889 A.H., 1484 A.D., an ambassador came from the Ray of Champaahr, and submitted a petition to the following effect: "When in former times Sulthan Mahmud, son of Sulthan Ahmad besieged Champaahr, Sulthan Mahmud Shih came to help and assist the slaves; and released us from the siege; and now Sulthan Mahmud Gujrati has come and is again besieging Champaahr. If your Majesty considering our ancient relations of servitorship to you, would advance to release us, it would be the cause of an increase of your protection and bravery. A sum of one lakh of tankus would be remitted to your officers as a contribution towards your expenses." When the report reached Sulthan he collected his troops, and came and took up his residence in the palace of Na'leha. The next day he sent for the learned men and the Qadis to his majlis and asked them for a ruling on this point. "A Musalmans Badsah has besieged a hill of a Kajir. Is it allowed to me according to the law of the Prophet that I should

the coming of Bahlul Ludi and the destruction of Alhanpar or Palanpar was among the effects of these conjunctions. They do not appear to be mentioned either by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

1 The five stars are Mercury, Zoro, Venus, Jupiter, and Saturn.

2 The MSS. have  which is an error; while Firishtah in the corresponding passage has احتلالی. This last seems to be the most appropriate word, and I have adopted it.

3 So in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. As a matter of fact the correct name of the son of Sulthan Ahmad was Sulthan Muhammad. Probably Sulthan Muhimmud, who ascended the throne in 862 A.H., and was contemporaneous with Sulthan Mahmud Khalji, who reigned from 839 A.H. to 873 A.H., is meant, but he was the son of Sulthan Muhammad and grandson of Sulthan Ahmad. Firishtah lith. ed. mentions the fact of Sulthan Qiyath-ud-dins march to Na'leha, but he does not mention the particulars of the previous siege. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the matter.

4 One MS. has, by mistake, خلاص کرده بود instead of خلاص بودند.
advance to aid the Kāfirs?" All the learned men said, "It is not allowed." Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din then bade farewell to the ambassador from Chāmpānīr; and went back to his own capital.

When old age overtook the Sultān, disputes commenced about the possession of the kingdom between Sultān Nāsir-ud-din and Shujā'at Khān, who had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-din; and in spite of the fact, that they were twin brothers, things came to such a pass, that they made attempts on the lives of each other. Rāni Khūrshīd, the daughter of the Rāy of Baglāna who was the chief inmate of the harem of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din, took the side of Shujā'at Khān, and wanted to turn Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din against Sultān Nāsir-ud-din. This matter will be described in the account of Sultān Nāsir-ud-din. To be brief, Sultān Nāsir-ud-din lost the bridle of power and fled from Mandū; and having taken up a position in the centre of the kingdom, brought over the amīrs to his side; and coming back besieged the fort of Mandū. Sultān 'Alā-ud-din having given encouragement and comfort to a body of five thousand Gujarātīs made vain efforts. In the end, the Ghiyāth Shāhī amīrs opened the gates; and invited Nāsir-ud-din into the fort. When Shujā'at Khān saw that Sultān Nāsir-ud-din had entered by the gate, he went and took shelter with

---

1 One MS. has شجاع خان. Firishtah's account of the quarrels between two brothers is somewhat more detailed. He says they began in 903 A.H., 1491 A.D., when Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din had become old and decrepit. Rāni Khūrshīd attempted to have Nāsir-ud-din seized; whereupon in 905 A.H., he fled; and seeing that the Rāni was still bent on his destruction, he took up a position in the centre of the country, and amīrs and soldiers came, and joined him; and he assumed the emblems of royalty, and advanced and besieged the fort of Mandū. As he had acted as his father's vāsr for years, people knew him. They opened the gates of the fort and brought him into it without the opposite party knowing anything about it. Shujā'at Khān or 'Alā-ud-din fled to his father's palace, but he and the Rāni were dragged out; and he and his son were butchered like so many sheep. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 239) gives a similar account, but he adds that Nasir-ood-Deen was admitted into the fort by the Tarapore gate, on the 24th of Rubbee-oos-Sany, A.H. 906, October 22nd, 1500 A.D.; and also that Alla-ood-Deen and all his children and all his family were put to death. The account in the Cambridge History of India, page 363, is somewhat different in some particulars.

2 One MS. has بنجمهار گجراتی را و بغور موافق ساخته دالاسا کرد; this is followed in the text-edition.
his father; and after some days, when the foundations of the palace of the Nāsir Shāhī rule became stronger, Shujā'at Khān and his sons were summoned to the Sultan's presence and were beheaded. On the 9th of Ramadān in the year 906 A.H., Sultan Qhiyāth-ud-dīn was attacked by the disease of dysentery, and joined the vicinity of God. Some say that Sultan Nāsir-ud-dīn killed his father by giving him poison. Sultan Nāsir-ud-dīn sent a message to Rānī Khūrshid that she should make over to the treasurer all the treasures of the Sultan which were in her possession, otherwise she would suffer much trouble. The Rānī having regard to his probable harsh treatment, brought over all the treasures and property which were hidden and concealed in the harem; and made them over to the Nāsir Shāhī agents.

The period of his (i.e., Sultan Qhiyāth-ud-dīn's) reign was thirty-two years and seventeen days.

**AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN NĀSIR-UD-DĪN.**

Historians are agreed that the birth of Sultan Nāsir-ud-dīn took place during the reign of Sultan Maḥmūd Khaljī. Maḥmūd Shāh and Qhiyāth Shāh in their great joy arranged festive entertainments; and for one month kept the bed of pleasure and enjoyment spread out. In thanks-giving for this great gift, the ordinary ra'iyyats generally, and men of wisdom and deserving men specially, were made participators in the board of their benefactions and the tables of their favours. Astrologers, who knew the stars, reported that the Shāhzhāda was born with a happy fortune, and in an auspicious moment; and would get perfect nurture and full education from the nurse of the age; and will be supreme and unrivalled in all the various arts, and the different cultures and education. On the 7th day after the birth, he was produced before the great and holy men, and received the name of ʻAbd-ul-qādir. Both in the time of his youth and in that of his manhood, the marks of royalty and empire were patent

---

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 240) thinks that the accusation is false, as Nasir-ood-Deen had "been already crowned by his father's consent", but the fact, that many of the important nobles rebelled against Nāsir-ud-dīn, would lead one to infer that the accusation had some foundation.

2 Firishtah and Col. Briggs make it thirty-three years.
and clear and bright on his forehead. When he reached the years of discretion, and excelled all his contemporaries in the matter of the duties of leadership and chieftainship, Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din made him his heir apparent; and entrusted the duties of the vazārat to him. His younger brother, Shujā’at Khān, although outwardly he did not forget any of the minutiae of agreement, still being hostile to him in spirit, got a number of men to combine with him. One day he represented in private to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din that “A number of audacious, low men have collected in the service of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, and are inciting him to seize the kingdom. It is better to remedy an event before it actually occurs.” He made so many insinuations, that the intention of seizing the Shāhzāda and of imprisoning him became impressed on the Sultān’s mind. But as the marks of nobility and the token of sovereignty were evident in his countenance, his paternal affection induced him to apply the ointment of kindness and favour on the wound of his heart, and make him more powerful. He accordingly ordered that the pay-master of the kingdom should send orders to the amirs and to heads of all bands, that they should go every morning to offer their salutation to Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, and should attend at his stirrups to the palace gate.

Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din now took up all the affairs of state permanently in his own hand; and appointed his own gūmāshtas (his agents) everywhere. As he allotted the management of the Khālsa parganas (i.e., parganas in the direct possession of the sovereign) to Shaikh Habīb and Khwājah Suhail eunuchs, 2 Yakān Khān and Amman and Mūnjā Baqāl, who had before this been the officers in charge of the Khālsa complained to Rānī Khūrshid, who was of a mannish disposition. The latter as she was inclined towards Shujā’at Khān, and her mind was not free from evil towards Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, reported (to the Sultān) through Shujā’at Khān that Malik Mahmūd kūtwāl and

---

1 One MS. has the text I have adopted, while the other omits the word Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din, and the lith. ed. has روزی در خلوت، دیوان شا بورض رسانید.

2 The names in the MSS. are as I have given them here. The lith. ed. omits Amman. Firishṭāḥ lith. ed. has متنی خان, and متنی خان. The names are not in any other history that I have seen.
Sëv Dâs Baqâl, who were the heads and chiefs of the rebels and traitors, have become specially attached to Sulṭân Nâşir-ud-din, and have made the lease of certain mauqâs appertaining to his jâgîr the pretext of their visits to him. Sulṭân Ghiyâth-ud-din summoned Malik Maḥmûd and Sëv Dâs, and, without asking them any questions and making any enquiries, killed them; and ravaged and destroyed the people in their houses.

After this, Sulṭân Nâşir-ud-din withdrew his hands from the duties of the vazârat, and did not for some days attend to salute the Sulṭân. Râni Khûrshid and Shujâ‘at Khân, having got an opportunity through the exertions and management of Yakân Khân and Mûnija Baqâl, spoke words full of interested suggestions in the garb of disinterestedness, and, having stretched their misappropriating hands to the treasury, with a composed mind took upon themselves the full management of the affairs of the government. Owing to his great age, Sulṭân Ghiyâth-ud-din agreed to their doing so. But as he had heard from disinterested persons that Râni Khûrshid and Shujâ‘at Khân wanted to calumniate and falsely accuse Sulṭân Nâşir-ud-din, he waited to see their further proceedings. As Shaikh Habîb-ul-lah and Khwâjah Suhaïl knew that Mûnija Baqâl was the prime mover in all this mischief and disturbance, they waited for an opportunity, and killed him; and fled and went to the harem of Sulṭân Nâşir-ud-din. Râni Khûrshid narrated this story to Sulṭân Ghiyâth-ud-din with much exaggeration and embroidery; and on hearing of this occurrence, the flame of the wrath of the Sulṭân blazed up; and he sent a number of men with Yakân Khân that they might seize the murderers and

1 The name is سوداس سوداس Sodâs, Sodâs, and the lith. ed. has سوداس Sodâs.

2 The account of the intrigues and fighting between Sulṭân Nâşir-ud-din and his partisans on the one side, and Shujâ‘at Khân and Râni Khûrshid and their adherents on the other, which extends over several pages in the Tabaqât, is dismissed in the course of some twenty lines by Col. Briggs on pages 238, 239 of vol. IV of his history, and also in some lines in the Cambridge History of India, page 363.

3 One MS. has زوارت , and the other after شغل; while the lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. I have adopted زوارت. In the text-edition, however, it is زوارت.
1 bring them out from the house of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn. When he
gave these men permission to go, he told them that they were on no
account to forego any of the minutiae of respect and honour towards
Nāsir Shāh.

At this time Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhaill mounted
their horses from Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn's palace, and rode away to the
open country. On the way they went on saying, "We are going to
the house of the Qādī. Whoever wishes to make any complaint about
the murder of Mūnjā Baqāl, let him appear there." Yakān Khān and
the other amīrs on arriving at the Nāṣir Shāhī darbār sent a message.
The reply came, "Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhaill did not
kill Mūnjā Baqāl under my orders, and I do not know where they are
gone." Yakān Khān did not accept this reply, and for three days
kept the harem of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn under guard. When the
Sultān knew that the murderers had fled, and giving further trouble
to his son was wrong, he sent Mashīr-ul-mulk 2 and Manhī Khān to
him; and sent him a message to say that, "If my son's heart has not
been aggrieved and the dust of pain has not clouded the seat of his
mind, he should, as in former days, come to me, for I have no more
strength to endure the pain of separation and estrangement."

Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn, 3 notwithstanding a hundred reasons for
cautions, obtained the honour of kissing the feet of his benefactor and
father; and the father and the son washed off the dust of disturbance
from the pages of the age with their tears. And Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn
again became zealous in the Sultān's service; and every day saw
fresh signs of the Sultān's affection towards him. He planned the
building of a palace for his residence in the vicinity of the Ghiyāth
Shāhī palace, so that he might always, when he wanted to do so, have
the honour of waiting on his father. Rānī Khūrshīd took advantage
of an opportunity one day, and said to the Sultān; "Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn
has erected for himself a house close to the Jahān-numā palace; and

---

1 One MS. has بیلورد, the other has بیلورد, while the lith. ed. has بیلورد.
2 The name is Mānī Khān, in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is مسلم خان, Mustahī Khān, while in the lith. ed. of Firishtā it is مسلم خان
Muntahī Khān.
3 Firishtā makes the matter clear by saying بیو جریب بیم حبس و قید و دنیا, i.e., in spite of fear of imprisonment, etc.
he apparently intends to act treacherously." Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din without any consideration or deliberation ordered Ghulib Khan, koluteil, in the year 905 A.H., to destroy completely the Nasir Shahi palace. Sultan Nasir-ud-din started the same night, with a body of his adherents, in the direction of Dhbar, which is situated in the forest of Kishun. Shaikh Habib-ul-lah and Khwajah Suhail came there, and waited on him. Rani Khurshid and Shuja'at Khan sent an army in pursuit of him, without giving any information to Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din of their having done so. But Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din sent Tatir Khan, so that he might, after conciliating Nasir Shah bring him back to the city. Tatir Khan left his men in the village of Bakankaalu; and went in company with Malik Faqiul-lah Badeh, Mir Shikar, to Sultan Nasir-ud-din, and gave him his father's message. The latter wrote a petition which he gave to Tatir Khan, and directed him that he should go and read it to the Sultan, and bring his reply. The well-intentioned Tatir Khan went on wings of speed to Shadiabad, and reported the substance of the petition to Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din. But he had not yet received any reply, when Rani Khurshid, who had very great influence on the mind of the Sultan, sent an order to the pay-master of the empire, that he should appoint Tatir Khan to attack and destroy Nasir-ud-din. When Tatir Khan became acquainted with these facts, he came down from the fort, and advanced towards Barah.

The army which had been sent to attack Nasir Shah was on arrival at Bakankaalu puzzled and amazed about the result of their acts. (They knew) if they decided to fight, they had reason to be afraid that when the turn of Nasir Shah came, each one of them

---

1 One MS. has by mistake instead of قدری.
2 Firishtah explains that Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din, had, on account of his great age, lost his sense and intelligence.
3 The name appears to be Bakankaalu in the MSS. and Bakbakalu in the lith. ed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has در کمینگاه Kankanu is adopted in the text-edition.
4 I cannot make out whether or is the name of a place or otherwise.
5 See note 3 above. At this place one MS. has بوضع Bakankaalu, while the other has بوضع Kankaloo in the village of Bakankaalu. The lith. ed. has بوضع Kankaloo in the village of Kankaloo.
would receive capital punishment; and if they went back to Mandū they were afraid of punishment by Rānī Khürshid in the immediate future. They were still wandering in the plains of amazement when they heard that Sultan Nasir-ud-din had left that place and had marched to and encamped in the town of Thahnah. At this station, Malik Mahta and Malik Haibat, who were among the great amirs of the Ghīyāth Shāhī state came and joined him; and the power and splendour of Nasir Shāh were much increased. From that station he moved to the town of Rājāwiyyah; and Maulānā Imād-ud-din Afjāl Khaṇ and a body of the zamīndārs of that neighbourhood joined him there. He stayed there for a few days on account of the pleasant nature of the air, and the freshness and verdure of the fields; and had, with the consent of the amirs the royal umbrella raised over his head, on the day of the ʿĪd-i-fitr (the festivity of the breaking of the fast); and distinguished the amirs and divines and heads of groups by bestowing valuable robes of honour on them.

At this time news was brought to him, that Shujāʿat Khaṇ’s troops had started from the village of Bakankālū with the intention of giving battle; and had arrived in the village of Kandūyah.

1 The name looks like Tahnah or Natnah in the MSS; and Bhaliah in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Hosain has Nastn.a in the text-edition.
2 One MS. has Dawlāt Ghīyāth al-dīn Shāhī, while the other and the lith. ed. have Dawlāt Ghīyāth Shāhī.
3 The name is Rājāwiyyah, in both MSS., while the lith. ed. has Ajārnāh; and the lith. ed. of Firishtah has Jadīlāh. M. Hidayat Hosain has Ajāiyyah in the text-edition.
4 The reading in one MS. is Zimīn Darōrān An Nāhibah, which I have adopted. The other MS. has Alhanah and the lith. ed. has Rāikhtah instead of An Nāhibah. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has a few words in Zemīn Darōrān, some zamīndārs.
5 The name is here written as Kankātu in one MS. and Kikālū in the other, and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kankānū.
6 The name appears to be Kandūbah in the lith. ed. In later passages it is written as Kandūyah in the MS., and I have adopted that name. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kandūhar.
Nāṣir Shāh sent 1 Malik Malhū to chastise them. As the star of his fortune had become resplendent over the horizon of greatness, when the two armies met the breeze of victory and triumph blew over the plumes of Malik Malhū's standard; and the enemy fled and went to Mandū; and Malik Malhū joined Nāṣir Shāh's camp at Rājāwiyah, with much booty. On the 16th Shawwāl in the year 905 A.H., 1499 A.D., he marched from that station towards the town of 2 Aūjūd. Mubārak Kān and 3 Himmat Kān now came and joined him. And when he arrived in the town of Sundarsi, Rustam Kān, the governor of Sārangpūr, came and waited on him; and brought some elephants and much other property as a tribute. After his arrival at Ujjain, amīrs and faujdārs and thānādārs came to his threshold in great numbers. Rānī Khūrshid and Shujā'at Kān (now) in fear of their lives, reported to Sūltān Ghiyāth-ud-din, that Nāṣir Shāh had arrived at Ujjain, and all the amīrs and thānādārs had turned to him; and the fort of Shādīābād would be besieged in the near future.

Ghiyāth-ud-din sent Shaikh Auḷiyā and Shaikh Burhān-ud-din as ambassadors, and sent the following message through them, "It is a long time since I have placed the bridle of the work of government in the grasp of my son's hand of power. If acting in a spirit of sincerity and attachment, he would send away the mob of common people, which has collected round him, and would come and wait on me, the affairs of the empire would again be entrusted to his penetrating intellect and judicious consideration. At that time, if he considers it advisable, he can allot the territory of Ranthambhōr to Shujā'at Kān, who stands in the relation of a son to him; and the flame of disturbance and revolt should be extinguished by the waters of peace." Nāṣir Shāh did not bind himself by any reply; and towards the end of Dhi-qa'dah of the aforesaid year, marched from the town of Ujjain to the town of Dhār; and halted there for some days. About this time

---

1 That is the name in both MSS. and in the lith. ed., but Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Mahmūd.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have the reading I have in the text; but the other MS. has بلوجه قصدة أجود گشتinstead of دید گشت و راو موجود گشت. M. Hidayat Ḫosain has adopted Ajūd for Ajūd in the text-edition.

3 The name is مصباح خان and without any dot above or below the third letter in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not name these men.
news came that 1 Yakān Khān had come down from Shādiābād, with three thousand horsemen, with the intention of giving battle. Immediately on hearing this news, Malik 2 ʿĀṭan was sent with five hundred horsemen to the village of Hānspur. Yakān Khān receiving information of this advanced towards Hānspur. After a fight between them, Malik ʿĀṭan was victorious; and 3 one hundred brave men out of Yakān Khān's troops, who knew men, were slain. Malik ʿĀṭan seized eighty horses and much booty, and returned to the town of Dhār. Yakān Khān with the men who had escaped the sword fled and entered the fort. After a few days, Yakān Khān, at the incitement of Rāni Khūrshid and Shujaʿat Khān, again came out of the fort with a body of men whom he had got together, with the determination of fighting another battle. Immediately on hearing this news, Nāṣīr Shāh nominated Khwājah 4 Suhaíl and Malik Mahta and Malik Haibat and Miyān Jiw to attack and crush Yakān Khān; but as soon as the eyes of the latter fell on Nāṣīr Shāh's troops, his foot of firmness and stability slipped; and he fled without attempting to fight; and, in short, wherever the two sides met, the breezes of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Nāṣīr Shāh's standards.

On the 22nd of Dhīl-bijjal-ul-hārām of the aforesaid year, (Sultān Nāṣīr-ud-dīn) took up his quarters in the Jahān-numā 5 palace at

---

1 See note 2, page 554. Here the name is yakān khān without any dot above or below the first letter in one MS. and yakān khān in the other MS., and yakān khān in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has makhmān khān as before, and describes him as the cause of all disturbance and dispute. I have adopted yakān khān.

2 He is so called in both MSS. The lith. ed. has Malik uṭūn ʿaz utūn. The name of the village is Hānspur in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; hanspūr in the other MS. and Hanslūr in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have baksad nāẓar mardanā morom shalās. I do not understand the exact meaning of these words. Firishtah simply has baksad ṣāḥabī makhmān khān.

4 The names are as I have got them in the text in one MS. There are slight differences as regards the second and the fourth in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not give the names, though he mentions the second attempt.

5 One MS. has koshk, while the other MS. and the lith. ed. have koshk.
Na'lichea. At this station his spies brought the news, that Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din, in his old elegant person, intended to come, in order to comfort and counsel his son (i.e., Nasir-ud-din); and in order to carry out this intention he had moved from the capital, and had taken up his residence in the centre of the kingdom; and he would move from the place at a moment which the astrologers had selected; and after trying to please his son's heart he would return to Shādiābād. Nasir Shāh was pleased and delighted on hearing this news; and waited in expectation of the joy-giving arrival of his father; but Shujā'at Khān, with the advice of Rānī Khūrshid, had the Sultan's litter taken up and had it carried towards Na'lichea. When they arrived at the Dehli gate, and as age and senility had overcome the Sultan, he asked those who were near him, where they were taking him to. Some of them informed him of what had happened. He said, "I will go another day. You should turn back to-day." The servants having no alternative turned back. When Rānī Khūrshid heard that Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din had returned from the way, she knew that this had happened at the incitement of Nasir Shāh's well-wishers. She summoned the men into her presence, and having used harsh words towards them demanded the reason of their action. They said that the Sultan had returned according to his own wishes; and no one else had any hand in the matter.

Shujā'at Khān, then with the advice and consent of Rānī Khūrshid repaired the broken and ruined parts of the fort, and distributed the bastions (among his commanders). Nasir Shāh also advanced from his position, and arranged batteries round the fort. Everyday numbers of men were slain from each side. Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din sent the ablest of the judges, Mashīr-ul-mulk, to arrange for peace; but, as he did not get a reply like what he wanted, and was afraid of Rānī Khūrshid, he remained where he was. As the siege became close, and the garrison was in great anxiety and distress owing to the non-arrival of grain and other necessaries; and bearing in mind the purport of the text, that change is best even though it may go against us, directed their attention to this, that the office of the Sultan

---

1 The actual words are صفة مرض مماليك. I cannot find out the exact meaning of the first two words.
be fixed on Naṣir Shāh. Amongst the amīrs, who were still in the fort, Muwāfīq Kháñ and Malik Faḍl-ul-lah, Mīr Shikār, (chief huntsman) availing themselves of an opportunity betook themselves to the service of Naṣir Shāh. The latter bestowed a lakh of tankas on Muwāfīq Kháñ. When Rāni Khūrhshid and Shujā’at Kháñ received information of this, they dismissed ‘Ali Kháñ from the charge of the fort; and made over the guarding of the fort and the government of the city to Malik Piyaṛā, on whom they conferred the title of ‘Ali Kháñ. They also sentenced 1 Muḥāfīz Kháñ and Sūrajmal to death. The amīrs and the great men and all the residents of the city became heartbroken on seeing this punishment; and sent petition to Naṣir Shāh, and prayed for permits of protection. After a few days the siege was carried on to such a point, that among the garrison, nothing was left of any grain except the name; and many people came out of the fort on account of the famine.

Naṣir Shāh mounted his horse on the night of 18th Safar in the year 906 A.H., with the object of capturing the fort. When he arrived close to the fort, the men in the bastions came up and shot arrows and musket shots; and many active and brave warriors were wounded. In the end Sulṭān Naṣir-ud-din advanced towards the bastion of seven hundred steps. Dilāvar Kháñ Jangjū to his great honour, managed to get into the fort. Sulṭān Naṣir-ud-din also entered the fort. Shujā’at Kháñ, with a number of trusted men, came out on a turret of the fort, and exerted himself, and showed great bravery. Sulṭān Naṣir-ud-din, in his own elegant person, shot many arrows; and 2 many men fell under his arrows of fate. As reinforcements reached Shujā’at Kháñ time after time, and brave warriors belonging to Naṣir Kháñ’s army received wounds, the latter thinking it advisable to return came out of the fort to his own camp. He bestowed much favour and kindness on the men who had exerted themselves, and offered their lives in his service; and comforted them by bestowing new robes of honour, and enquired about their health and condition.

1 Firishtah explains كه از مواقفان سلطان ناموالدین خلیجی میدانست, i.e., whom they knew to be partisans of Sulṭān Naṣir-ud-din Khalji.

2 The actual words are مردم خوب بر سر نبهر فرخ یا رفته. The meaning is not very clear, but I think my translation is correct. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has مردم خود بخبر فرخ یا در کشتنند.
After some days, the sons of Shēr Khān, son of Muẓaffar Khān, the governor of Chandērī came and joined the camp of Nasīr Shāh with one thousand horsemen and eleven elephants. In the first majlis after their arrival, Nasīr Shāh conferred the title of Muẓaffar Khān on the elder, and As'd Khān on the second son. Owing to the arrival of the army of Chandērī, new vigour and strength, appeared in the men of the army. At this time some men in the garrison of Mandū, who had the charge of guarding the 1 Mālpūr gate, sent a notice to the besieging army, that if Nasīr Shāh's troops came in that direction, the fort will come to his possession without any difficulty or trouble. Sulṭān Nasīr Shāh sent Mubārak Khān and Shaikh Ḥabīb-ullah and Muwāfīq Khān and Khwāja Suhail and a number of others on the night of the 24th of Rabī'ul-akhir of the afore-mentioned year. Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah told them, that if they succeeded in capturing the fort, he would send his ring, that they might know that the fort had come into their possession. When the amirs reached the gate, the citizens, in concert with Zabardast Khān son of Hazbar Khān who had charge of the silāhkhāna (armoury) of the fort, slew the keeper of the Mālpūr gate and opened it; and Nasīr Shāh's men galloped into the fort.

Shujā'at Khān with his army in battle array advanced to fight, but was unable to do anything; and fled and got into his own house, and then taking his family and children with him retired into the harem of Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din. Shaikh Ḥabīb-ullah, then according to previous arrangement, sent his ring; and brought Nasīr Shāh in. He reached the Mālpūr gate in a moment and got into the city. The amirs hastened to wait on him, and offered their congratulations. Some foolish men set fire to some of the palaces and mansions of Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din, 2 without any order from Nasīr Shāh; and they seized and brought Shujā'at Khān and Rānī Khūrishid and some other persons; and having commenced to plunder and ransack the city devastated it for two days. Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din then made up his mind and formed a determination, and moved from the place to the palace of Sarsatī and took up his abode there.

---

1 One of the MSS. has بابلور instead of ملپور. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, calls it the Bālāpur gate.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بی امیر ناصر شاهی, while the other MS. has بی استحباب و حکم ناصر شاهی.
On the 3rd day, which was 1 Friday the 27th of Rabi‘-ul-ākhir of the afore-mentioned year, Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din sat on the throne of the empire and 2 made over Shujā‘at Khān and Rānī Khūrshid to custodians. He sent Malik Mahta to Na‘lcha (to bring) his 3 second son, who was known as Miyan Manjhla; and making the latter his heir, conferred on him the title of Sultan Shihāb-ud-din. He allotted to him the Șafa Bāgh, which was situated near the palace of Sultan Ghīyāth-ud-din as his residence. The same day the Khwāba was read in the name of Nāsir Shāh; and pearls and other gems, which were showered over his umbrella, were distributed among deserving men. Yakān Khān and Amman and Muhāfiz Khān Jadid and Mufarrāh Pidar Ḥabshi and other men, who had been hostile to him, were punished with death; and some men were brought away from under the sword, and were kept in imprisonment. According to the established custom he confirmed fiefs 4 on the men who had sided with him. He conferred on Shaikh Ḥabib-ul-lah the title of ‘Ālam Khān; and to Khwājah Suhaill to whom he 5 had given the pargana of Āshlah, he gave the post of Sipahsālāri (office of commander-in-chief). On the 3rd of Jamādi-ul-ākhir of the afore-mentioned year, Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din was honoured by being allowed to do homage to his father and benefactor Sultan Ghīyāth-ud-din. The latter took him into his arms, and wept a great deal, and kissed his head and face; and on giving him permission to retire, bestowed on him the cap of state and the

---

1 Firishtah lith. ed. gives the same day and date. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 240) also has Rubbee-oo-Sany 27, A.H. 906, October 25, A.D. 1500, as the date of Sultan Nasir-ood-Deen’s accession. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, has October 22nd, 1500.
2 Niẓām-ud-din does not appear to mention the execution of Shujā‘at Khān but Firishtah mentions it. See note 1, page 552. Col. Briggs says Shoojat Khan and “all his children and the whole of his family” were put to death. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, also says that Shujā‘at Khān was put to death.
3 Neither Niẓām-ud-din nor Firishtah gives any reason for the selection of the second son as the heir-apparent in preference to the eldest son, or whether the latter was dead or otherwise disqualified.
4 One MS. inserts شیخ حبیب الله را before و انجماد.
5 One MS. omits گنگ کے and ہو ، and the other has ہو گنگ کے .
robe of woven hair, which he used himself to wear on the days of public audience and other auspicious days; and placing the royal crown on his head made over to him the keys of the treasury, and offering him felicitations and congratulations bade him adieu.

On the 16th of Rajab of the afore-said year, he bestowed on Sultān Shihāb-ud-din the same fur cloth robe and the cap of state, and also gave him twenty elephants and one hundred horses and eleven royal umbrellas, two pālīs and also a standard and a kettle-drum and a red pavilion and twenty lāhks of tankas for his household expenses.

After a few days Muqbil Kāhn, the governor of Mandesōr 2 fled owing to his extreme misfortune; and Mahābat Kāhn, in whose charge he was, was sent immediately that he might seize and bring him back, with the threat that otherwise he should expect the thunderbolts of punishment. Mahābat Kāhn made great exertions, but (being unsuccessful) went and joined Shēr Kāhn (the governor of Chandēri). 'Alī Kāhn and some other men of evil destiny, who were suspicious and afraid owing to their evil deeds, also went and joined Shēr Kāhn. The latter marched from the neighbourhood of Na'leha and advanced towards Chandēri. Sultān Naṣīr-ud-din sent Mubārak Kāhn and 'Ālam Kāhn to Shēr Kāhn, so that they might, in any way that they could, reassure him. Although they gave him words of sage counsel, he spoke rare words in answer to all their arguments; and wanted to imprison both of them. On the pretext that he was going to consult

---

1 The lith. ed. has كلاه دولت قبلی موزنہ, which, however, is printed as كلاه دولت قبلی سرزنہ in it. The MSS. omit كلاه دولت, though they mention it a little later. I have therefore retained it. موزنہ appears to mean made of woven cloth of hair, and Firishtah explains the importance of sanctity of this robe by saying از باب سید محمد نور بخش, i.e., appertaining to Saiyid Muḥammad Nūr Baksh.

2 Firishtah says قمر ورزید, but like Nişām-ud-din, he gives no reason for this. Col. Briggs quotes in a note (vol. IV, p. 241) some of the intrigues and fighting between Nasir-ood-Deen on the one side, and Shoojat Khan and Rany Khoorsheed on the other, from the Muntukhib-oat-Towareekh; and says these are not mentioned by Firishta, although as a matter of fact they are. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, says that the āmiris declined to believe that Sultān Nasir-ud-din “had ascended the throne with his father’s consent”, and, therefore, rebelled. Firishtah does not say that Muqbil Kāhn was in charge of Mahābat Kāhn. He however agrees with the text in saying that he was sent to bring the latter.
with his mother, he came out of the pavilion, and made over Mubārak Khān and ‘Alam Khān to his own men. The latter seized Mubārak Khān, and slew two of his servants. ‘Alam Khān took the opportunity to get to his horse; and with great quickness came out of the camp, and reported the matter to Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din. The latter left his son Sultān Shihāb-ud-din, in charge of the government of the fort of Shādīābād; and took up his quarters, on the 9th Shābān of the afore-mentioned year, in the Jahān-numā palace at Na’lcha. When Shīr Khān arrived in the fort of Ujjain, he again, at the instigation of Mahābat Khān turned back to give battle, and came to Dībālpūr, and plundered the town of Hindīāh. Immediately on hearing this, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din marched forward, and took up his residence in the palace of Dīrār.

At this time they brought the news that Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-din had passed away from the waste place of the world to the popular land of after-world. According to one statement he was poisoned at the instance of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din. ¹ It is a matter of experience that a parricide never attains to old age and never becomes successful. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din ruled for ² eleven years. Therefore the allegation of his attempt on the life of his father may be a mere calumny, but knowledge is with God alone.

In short, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din wept much at the death of his father, and was in mourning for three days. ³ On the 4th day he

¹ Firishtah gives the same reason for disbelieving the guilt of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din; but he is not so positive as Nizam-ud-din as he prefixes the word شايرd perhaps, to the sentence about Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din’s innocence. Col. Briggs thinks that it is not just to accuse him of that crime; while the Cambridge History of India (p. 364) says that the poison was “administered, as it was generally believed, by his orders.” One would have thought, that seeing that the father was so weak in body and mind, and so helpless, it would be futile and unnecessary to cause his death; but there is the fact that some of the nobles rebelled, because they believed that Nāṣir-ud-din had not ascended the throne with his father’s consent.

² Both MSS. have سیردار سال 13 years, but the lith. ed. has سیردار سال 11 years. Firishtah lith. ed. has many years. As Nāṣir-ud-din’s reign lasted from 905 to 916 A.H., the reading in the lith. ed. is correct and I have retained it.

³ Firishtah lith. ed. agrees generally with the text as to the Sultān’s proceeding against Shīr Khān. Col. Briggs however (vol. IV, p. 241) says
started on his march; and Shēr Khān in fear of his life turned back to his own country. ʿAin-ul-mulk and some other sardārs separated from him and joined the camp of Nāṣir Shāh. The latter pursued Shēr Khaṇ, and the latter turned back in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr to engage him; and after doing so, fled. He could not stand firm in Chandēri itself, and went away to the country of Erij and Bhāndir; and the dust of the disturbance settled down; and Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn went to Chandēri. When some days had passed, the Shaikhzādas of Chandēri sent a letter to Shēr Khaṇ, saying, that as most of the Shādībād troops had dispersed, and had gone away to their jāgirs; and as, owing to the rains, the amīrs would not be able to assemble quickly, if he would come to Chandēri, and the men of the city, should in conjunction with him come out in great numbers, it was probable that they would be able to seize Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn; and even if he should escape, the city could be conquered in a very easy way. Shēr Khaṇ without any delay marched out and arrived within six karōhs of Chandēri. Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn became acquainted with the consultations of the Shaikhzādas, and appointed Iqbal Khaṇ and Mallū Khaṇ with a well-equipped army and mast elephants to get rid of Shēr Khaṇ; and sent two lakhs of tankas in cash with them to defray their expenses. They had not yet gone two karōhs, when Shēr Khaṇ relying on the statements of

that Sheer Khan's adherents “wrote to him that the King had retreated to Mando on account of the rains.” This is not correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, says that, “After an unsuccessful attempt to crush this rebellion, and another attempt, equally unsuccessful, to conciliate the rebels, he took the field against them.” This also is incorrect, if Niṃām-ud-dīn and Firishtah are correct. Neither of them speaks of the first unsuccessful attempt to crush the rebellion.

1 Both MSS. have وهم جاين, which I have adopted, but the lith. ed. has بيم جاين.
2 The MSS. have Nāṣir Shāh, and Nāṣir Shāhī; and the lith. ed. has Nāṣir-ud-dīn.
3 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have اطلع نموذة, which does not appear to be quite correct. Firishtah lith. ed. has اطلع باقنی which is better, and I have adopted it. In the text-edition. M. Hidayat Hosain has retained اطلع نموذة.
the Shaikhzadas came forward to meet them; and after the arraying of the troops the two sides fought bravely. In the midst of the struggle, Shér Khán happened to receive a wound, became disabled, and 1 got the fruit of his rebellion. 2 Sikandar Khán was killed in the battle-field. Khwajah Suhail and Mahâbat Khán placed the wounded Shér Khán in a box (some sort of howdah) on the back of an elephant and took the way of flight. As Shér Khán died on the way, they buried him, and went on in their flight. Iqbal Khán returned after pursuing them for some distance. Sultan Nasir-ud-din was delighted and pleased on hearing this news; and went to the battle-field, and 3 from there sent Sikandar Khán to Chandéri, so that he might expose Shér Khán’s body on a gallows. He placed the bridle of the government and defence of that territory in the grasp of power of 4 Bihjat Khán; and marching by successive stages arrived in the pleasant town of 5 Sa’uldépur. There some men reported to him, that Shaikh Habib-ul-lah, 6 who had the title of ‘Álam Khán, intended to act treacherously, and was waiting for an opportunity. Sultan

---

1 The words in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are كرود. The other MS. incorrectly omits the verb كرود; but in either case the meaning is rather obscure. I think, however, my translation is correct. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage omits this semi-moral observation.

2 It is not stated who he was. Firishtah in the corresponding passage says كم عددة ان قوم بود. Firishtah agrees generally with the text in respect of the battle and the incidents preceding and following it; and so do Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India.

3 Firishtah differs slightly, and says that the Sultan went to the battle field, exhumed Shér Khán’s body, and sent it to Chandéri, so that it might be suspended from the gallows there.

4 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 242) calls him Himmut Khan; and the Cambridge History of India, page 364, has Bihjat Khán.

5 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 242) calls the place Adilpoor. It is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

6 The actual words are نسبت بعالم خان in both MSS. and in the lith ed. I do not actually understand the meaning of the word نسبت in this context, Firishtah has in the corresponding passage نسبت بدام الغلابي بعالم خان which is perfectly clear, and I have translated the passage accordingly. M. Hidayat Hosain has retained the reading of the manuscripts, but refers to a variant شعر instead of نسبت in another MS.
Nāṣir-ud-dīn imprisoned him, and sent him to Mandū, in advance of himself.

On the 10th Sha'bān 907 A.H., he entered the fort of Shādiābād attended with victory and triumph. He then occupied himself with pleasure and dissipation, and most of his time was spent in the drinking of spirituous liquor. In his drinks, he ordered his father’s amīrs to be murdered owing to a suspicion of their treachery; and he supported and favoured his own men. His immorality and tyranny reached such a pitch, that one day, when drunk he was asleep on the bank of a reservoir. By accident he fell into it. His attendants, who were watching him, brought him out of the water. When he came to his senses, he asked who had taken him out. Four slave girls told him, “We performed this service.” He ordered all four of them to be executed. He had heard from the chief men of Ujjain (apparently the reservoir was in that city and this incident occurred there), that that reservoir or tank was the Kaliyādah. He ² planned the erection of a palace there, in the Bāgh Firūz, of such grandeur, that people, who had travelled over the inhabited fourth part of earth, never saw anything like it. Gradually his desire for building reached such a point, that out of the seventeen krōrs of Mālwa money, which had come to him by inheritance, he spent five krōrs on different structures.

On the 22nd Dhi-qa’dah 908 A.H., he came to the town of Na’lēha with the intention of destroying the country of ³ Kachwārah. And

¹ Firishtah narrates this incident in greater detail. According to him, the Sultān rolled into the water, and the four slave girls pulled him out, some seizing hold of his hands, and the others the hair of his head. They also put him into dry clothes. When he recovered his senses he complained of headache, and the slave girls, hoping for a reward, told him what had happened, after the usual prayers and praise; he flew into a rage, drew his sword, and cut down the poor and helpless slave girls. And then Firishtah indulges in three couplets, expressing the woes of the hapless women, and their having their revenge on the day of resurrection.

² Firishtah does not mention the erection of the wonderful palace and the other buildings.

³ The name is written as ظپار in the MS. and ظپار in the lith. ed. both of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 243) has Keechiwara. The Cambridge History of India does not mention this invasion at all.
when by successive marches, he arrived in the town of 1 Āgar, he
found the air of that place to be pleasant, and built a lofty and 2 noble
palace there; which is now one of the wonders of the age. He remained
in that town for some time; and sent his troops in different directions,
and having chastised the rebels and taken tribute from them, returned
(to his capital).

In the year 909 A.H., 1803 A.D., he again moved in the direction
of 3 Chitōr; and when he arrived in the centre of the country, the
Rāja of Chitōr and all the zamīndārs sent tribute. 4 Bhawānīdās,
the son of Shevdās, who was a near relation of Rāymal Chitōrī brought
his daughter as tribute. Sultān Nāsir-ud-din gave her the title of
Rānī Chitōr, and bestowed many favours on Bhawānīdās. In the-
course of the Sultān’s return, scouts brought the news, that
Nizām-ul-mulk Dakinī had invaded the country of Asir and Burhānpur.
As Dāūd Khān, the ruler of Asir, had always sought the protection
of Nāsir Shāh, the latter sent Iqbal Khān and Khwājah Jahān to Asir
and Burhānpur. Nizām-ul-mulk then turned back and returned to
his own country. Iqbal Khān had the public prayer read in Asir
and Burhānpur in the name of Nāsir Shāh, and returned to the capital
city of Shādīkhān Mandū.

In the year 5 916 A.H., 1512 A.D., Sultān Shihāb-ud-din raised
the standard of rebellion at the instigation of some of the amīrs of

---

1 The name is written as Āgar in the MS., and as Ākär and Ākēr in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 243) calls the place Akburpoor. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the place here but later on (p. 367) it calls it Āgar.
2 One MS. omits the word علی عالم after ١٠٥٩.
3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 243) all have Chittoor, but the lith. ed. of Firishtah has Jaipūr. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, says the Sultān in 1503 “led a marauding expedition into the dominion of the Rānā”, but does not mention the place.
4 He is so described in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed., but the lith. ed. of Firishtah calls him جبونداس کہ قروایت قربہ برائے داشت. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 243) has “Raja Jewundas, one of the subordinate rajas.” The Cambridge History of India has not mentioned it. Firishtah lith. ed. says the daughter of Jhūndās was named Rānī Jaipūrī; but Col. Briggs says that she was afterwards dignified with the title of the “Chittoor Queen.”
5 The Cambridge History of India, page 364, gives 1510 A.D., as the year of the rebellion.
perverted destiny; and came out of the fort of Mandū. The amirs of the frontier districts mostly joined him, and he marched from the town of Na’îcha to the town of Dhār. Sultān Nāşir-ud-din arrived there with a body of his special troops; and from that place he advanced towards Dhār, with the intention of giving battle. Sultān Shihāb-ud-din, considering that his father’s followers were weak, advanced to engage him; but in the end, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Nāşir Shāh’s standards. Sultān Shihāb-ud-din fled towards Chandērī. The brave warriors in Nāşir Shāh’s army pursued him; and were about to take him prisoner, but (on account of) fatherly love and paternal affection (he) forbade the men from further pursuit.

On the following day he marched from that station and went forward. When Sultān Shihāb-ud-din arrived in the town of 1 Sipīrī, Sultān Nāşir-ud-din sent a number of wise men to him, so that they might instruct him, and lead him from the by-path of error to the high-road of guidance. But as the way of righteousness was hidden from his side and the veil of negligence and of the love of splendour had been drawn down on his eyes, he never gave a reply that might be of any use. On the following day he sent a reply, “At present his shame and self-abasement prevent his acquiring the good fortune of waiting on Your Majesty. If a small part out of the many portions of the empire be bestowed on this slave; he would after a few days honour himself by rendering homage.” When the men who had been sent knew that it would be impossible to bring about an interview, they came back and reported the matter. Sultān Nāşir-ud-din said, “Verily we are for God, and verily we shall return to him.”

Hemistich:

The soil devoured the seed that in hope of thee I sowed.

He then sent a farmān to Ranthambhōr to summon Ā’zam Humāyūn, his younger son. The latter came on wings of speed and steps of eagerness and waited on his father near Chandērī. Sultān

1 The name of the place is written as سیپری in one or two places in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but as سپری in other places. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, also has Sipri. Firshah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) both have “Dehly” instead of Sipri. This of course is incorrect.
Nāsir-ud-din started from Chandēri on the following day; and advanced to the town of Sipri. At that station, he ordered the attendance of the amirs and the great men of the city; and said, "As Shihāb-ud-din has made undutifulness and revolt the return for paternal love, I am removing him from the position of the heir apparent; and I am making my son Ā'zam Humāyūn my heir." He then gave him the title of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, and bestowed a robe and the crown of the empire on him; and returning from the town of Sipri resided for some days in the village of Behishtpūr. As the temperature of Sultān Nāsir-ud-din was high, and as in spite of the fact of its being the winter, he got into cold water and remained in it for a moment, his health immediately turned from the normal; and various diseases and ailments with mutually opposed results attacked him. Although the physicians tried to effect a cure, they had no success.

Couplet:

Oxymal, by fate's decree, increased his bile,
The oil of almonds dryness produced.

Sultān Nāsir-ud-din, seeing that his condition was unsatisfactory sent for Maḥmūd Shāh, and the amirs and the great men of the country to his presence; and opening his lips to give utterance to counsels and precepts said: "As the great and holy God has selected this excellent

---

1 The name is in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and in the lith. ed. of the ープァィャ in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) has Burt, and, in the Cambridge History of India.

2 Firishtah's account agrees with that in the text, but he surmises that the fever was caused from excessive drinking or from infection of the humours of the body or the influence of the air. Col. Briggs's account (so far it goes) agrees with that in the text. The Cambridge History of India, pages 364, 365, gives two accounts of the manner of Sultān Nāsir-ud-din's death. The first agrees with that in the text. According to the other he suspected many of his nobles to be secretly in correspondence with Shihāb-ud-din, and threatened them, so that they became apprehensive and poisoned him. I have not seen this said anywhere else.

A mixture of honey and vinegar prescribed for the bile.

4 Firishtah does not ascribe any speech to the Sultān, and considering the latter's disposition and habits, and his condition at the time, it is not likely that he could make such a sensible and eloquent address. However, as it is there, I have translated it.
son (of mine) from the entire people of the world, and has entrusted the bridle of the affairs of all people to his grasp of power, it behoves him, that he should not place his foot out of the high-road of worship of, and submission to God; and should not become subject to lust and sensuality; and should write the text of ‘love to the people of God’ on the leaf of his mind and the page of his heart. He should also not withhold the favour of God from the people, as it has not been withheld from him. He should also shorten his hand from the skirts of the oppressed. He should not in his public audiences give way to hesitation and weariness; and should not close the path of approach of the oppressed to him; and should properly listen to their words. He should not also, in administering justice and equity, allow any difference between the weak and the strong, and the high and the low; so that he may not become ashamed on the day of the judgment. He should also treat with honour and respect all Saiyids who are the fruits of the garden of the prophetship and of the emissary of God; and should make the high society of the learned, who are the heirs of the prophet, green and fruitful by the beneficence of the clouds of his rewards. He should also consider it right and proper to refrain from the society of stupid and foolish men, who are satisfied with husk of words; and are ignorant and unmindful of the purity and greatness of saints. He should also lay the foundation of houses of piety and goodness, which are the effects of one’s good fortune, in all parts of the dominions. In short, he should devote all his energy in carrying out the wishes of God; and in the administration of the affairs of the state always take counsel (with wise men).” Shâhzâdah Mahmûd Shâh and the great men of the kingdom were in great pain and anguish on hearing this speech. (The Sultân) then, with a true determination and a right resolution made repentance of all his sins and iniquities in the presence of the learned men, and after a moment accepted the summons of the just God. The period of his reign was eleven years and four months and twenty ¹ three days.

Couplets:

From the cold earth, rose this palace grand;
But as you make it warm they tell you "rise"!

¹ Firishtah lith. ed. has eleven years and four months and three days and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) has eleven years and four months.
As this world of dust has such foundations weak,
Soon should it be scattered to the wings, and ruin be.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD SHĀH, SON OF NĀṢIR SHĀH.

On the 1 3rd day of Ṣafar in the year 917 A.H., Maḥmūd Shāh, the son of Nāṣir Shāh, ascended the throne of the Khaljī empire, in the village of Behishtpūr, with 2 an auspicious and triumphant fortune and at a happy time. The rites of thanks-offering and of wave-offering having been performed, each one of the great men of the age was made happy with royal beneficence; and from the same majlis sent the coffin of Nāṣir Shāh to the fort of Shādiābād.

3 Sultān Shihāb-ud-din on becoming acquainted with the event (Ḥādīthā, i.e., probably his father’s death), betook himself from where he was by rapid marches, to Nasratābād Na’lcha. Muḥāfīz Khān Khwājah Sard and Khwās Khān shut the gates in his face. On the following day, he sent a message to them, by one of his immediate attendants, that if they would act in friendship with him, it 4 was certain, that the loosening and fastening of the affairs of the state would be entrusted to their wisdom. Muḥāfīz Khān and Khwās Khān said, “As the ordinance of the empire, has been recorded in

---

1 Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India gives the date of the accession.

2 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has بطالع ضرخاتة فوز لازمان سعادت أثر for بطالع ضرخاتة فوز در زمان سعادت أثر. The lith. ed. has بطالع ضرخاتة فوز در زمان سعادت أثر.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 356, says “Shihāb-ud-din, on hearing of his father’s death, returned to Mālwa and marched on Māndū, but Mahmūd II. outstripped him and arrived there first, and when Shihāb-ud-din reached the city, the gates were shut in his face.” This appears to me to contain more than one inaccuracy. There was no race between the brothers; and it was the gates of Na’lcha and not of Māndū that were shut in Shihāb-ud-din’s face by Muḥāfīz Khān, who was the governor of the former place and not of the latter. It is true that Col. Briggs also says that the gates of Mando were shut in his face and Muḥafiz Khan refused him admission. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) also says that immediately after this the Prince “fled to Aseer”, and says nothing about his defeat by Jāwāsh Khān. The Cambridge History of India appears here to follow Col. Briggs and does not refer to the Ṭabaqat or Firishtah at all.

4 Both MSS. omit ٍعست after يقين; but I have retained it.
the renowned name of Mahmūd Shāh, in the office of destiny and fate, the best course is that you should join the camp (of Sultan Mahmūd); and should change the foulness and roughness of a strange man for the purity of friendship."  

1 Sultan Shihāb-ud-din becoming despondent retired towards Kandāsah.  

2 When Sultan Mahmūd knew that Sultan Shihāb-ud-din had gone away towards Mandū, he marched by successive stages and took up his residence in Jahān-numā kiosk of Na'līcha, on the 2nd Rabi'-ul-awwal of the afore-mentioned year.

From there he sent  

3 Jāwash Khān with a detachment of troops to crush Sultan Shihāb-ud-din, and he sent eleven elephants with him. He then went to the fort of Shādiābād, on a date which had been selected by the astrologers, and at an auspicious moment on the 6th Rabi'-ul-awwal, had the golden throne, encrusted with gems and pomegranate-colour rubies, in the open plain near the audience hall, and  

4 had twenty-one other thrones raised around it, and Mahmūd Shāh ascended the throne of the Khaljī Sultāns from the east of the

1 One MS. omits the whole sentence from شاه سلطان to كندويه. The name of the place is Kandūhah in the MS. which has the sentence, and Kandīyah in the lith. ed. Firishtah is very brief here and does not mention the place.

2 There is much difference in the readings. One MS. has صلاح شاه محمد بندور رفته بنچ while the other has صلاح شاه محمد دو رفته بنچ and the lith. ed. has صلاح شاه محمد دو رفته بنچ. The reading in the first MS. is manifestly incorrect, and there is not much to choose between the other two, but on the whole I think the reading of the lith. ed. is the best.

3 The name is جراح خان in one MS., and in several places in the other. In the latter it is جلوس خان in one place. The lith. ed. has جراح خان. The expedition against Sultan Shihāb-ud-din is not mentioned by either Firishtah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

4 I have translated the text as it is in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but I am very doubtful about its correctness. I cannot understand the reference to the twenty-one thrones, and also to the rising of Mahmūd Shāh from the east of the throne of the empire. As regards the rising of Mahmūd Shāh from the east the reading from Firishtah is a great improvement. It is مصعود شاه از افطق سرباز جهانداری طالع گفت. Probably the correct reading of the Tabaqāt was something like this. As to the twenty-one thrones, I cannot hazard any explanation.
throne of the empire. The 1 amīrs and the great men of the city and the notabilities of the kingdom stood in their proper places. Each one of them received such distinction as was suitable for his position; and some of the amīrs were honoured with titles; and seven hundred elephants, which were 2 in the environs of the fort came into use.

After a few days a report came from Jāwash Khān, to the effect, that as the star of the good fortune of Sūltān Shihāb-ud-dīn had fallen into the abyss of ruin, he did not listen to all the friendly advice and the wise precepts which were given to him; and came forward to give battle. And this helpless one (i.e., he himself) advanced to chastise him, placing the great good fortune of His Majesty in the vanguard; and at the first onset Sūltān Shihāb-ud-dīn’s foot of firmness slipped from its place, and he fled. The bearer of his umbrella was slain, and the umbrella fell into our hands. He himself fled to the country of 3 Asīr. As the rainy season had now come, Sūltān Maḥmūd Shāh summoned Jāwash Khān back. The latter returned to the fort on the last day of Rabi’-ul-awwal, and received many favours.

Sūltān Maḥmūd, now having his mind at rest in respect of Sūltān Shihāb-ud-dīn, entrusted the management of the affairs of the kingdom to 4 Basant Rāy, to whom the post of the vazīrat of Nāṣir Shāh had belonged. Basant Rāy, 5 owing to his great pride and ignorance,

---

1 I have adopted the reading in the MS. That in the lith. ed. is امراء و اركان و اكلمو معاف مالک.
2 The MSS. have بردور قلعة but the lith. ed. has بر قلعة. I have adopted the former. The meaning of بصرف درآمد is not at all clear. The corresponding passage in Firishṭah is more intelligible. It is و دفندل زنجير فی لک در قله می. And seventy elephants were armed with housings of velvet and gold tissue.
3 The Tabaqat has خدای اسیر. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, however, says, he retired to the fortress of Asūr.
4 The name is written in various places in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishṭah as یسیب نیبات رای. Basant Rāy, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) has Buswunt Row and the Cambridge History of India (p. 365) has Basant Rāi.
5 The nature of Basant Rāy’s offence is not quite clear. Of course he was a Hīndū, and the other amīrs were Musalmāns, but Basant had apparently
did not maintain the usual relations towards the army, and did not leave out any minutiae of meanness and mischief-making; and having adopted a harshness of behaviour did not show proper respect towards the amirs and sardars. The latter, having availed themselves of an opportunity, killed him in the audience hall on the 7th Rabi'-ul-thani. Naqd-ul-mulk, who was of the same religion as Basant Ray, and the latter’s colleague in service, fled into the harem of the Sultan. Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan talked together, and said, “Unless the kingdom is purified of the contamination of the existence of this impure one, he will always be in ambush for taking revenge for Basant Ray.” They sent the following message to the Sultan by Sadr Khan and Afjal Khan, “Nothing has been done, and nothing will be done by these loyal slaves, except in the way of a sincere desire for Your Majesty’s well-being, and it must be clear to your illuminating wisdom, that as the affairs (of the kingdom) have not been well arranged, the act of leaving the threads of the administration in the grasp of people who are strangers to us in creed and religion, is (likely to be) the cause of disorder in the conduct of government. It has probably been submitted to Your Majesty by some of your well-wishers, what kind of treatment Basant Ray meted out to the amirs and to your other loyal adherents. His sole object was, that your old servants might become heart-broken; and they and their retainers might be

been the minister of Nasir Shah also. The Tabaqat says he did not show the usual courtesy towards the army, and left out no minutiae of Dqa‘iq-ke-Fa‘lta in the translation. Firishtah ed., of Dqa‘iq-ke-Fa‘lta appears to mean little- ness or meanness; Dqa‘iq-ke-Fa‘lta economy or thrift; and Dqa‘iq-ke-Fa‘lta means mischief-making. I have adopted the translation. Firishtah says the other amirs became hostile to him lest he become too powerful (مباذا نقرب و نسلت بهم رساند). Col. Briggs says he was a personal favourite of the King, and had attended him from the period of his birth; and he also says that the conspirators declared that he had laid a scheme to overturn the government. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, is satisfied with saying that the Muslim nobles resented his holding the high office of minister.

1 One MS. has quite incorrectly جانب مدينة instead of جانب مدينة.
2 Firishtah lith. ed. also calls him Naqd-ul-mulk; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) has Nizam-ool-Moolk. He is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.
3 It is مخصومة instead of Mukhtas Khan in the text-edition.
dispersed. This was in fact disloyalty on his part; and we your loyal servants, in a body, removed him out of the way. Naqd-ul-mulk is also following in his footsteps. If it be your noble order, the world might be purified of the contamination of his existence." Sultan Mahmud in his weakness and helplessness sent Naqd-ul-mulk to the amirs; but he ordered that he might be externed, and no injury caused to his life or property. When they brought Naqd-ul-mulk, 1 the amirs, acting in a body, expelled him. Sultan Mahmud was aggrieved at these proceedings of the amirs, and at their domination; and the purity of his heart was changed to resentment.

Muhafiz Khan, eunuch, the combination of whose disposition was made up of malice and wickedness, 2 owing to his longing for the vazirat, reported (to the Sultan), in private, words that were not true 3 in respect of the amirs. It so happened, that one day availing himself of an opportunity, he represented to the Sultan, that Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan wanted to raise one of the (other) sons of Nasir Shah on the throne. Sultan Mahmud, simply on hearing this news, became anxious; and wanted to punish the two ministers. But afterwards acting with patience and calmness, he set about making enquiries and investigations.

When Muhafiz Khan saw, that his words had not produced any result, he grew more insistent in his calumnies; and every day made use of harsh words, till one day Sultan Mahmud ordered some people,

1 Firishtah says that to this extent they tried to please the Sultan.
2 Firishtah lith. ed. is not explicit about Muhafiz Khan's motive; and neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India says what his motive was. Firishtah and Col. Briggs say nothing about Muhafiz Khan's intrigues against Mukhtas Khan and Iqbal Khan; but they say that he quarrelled with the Sultan and used unmannerly language towards him. After some fighting the Sultan had to leave Shadlabad; and Muhafiz Khan then brought Sahib Khan out of the fort, and raised him to the throne. According to the Tabaqat this happened sometime afterwards, i.e., after the rebellion of Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan and the death of Sultan Shihab-ud-din, and the submission of a petition by Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan. The Cambridge History of India mentions the intrigues of Muhafiz Khan and the rebellion of Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan, etc. (p. 365).
3 The reading in the MSS, and in the lith. ed. is امراء but I think the meaning is about or in respect of the amirs.
4 مقصود خان in the second MS.
that they should slay Iqbāl Khān and Mukhṭār Khān, when they come, according to custom, to make their salute.

And when things came to such a pass, one of the eunuchs, who was on special terms with Mukhṭār Khān, reported to him what was happening. Mukhṭār Khān immediately went and informed Iqbāl Khān; and an hour had not yet elapsed when a man came to summon Mukhṭār Khān and Iqbāl Khān. 1 Mukhṭār Khān hastened without any delay to wait on the Sultān; and Iqbāl Khān remained occupied with the affairs of state. Mukhṭār Khān, seeing that things were not as on previous occasions, 2 returned, and came to Iqbāl Khān; and they went away to their respective houses. Muḥāfīz Khān then reported to the Sultān that Mukhṭār Khān and Iqbāl Khān had gone away to their houses, so that they might collect their retainers, and raise one of the Shāhīzādas to the 3 sultānat. He suggested that it would be advisable to go there and seize them; 4 and not defer what should be done today to tomorrow.

Couplet:

Time 5 takes off from the man,
Who to tomorrow delays today's work.

Sultān Maḥmūd believed the words of that 6 deceitful traitor, and advanced towards the houses of Mukhṭār Khān and Iqbāl Khān. The latter fled with a hundred horsemen and foot soldiers, and came out of the fort on the side of 7 Qaḍīpūr, on the night of the 24th Rabī‘-ul-thānī. They rode all night, and in the morning reached the village of 8 Sarābah, near the Narbada river. From that place

---

1 One MS. by mistake omits the whole sentence from مُغْفِظُ خَان to مشغِلُ بُود.
2 One of the MSS. has بِر امَّة instead of بِرَكَّشَّة.
3 One of the MSS. has بطلب instead of بِسْلُنَت.
4 One MS. omits the words from نيندا أَرَزَدَ كَأَرَ امرِؤَ.
5 The word in the MS. and in the lith. ed. appears to be تُبْرَأ which may be derived from تُبْرِر to break off.
6 One MS. omits the word مَكَار.
7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have قَائِمٌ بِبُرَ but the other MS. has غَارِبِي.*
8 Firisṭah and Col. Briggs do not name the village. They narrate the facts of the rebellion of Mukhṭār Khān (whom they call Maḥbūs Khān) and Iqbāl Khān after the narrative of the rebellion of Muḥāfīz Khān and the raising
they sent Naṣrat Khān, son of Iqbal Khān, on the 25th of the month in the direction of the country of Asir, to bring Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-din. Early the next morning, Sulṭān Maḥmūd sat on the masnad of rule in the audience place; and conferring the title of Khwājah Jahān on Muhāfiz Khān entrusted the office of the vażīrat to him. He then conferred the titles of Majlis-i-Karim on Afḍal Khān, and of Dastūr Khān on Jāwash Khān, and sent them to put down Mukhtās Khān and Iqbal Khān.

When Naṣrat Khan, after traversing various stages, arrived in the presence of Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-din, the latter in his great joy and happiness, started on the following day from the country styled "the Mumtāz", which is a name for the territory of Bijāgarh and Kharkūn; and in his great eagerness he traversed thirty karōhs in one day and night. It so happened, however, that the heat was so great, that fish were scorched in the depth of the sea, and fiery natured salamanders were drowned in their own sweat, and Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-din fell ill and his condition became abnormal, and on the 3rd of Jamādī-ul-awwal he accepted the summons of God.

Couplet:

There is the way of non-existence, which none who exists,
Will e'er the danger of traversing escape.

And some say that he was poisoned at the instigation of Sulṭān Maḥmūd. Naṣrat Khān, dressed in blue (mourning) garments, and taking the corpse with him came to Sarābah, where the Khāns were assembled. When he arrived there, Mukhtās Khān and Iqbal Khān, in great sorrow and distress, sent the dead body to the fort of Shādt-

of Şāhib Khān to the throne by the latter. According to Firishtah lith. ed. Iqbal Khān and Maḥṣūs Khān went themselves to Asir, and held the umbrella over the head of Shihāb-ud-din; and after his death they raised the umbrella over the head of his son, and gave him the title of Sulṭān Hūshang. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 250) agrees generally with the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but he says, contrary to the other historians, that it was Medny Ray, who had acquired an undue influence over the Sooltan, who persuaded the latter that Yekbal and Mukhsoos Khan "were carrying on a treasonable correspondence with the King of the Deccan"; and at his instigation the Sooltan ordered the former to be put to death. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, also does not mention it, though it says that they fled to the Narbada. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has Saraiyah in the text-edition.
ābād. They gave the title of Hūshang Shāh to 1 the adopted son of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, and held the umbrella over his head; and raising the dust of disturbance, started from that country towards the centre of the country of Mālwa.

2 Couplet:

Jāmī! it is better that at this stage you adopt the view,
That from the deaths of others, you fear your own.

After the arrival of the dead body, the Sultān wept much, and deposited it in the earth. He carried out the customary rites of mourning, and gave alms to deserving people. After finishing them, he sent Nizām Khān to reinforce Dastūr Khān. Nizām Khān traversed the stages on wings of speed and joined him. Then joining their forces, they attacked Hūshang; and the latter fled, and took shelter in 3 the hills of Bahār Bābā Hājī.

While these things were happening, petitions came from Iqbal Khan and Mukhtās Khan, to the effect that, "Nothing has ever been done by these ancient hereditary slaves except rendering loyal service to your Majesty; and Muḥāfiz Khān, owing to his envy and ill-will, having spoken interested and malicious words has turned your noble heart against your old servants. They hope that the truth about the disloyalty and 4 wickedness of Muḥāfiz Khān and of his acts will be revealed to your just mind. They also believe that some of your other loyal servants, will, in their disinterestedness, attest in private

1 Both MSS. have متبني, adopted son, but the lith. ed. has پسر, son. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, also has son.

2 The meaning and appropriateness of the couplet are not very clear. Also the first word is either جامی which is the name of the celebrated Persian Sūfī poet who was a native of Jām, or جامی a place. I think Jāmī is better.

3 Firishtah lith. ed. has کوه‌ها گرفتند and fleeing to the hills. He goes on to say that after some time Iqbal Khān and Makhaṣṣ Khān joined the service of Sultān Maḥmūd, and were received with favour. Somewhat contrary to this, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 250) says, that after some slight opposition, "the prince and his minister (apparently Yekbal Khan) threw themselves on the King's mercy." On the other hand, the Cambridge History of India, page 365, says that "Hūshang took refuge in Schore, but the leaders convinced the king that they were loyal at heart."

4 The phrase is حرم زادگی حرم خواابی حرام مخفور, in the MSS., and حرم خواابی حرام مخفور in the lith. ed. In the text-edition it is نا دولت‌خواابی و حرام خواابی.
to the truth of these words." When the purport of these petitions became known to Sultān Maḥmūd, some of the Sultān's servants said that, "The object of Muḥāfiz Khaṇ in making the insinuations was, that he should be able to act independently in carrying out the affairs of the state; and the turn of the vazīrat would not come to him, if Mukhtar Khān and Iqbal Khān were there. In fact, his whole energy had been devoted to this, that he might place a new face on the affairs; and having brought one of the sons of Ṣāṣir Shāh out of prison, he should assign the name of the Sultān to him; and should himself be the loosener and fastener (sole dictator) of all affairs."

Sultān Maḥmūd, who had no caution and foresight in his acts, ordered that when Muḥāfiz Khaṇ comes to make his salute, he should be seized, and kept under guard, and should, after investigation, be punished. When the adherents of Muḥāfiz Khaṇ informed him of the truth of what had happened, he appeared in the precincts of the audience hall, with his retainers, on the following day, which was the 18th Jamādi-ul-Āwwal. After a little while Sultān Maḥmūd summoned him to his private chamber. He went there, and gave harsh replies to his words. Sultān Maḥmūd, in great anger and bravery, marched out with few followers from among his servants and a body of Abyssinians; and that wicked man fled out of the palace; and taking possession of the outer building raised the standard of revolt. He brought Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, son of Sultān Ṣāṣir-ud-dīn; and besieged Maḥmūd Shāh in his palace. He was about to seize the latter, when he came out in the middle of the night, and started towards the town of Ujjain. From that place he summoned Dastūr Khān and the other amirs to his presence, after giving them assurances of his favour. That very night when Sultān Maḥmūd started in his flight, Muḥāfiz Khaṇ bestowed the title of Sultān Maḥmūd on Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, and placed him on the throne. After some days, Dastūr Khān arrived in Ujjain; and after him, Mukhtar Khān and Iqbal

---

1 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say, that he received the title of Sultān Maḥmūd. It shows a lack of imagination in Muḥāfiz Khaṇ that he could not give him any other title. It must have been very confusing to have the same name for both the Sultāns. Firishṭah and Col. Briggs do not appear to mention the title which was given to Sāhib Khān. In fact he is always called Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān in the histories. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, says that Sāhib Khān was proclaimed king under the title of Mahmūd II.
Khān joined the Sulṭān. Shāhzāda Śāhīb Khān, on hearing this news, summoned Sadr Khān and Afjāl Khān; and he had engagements and promises with them confirmed by very strong oaths.

On the 5th of Jamādi-ul-āwwal, he left the fort of Shadiābād in charge of Mawadāb Khān and marching to the town of Na'īcha, made it his camp; and with the concurrence of Sadr Khān, ordered that a third part of the wages of the soldiers should be paid to them in cash from the treasury, to enable them to make the necessary preparations for the march to Ujjain. Sulṭān Maḥmūd marched from Ujjain to Dībālpūr; and after a watch of the night, the commanders, who had their families in Mandū mounted their horses, and started for the camp of Shāhzāda Śāhib Khān. The next day Sulṭān Maḥmūd marched from Dībālpūr in the direction of Chandéri; and writing an account of what had happened, sent it to Bihjat Khān. The latter wrote in reply, "This slave is bound to obey him, who should have the capital city of Shādiābād in his possession." Sulṭān Maḥmūd on receiving this reply became amazed and anxious about his future. He halted in the village of Behishtpūr and held a consultation. Some of his adherents said, "We should take shelter in the fort of Ranthambhōr." The opinion of others was, that they should ask for help from Sulṭān Sikandar Lūdī. Sulṭān Maḥmūd declared, "It appears in my mind that we should wrap up our feet in the skirt of patience; and should wait for the rising of the stars of good fortune; it appears that it is right to take shelter in the fort of Ranthambhōr for a time, as it is imaginable that we should have help and support. It appears improper, however, on my side, to ask for help from my equals." And cutting off the chain of hope from all created things, he waited for the appearance of what was in the womb of fate.

After a few days, Mēdīnī Rāy, who was distinguished by great bravery and experience, came from his thāna and joined him. Bihjat

---

1 The readings are slightly different. One MS. has عهود و بیہمان را بابیمان گردانید. This appears to be the best reading. The other MSS. have عهود را بیہمان غلاف گردانید. This does not appear to be correct. The lith. ed. has instead of عهود ، and omits the ١ ار after بیہمان ، in the reading in the first MS.

2 The name is Morad Khan in one MS. and Moradnāsh Khan in the other, and in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Hosain has خوودن خان in the text-edition.
Khan becoming aware of the impropriety of his (previous) acts, sent 1 Sharzhah Khan, his son, to attend on the Sultan; and the latter, feeling that he was now more powerful, determined to march to Mandu. After some time news came that Shahzada Shabib Khan was advancing towards Chanderi. When he encamped in the village 2 Shahriar, the parties thought it advisable that they should arrange their troops the next morning, and await the blowing of the wind of victory and triumph. It so happened, that after the passing of one watch of the night, 3 Afdal Khan mounted his horse, and came to Sultan Mahmud's camp; and a little more than half the army, acting in concert with him, also joined Sultan Mahmud's camp. Shahzada Shabib Khan and Muhafiz Khan, in great terror and confusion, set fire to their camp, and fled. On the 4th day they arrived in Nasratabad, and opened the hand of lavishness for squandering the treasures, and occupied themselves with guarding and arranging the fort.

Sultan Mahmud performed the rites of offering thanks to God, and advanced towards Shadiabad. When he arrived in the village of 4 Sirsia, the adopted son of Sultan Shihab-ud-din and his amirs, who had fortified themselves in the foot hills of Bahar Baha Haj,  

---

1 The name is Sharzhah Khan in both MSS. Col. Briggs calls him Shirza Khan, governor of Chanderi. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqat has Siddat Khan and the Cambridge History of India, page 366, has Shiddat Khan.

2 The name of the village is Shahrwa and Shahrwa in the MSS. and Shahwa in the lith. ed. The name does not appear in Firishta or in Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India, though they all mention the battle which took place there. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted Shahwa in the text edition.

3 Neither Firishta nor Col. Briggs mentions the defection of Afdal Khan from Shahzada Shabib Khan's camp. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, mentions it, but its account differs in some particular from that in the text. In the first place, it says that the armies met in the evening. This is correct, if it means that the armies came near each other in the evening; but it certainly is not correct if it means that the armies engaged each other in the evening. Then it says, that Afdal Khan deserted, "taking half of the army with him." This is very indefinite, as it does not say half of what army he took with him. The Tabaqat is quite definite, and I presume it is correct that he took all his own army and half of Malik's army.

4 The village is called Sirsia in both MSS., and Sersia in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in either Firishta or in Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.
came to Sultan Mahmūd and obtained a promise of safety. Then by successive marches Sultan Mahmūd encamped in the town of Sirsah; and on the next day which was the 17th of Ramadān in the year 917 a.h., he advanced to Shādiābād, the seat of the throne, with his army in battle array. On both sides the ranks were arrayed, and the field of slaughter was arranged. Shāhzāda Šāhib Kāhn, acting with bravery, attacked Sultan Mahmūd's army. At this time an elephant advanced towards Sultan Mahmūd; and he shot an arrow aiming at the breast of the filbān with such force, that it came out of the latter's back. At this time Mēdinī Rāy with a body of his Rājpūts utterly routed Šāhib Kāhn's army, wounding the latter with their lances and jamdhars (a kind of dagger). The Shāhzāda being unable to withstand them fled; and some of his men took shelter in the fort; and 3 a number concealed themselves in the caverns, which are to be found in the neighbourhood of Mandū. Sultan Mahmūd pursued them as far as the Hauḍ-i-Khāṣ (special reservoir), and encamped there.

The Shāhzāda occupied himself with the defence and other arrangements of the fort; and endeavoured day and night to secure it against attack. Sultan Mahmūd, owing to his natural kindliness sent the following message to him, "As the relation of brotherhood is between us, and the observance of the relation of kinship is one of our duties, natural morality induces me that I should bestow on you whatever place you may ask for; and you may take away as much property as you can carry away, and may go away without any objection from me. So that for no reason whatever the blood of

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 366, gives November 28th (1512?) as the date of the battle.

2 One MS. has فراوان حمله اورد, but the word فراوان does not occur in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

3 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have فراوان در غارهای که در حوالي مئندو واقع است مختلفی شدند, with the difference that the MS. has by mistake in place of the MS. has instead of . The other MS. has در کوهها و غارهای که در حوالي مئندو واقع است مختلفی شدند. The reading in the lith. ed. appears to me to be the most correct and I have accepted it. In the text-edition it is فراوان در غارهای که در حوالي مئندو واقع است - مختلفی کشند.
Musalmāns may not be spilled.” Shāhzhāda Šāhib Khān, being proud of the strength of the fort, did not agree. Sūltān Maḥmūd then seized the environs of the fort, and made great efforts in carrying on the siege; till on the 16th Shawwāl of the afore-mentioned year (the troops) by the exertions and endeavours of Maulānā ‘Imād-ud-dīn Khurāsānī and other brave soldiers entered the fort about the beginning of true dawn; and attacking the men in a bastion fought hand to hand with them; and in the winking of an eye mingled the blood of the followers and adherents of the Shāhzhāda with the dust of wretchedness. The Shāhzhāda and Muhāfīz Khān taking with them a quantity of precious gems, fled by the path of the seven hundred steps; and on the 4th day joined the camp of Sūltān Mużaffar in 1 the town of Barōdā, one of the dependencies of Gujrāt. Sūltān Mużaffar considering, the arrival of the Shāhzhāda an honour, did not leave out a single minutiā in the rites of hospitality. He promised that at the end of the rainy season he would take possession of the country of Mālwa, and divide it among the brothers.

From that place they went to Chāmpānīr. 2 One day the Shāhzhāda happened to go to the house of Yādgār Mughul, who was celebrated as Surkh Kūlāh (the red cap), and had come to Gujrāt, as an ambassador from Shāh Isma‘īl Šafī. There were high words among their servants, which ended in a scuffle. A report spread among the common people, that Yādgār Surkh Kūlāh and his men had taken the Shāhzhāda of Mandū as prisoner. Men belonging to the army of Gujrāt, coming in crowds, killed some of the retainers of Surkh Kūlāh. The Shāhzhāda, from shame and ignominy, turned his face towards the kingdom of Asīr, without taking leave of the Sūltān. He with three hundred horsemen encamped at the village of 3 Lōrgāon, which is distinguished as the boundary of Asīr. Lōdhā the governor of the

---

1 Both the MSS. have در قصبه بروده بگچرات, but the lith. ed. has در قصبه بروده از توابع بنجرات. I have adopted the latter reading. M. Hidayat Hosain has در قصبه بروده گچرات in the text-edition.

2 One MS. omits the word منزل بر و also the word before لورکانو لنگاون. The name of the village is written as لورکانو, probably Lōrgāon, in the MS., and as لنگاون Naugāon in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in either Firishtah or in Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. In the text-edition it is لورکانو.
town of Kandūyah, having received information of this, came with great quickness and attacked him. Sāhib Khān fleeing from him sought shelter with the ruler of Kāwil, which is in the Deccan. As affectionate relations existed between Sultān Maḥmūd and the ruler of Kāwil, the latter kept himself back from helping the Shāhzāda, but allotted a few villages as a contribution towards his expenses.

After that, as disturbances disappeared from the kingdom, and disorder was changed into order, Sultān Maḥmūd took his place on the da'is of peace and tranquillity. Governors and thānādārs and revenue officers went to the different divisions and districts for the organisation of the kingdom. Mēdīnī Rāy wanted to become all powerful, and to remove the amirs of Ghiyāth Shāh and Nāṣīr Shāh out of the way; and in pursuance of this wicked purpose he began to speak ill of the amirs; and in private he slandered everyone, till one day he submitted (to the Sultān), that Afṣal Khān and Iqbal Khān had sent 1 letters to Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, and wanted to re-awaken the disturbances which had been put to sleep. Sultān Maḥmūd imagining these interested words to be disinterested, ordered, that when Afṣal Khān and Iqbal Khān should come to make their salāms they should be slain. On the following day, when they, in accordance with the usual custom, came to make their salāms, both of them were seized and torn joint from joint.

Sikandar Khān, the governor of 2 Satwās, and Fath Jang Khān Shērwānī, seeing this audacity and violence of Mēdīnī Rāy fled and went to their jāghirs. Sikandar Khān rebelled and took possession

---

1 The word is written as مکاتب in the MSS.; and ماکتب in the lith. ed. This last appears to me to be the best and I have retained it. In the text-edition it is مکاتب.

2 The name is written as سیواس، and اوسوم اواس and اوسوم l Aswās, and ستوس Satwās in different places in the MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. mentions Sikandar Khān, and his rebellion; but does not, as far as I can make out mention the name of his jāghir. Col. Briggs in one place (vol. IV, p. 251) calls him “Sikundur Khan of Bhilsa”; but this is apparently a mistake, for it was Mansūr Khān, who was sent against him, and not Sikandar Khān, who was a jāghīrār of Bhilsā. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, calls Sikandar Khān, governor of Satwās. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted سواس in the text-edition.
of the country from Kanduyah to Shahahabad, and drove out the revenue officers of the Khāla. Sultān Mahmūd came down from the fort of Mandū, in order to put down this rebellion, on the 5th of the month of Jamādi-ul-āghir of the year 918 A. H.; and took up his residence in the Jahān-nunā palace at Na’lcha. He entrusted the office of the vazīrat to Mēdini Rāy. He sent men to Bihjat Kān, governor of Chandēri, and other amirs, and summoned them. Bihjat Kān in spite of the relationship of Khānazādi (being a slave by descent), fearing (what Mēdini Rāy might do to him), wrote an excuse about the near approach of the rainy season. Sultān Mahmūd affected to overlook this; and wrote to Mansūr Kān, the feudatory of Bhilsā to advance and put down Sikandar Kān. Mansūr Kān collected his troops and advanced to attack Sikandar Kān; but when he arrived in the neighbourhood of the latter’s country, his spies brought him the news, that Sikandar Kān had collected an immense army; and had also got the Rāys of Gondwāna to join him. Mansūr Kān halted there, reported the facts to Sultān Mahmūd, and asked for reinforcements. Mēdini Rāy wrote in reply, that if he was guilty of procrastination and delay in seizing Sikandar Kān, he would become liable to suffer from the chastisement of the Sultān’s wrath. Mansūr Kān on receiving this order, became amazed and anxious about his future; and returned and joined Bihjat Kān. Sanjār Kān who had been nominated to reinforce Mansūr Kān also went and joined the latter.

Sultān Mahmūd on hearing these news started from the capital, came to Dhār, and performed the pilgrimage to the tomb of Shaikh Kamāl-ud-din Mālwi. He then sent Mēdini Rāy with a large army and fifty elephants, from the town of Dībālpūr, to put down Sikandar Kān; and himself went to Ujjain. Mēdini Rāy, on arriving at

---

1 Firishtah lith. ed. describes the country as كنده کا قصبه شاہا با باد but he does not say that Sikandar Kān took possession of it. He says that he had possession of it, در نصر داشت. Col. Briggs on the contrary says, “He occupied the country lying between Kuhndwa and Shahabad”; and about the last-named place says in a footnote “probably Shāhpūr”. The Cambridge History of India does not mention what territory Sikandar Kān seized.

2 The word is حكم in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and in the other MS. تحكم.

3 In text-edition it is تجئر خان Tujjār Kān instead of سنجئر خان.
Satwās stretched his hand for plunder and devastation; and the unalloyed pleasure of Sikandar Khān having thus become disturbed, he, in his helplessness, sought the path of peace; and through the intervention of Ḥabib Khān came to Mēdīnī Rāy. The latter went to Ujjain, and obtained the pardon of Sikandar Khān's offences. Sultān Maḥmūd drew the pen of pardon across his offences and allotted (confirmed) his rank and jāgīr. Sultān Maḥmūd then marched from Ujjain and came to the town of 1 Āgar. There a petition or report came from the dārōgha (superintendent) of the fort of Shādiābād to the effect, that a body of low people had risen in revolt on the night of the 25th Ramaḍān; and had raised the umbrella, which they 2 had brought from the tomb of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, over the head of a man of obscure descent; and had stretched their hands to plunder the city; but that by the good fortune of His Majesty he (the dārōgha) had seized the head and ringleader of the mob; and the men had been punished. The Sultān sent an order containing expressions of favour and encouragement to the dārōgha; and himself went towards 3 Bahār Bābā Ḩājī.

From that place he sent a letter giving encouragement and promising favour to the Bihjat Khān by the hand of Bherōdās; but as his all-seeing eye was besmirched with the dust of misfortune, he sent an improper reply; and sent men to Kāwil that they might bring Shāhzāda Ṣāḥib Khān, making him their leader. He also submitted a petition to Sultān Sikandar Lūdī, to the purport, that Maḥmūd Shāh had entrusted the bridle of loosening and fastening and of defending and regulating the kingdom to the hands of Kūfīrī; and had placed his foot of submission outside the path of the 4 Mustafā (the chosen one, Muḥammad) to whom be the salutation; and has

---

1 See page 570 and note 1 on the same page. The Cambridge History of India, which does not mention the town at the place referred to on page 225, mentions it here (p. 367), and calls it Āgar.

2 One MS. has 1اولوود and the other 2اولوود. The lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. I have inserted the text-edition it is 3اولوود. برداشته.

3 See page 581.

4 One MS. has by mistake 4سلم مصطفو and also has 4سلم and also has 4سلم و المتتنع after. The lith. ed. has 4سلم و المتتنع instead of 4سلم.
made the followers of Islam wretched and miserable, and the Kafirs and Râjpûts dear and honoured. 1 If a detachment of his victorious army should arrive in these parts, the public prayers would be read in the name of that Bâdshâh, who is the asylum of the faith; and his coin would be current in the country. When Bherôdâs came and reported all this, Sultân Maḥmûd collected troops, and after one week marched from Bahâr; and encamped in the village of Shikârpûr. On the following day, he sent Mukhtâs Khân with a large army to Chandrô, in advance of himself.

4 About this time news came that about the middle of Muḥarram-ul-ḥarâm in the year 919 A.H., Sultân Muẓaffâr Gujrâtî had encamped in the town of Dhâr, with a large army and five hundred elephants; and was occupying himself with hunting, in the environs of the village of Dilâwarah. Although Rây Pîthôrâ and the other amîrs, who were in the fort of Mandû, sent a message to him, in their distress and weakness, by some trustworthy men to the effect that at this time, when Sultân Maḥmûd was engaged in attending to the administration of his kingdom, his (i.e., Sultân Muẓaffâr’s) intention of invading it appeared to be altogether remote from the rules of bravery and humanity. He did not at all listen to it with any idea of good will and acceptance; and sent Niẓâm-ul-mulk Sultânî with a large army to the neighbourhood of Na’lîcha. The latter arrived at the Ha wd-i-Râdî

---

1 The facts of Bihjat Khân’s sending for Shâhzâda Šâhib Khân, and also asking Sultân Sikandar Lûdi to send an army, and promising that the public prayers would be read in his name appear to be rather inconsistent; but Firîstâh explains that if Sultân Sikandar Lûdi would help to place Šâhib Khân on the throne, the Khubba would be read in his name as the suzerain or overlord.

2 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has سکھ ایشاؤر گئیں سا حت شد, and the other has the same except that the words ایشاؤر سا حت شد instead of ایشاؤر گئیں شد while the lith. ed. has ایشاؤر گئیں شد. I have adopted the first reading. In the text-edition the reading is the same except that is used in place of ایشاؤر, and سا حت instead of شد.

3 I suppose this means Bahâr Bâbâ Ḥâjî.

4 The inroad of Sultân Muẓaffâr is only incidentally and briefly mentioned by Firîstâh and Col. Briggs. The Cambridge History of India (p. 367) also mentions it, and adds that “Muẓaffâr was recalled to Gujarât by domestic disturbances.”

5 Son of Mûdîn Rây.
(the Râni’s reservoir or tank), but returned from there. At the time of his return, a body of men came down from the fort and attacked him. Nizâm-ul-mulk turned round and slew some of the men; and the others sought shelter in the fort. Sultan Maḥmûd on receiving this terrible news, became distressed in mind, and anxious and amazed; and did not know in what direction he should attempt first. Suddenly while he was extremely distressed, news arrived that Sultan Muẓaffar Gujrātī had turned back, and had gone back to Gujrāt by way of Dahūd. Sultan Maḥmûd having performed the rites of offering thanks to God, placed the destruction of Bihjat Khān in the forefront of his energy.

After some days, news came that Sikandar Khān had again raised the standard of rebellion and a flag of violence; and had taken forcible possession of some villages belonging to the Khâlṣa (i.e., lands in direct possession of the Sultan). Sultan Maḥmûd deputed the governor of the town of Kandūyah named Malik Lodhâ to punish him. Malik Lodhâ advanced towards Satwâs. After the two sides had met, the dust of disturbance and warfare continued from morning till evening. In the end Sikandar Khān being unable to withstand him,

---

1 One MS. has  جمیعی, and the other  مرمّد . The lith. ed. has neither, or any similar word.

2 In the text-edition.

3 About Kandūyah see page 558 and note 6 on the same page. Firishtah has at this place حاکم کندو و ملک بوده . Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 254) calls him “Mullik Lado, the governor of Kuhndwa.” In another place Firishtah lith. ed. calls کندو و هزار کندویه . The Cambridge History of India, page 367, does not give the name of the governor, but calls him “a loyal officer who had endeavoured to reduce him to obedience.”

4 The Cambridge History of India, page 367, describes the incident in a single sentence, which owing to the necessity of too much compression or from error conveys ideas which are totally different from the facts, as narrated in the Ṭabaqāt and by Firishtah. The sentence (a part of which I have already quoted in the preceding note) is Sikandar Khān had defeated and slain a loyal officer who had endeavoured to reduce him to obedience. Malik Lodhâ was neither defeated nor slain by Sikandar Khān. On the other hand he defeated Sikandar Khān; and he was assassinated by a man probably a soldier in Sikandar Khān’s army, who had a private grudge against him.

5 In the text-edition here, but سواس earlier on, see note 2, page 587.
turned his face in flight. Malik Lōdhā’s troops pursued him, and were engaged in plundering. At this time, 1 a man whose family had been taken prisoner, came up to Malik Lōdhā, on the pretext of kissing his feet, and stabbing him in the side with a poisoned dagger destroyed the capital of his life. Sīkandar Kāhān on hearing this returned, and drove Malik Lōdhā’s men before him; and took six elephants and many horses as booty; and returned triumphant and victorious to Satwās. When this news came to Sūltān Maḥmūd, he considered the destruction of Bihjat Kāhān of primary importance, and advanced towards Chandēri. On the way news was brought to him, that about the middle of Dhil-hijjā-ul-ḥarrām, Shāhzāda Sāḥib Kāhān had arrived at Chandēri from Gōndwānā; and Bihjat Kāhān and Maṃsūr Kāhān had gone forward to meet him; and had proclaimed him as the Sūltān. Sūltān Maḥmūd halted at the village of 3 Sājanpūr, and occupied himself with collecting troops.

After some days news came that 4 Sa’īd Kāhān Lūdī and ‘Imād-ul-mulk had encamped at a distance of five karōhs from Chandēri with the army of Dehlī from the side of Sūltān Sīkandar to reinforce Sāḥib Kāhān. Sūltān Maḥmūd on hearing this news became extremely disheartened, and thought it advisable to 5 return to his own place (i.e., I suppose Mandū). On the way, he summoned the āmīrs to his presence; and got them to strengthen their promises and engagements by oaths. But in spite of their oaths and the renewal of their engagements, when a part of the night had passed, Ṣadr Kāhān and 6 Mukhtās Kāhān, who were 7 truthful āmīrs, fled towards Chandēri. Maḥmūd Shāh sent a body of men in pursuit; and himself encamped

1 Firishtah describes him as بیکی اراشاکریان سکندر خان کے حوالے میں اسیر شدہ ہوا i.e., one of Sīkandar Kāhān’s soldiers whose family had been made prisoner.
2 One MS. omits by mistake the words from بسطواس مردم ملک لو دہا ب پوگشہ.
3 The name is Sājanpūr and Sājan in the MSS., and Sijanpūr in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. The latter says in the corresponding passage that Maḥmūd “retired to Bhīṣa and remained for some time in that neighbourhood.”
4 One MS. omits Kāhān after Sa’īd.
5 One MS. has by mistake متعلقہ مقاومت instead of معلوہ مقاومت.
6 One MS. has مختار خان instead of دیگر مختار خان, Mukhtās Kāhān.
7 The epithet truthful is probably used ironically.
in the town of 1 Sirōnj. On the 1st of Şafar he passed through the inhabited part of the town of Bhilsā; and encamped on the bank of the neighbouring river. When his army went past the gate of the town the agent of Mansūr Khān, in concert with a body of the low or common people of the town, plundered those who had fallen behind. On hearing this news the spirit of the bravery and self-assertion of Sultān Maḥmūd came into motion; and he gave an order, so that in a moment his men seized the citadel, and slew that body of men of evil destiny. The citizens were plundered owing to the 2 wickedness of those men; and their wives and children became subject to the misery of slavery.

The Sultān having halted in those parts for some days for hunting. 3 Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān and Bihjat Khān, considering this delay to be a very great boon, sent Malik Maḥmūd with a large army towards Sārangpur. Jhujār Khān, the agent of the feudatory of Sārangpūr, fought with and defeated him. Malik Maḥmūd fled, and did not rest till he had arrived at Chandērī; and Jhujār Khān seized much booty, and returned to Sārangpūr. At the time when the detachment under Malik Maḥmūd returned fleeing, Saʿīd Khān Lūḍī and 'Imād-ul-mulk sent this message to Bihjat Khān “The promise had been given, that when the 4 victorious Sikandari troops should arrive in the 5 territory of Chandērī, the public prayers would be read in the great name of the Sikandar of the age (i.e., Sultān Sikandar Lūḍī); and the Dirahams

---

1 The place is so called in the MSS., and also in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned by Fīrishtah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

2 One MS. has by mistake سرویت instead of شرویت.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 367, omits the events between the proclamation of Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān as Sultān, and the sending of the force by the rebels to Sārangpūr. It mentions the latter event, but does not give the name of the commander of the force or that of the agent of the governor of the place who defeated him. Fīrishtah lith. ed. also mentions the incident and he gives the name of the commander of the force as محمد نام شخص, i.e., a man of the name of Maḥmūd; but does not give the name of the agent of the governor who defeated him. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 254, 255) calls the commander of the force “one Mahmood Khan” but says “he was alarmed at the approach of the King’s army” and “fled disgracefully.”

4 One MS. has منصر but the other and the lith. ed. have منصرة.

5 One MS. omits بخطه چندبری.
and Dinārs would be struck and 1 imprinted with the name of that sovereign; but up to the present day no sign of these things has shown itself." As they 2 did not get a reply such as they wanted, they marched from the village of Shahrāi, and halted at a place fourteen karōhs further back. From that place they sent a report of what had happened. Sultān Sikandar sent a farmān recalling them. When Sultān Sikandar's army, annoyed at what had happened, went towards Delhi, Sultān Maḥmūd being expectant of receiving the grace of God, planned a hunting excursion. At this time, one day in the course of the hunting a spy submitted a report, that Khwājah Jahān and Muḥāfiz Khān had marched away towards Shādiābad with a large army. Sultān Maḥmūd returned from the place where he received the report; and deputed Ḥabīb Khān and Fakhr-ul-mulk and 3 Hāmkaran to put down and crush Muḥāfiz Khān. Ḥabīb Khān and the other amīrs arrived at Na'lcha on the 16th Rabi'-ul-ḥāni. It so happened that Muḥāfiz Khān had arrived there three or four hours before them; and a battle having taken place, he, owing to the ill luck which always follows a rebel, was killed; and his head having been cut off, they returned with victory and triumph to their own camp. Shāhzāda Ṣāḥib Khān, on hearing this news was full of grief and sorrow; and shut the door of the entrance and exit of the Khāns before his face.

Bihjat Khān and Ṣadr Khān thought it advisable, that with the intervention of the learned men and Shaikhs, they should ask for the pardon of their own offences, and should pray for one out of the

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ملوك instead of ملوك, which is the correct word.
2 One MS. has by mistake تنشيدن instead of نتشيدن. Firishtah explains that public prayers were read in Sultān Sikandar's name in Chandērī, but as about forty thousand Rājpūts had assembled in Sultān Maḥmūd's army, Sultān Sikandar recalled the force which he had sent, and which, according to Firishtah, consisted of twelve thousand horsemen.
3 The name is written with slight variation in the MSS. and in the lith ed., but looks like Hamikaran. Firishtah lith. ed. gives the name of Ḥabīb Khān and Fakhr-ul-mulk, and adds many of the Rājpūt amīrs. Hamikaran or Hāmkaran was apparently one of them. Col. Briggs mentions the name of "Hubeeb Khan" alone. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, says briefly "an attempt of Muḥāfiz Khān to return to Māndū was defeated."
many districts of the kingdom for Shāhīzāda (Ṣāhib Kān). They then went together to Ṣāhib Kān and submitted these proposals to him. He said, "This has been recurring to my mind for a long time. I have been sorrowful and unhappy at the coming of Sultān Maḥmūd’s army; but praise be to God! that this danger has passed away." Bihjat Kān then, with the advice of the amirs, sent Shaikh Āuliya to the Sultān’s camp; and prayed for the pardon of their offences; and asked for a place to help in the expenses of the Shāhīzāda. ¹ Sultān Maḥmūd, considering this to be one of the supernatural mercies and indubitable blessings, made over the fort of Rāisin and the villages of Bhilsā and Dhamōni to the Shāhīzāda; and gave him for his immediate expenses ² ten lakhs of tankas and also twelve elephants, and sent farmāns promising favour to Bihjat Kān and ³ the other amirs and Kham. He then gave permission to the emissaries of Bihjat Kān to return; and sent a body of his own servants with them. When Shaikh Āuliya and the other emissaries arrived in the neighbourhood of Chandērī, Bihjat Kān sent his son Sharzah Kān to welcome them; and met them on their arrival with honour and respect. When he learned the purport of the farmāns, he sent the farmān for the government of Rāisin and Bhilsā to Ṣāhib Kān by the hand of Sharzah Kān; but kept the ten lakhs of tankas in cash and the twelve elephants with himself. Some strife-mongers said to Shāhīzāda Ṣāhib Kān, that Bihjat Kān had determined that on the morning of the ‘Id-i-fitr (the ‘Id of the breaking of the fast) he would seize him and some of his immediate adherents in the Nimāzugāh; and ⁴ he had accordingly sent Shaikh

¹ One MS. omits Maḥmūd after Sultān.
² Firishtah lith. ed. has ٨ ﷶ ﷲ ﷳ ﷱ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ 

³ There are slight variations in the readings. The reading I have adopted is that in the lith. ed. One MS. omits ٥ ﷶ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ ﷲ ﷳ 

⁴ The meaning is not clear. On the whole it appears that Bihjat Kān did all this, but why he should have strengthened the engagement with Shaikh Āuliya or should have sent for some troops is not very clear, if he was arranging matters secretly to secure Ṣāhib Kān on the day of the ‘Id. Firishtah does not make matters clearer, as he says that Ṣāhib Kān betook himself to Sultān Sikandar Lāḍī immediately on hearing that Bihjat Kān wanted to make him a prisoner. Col. Briggs does not refer to the matter at all. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, says that "The retention of the money by Bihjat
Aūliyā to the camp, and had strengthened the promises and engagements with oaths; and had sent for a body of troops. On hearing this news, a great fear and terror came on the Shāhzāda; and he spent all day in thought and anxiety; and on the night of the 9th Ramadān, he without thinking of his ultimate fate chose to tread an unknown path; and betook himself to Sultān Sikandar’s army, which was on the frontier (of Mālwa). When this news reached Māhmūd Shāh, he on the 19th Shawwāl came to Chandārī. 1 Bihjat Khān and the great men of the city hastened to welcome him, and made their excuses. Māhmūd Shāh drew the line of pardon across the page of their offences and distinguished each one of them by conferring robes of honour and by giving rewards. He stayed there for some days, and having arranged the affairs of that neighbourhood went back to the capital city of Shādiābād.

Then at the wicked instigation and by the evil counsel of Mēdini Rāy he struck the merciless sword at the amīrs and sardārs; and making each of them suspected and accused of offences not committed by them brought them into the place of punishment. Gradually things came to such a pass, that the disposition of Māhmūd Shāh turned from all the amīrs, and in fact from all Musalmāns. He placed the mark of dismissal on the forehead of the old officers who had formed a faithful band, and had been entrusted for years, under the government of Ghīyāth Shāh and Nāṣir Shāh, with all matters of revenue; and appointed the helpers and confederates of Mēdini Rāy in their places. Owing to these acts, most of the amīrs, sardārs and public servants became broken hearted, and holding the hands of their relatives and families chose to exile themselves from their country. The fort of Shādiābād, which had at one time been the home of learning and contained men of wisdom, and Shaikh, became the residence of 2 Kāfirs. Things finally assumed such a shape, that all offices and

Khān excited the apprehensions of Muhammad, who believed that he was about to be betrayed to his brother."

1 I suppose that the Sultān and they all considered that the flight of Sāhib Khān had offered them a very easy way out of many difficulties.

2 The word is written as Kūzarān in the MSS. and Kūzar in the lith. ed. I cannot find any meaning of ḫūzar or Kūzar that would suit the context. The nearest meaning of ḫūzar is a class of gipsies in India, and of Kūzar the blind. In
ports in the government of Maḥmūd Shāh, even down to those of a darbān (door-keeper) or jilbān, (elephant-keeper) were given by Mēdīnī Rāy to his own agents. There did not remain in the service of Sultān Maḥmūd more than two hundred men belonging to the class of Musalmāns. And 1 even Musalmān and Saīyid women 2 were taken by the Rājpūts, and were turned into slave girls. They were taught the art of dancing, and were made to join the akhāras (dancing clubs). They even took possession of the singing women of Sultān Nāsīr-ud-dīn.

Sultān Maḥmūd although he saw the power and violence of the Rājpūts was powerless. And as the custom among the people of Hindūstān is, that when they send away one of their servants, or bid adieu to a guest, they give him pān (beetle leaf), Sultān Maḥmūd sent a vessel filled with pān made into packages for chewing to Mēdīnī Rāy by the hand of Ārāīsh Khaṅ; and gave him a message, that after that he had permission to leave (the Sultān's service); and he should go out of his (the Sultān's) kingdom. The Rājpūts replied, "We forty thousand horsemens have up to this day performed loyal and devoted service; and have never committed any fault. We have done praiseworthy service. We do not know what fault has been committed by us." When Ārāīsh Khaṅ took this reply, the Rājpūts assembled in the house of Mēdīnī Rāy, and determined that they should remove the Sultān; and place Rāy Rāyān, the son of Mēdīnī Rāy, on the throne. Mēdīnī Rāy said, "At the present moment the

the corresponding passage in Firishtah, the word is کاftarān, which is all right and I have taken it. M. Hidayat ʿOsāīn has adopted گواراون or gipsies in the text-edition.

1 Firishtah lith. ed. says that 'Ali Khān, one of the old amīrs, who was the governor of the city was exasperated by the domination and violence of the Rājpūts, and he assisted by the people of the city took possession of the fort when Sultān Maḥmūd had gone on a hunting excursion attended by his Rājpūt servants. When they returned they besieged the fort, and 'Ali Khān had to evacuate it. He was pursued and was seized and executed. This is mentioned also in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 256), but he changes the name of 'Ali Khan to Ghalib Khan. The Cambridge History of India does not mention these incidents.

2 One MS. has  شدند in place of  شد, and then leaving out the following words as far as استیلاً را جوہروان, substitutes for them  سلطان مصمود ابی امرأة دیدة, substitutes for them  اسی ی را جوہروان، ہی طاقت ہند.
saltanat of Mâlwa is in reality in our possession. If, however, Maḥmûd Shâh does not remain as a buffer, Sulţân Muẓaffâr Gûjrâti will come galloping along and will seize the kingdom. Therefore we should, in every way that may be possible, endeavour to please our master."

Then Médini Rây with other Râjpûts waited on the Sulţân, and standing in the place of those who prayed for pardon submitted, "It is not 1 concealed from your world-adorning wisdom, that from us (who are your) slaves, nothing 2 but loyalty and service has been shown. By the grace of God we slew with great torment Muḥâfîz Khân, who was a great enemy of the Sulţân. Although man is steeped from head to foot with sins and offences, still no offence has been committed by us, which might throw dust over, and cause pain to Your Majesty's gracious mind; and even supposing that owing to human frailty a harsh deed should have been perpetuated by us, we hope that, with your innate generosity and natural inclination to forgive, you will grant us pardon for it; and after this, nothing will be done by us that would be contrary to your wishes and pleasure." Sulţân Maḥmûd whether willingly or otherwise acted with politeness, and abandoned the idea of a conflict on this 3 condition, that he would make over all the posts in the different offices, according to previous custom, to the old Musalmân officers; that Médini Rây would not give his men any right of interfering in the affairs of state, and they should send out Musalmân women from their houses; and should shorten the arm of oppression. Médini Rây owing to the exigencies of the time accepted the conditions; and tried hard to please the Sulţân. But 4 Sâlbâhan, who was the vazir, refused to obey, and refused to give up his wicked acts and evil practices.

---

1 One MS. has مختلف while the other and the lith. ed. have مختلف.
2 Both MSS. have بعد, but the lith. ed. has بعث.
3 The same conditions are mentioned by Firishtah, lith. ed., but the word مالي is inserted after ملكي in it. Col. Briggs mentions them also with some variations. The Cambridge History of India (p. 368) mentions only one condition, viz., that about the keeping of Muslim women by Râjpûts as concubines, which it describes as the greatest offence in the eyes of the Muslims.
4 The correct transliteration of the name as in the text is Sâlbâhan; but the correct translation of the Sanskrit name is Sâlibâhana. Col. Briggs transliterates the name as Salb'han, but in a note has Salivahan. The Cambridge History of India, page 368, has Sâlibâhan. In the text-edition it reads
THE SULTĀNS OF MĀLWA

Sultān Maḥmūd with great bravery, in spite of the fact that he had not more than two hundred Musalmāns in his service, determined in consultation with some of his special adherents, that when he should return from hunting, and Mēdīnī Rāy and Sālbāhan should receive permission to go to their houses, they (i.e., those adherents) should, at the time of their returning, cut them to pieces. The next day he went out hunting, leaving the men, who had been chosen for the work, at their places. Returning from the hunting, he went into his private chamber and gave permission to Mēdīnī Rāy and Sālbāhan to go home. At this time those men came out of ambush, and wounded Mēdīnī Rāy and Sālbāhan. The last named was killed on the spot; but as Mēdīnī Rāy’s wounds were not fatal, he was carried to his house. The Rājpūts on hearing this news, prepared themselves and collected in Mēdīnī Rāy’s house with the object of causing an injury to Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter, on hearing this, with very great bravery and courage came out of the palace with only 16 Musalmān horsemen and a few foot soldiers in order, so to say, to suffer martyrdom; and prepared to fight. Some thousands of Rājpūts came forward and commenced an attack. One of the Pūrabīya Rājpūts, who was noted for his bravery, placed his foot firmly on the battlefield, and threw a weapon at the Sultān. The latter carried it and cut the assailant asunder. Another Rājpūt threw his javelin at the Sultān. The latter caught it on his sword; and cut him into two from his

1 Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally with the text, as to the attack on Mēdīnī Rāy and Sālbāhan, the subsequent attack by the Rājpūts on the palace, and the Sultān’s great bravery in repelling it. It appears, however, that the first attack on the palace was made without consulting or asking the permission of Mēdīnī Rāy. They also say that although the Sultān was deficient in intelligence, he had no equal in bravery; and also that when the Rājpūts asked for Mēdīnī Rāy’s permission to make a second attack, (Col. Briggs says, they asked him to head it) he told them to desist from it. The Cambridge History of India, page 368, says, that the Rājpūts “were defeated, chiefly owing to their fear of provoking the intervention of Muẓaffar II of Gujarāt.” This is certainly not correct. The Rājpūts were defeated in a fair fight, although the odds were very much in their favour. They were, however, forbidden by Mēdīnī Rāy from making a second attack, for fear chiefly of provoking the intervention of Sultān Muẓaffar of Gujarāt, which is very different.
waist. The Râjpûts on seeing this fled, and collected together, and wanted to advance in a great crowd to slay the Sulţân.

When Médînî Rây became acquainted with this resolution, he said, "Mâhmûd Shâh is my benefactor, if his men wounded me by his order, what business is it of yours? If the shadow of his greatness be not over our head, Sulţân Muţaffâr Gujrâtî would completely destroy us." The Râjpûts went back to their houses at the word of Médînî Rây, and the tumult subsided. That night Médînî Rây sent a humble message to the Sulţân saying, "As during the whole of my life I have never done anything but wish for your welfare, and act faithfully to my salt, I have carried my life in safety from the wounds. If in reality, the affairs of the kingdom can be better regulated by my being put to death, I have no objection even to that." Mâhmûd Shâh said, "I have arrived at the conclusion, that Médînî Rây is a loyal servant of mine. Owing to his great devotion to me, he kept the infuriated Râjpûts back yesterday from creating disorder and disturbance. I shall heal his wounded heart with the ointment of favour and graciousness."

After some days, when Médînî Rây's wounds had healed, he came with five hundred armed horsemen to make his salâm; and thenceforward he came every day in the same way to make his salâm. Mâhmûd Shâh, on account of his great courage and bravery, treated him in the same way as before, and reassuring him sent him to the office, so that he might attend to the affairs of state. When a considerable time elapsed with the Sulţân acting with gentleness and courtesy; and he saw that there was nothing left to him of rule except the name, he in the months of the year 920 A.H., came out of the fort of Mandû on the pretext of going out hunting. He took with him Râní Kaniyâ, who was the most beloved of his harem, and the large body

\[1 \text{ There are variations in the readings. One MS. has زخم أو مدمج كود in place of زخم أو مدمج كود. The lith. ed. has a different reading میدینی رایي. In the text-edition it is میدینی میدینی.}

\[2 \text{ The name is written in the MSS. as رانی کنیا and رانی کنیا in the lith. ed. See, however, note 2, page 392, from which it appears that she was called Râní Kanâkra in the Mirât-i-Sikandari.}

\[3 \text{ The sentence is left incomplete in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. In the corresponding passage, Firishtah has به بهانه شکار راجپوتان نزد بسوار قوم.}
of Rājpūts, who used always to accompany him as his guard and always went about surrounding him. The Sultān said in private to the superintendent of the stables, who was an old servant of his, “I shall go out hunting tomorrow; and I shall make the Rājpūts run so much in pursuit of the game, that when they would arrive in the camp they would have no sense or power of movement left. When midnight should have passed, you should make three very swift horses ready outside the camp; and should inform me.” On the following day he went out hunting and when the evening came, and the Rājpūts went to sleep owing to much fatigue, the superintendent of the stables, in accordance with the orders, brought out three specially selected horses and informed him. Mahmūd Shāh relying on the Divine aid and help went up to the horses, and all three of them turned to the open country, which was quite unknown to them. After traversing many stages and passing many places, when they arrived in the town of Dahūd, which was on the boundary line of Gujurāt, Qaisar Khān, the thānadār of Sultān Mu'azzar Gujurātī, carried out the customs of welcoming him, and performed the rites of hospitality. He presented pavilions and all necessary articles; and wrote a report to Sultān Mu'azzar; and made him acquainted with the fact of Sultān Mahmūd’s arrival. When the news reached Sultān Mu'azzar at Chāmpānīr, he carried out the customs of offering thanks to God; and he sent Qaisar Khān and Tāj Khān and Qawām-ul-mulk and other great amīrs to welcome Sultān Mahmūd. He also sent ‘Irāqī horses and some elephants and articles of the tōshakhkhāna (ward-robe), red curtains, articles of farāshkhāna and other equipages which are required by Sultāns. He himself advanced some stages to welcome the guests. Afterwards when the conjunction of the two beneficent planets and the meeting

1 One MS. has سه, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. omit the word سر.
2 For another account of the flight of Sultān Mahmūd, and of his reception by Sultān Mu'azzar, and the subsequent events, see the section about Gujurāt, page 302 onwards.
3 Jupiter مشتري, and Venus الزهرة, i.e., here the two Sultāns.
of the two luminaries took place in one majlis and on one throne, Sultān Muẓaffār observing the customs of generosity and the rites of liberality made wise inquiries and presenting royal gifts placed (soothing) ointment on his wounded (spirit).

After some days, 1 Sultān Muẓaffār advanced into the country of Mālwa with a well-equipped army; and when he arrived near Dhār, Rāy Pithòrā strengthened the fort of Mandū, and busied himself with measures of guarding it. Médīnī Rāy and Silhadi went to Chitòr with some thousands of Rājpūts, and sought the protection of Rānā Sāṅkā. Sultān Muẓaffār besieged the fort of Mandū, and distributed the batteries. After some days Rāy Pithòrā approached him with humility, and after asking for safety prayed for fourteen parganas for his own jāgīr. Sultān Muẓaffār in his great kindness granted his prayer. On the following day Pithòrā again sent a message saying, "As we have committed many evil deeds, and fear and alarm have come upon us, if you would retire with your army for a distance of three karōhs, we would take hold of the hands of our wives and children, come down from the fort, and surrender it to anyone whom you may order." Sultān Muẓaffār accepted the prayer of that deceitful band, and took up a position three karōhs behind his former station. Then it became clear, that Rāy Pithòrā was merely wasting time, and waiting for the arrival of 2 Médīnī Rāy and Rānā Sāṅkā.

The Sultān then, acting with hostility and violence, returned (to his former camp); and surrounded the fort like the centre of a circle. At this time news was brought that Médīnī Rāy and Silhadi had given large sums to Rānā Sāṅkā, and promising him more were bringing him with all the zamindārs of the neighbourhood to aid and reinforce them, and they had arrived near the city of Ujjain. Sultān Muẓaffār sent Āẓam Humāyūn 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpur, who was his nephew (sister's son) and son-in-law, and Fath Khān and Qawām-ul-mulk to chastise and punish Médīnī Rāy

---

1 Niẓām-ud-dīn does not say what Médīnī Rāy did to meet Sultān Muẓaffār, Firishtah and Col. Briggs do so in some detail. For another account of the siege and capture of Mandū as given in the history of the reign of Sultān Muẓaffār in the section of the Ṭabaqāt about Gujrat, see pages 303, 304.

2 In the text-edition it is رمانہ سالکا و میدنی رائی instead of Médīnī Rāy and Rānā Sāṅkā.
and Rāņā Sāṅkā; and devoted his energy to the capture of Mandū fort. It so happened that a man came and represented, "The hill (on which) the fort is built can be climbed by an easy path, and Rāy Pithōrā has got only a small number of men there. As tomorrow is the day of the Holi festival, the Rājpūts will be occupied in their houses with play and amusement. If on that day you return to your camp, after fighting at the other batteries, and after that send a detachment by that path and keep another detachment ready to help and reinforce it, it is possible that the fort would come into your possession."

Sultān Muţaffar liked his advice, and strengthened him with promises of favour and reward. On the 13th Šafar in the year 924 A.H., 1529 A.D., the soldiers of the Gujārāt army commenced to fight from the different directions, and made many brave assaults. The Rājpūts also exerted themselves almost beyond their power. The Gujārāt army beat the drum of retiring just before the afternoon, and returned to their batteries. The Rājpūt sardārs as they had made very great exertions, and as it was the day of the Holi, left a few men in the bastions and rested in their houses. When half the night had passed, Tāj Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk with a body of great warriors commenced to climb the hill along the agreed path, with that guide in front of them. Tāj Khān also ascended it by another path. 'Imād-ul-mulk, on arriving near the rampart, found that the Rājpūts were asleep, and had no knowledge of the coming of the enemy. Immediately his men made a ladder of 2 farangī lances, which enabled a body of them to climb to the top of the rampart. When these men saw, that the sleep of death had overpowered the Rājpūts, they very silently put their feet on the ground and opened the gate. When the gate was being opened, the Rājpūts came to the place. The warriors who were outside the gate made an onset and got inside the fort and cut some of the Rājpūts into pieces; and those who escaped the sword fled.

---

1 Firishtah does not give the date, but simply says in the beginning of the year 924 A.H. The date is not given in the section of the Cambridge History of India about Mālwa, but is given as "February 23rd, 1518, the day of the Hindu festival of the Holi", in the section about Gujārāt (p. 319).

2 Both the MSS. have ز نیرهی مانی فرنگی, i.e., of French or European lances. I have not been able to find out what these special lances or spears were like.
When this news reached Rāy Pithōrā, he sent Shādi Khān Pūrabiya with five hundred Rājpūts, in advance of himself, to put down ‘Imād-ul-mulk. He himself followed Shādi Khān with some thousands of Rājpūts. The Gujrāt warriors coming within bow-shot pierced the men who were coming along in front of Shādi Khān with their arrows; and they on receiving those life-scourching wounds fled like wounded pigs. About this time Sultān Mużaffar Gujrātī entered the fort by the same route. When the eyes of the garrison fell on Sultān Mużaffar’s standard, they returned to their houses and performed jauhar. (This is) a practice of the Rājpūts, that in times of discomfiture and distress, they set fire to their houses, and put their wives and children to death, and burn themselves. They call this practice jauhar. Hosts and crowds of Gujrāt warriors entered the houses and residences and committed a general massacre. It has been correctly ascertained, that during that night and a part of the following day nineteen thousand Rājpūts were slain; and so much booty and so many prisoners fell into the hands of the army of Gujrāt, that the 1 accountant of the age confessed his weakness and failure in computing them.

When with the strength of Divine help, the victory was attained; and the Rājpūts, who had been unfaithful to their salt, had received their reward, Sultān Maḥmūd came, and offering his congratulations, asked quickly, “What does the lord of the world order me?” Sultān Mużaffar, in his 2 greatness said, “May the rule of Mālwa be of good omen to you.” He left Sultān Maḥmūd in the fort of Shādiābad, and returned immediately to his camp. On the following day he raised the standard of departure from that station towards Ujjain with the object of punishing Rānā Sānkā. When he arrived at the fort of Dhār, they brought him the news, that ‘Ādil Khān and the amīrs had not yet gone beyond the town of Dibālpūr Banhariya, when Rānā Sānkā, on hearing the capture of the fort, had fled and gone to his own country; and had traversed a distance of twenty-seven karōhs, taking Mēdini Rāy and Silhadi with him. Sultān Mużaffar, on hearing this news, carried out the practice of praising, and offering

1 A figurative way of saying that the booty and prisoners were beyond computation. One MS. has by mistake instead of روزگار.
2 One MS. has by mistake instead of پرداز.
thanks to God; and summoned 'Ādil Khān and the amirs. Sūltān Maḥmūd waited on Sūltān Muẓaffar at this station, and submitted: "If your Majesty would go to the fort of Shādiābād, and would exalt me by remaining there for one day:
Couplet;
On that side, your greatness would suffer no less,
On this side it would give me nobility great."

Sūltān Muẓaffar left his camp at Dhār, and went himself to the fort of Shādiābād. Sūltān Maḥmūd carried out all the duties of hospitality, and offered suitable tribute. After the majlis and the entertainments were over, Sūltān Muẓaffar went over the buildings and the gardens and then went back to his camp. From there, accompanied by victory and triumph, he started on his journey to Gujūt.

Sūltān Maḥmūd, on account of his great affection and devotion, 1 attended on him for some stages. Sūltān Muẓaffar then bade him farewell, and left Āṣaf Khān Gujūtī with some thousand horsemen to help and reinforce him; and 2 asked to be excused. Sūltān Maḥmūd taking up his abode in the fort of Shādiābād, in concert with Āṣaf Khān, sent letters of encouragement and favour to the amirs, sardārs and his own soldiers and summoned them. The amirs and his own servants came to Mandū from the various places where they resided with happy and joyful steps; and when his army assembled round him, he, with the advice and concurrence of Āṣaf Khān, advanced to attack 3 Hēmkaran, who had fortified himself in the fort of Kākrūn, on behalf of Mēdinī Rāy. On becoming aware of

---

1 The words in one MS. are مراوتة رفث مشارع. In the other MS. a word which looks like مشارح مشارع is written in place of مشارع; the word is clearly مشارع in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. مشارع means willing, wishing, desiring. I consider مشارع the best reading, and have adopted it. In the text-edition مشارع has been adopted.

2 The words are مدر خواست in the MSS., and بدر خواست in the lith. ed. There are no corresponding words in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I do not know what reason there was for Sūltān Muẓaffar for asking to be excused. I suppose it was a mere matter of courtesy.

3 He was called Bhām Karan in the Gujūt section of the Tabaqāt, vide page 307 and note 1 on the same page. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has بھکر in the text-edition.
this, Mūdīnī Rāy said to Rānā Sāṅkā, "All that I have, is in the fort of Kākrūn. I came to you, praying for your help, with the object that you would deliver over the country of Mālwa to me, after thoroughly purifying it. But now things have come to this 1 pass, that they are taking away from me whatever I have." The 2 daring and boorishness of Rānā Sāṅkā having come into motion, he came out of the fort of Chitār with some thousands of blood-thirsty Rājpūts, and advanced towards Kākrūn. When this news reached Sultān Mahmūd, he owing to his great courage and bravery, abandoned the path of prudence and caution, and raising the siege of Kākrūn, advanced to meet Rānā Sāṅkā in battle. He marched most of the days, and it so happened that on the day on which the battle was to take place, he had traversed a very long distance, and had halted at a distance of seven karōhs from Rānā Sāṅkā. When this news reached the latter, he sent for his amīrs, and said, "It is best that we should attack the enemy at this very moment, for they have come a long way and have no strength to move or exert themselves. If we advance fast and quickly, they will have no time to 3 array their troops; and our work would be done with ease." All the Rāys and Rājpūts praised and attested to the correctness of this declaration; and they mounted and advanced with their troops in good order.

When they arrived near Sultān Mahmūd’s camp, 4 the troops of the latter came one by one or two by two (i.e., in very small bands) into the battle, in the way which Rānā Sāṅkā had predicted; and were immediately made martyrs. Because they fought without being properly marshalled, thirty-two sardārs among the old and

1 One MS. has کار بجگلی رسیده while the other has کار بجگلی رسیده. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. which is کار بجگلی رسیده.

2 The words in the MSS. are جمیت و چهارمیت. The words in the lith. ed. are جمیت. عرق جمیت is of course incorrect.

3 Both MSS. have نوج راست کرد. I have adopted this, though the نوج راست کردن of the lith. ed. is equally good, if not better.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. says, that Āsaf Khān and the other amīrs said, that they should not engage the enemy that day, but Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, کد از عقل بي بهره بود ی. e., who was destitute of intelligence, did not accept their advice.
trusted men became martyrs; and of the Gujrat army, 1 Āṣaf Khān and five hundred horsemen drank the sharbat of martyrdom; and a great defeat fell on Sultān Ḍāmūd’s army. The latter, however, who was extremely brave and courageous, stood in the field of chivalry with two or three horsemen; and when the Rājpūt troops advanced against him, he galloped on his gray horse, which was as swift as the wind and the lightning; and dived into the Rājpūt army, which was like a sea of swords and spears. He received a hundred and more wounds on his armour; and as he wore two suits of armour, fifty of those wounds passed through the inner armour and reached his body. In spite of his having received so many wounds, he did not turn his face from the enemy. When he fell off the back of his horse on the ground 2 the Rājpūts recognised him, and carried him to Rāna Sāṅkā. Every one of them poured forth their praises and eulogies; and offered to sacrifice themselves in his honour. Rāna Sāṅkā stood before him, with his arms crossed on his breast, and carried out the duties of service and attendance, and arranged for the treatment of his wounds. When the Sultān regained his health, Rāna Sāṅkā prayed that he should be exalted by the Sultān by bestowing his crown on him. Sultān Ḍāmūd made over the crown, decorated with pearls and other precious stones (Yauqīt, which means both rubies and sapphires). 4 Rāna Sāṅkā then sent ten thousand Rājpūt horsemen with him, and sent him to Mandū; and himself went back to Chitūr.

---

1 It may be noted that in the section about Gujrat, it was the son of Āṣaf Khān, and not Āṣaf Khān himself who was said to have been slain, vide page 307. In the corresponding passage here, Firishtah agrees with the Tabaqāt that Āṣaf Khān with five hundred Gujrat horsemen was slain, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 263) says, as in the Guzerat section, that “Asuf Khan’s son and almost the whole of the Guzeratties were killed.”

2 Firishtah also says that the Rājpūts recognised him, but one would have thought that, as he had fought with such bravery he would be the cynosure of all eyes, and there would be no necessity or difficulty for recognising him.

3 This appears to be a rather extraordinary prayer, but Firishtah says that as on the day of the battle, all Sultān Ḍāmūd’s baggage had fallen into the hands of Rāna Sāṅkā and of the Rājpūts, and they did not find Sultān Ḍūshang’s جمع among the other articles, he asked for it, and Sultān Ḍāmūd got it and gave it to him. The Cambridge History of India, page 369, says the Rāna compelled Ḍāmūd “to surrender all his crown jewels.”

4 Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. say that Sultān Ḍāmūd was sent to Mandū with an escort of ten thousand horsemen; but Firishtah lith. ed. and
1 It will not remain concealed from the minds of intelligent men, that Rānā Sānkā’s act was on a higher level than that of Sultān Muẓaffar. The latter gave help to one who had sought shelter with him; but Rānā Sānkā having captured an enemy in battle gave him back his kingdom. No act similar to this wonderful one is known up to the present day. In short, on hearing this news, Sultān Muẓaffar sent a large force to reinforce Sultān Maḥmūd; and sending an affectionate letter applied ointment to the wounds of his heart; and showed great kindness towards him. The Gujrat troops remained in Mālwa for a long time; but after the rule of Sultān Maḥmūd had acquired a certain amount of strength, the latter sent a letter to Sultān Muẓaffar, in which he renewed his protestations of gratitude; and prayed that, as his government had assumed a desirable aspect, Sultān Muẓaffar should recall his troops. The latter did so; but after the departure of the Gujrat army, Sultān Maḥmūd’s weakness became evident and patent. He was bereft of nearly the whole of his territory. Rānā Sānkā seized a portion with violence and tyranny; and Silhadi Pūrabiya brought the country from the boundary of Sārangpūr as far as Bhilsā and Rāisīn under his control, and became independent. Sikandar Khán was in possession in the neighbourhood of 2 Satwās and its dependencies. So that of the kingdom of Mālwa only a tenth part remained in the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd; and he remained with

Col. Briggs reduce the number of the escort to one thousand horsemen; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 263, footnote) says (without giving any authority for making this statement), that Sooltan Mahmood was conveyed in the first instance to Chittoor, where the place of his confinement is still shown; but he was released on recovery from his wounds. In the same note Col. Briggs contrasts the chivalrous conducts of Hindoo princes, “in their behaviour to Mahomedans in general, with the sordid, cruel, and bigotted conduct of the latter” to the Hindoos. This is correct; but I do not know whether the story of Sultān Maḥmūd being taken to Chitor, like the other story of Rānā Kōnbhā’s defeating Maḥmūd of Gujrāṭ and Maḥmūd of Mālwa, and keeping the latter as a prisoner at Chitōr, has any foundation in fact.

1 Niẓām-ud-din shows himself superior to all communal prejudice by this eulogy on Rānā Sānkā’s conduct; but it appears to me that the latter rather marred his proceedings by demanding the surrender of the Mālwa Crown Jewels.

2 The name is written سووس in the MSS., and سووس in the lith. ed.; but we have already found that the jāqīr of Sikandar Khán was Satwās.
twenty thousand horsemen in 1 Jāwar. Although Rānā Sāṅkā possessed the power of taking possession of the entire country of Mālwa, still having the fear of Sūltān Muẓaffar before his eyes he restrained himself, (kushīdah ‘inān būd, which may literally be translated as: he kept a tight hold on his bridle).

It so happened that at this time, when Sūltān Muẓaffar passed away, and the enemies (of Sūltān Maḥmūd) acquired power and strength, the violence of Sīhādī extended beyond all measure. So in the year 926 A.H. (1519 A.D.), Sūltān Maḥmūd having collected 2 an army, advanced towards the country of Bhilsā. 3 Sīhādī marched to the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, and fought with him. Sūltān Maḥmūd’s army was routed, but he himself stood firmly in the field of bravery with twenty horsemen; and coming within bow-shot fought with the greatest courage and boldness till some of the renowned warriors in Sīhādī’s army fell on the dust of destruction at his hands; and things came to such a pass that Sīhādī escaped by flight. Sūltān Maḥmūd pursued him for a part of the way, and separating (seizing) twenty-four elephants returned to Mandā. After that Sīhādī came forward in a spirit of submission and friendliness, expressed his contributions, and sending some beautiful things and presents in the way of a tribute, asked for 4 pardon for his past conduct.

And during the year 932 A.H., 1525 A.D., Sūltān Muẓaffar accepted the summons of the just God, and the business of the

---

1 The name is Jáwar in the MSS., and Khāwar in the lith. ed. I have not found it mentioned anywhere else. The Cambridge History of India, page 369, says that Maḥmūd’s authority now extended only to the neighbourhood of the capital. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has جادر in the text-edition.

2 One MS. has لشكر instead of لشكر.

3 Fīrishtah’s and Col. Briggs’s (vol. IV, p. 264) accounts agree generally with the text; but they say that Sūltān Maḥmūd rallied the few men who were with him, when Sīhādī’s troops were engaged in plundering, and after defeating the latter pursued them to Sārangpūr, and took possession of it, together with twenty-four elephants. Sīhādī made no attempt to recover Sārangpūr and remained content with Bhilsā and Rāāsīn.

4 The word is written as استفسا in the MS., and استفسا in the lith. ed. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. In the text-edition it is استفسا.
government devolved on Sultān Bahādur. 1 Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar came to Sultān Maḥmūd; and the latter, as he was bound by ties of gratitude to Sultān Muẓaffar, showed the greatest respect to Chānd Khān, and left no minutiae of friendliness and generosity unobserved. Raḍī-ul-mulk, who was one of the trusted amīrs of Sultān Muẓaffar, fled from Gujrat, and waited on His Majesty Firdūs Makānī 2 Bābar Bādshāh; and devoted all his energies to the object, that the rule of Gujrat might be transferred to Chānd Khān; and in order to carry out this purpose, he came from Āgra to Mandū; and after consulting with Chānd Khān went back to Āgra. When this news reached Sultān Bahādur, 3 he sent a letter to Sultān Maḥmūd, to the effect that it appeared strange that the ungrateful wretch, considering the affection and devotion, (which he owes to me), should desert me; and going to Chānd Khān should endeavour to create a disturbance. After some time Raḍī-ul-mulk again went to Mandū and then returned to Āgra. On this occasion Sultān Bahādur did not send any message at all, but prepared to chastise Sultān Maḥmūd.

As it had become clear to everybody that Sultān Maḥmūd would get no help or reinforcement from Gujrat, and did not himself possess such a force that he would be able to meet an enemy with strength and power, Ratan Sēn, son of Rānā Sāṅkā advanced into Mālwa with great force. It happened also that at this time Sultān Bahādur arrived near the boundary of Mālwa with the object of punishing some of his refractory subjects, and chastising those disturbers of peace. Sultān Maḥmūd, in his perplexity and distress, summoned Muʿīn Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, from Satwās, and Silhadi to his aid. When they waited on him, he conferred the title of Masnad ʿĀli on Muʿīn Khān,

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 369, describes Sultān Maḥmūd's conduct as characterised by incomprehensible folly and ingratitude. I cannot agree to the charge of ingratitude. He had reasons to be grateful to Sultān Muẓaffar, but he could not refuse to give an asylum to Chānd Khān without being accused of ingratitude. He should, however, have accepted Sultān Bahādur's accession, and should not have allowed Raḍī-ul-mulk to come to Mandū and intrigue against Sultān Bahādur; but by all accounts he was as weak mentally as he was brave in battle.

2 One MS. has by mistake Humāyūn Bādshāh.

3 There are various slight differences in the readings, and the meaning is not quite clear; but the reading and the translation I have adopted appear to be correct.
and bestowed on him a red pavilion, which is specially reserved for a Bādshāh. He also gave some paraganas to Silhadi, and tried to please him. Mu'in Khān, who was really the son of an oil-seller but whom Sikandar Khān had adopted as a son, fled from Sultān Maḥmūd, and joined Sultān Bahādur in the village of Sanbal; and made the complaint of his benefactor, 1 a choice subject of talk in the majlis.

When this news reached Sultān Maḥmūd, he sent Daryā Khān to wait on Sultān Bahādur, with the following message, "The rights of nurture of your dynasty are incumbent on me; and as the distance between us has become less, I wish to appear in your presence, and offer my congratulations on your accession." His emissary disclosed by winks and gestures, that his master was abashed and ashamed, owing to his having given an asylum to Chānd Khān; and had not the hardihood to come. Sultān Bahādur comforted him, and said, "I have no sorrow about Chānd Khān; and will not trouble your master about making him over to me." He started from that place, and by successive marches arrived and encamped on the bank of the river 2 Karḵhī. After five days Ratan Šen, son of Rānā Šānkā, and Silhadi Pūrabiya waited on Sultān Bahādur at this station; and both of them made complaints about Sultān Maḥmūd. Ratan Šen received permission from the same place; and went to Chitōr. Sultān Bahādur then marched from there and encamped in the village of 3 Sanbal; and waited for the arrival of Sultān Maḥmūd; but as the latter had come to know that repeated complaints had been made about him to Sultān Bahādur, he marched from Ujjain towards Satwās, on the pretext of chastising the servants of Sikandar Khān.

It so happened that while hunting he one day fell off his horse, and his right arm was broken and being now disabled and powerless he returned to the fort of Mandū; and commenced making preparation for defending it. Sultān Bahādur then by successive marches advanced towards Mandū. At every station servants of Sultān Maḥmūd

---

1 The actual words are تعظمه مجلس ظرائه.
2 Firishtah lith. ed. also has Karḵhī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 267) has Gurchy, and says in a footnote "this is certainly a mistake."
3 The MSS., which have سنبل some lines before this, have here, by mistake, سنبل in the text-edition.
separated from the latter and entered his service. In the town of Dhār, Sharzah Khān, who was a great sardār, also came and joined him, and when he arrived at the town of Na'īcha, he besieged the fort and distributed the batteries, and himself took up his residence in Muḥammadpūr. Sultan Maḥmūd fortified himself in the fort of Mandū with three thousand men, and every night he went over to inspect all the bastions, and then took his rest in the college of Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-dīn. But when he came to know that the men in the fort were hostile to him, and had obtained promises from Sultan Bahādur, he moved from the college and came to his palace. He then arranged things for a festive gathering, and occupied himself with play and pleasure. When his well-wishers spoke to him about this, and inquired whether it was the time for pleasure and enjoyment, he said, "As these are my last breaths, I wish that they should pass with joy and in the fulfillment of desires."

On the 9th of Sha'bān in the year 937 A.H. (May 25th, 1528), at the time of the true dawn, the standards of state of Bahādur Shāh arose above the horizon of the fort of Mandū. At the same moment Chand Khān, son of Sultan Muẓaffar, descended from the fort, and took the path of flight. Sultan Maḥmūd armed himself, and with a small body of followers met Sultan Bahādur; but finding that he had not the power to withstand him, and considering that the slaughter of the inmates of his harem should precede his own death, advanced towards the palace with about a thousand horsemen. His men leaving their horses (outside), entered the palaces; but Sultan Bahādur's troops had (already) surrounded them. Sultan Bahādur sent a message to the

---

1 The readings in the MSS. appear to be انغاس باز بسيس ايقبالش بارهلمان and in the lith. ed. انغاس با سه. None of these appear to be correct. The reading in the lith. ed. of Firishta انسفاس و اسبين is correct and I have adopted it.

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have علم و شيق. Firishta lith. ed. has the more commonplace علم و عشتر.

3 See note 5, page 353, as to the day. The date according to the Christian era is given by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 268) as May 29th, 1526 A.D.; but March 17th, 1531, is the date in the Cambridge History of India, page 369, of the capture of Mandū by Bahādur Shāh.

4 One MS. has by mistake جميت instead of جميت.

5 One MS. has by mistake خون instead of شد. The other MS. has شد.
effect that there was protection and safety for Sultān Mahmūd and
the inmates of his harem, and his amirs; and no one would interfere
with anybody's honour or property. Some of the men, who were
specially near to Sultān Mahmūd, kept him back from killing the
members of his family; and told him, that the Bādshāh of Gujrāt
although he might be bad to him, his badness would be better than
the goodness of others. (They also said), that there was a strong
belief, that when he would go and meet Bahādur Shāh, the latter
would again entrust the rule of the country to him. While this was
going on, Sultān Bahādur had entered the palace of Sultān Mahmūd
and had taken up a position with his amirs on the terrace of La'ī
Mahal; and sent a man to summon Sultān Mahmūd. 2 The latter
left his sardārs in the palace and himself came to Sultān Bahādur
with only seven of his sardārs.

The Sultān, (that is Sultān Bahādur) showed him every respect
and honour, and they embraced each other. After sitting down,
Sultān Mahmūd used a little harsh language; and after that the
two Sultāns remained silent till the end of the meeting. But it is
narrated, that the effects of a change in Sultān Bahādur's disposition
made its appearance. The words which were used in that majlis
were these, 5 "I have given an assurance of safety to the Maḩmūd
Shāhi amirs. Let them go and settle down in their residences; to

---

1 One MS. has عیال, the other has no corresponding word; while the lith.
ed. has معمال.
2 One MS. leaves out Sultān Mahmūd, and the lith. ed. Maḩmūd.
3 One MS. has by mistake فورستاد instead of أمَّمَد; and then adds also by
mistake سلطان معمود بهادر آمود.
4 Firishtah lith. ed. has سلطان بهادر اندک درشفتی کوکه ساکن شد, but he
adds further on:
ود در بعضی نشخوا بنظر آمود که چون سلطان معمود در تکام درشفتی نمود و
شاه بهادر شاہ گجراتی که در مکالم عفر بود حکم حیدر نرخنود -
Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 268) says, "Bahadur Shah was disposed to treat him
kindly, and even to restore to him his government; but the irritability of Sooltan
Mahmood's temper and his pride combined hurried him away so far, that he
abused Bahadur Shah grossly to his face." The Cambridge History of India
is silent about the interview between the two Sultāns in both the sections about
Gujarat and Mālwā.
5 One MS. omits by mistake the words from امنان دادیم رفته.
everyone who is in the harem of the Sultān, I have given assurance of safety." He then ordered the ushers and heralds to drive the people out of the palace; and after a moment, he left Āsaf Khān, with one hundred silāhdars (troopers) to guard Sultān Mahmūd; and himself went inside the palace. On the next day, which was the 10th Sha‘bān, Sultān Bahādur also gave the seven men, who had come with Sultān Mahmūd, assurances of safety; and gave them permission to go away. On Friday the 12th Sha‘bān, the public prayers were read in the name of Sultān Bahādur from the pulpits of the capital city of Shādiābad. On the night of Saturday chains were put on Sultān Mahmūd’s feet; and he and his seven sons, the eldest of whom had the title of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, were made over to Āsaf Khān, and Iqbal Khān so that they might be taken to the fort of Chāmpānīr, and kept there in imprisonment.

On the night of the Shab-i-barāt (the night consecrated to the memory of forefathers), which was the 14th of 1 Sha‘bān, Rāy Singh, the headman of the 2 Māls made a night attack on the camp of Āsaf Khān and Iqbal Khān, with 3 two thousand Bhils and Kolīs. Sultān Mahmūd had at that moment finished the prayers of the Laylat-ul-barāt (same as Shab-i-barāt), and placed his head on the pillow, when the noise and tumult commenced. When he woke up, he cut the chains on his feet. At this time, the guards made a martyr of him, as they were afraid that he might escape; and disturbances 4 might again appear in the country.

Couplet:

What 5 a dog’s trick it is, of the evil doing sky,
That it makes the tigers the prey of dogs.

---

1 One MS. omits شعبان
2 Both MSS. have خانه. The lith. ed. has خانه. Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the name. The Māls is a local name of the hilly country. M. Hidayat Hosain has مالیہ باد 5 Malhahbād in the text-edition.
3 One MS. has 35 ten thousand.
4 The MSS. have incorrect readings. One has در ملکت پیدا، the other has در ملکت پیدا، and the other has باری سک سک باری سک in the text-edition it is باری سک، the other has باری سک while the lith. ed. has باری سک.
On the morning following that night Āṣaf Khān and Iqbāl Khān made preparations for putting him in a shroud and burying him; and buried him on the bank of the reservoir of Dahūd. His seven sons were kept in imprisonment in Chāmpānîr.

The period of his reign was twenty years and six months and eleven days.

2 AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF SULTĀN BAHĀDUR.

After the death of Sultān Muẓaffar, the country of Mālwa came into the possession of Sultān Bahādūr; and most of the āmīrs of Sultān Muẓaffar came to him. As Silhādi Pūrābiya had entered the service before all the other āmīrs, sarkārs of Ujjain and Sarangpūr and the fort of Rāisnān were allotted to him as his jāgīr. After the rains, the Sultān went to see Burhānpūr. Bhūpat the son of Silhādi was with him. As signs of turbulence and recusancy became apparent from the circumstances of Silhādi, the Sultān at the time of his return sent Āmīn Naṣīr to bring Silhādi to him, and he (Silhādi) passed the time by various tricks of delay; till in the town of Dhār he was seized by the talons of fate, as has been written in the section about Gujrat. Sultān Bahādūr advanced towards Ujjain, in order to chastise

---

1 Both MSS. omit يَعْلَم.

2 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS., but one of the MSS. adds the word Gujratî after Sultān Bahādūr. The lith. ed. omits the word حكومت.

3 One MS. omits بسدر.

4 He is called ابن نصر in both MSS. in this place; but about the various names by which he was called, and the result of his mission to summon Silhādi, see page 356 and note 2 on the same page, in the section about Gujrat.

5 The readings are somewhat different, and the meaning is not quite clear. One MS. has در نصبه دهار بعنک فضا گوینتار شرد. The other has the same reading but the word بعنک is written as بعنک. The lith. ed. has Hār instead of Dhār, which is of course incorrect; but otherwise agrees with the reading in the second MS. The corresponding passage in Firishtah is perhaps somewhat better. Silhādi was not killed at this time. It cannot therefore be said, that he was seized by the talons of destiny or fate. He certainly incurred the wrath of Sultān Bahādūr; but جنگ غصب or جنگ غصب or the battle of wrath has hardly any meaning. جنگ غصب or talons of wrath is certainly better.
all the Pūrabiyās. Silhadi's son fled from Ujjain; and went to Chitōr. Sultān Bahādur bestowed Ujjain on 1 Daryā Khān Mandōwāli; and advanced to Rāisīn. On the way he left Ḥabīb Khān at Āshṭa; and Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, at Sārangpūr; and went and besieged the fort of Rāisīn. When the period of the siege was protracted, and unknown images appeared on the pages of the world, Silhadi of evil destiny, after he had become a Musalmān performed jauhar, and met his death. This matter has been narrated in detail in the accounts of Sultān Bahādur in the section about Gujrat. Sultān Bahādur, having entrusted Rāisīn, and the neighbouring districts, to Sultān ʿĀlam Kālpīwāl, returned to Gujrat. He then left Iḵtiyār Khān in charge of the government of the fort of Mandū; and advanced towards Chāmpūnur.

In the year 940 A.H., 1533 A.D., he collected troops, and advanced to conquer Chitōr. 2 After besieging it, he, owing to certain matters, made an amicable settlement, and returned to Aḥmadābād. In the year 941 A.H., he again collected troops, and besieged Chitōr. After the conquest of Chitōr, he fled, in the neighbourhood of Mandisōr before His Majesty Jinnat ʿĀshīānī Humāyūn Bādshāh; and retired to Gujrat, as has been narrated in its place.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF THE DEPUTIES OF HIS MAJESTY JINNAT ʿĀSHĪĀNĪ, MUḤAMMAD HUMĀYŪN BĀDSHĀH.

When the country of Mālwa, and in fact the country of Gujrat also came into the possession of the servants of the powerful Chaghhtāl government, His Majesty, after the conquest of Gujrat, left Mirzā ʿAskari and Yādgār Nāṣir Mirzā in Gujrat; and himself went to Mandū. After one year 3 Divine jealousy came into operation. The Mirzās and all the amīrs abandoned Gujrat without any war having taken place; and went towards Āgra. These events have been mentioned in their own place. His Majesty, Jinnat ʿĀshīānī also, for reasons of

---

1 Firetah calls him Daryā Khān Lūdī; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 270) has Budr Khan, having joined the preposition ب to كر and omitting يا.

2 One MS. leaves out by mistake the words from بعد ل معاصرة to به احاديداد سرگشت.

3 The words are دیرت الی Divine jealousy, or probably Divine wrath.
state, left Mālwa; and went away to Āgra. For the period of one year the country of Mālwa was in the possession of the Chaghtāi rulers.

1 An account of Mallū Khān, Qādir Shāh.

When owing to the death of Sultān Bahādur, there was disorder in the country of Gujrat, and the country of Mālwa remained without a ruler: at about that time His Majesty Jinnat Āshīāni turned the bridle of departure from Āgra towards the country of Bangāla. 2 Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān gave himself, in concert with the amirs of Mālwa, the title of Qādir Shāh. He brought the country, from the town of Bhilsā to the vicinity of the Narbada river into his possession; and divided it among the old amirs. Bhūpat Rāy and Pūran Mal, the sons of Silhadi came back from the territory of Chitōr, and took possession of the fort of Rāisin, and its neighbourhood. The power and grandeur of Qādir Shāh increased day by day; and the zamindārs of all the surrounding country acknowledged allegiance to him, and sent him tribute every year.

And gradually things came to such a pass, that 3 Shēr Khān Afghān, at the time when His Majesty Jinnat Āshīāni was engaged in trying to effect his destruction, sent a farmān to him from Bengal,

1 There are slight differences in the headings in the MS. One has ذكر ملوك خان قادر شاه and the other has ذكر قادر شاه. The heading in the lith. ed. ذكر دالور سلطان بهادر جغرافي ملوك قادر شاه is certainly incorrect.

2 Firishtah, Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India all generally agree about Mallū Khān’s rise to power, but Firishtah says جوز أورده بعد بك سال از نصر لمشك جغتاني براورد خود را سلطان قادر ناميد and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 271) also says that “he retook all the country lying between the Nurbudda and the town of Bhilsa after a struggle of twelve months against the Dehly officers”; while the Cambridge History of India, page 369, says, he “reduced to obedience other sīef-holders in Mālwa.” As regards Bhūpat and Pūran Mal, Firishtah lith. ed. says, they came out of the fort of Jaipūr, and took possession of the fort of Rāisin and that neighbourhood; and they admitted their allegiance to Qādir Shāh and sent him tributes. Col. Briggs agrees to the latter statement, but says they came marching from Chittoor. The Cambridge History of India does not say anything about them.

3 Firishtah lith. ed. describes him as Shēr Shāh Afghān Sūr; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 271) curiously calls him Sheer Shah, Poorby Afghan, King of Bengal.
with his seal affixed to it, to the following purport; "As the Mughals have come into (invaded) the country of Bangāla, I pray that following the path of sincerity, you should either yourself advance towards Āgra, or sending an army create a disturbance in the neighbourhood of that city so that the Mughals might return from this country." Qādir Khān also wrote a reply to the *farmān*; and sent it, after affixing his seal to it. Ṣaīf Khān Dēhlavī, who was in his service, and always in an unceremonious way told him the truth without mincing matters, represented, "Shēr Khān has so many retainers, and such splendour, that it is permissible for him to affix his seal on the face (of a *farmān*)." Mallū Qādir Shāh said in reply, "How does it matter. The great and holy God has now placed the bridle of the defence of this great country in the grasp of my power. If he does not observe the rules of courtesy, it is not necessary that I should show honour to him."

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have مُحَاشِرَتُ نُزُوُودِی کَرَدُه, while the other MS. has مُحَاشِرَتُ نُزُوُودِی کَرَدُه. Firishtah lith. ed. also has مُحَاشِرَتُ نُزُوُودِی کَرَدُه, which appears to me to be better than either of the other readings.

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have طریقه اخلاص مستمدی ائست; and I consider that my translation is correct. Firishtah lith. ed. has طریقه اخلاص مستمدی ائست which I would translate as "the path of sincerity demands." In any case the language of the *farmān* does not, in my opinion, quite justify the statements in the Cambridge History of India, page 370, that the language used by Shēr Khān was "too peremptory for the occasion." It should be stated however that Firishtah says that Qādir Shāh was angry, but it would appear that this was not on account of the language, but because Shēr Khān had sent a *farmān* and not a letter. According to Firishtah, Qādir Shāh said to his mansūhī "do thou also write a *farmān* and affix the seal to it." It is difficult to say whether the statement in the Cambridge History of India, that Qādir Shāh "returned an insolent reply" is correct. I do not know what the language of the reply was; but Shēr Shāh was angry, that the reply was in the shape of a *farmān*. It appears that Ṣaīf Khān Dēhlavī who, was one of Qādir Shāh's courtiers, objected to the latter's sending a *farmān* in reply to Shēr Shāh; but Qādir Shāh thought himself to be in every way Shēr Shāh's equal. It appears also that communications from superiors and masters were sealed on the top or face of the paper. In this case both *farmāns* were sealed on the face of the paper, so that both Shēr Shāh and Qādir Shāh arrogated to themselves a superiority over the other.

3 There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have چه دخلم دارد چه دخلم دارد, I have accepted this and have translated it in the text. The other MS. has چه دخلم دارد چه دخلم دارد, i.e., what harm is there in this.
When Qâdir Shâh’s farmân came under Shêr Khan’s eyes he removed the impression of the seal from the paper, and preserved it in the scabbard of his dagger; and said, “If the great God so wills, I shall ask him the reason of this rudeness in my presence.”

The country of Mâlwa remained in the possession of Qâdir Shâh, till the time when Shêr Khan, after conquering and acquiring dominion over the country of Hindûstân, advanced to conquer Mâlwa; and when by successive marches, by way of 1 Khîrâr he arrived near Sârangpur, Saif Khan Dâhlavi who was a 2 servant and courtier of Qâdir Shâh said, “The safest course is this, that as a mighty Bâdshâh has come into the country and the strength to withstand him is lacking, you should go on the wings of speed and on the steps of eagerness, and meet him without giving (previous intimation).” Qâdir Shâh considering this opinion to be right, went rapidly from Ujjiain to Sârangpur, and appeared in Shêr Khan’s darbâr. When the chamberlains informed Shêr Khan of his arrival, he summoned him to his presence, and distinguished him with special favours. He dressed him in a robe of honour; and asked him where he had taken up his quarters. Qâdir Shâh 3 said in reply, “The abode of his slave is the dust of your threshold.” Shêr Khan was pleased with this reply, and bestowed on him a red pavilion and an audience tent, and a special bedstead, and sleeping robe, and articles for the wardrobe. He halted for one day at Sârangpur, and then advanced towards Ujjiain. On the way he gave orders to 4 Shujâ’at Khan, that he should keep special watch on the dear guest and should give to him from the government (stores) whatever he might require.

1 The name is Khîrâr in one MS. and Khîrâ in the other. It is Kharâr in the lith. ed.

2 Both MSS. omit the مصاحب and كورك, but as it is in the lith. ed., I have retained it.

3 Firishtah does not credit Qâdir Shâh with giving the poetic and polite reply attributed to him by Niqâm-ud-dîn. According to Firishtah he only said فلان جال, or such and such a place. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 272) says, he had a secret conference with Sheer Shah, which does not appear to be correct.

4 One MS. has Shujâ’ Khan instead of Shujâ’at Khan. The same MS. has by mistake أزعمات مربع خود خبردار باشید. Shêr Shâh’s language appears to have been ironical.
When he arrived in the district of Ujjain, 1 Shēr Khan gave him as a matter of unconsidered hurry, the sarkār of Lakhnauti in exchange for the country of Mālwa. He also ordered that Qādir Shāh should send his family and dependants to Lakhnauti and should himself remain in attendance on him. Mallū Khaʾn brought his family and children to the city of Ujjain, and took up his residence in a garden which was located between the camp and the city. One day he was going from his residence to wait upon Shēr Khaʾn, when he saw, on the way, that a number of Mughals of Gwāliar were engaged in cutting earth with their spades, and working the earth in properly constructing the bastions of the fort which (Shēr Khaʾn’s officers) always built round his camp. Mallū Khaʾn considered in his mind, “If I accompany Shēr Khaʾn, he will of course order me to do similar earth work”, and he determined on flight, and was engaged in thinking how he he should manage it. Shēr Khaʾn, becoming cognizant of this, said to Shujāʾat Khaʾn “From some improper acts, which have been committed by Mallū, it has come into my mind, that I should chastise and punish him; but as he came and made his submission to me without being sent for, it was right that I should please him. Now that he has come to this place, do not say anything to him, so that he might go away.” Mallū finding an opportunity fled. When Shēr Khaʾn received this news, he sent a detachment in pursuit; and he mounted himself and after going a part of the way stopped; and the amīrs who had been sent in pursuit, went a part of the way, and then returned. Sikandar Khaʾn Sawāsī lest he should also escape was made over to jailors.

Mallū Khaʾn’s rule was for six years.

---

1 Firishtah explains, that contrary to the expectation of Qādir Shāh Shēr Shāh, being tempted to keep Mālwa for himself gave him the sarkār Lakhnauti. I am not quite sure about the meaning of the expression, which is used by Nizām-ud-dīn also; but I suppose it has the meaning I have given it in the text. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 272) says, Sheer Shah “conferred on him the district of Luknow as a residence”. The MSS. also have سرکار لکنونو سرکار لکنونو سرکار لکنونو in one place; but Firishtah lith. ed. has sarkār Lakhnauti, and the Cambridge History of India, page 370, has “the government of Bengal”. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted Lucknow.
1 They say that when Mallū Khan fled, Shēr Khan said this hemistich, and Shiākh 'Abd-ul-ḥai, son of Shiākh Jamāl, who was one of his courtiers, said the second hemistich.

Couplet:

You see how Mallū the tricky slave behaved to me,
Did not the Prophet say, no good in stupid slave.

As this couplet is not destitute of wit, it has been inserted here.

2 An account of Shujā' Khan

When the country of Mālwa came into the possession of Shēr Khan, he halted for some days in the town of Ujjain, and occupied himself in arranging and regulating the affairs of that ʿṢūbah. He gave the towns of Ujjain and Sārangpur to Shujā' Khan, who is generally known by the name of Sajāwal Khan, and entrusted the government of the whole country of Mālwa to him. He appointed Hājī Khan Sultānī to Dhār and the neighbouring country. Natū Khan was appointed to the sarkār of Hāndiyah and that neighbourhood. He then advanced towards the fort of Rantambhōr. After a few days news came that Naṣīr Khan, the son of Sikandar Khan, brother of Sikandar Khan, who was in imprisonment had come forward to attack Natū Khan. Shujā' Khan collected his men and advanced

---

1 This anecdote and the couplet are also mentioned on page 169 of the second volume of the English translation in the history of Shīr Khan's reign.

2 The heading is differently given. One MS. has ذكر حکومت شجاع خان. The other MS. omits the words حکومت; while the lith. ed. has ذكر شجاع خان بند بندات شیر شاه. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ŧosain has ذكر شجاع خان or an account of Shujā' Khan.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 370, says, "And retired from Mālwa, leaving behind him as viceroy Hājī Khan and Shujā'at Khan as governor of Satwās." This statement agrees with that on page 168 of this volume; but the statement made in the Tabaqāt and by Firishtah at this place is different.

4 Banū Khan in the text-edition.

5 The text is a translation of the reading in the MSS.; but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have نصر خان بن سکندر خان معبود بچنگ شجاعت خان. This may be the correct version, as there is no mention of what Natū Khan did to meet the attack. On the other hand even the lith. ed. (though not Firishtah) says that Shujā'at Khan advanced to Satwās and Hāndiyah, which he would not have done, if he had been attacked himself.
towards Satwās and Hāndiyah. After the two sides had met, Naṣīr Khān entered into a compact with some of his retainers and courtiers, that they should devote all their energies to seize Shujā' Khān alive, in retaliation for Sikandar Khān, so that the latter might perhaps in this way obtain his release. Then after the flames of slaughter and destruction had blazed up, Naṣīr Khān and some of his servants, gradually with great patience, brought themselves close to where Shujā' Khān was, and seizing him by his collar, and the hair of his head went back towards their own army. In the meantime Mubārak Khān Sarwānī coming to know of what had happened, betook himself to where Shujā' Khān was, and fighting bravely released him. He fought so hard, however, that one of his legs was severed below the knee joint; and he fell off from his horse. Naṣīr Khān's soldiers wanted to cut off his head from his body; but Rājā Rām Shāh of Gwāliar, who was in the service of Shujā' Khān, in concert with some Rājpūts, advanced to help Mubārak Khān Sarwānī, and carried him off (from the field). Naṣīr Khān did all that was required of him in the way of bravely exerting himself, but in the end victory and triumph showed their face to Shujā' Khān. Naṣīr Khān fled, and went into the country of Gōndwānā.

As Shujā' Khān had six wounds on his face and his arms, they lifted him, and carried him victorious and triumphant, to his own

---

1 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have نوگران مصاحب without any conjunction between the two words.

2 The words in the MS. and in the lith. ed. are تحمل نیوده، the meaning of which is not quite clear.

3 The word is سرائیص in one MS. and سروائیص in the other and in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. has سروائیص. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted سروائیص Sirānī.

4 The word is گوالیار and گوالیار in the MS. and گوالیار in the lith. ed. شکر خان گویند, to نصر خان گویند. Firishta has five or six wounds.

5 One MS. omits by mistake the words from حضرت او در بروای نباید, instead of حضرت او در بروای نباید. Firishta has five or six wounds.

6 The readings are somewhat obscure. The MSS. have بچا در ابودن, which has some meaning but which does not say to what place he was carried. The reading in the lith. ed. is i.e., carried him into his presence; but this also leaves out the name of the person into whose presence he was carried. Firishta in the corresponding passage has در چالا در انداخته بدارید بودند. This
place. They had not yet bound up his wounds, when a letter came from Ḥājī Khān Sultānī to the purport, that Mallū Khān had come from Bānswālah with a large force to attack him; and that a battle was a matter of today or tomorrow. Shujā' Khān seated himself that very day and in the condition in which he was in a sukhasan and advanced to reinforce Ḥājī Khān; and with only the night intervening (i.e., on the following morning) Shujā' Khān came up with one hundred and fifty horsemen in the vicinity of Kūmli Mawāsah. He awakened Ḥājī Khān from his sleep, and the same moment without any delay began the battle, and defeated Mallū Khān. The latter fled in great distress and wretchedness, and went away to Gujrat; and did not again gird up his loins.

The power and splendour of Shujā' Khān increased day by day; and gradually he brought the whole of Mālwa into his possession. When Shēr Khān passed away in the neighbourhood of Kālinjar, and the duties of the sultanat devolved on Isām Khān. The latter, although he was still displeased with Shujā' Khān, but as Daulat Khān Ajiyālā, who was the adopted son of Shujā' Khān, was a great favourite

would be perfectly clear if we knew what in this place means, or for what word it is printed by mistake. He could not very well have been thrown into a pit or a well, and then taken to his camp. It would be all right if meant some kind of conveyance, or the word was a misprint for some words which meant a conveyance of some kind. As it is, it makes confusion worse confounded. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has i.e., to the army camp, in the text -

1 The name is written with some little variation in the MSS. and the lith. ed. The MSS. have and the lith. ed. has. The name is not mentioned by Firishtah or by any other historians as far as I know. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has in the text -

2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 273) says that Kadur Shah was defeated in a night attack, but this does not appear to be correct.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have , but the other MS. has , which is of course incorrect.

4 Firishtah calls him Daulat Khān without any suffix. He is called Daulat Khān Ajyāra in the Cambridge History of India, page 370, but on the next page the suffix is printed as Ajyāra instead of Ajyāra.
of İslâm Khân, in order to please the son, did not withdraw the appearance of outward favour from the father; and showed him all esteem and regard; and placed the reins of the affairs of the entire country of Mâlwa in the grasp of his powerful hand. This state of things continued till one day a man of the name of ‘Uthmân Khân in a state of drunkenness came into Shujâ’ Khân’s audience hall, and repeatedly spat on the carpets. When the farrâsh (the man who looks after carpets, etc.) forbade him, ‘Uthmân jumped up, and struck the farrâsh with his fist. There was much noise. The farrâsh told Shujâ’ Khân what had happened. He ordered, “First, he was drunk, second, he came into the audience hall, and third, he struck the farrâsh with his fist.” He said that both his hands should be cut off. ‘Uthmân Khân came to Gwâliar, and complained to İslâm Khân. After some time, Shujâ’ Khân came to Gwâliar to attend on İslâm Khân. One day ‘Uthmân Khân went to wait on Islâm Khân, and complained about what he had suffered. İslâm Khân was angry with him, and said, “You also are an Afghân; go and have your revenge.”

They say, that on hearing this news Shujâ’ Khân became aggrieved at Islâm Khân’s proceedings; and spoke unseemly words. While these things were happening, one day one of Shujâ’ Khân’s intimate friends came and informed him, that ‘Uthmân Khân was sitting in a blacksmith’s shop, and was sharpening his knife; and speaking absurd words. Shujâ’ Khân in his great pride was not restrained by these words, till one day when, riding on his sukhâsan, he went to the fort of Gwâliar, to offer his sulâms to İslâm Khân. When he came by the Hatiyâpâl gate, he saw that ‘Uthmân Khân was seated in a shop

---

1 The name is written Asîm Khân here in both MSS. and Aslam Khân in the lith. ed., but as he has been called İslâm Khân in previous and succeeding passages, I have kept that spelling.

2 This is apparently the Gwâliar in the Punjab hills. Firishtah calls it کوپیار که دار المملك سلمی شاہ افغان سوی بود.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have the name as Salîm Khân here, but I have retained İslâm Khân. Firishtah lith. ed. says Shujâ’ Khân became angry and spoke unseemly words about Şehr Şâh. This can scarcely be correct, as he had no grievance against the latter. On the other hand, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 274) says that Shooja Khan merely said, “Sulim Shah is a fool for his pains.”
wrapped up in an old mantle. Shujā' Khān wanted to enquire from him about the matter on the way. But 'Uthmān Khān suddenly jumped up from the platform of the shop, and wounded Shujā' Khān. The silāḥdārs, or armed retainers, who were accompanying the sukhañan, immediately seized him. They saw that he had an iron hand, rudely fashioned, which he had firmly fixed in the place of the severed hand; and with that badly fashioned hand, he had thrown 2 a dart. The silāḥdārs killed him on the spot; and turning back the sukhañan of the 3 Khān took him to his residence. The wound was on his left side; but as 'Uthmān Khān's hand had no strength, it was only skin deep.

When Shujā' Khān was wounded, and 'Uthmān Khān got his deserts, there was a noise and tumult among the men in the camp. Islām Khān, on receiving the news, sent the great men and the chiefs of the state, to make enquiries. He wanted also to come and visit him. But Shujā' Khān had understood, that his sons and other near relations suspected that ('Uthmān's) audacity was due to the instigation and encouragement of Islām Khān. He, therefore, had regard to their 4 fearlessness, and did not approve of Islām Khān's coming to him, and sent the following message, "This slave is a slave of 5 your

---

1 The readings are different here and are all more or less unintelligible. One MS. has صت پچیده 4. The lith. ed. has صت پچیده. Firishtah lith. ed. has in the corresponding passage خون را بکندر چندن پچیده and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 274) has "wrapped up in an old mantle." This latter would be all right, if کندر meant a mantle, but I cannot find that it has this meaning. However, for want of anything better, I have adopted it.

2 Here again the readings are somewhat different. Both MSs. and Firishtah lith. ed. have جعلی حوری, while the lith. ed. has عملی حوری. The latter appears to be incorrect, but I cannot find any meaning of جعل which would suit the context. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 247) has, "With the blade of a sword." M. Hidayat Ḥosain has بانی دست نااقص جعلی ضربی انداده, i.e., struck a blow with his useless artificial hand, in the text-edition.

3 One MS. has Shujā' before Khān.

4 One MS. has by mistake بی اتکه instead of بی باگی.

5 The pronoun ایشان is in the third person, although شما is also used in the same sentence. There are also differences in the readings. One MS. has که یادا عالم پدر ایشان است, while the other MS. has که من بین عالم پدر ایشان and the lith. ed. has که من بین عالم پدر ایشان.
father, and has never excused himself from death or from being slain; he was among the thirty persons who first joined your father and planted the standard of your greatness, as is known to everybody. And even now if he carries his life in safety from this danger, he may be of use to you. This slave does not wish to give you so much trouble that you should come down from the fort and cover all this distance; and indeed these inquiries and favours have been the cause of much distinction to this slave, and have greatly exalted him."

As Shujā' Khān was one of the great pillars of Islām Khān's government, and had the rights derived from having performed much service, Islām Khān, in spite of the fact that he had understood from his words what he was saying (or rather, what he meant), waited patiently that day, but on the following day he went to enquire about him. This faqīr (the author) has heard from some men, who had relations of friendship with Shujā' Khān, and were present in that majlis, that Fath Khān, the uncle-in-law of the sons of Shēr Khān, who was so well known for his great strength that no one could seize and twist his hand by intertwining his fingers with his own, (this is a favourite test in India even now), when he saw Islām Khān enter Shujā' Khān's pavilion alone, wanted to remove him out of the way, and held a consultation in this matter by signs and gestures with Miyān Bāyazīd, son of Shujā' Khān, who afterwards assumed the title of Bāz Bahādur; and Miyān Bāyazīd also concurred with him in this matter. Shujā' Khān, becoming aware of this, sent Fath Khān away to collect the things required for the tribute (which had to be placed before Islām Khān); and after a moment said farewell to Islām Khān. He told the latter distinctly that after this, he should not take the trouble to come again, for he said, "This slave apprehends lest the rights acquired by long service be destroyed; and the standard of greatness, which has been raised by enduring so much trouble and difficulty, be brought down at once."

---

1 One MS. has by mistake حاجی instead of حاجر.
THE SULTANS OF MALWA

After some days, when Shujā' Khān bathed, and alms and charity were distributed to deserving people; he one day mounted his horse and went to make his salām to Islām Khān. The latter bestowed one hundred and one horses and one hundred and one packages of various stuffs of Bangāla as rewards to the Khān. But as Shujā' Khān found out from his manner and behaviour, that these cajolries were filled with enmity, he passed the day in any way that was possible, and then coming back to his quarters spoke to his servants, that they should load his camp equipages. The people of the city thought that as that camping ground had become dirty, he wanted to remove to another place. But when all his men had loaded up everything he armed himself, and then ordered that they should beat the drum of departure. He then mounted his horse, and took the road to Sārangpūr. Islām Khān, on seeing this, became angry, and detached a body of soldiers to pursue him; and collecting his army he himself also advanced towards Sārangpūr. On arrival at that place Shujā' Khān commenced to equip his men; and when he heard that Islām Khān was coming, some of his men tried to persuade him to fight with the latter. He, however, said, "Islām Khān is the son of my late master and benefactor; I shall never fight with him; and I shall not allow that any one of my people should have such an intention in his mind." After the arrival of Islām Khān in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, Shujā' Khān came out of the city, and sending the families and dependants of his men in advance, went away in the direction of Bānswālah.

Islām Khān took possession of Mālwa, and leaving 'Isā Khān Sir with twenty-two thousand horsemen in the town of Ujjain, returned to Gwāliar. Shujā' Khān, although he had the power and the necessary force, never caused any damage to the country of Mālwa. As Islām Khān (at this time) advanced towards Lāhōre, on account of the rebellion of the Niyāzis, Daulat Khān Ajīyalā, who was a favourite of Islām Khān, and an adopted son of Shujā' Khān, prayed for the pardon of the guilt of the latter. Shujā' Khān then came and rendered

---

1 Apparently in those days, people did not bathe when they were ill or had a wound.

2 The word is جدل in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but it is جدل in the other MS.; the latter reading is adopted in the text-edition.
homage to İslâm Khan, who drew the pen of forgiveness across the page of his offences; and bestowed Sârangpûr, and the country of Râisîn, and some other Mabâls (estates) on him. He also gave him one hundred and one horses and much stuff and a gold ewer and basin, and granted him permission to return. When Shujâ' Khan went to his jâgîr, and İslâm Khan, after a considerable time, passed away by natural death; and the saltanat was settled on Mubâriz Khan 'Adâlî; the latter, 1 either on account of ancient acquaintance, or on account of the relationship of his being the husband of one of his wife's sisters, conferred the entire country of Mâlwa permanently on him. Shujâ' Khan then conferred the government of Ujjain and the parganas in its neighbourhood on Daulat Khân Ajîyâlâ; and Râisîn and Bhîlsâ on his youngest son Malik Muṣṭafâ, who was (afterwards) appointed to accompany Râja Bir Bal and Ḥâkim Abû-ul Fath in the Yusuf Zâi expedition and was killed there. He gave the government of Hândiyâh and Āshṭa to Miyân Bâyazid; and himself took up his residence in Sârangpûr. When a long time had passed in this way, and disorders took place in the saltanat of Dehli, and everyone became independent in the corner in which he was, Shujâ' Khan passed away by a natural death. 3 The period of the government of Shujâ' Khan was 12 years.

4 An Account of Baz Bahâdur, Son of Shujâ' Khan.

After the death of Shujâ' Khan, Bâyazid, his eldest son, betook himself to Sârangpûr, and took possession of all his father's property and retainers. As Daulat Khân Ajîyâlâ, owing to the proximity of

---

1 One MS. omits the first and substitutes بچه for the second. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has تاب ساق اسلاف. I find that one of the meanings of اسلاف in the dictionary is "the husbands of a man's wife's sisters." I have taken the word to mean this in this passage.

2 Malik Mustâfî in the text-edition. The clause corresponding to "who was (afterwards) appointed to accompany . . . . . . and was killed there" is omitted in the text-edition.

3 According to Firishtah he died in 962 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 275) gives 1554 A.D. as the corresponding year, but the Cambridge History of India, page 371, places his death in 1555, after Humâyûn had regained the empire.

4 One MS. omits بن شهاج خان.
his position to Islam Khan, was respected and honoured by all men, and every one was desirous of him (i.e., of his rule), Miyan Bayazid gave encouragement and made promises of favour to a number of men, and sent his mother to Daulat Khan, so that she might bring about some amicable arrangement. In the end they came to this decision, that Daulat Khan should be in possession of the sarkars Ujjain and Mandu and some other states; and Sargarpur and the Khalasa Mahals of Shuja Khan (i.e., the estates which he held in his own possession, without the intervention of Jagirdars), and the sarkars of Hardiyah and Kotli Birah and the country of Bhilwara should belong to Miyan Bayazid; and the sarkars of Raisin and Bhilse and other Mahals, which were situated in that neighbourhood, should be in the possession of Malik Mustafah. After that Miyan Bayazid, intending to act treacherously, went towards Ujjain, and told people that he was going to wait on Miyan Daulat Khan to condole with him. Daulat Khan, whose death was imminent, was unconscious of the (intended) treachery, and was killed. His head was sent to Sargarpur, and was suspended from one of the gates.

After that he took possession of most of the territory of Malwa. He had the royal umbrella raised over his head, and gave himself the title of Baz Bahadur Shah. After arranging the affairs of that side he advanced towards Raisin. Malik Mustafah, who was distinguished by much courage and strength, met him and after some warfare was defeated. Baz Bahadur then entrusted (the government of) Raisin and Bhilse to his own men, and advanced towards Kadrulah. As

---

1 One MS. has by mistake instead of 
2 The distribution given above appears in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The only difference is that one MS. has while the other has . and the lith. ed. has instead of . Firishtah lith. ed. has a somewhat different distribution. According to him Daulat Khan and Malik Mustafah got the territory mentioned against their names in the text; but Miyan Bayazid had Sargarpur and Sitwas (Satwass) and Sirohi and Barahima and Bhilwara and the Khalasa Mahal of Shuja Khan, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 275) has practically the same distribution.

3 The name is instead of . The name is, however, written further on. The name is not quite legible in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but looks like . Two or three lines further down the name is distinctly .
that place was in the occupation of a band of Miyānas (Miyāna Afghāns) and he did not meet with such treatment from them as he desired he slew a number of their sardārs, who were accompanying him, by throwing them into wells; and then advanced to fight the rest of that band. They fortified themselves, and did not show themselves at all backward in fighting with him. Fath Khan the uncle-in-law of Bāz Bahādur, some account of whom has been given before, received a cannon 2 ball here and was killed. In the end Bāz Bahādur took possession of Kadrulā, and came back to Sārangpūr.

After sometime, he advanced with a well-equipped army, with the object of conquering Garh Katinkah. When he arrived in that country, Rāni Duragāwati, who was the wife of the Rāja of Katinkah, and after his death ruled the country, collected the Kōndwān and commenced a battle at the head of the Ghāti (pass). As the Rāni’s infantry were more numerous than ants and locusts, they surrounded the men from all sides of the Ghāti. Bāz Bahādur in distress and dismay took the path of flight, and all his suite and equipages fell into the Rāni’s hands. Many of his best men 3 remained there. He himself, with very great trouble, betook himself to Sārangpūr, and began to repair the damages and losses in his army.

As he had undergone much hardness, he now desired that he should spend some days in pleasure. He collected musicians and singers from every place where they were, and occupied himself all day and night in (sensual) pleasure and enjoyment.

4 Then in the months of the year 5 967 A.H., when the desire

---

The place is not mentioned by Col. Briggs, but it is called Kelwāra in the Cambridge History of India, page 371. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted کدوارة

1 Firishtah and Col. Briggs do not say that it was the sardārs or Miyānas who were thrown into the well. Firishtah says وچی بعضی سیاہاران او سلوك ناموری نمودند; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 277) says, “Having met with opposition from some of his officers”, etc.

2 The word is توپ in the text, and توم in Firishtah lith. ed.

3 Firishtah explains اکثر بقتل آمدن from the sentence begins with آنکھیا، but as it would hardly be possible to begin a paragraph with “Till in the, etc.” I have begun it with “Then, etc.”

4 The MSS. have سبیع و سبیعین و نسمائه, i.e., 977 A.H. which is incorrect. Firishtah lith. ed. has نما و سستین و نسمائه, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 278)
of conquering M álwa found a place in the head, which touched the sky, of His Majesty, the Khalífâ-i-Ilâhî, may God perpetuate the shadow of his kindness over the people! he sent Adham Khân and Pír Muḥammad Khân and Sâdîq Khân 1 and Qiyâ Khân and Shâh Muḥammad Khân Qandahâri and his son 'Ādil Muḥammad, and Muḥîb 'Alî Khân and a number of others from among his servants to effect it. The great amîrs advanced towards Sârangpûr by successive marches. When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the village of Kaitûr, which is one fursukh from Sârangpûr, Bâz Bahâdur rose from the company of the singing women, and marched forward to fight with brave men. Although a large number of Afghâns, who had performed many feats of arms and seen much fighting, were collected together in his service, yet as good fortune was not his guide, he fled after a little fighting; and that country came into the possession of the servants of the triumphant greatness (i.e., the empire of Akbar). The details of this battle, and the remaining battles, which took place in M álwa, have been narrated, distinctly and in detail, in the history of His Majesty, the Khalífâ-i-Ilâhî. May God perpetuate His benevolence and favour on the people and may God prolong the days of his life to the day of resurrection!

Bâz Bahâdur had a wife Rûpmatí by name, 5 who loved him and was enamoured of him; and in the verses which he composed in the Hindî language he often inserted her name. He had a great passion for the society of women and the company of musicians.

He ruled in the country of M álwa for a period of sixteen years. After his flight from the country of M álwa he went to Gujarât. He next

---

1 One MS. omits Qiyâ Khân.
2 The name is written as in one MS. and the lith. ed., and in the other MS. Firishtah does not give the name of the place, but says, when the Mughal army got to one karûh from Sârangpûr; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 278) has "within a short distance of his capital, when he collected his troops around Sârungpûr, but they had hardly time to join, before the Moguls were within two miles of the place."
3 One MS. omits the word āndîk.
4 The same MS. omits the conjunction and.
5 It is not quite clear whether the author means that Rûpmatí loved Bâz Bahâdur and was enamoured of him, or vice versa.
went to the Rānā, who was the ruler of the fort of Kūnbhalmīr and Chitōr from Gujrat; and from there, he went and waited on His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī, and was enrolled in the band of his servants. He remained in that service for several years, till he surrendered the deposit of his life. The country of Mālwa is up to the present day in the possession of the Viceroy's of this daily increasing power.

SECTION IX. 1 THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULṬĀNS OF KASHMĪR.

From the year \(^2\) 747 A.H. to the year 995 A.H., 249 years \(^3\) was the period of the rule of the Muslāmān Sulṭāns in the country of Kashmīr. \(^4\) The beginning was from Āl-i-Ṭāhir.

\(^5\) Let it not remain concealed that the country of Kashmīr was always in the possession of Rājās, who ruled \(^6\) one after another, till the year 750 A.H., which was in the time of the rule of \(^7\) Rāja Sirdēv

---

1 The heading in the text is that in the lith. ed. The headings in the MSS. are غلبہ حکام کسی میر بقدر and غلبہ حکام سلارین نفر, which are both incorrect.

2 As regards the chronology of the Muslāmān Kings of Kashmīr, see page 100 of J.A.S.B., vol. LIV (1885), where Mr. C. J. Rogers working back from 795 A.H., the date of the death of Kutub-ud-Dīn, places the accession of Shams-ud-Dīn or Shāh Mīr in 743 A.H. This differs from the year in the text by four years.

3 The words from مدت علی ال ظاهر do not occur in one MS. The other MS. and the lith. ed. have them with slight variations. I have adopted the words in the first MS., but in the text-edition the last sentence (see note 4 below) is omitted.

4 This sentence is written as ابتداء از آل ظاهر in one MS. It is not to be found in any other MS. or the text-edition.

5 In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain inserts the heading ذکر حکومت above this line and not a page or so later as in the translation.

6 One MS. has by mistake از وی بکدیگر instead of از وی ام.

7 The name is written as سردیو Sirdēv and سردیو Sirdēvā in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firsiyah lith. ed. has سردیو Sirdēv and Sirdēvā in the MS. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 451) has Sena Deo, and the Cambridge History of India, page 277, has Sinha Deva. According to Jonarāja's Chronicle, line 129, Rājā Sīnhadeva died in his 77th year after reigning for fourteen years and three days less than six months and was succeeded by his brother Sūhadeva. It was in
a man of the name of 1 Shāh Mīr, who described his ancestry as follows:
Shāh Mīr, son of Tāhir Āl, son of 2 Karshāshab, son of Nēkrūz, and
referred the end (or rather the beginning) of his ancestry to Arjun,
who was of the Pāṇḍus; and the history of the Pāṇḍus is mentioned
in the Mahābhārat, which has been translated by the order of His
his reign, that many people came from distant countries in quest of service.

1 The name is Shāh Mīr in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. It is
Shah Meer in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 451), but it is Shāh Mīrzā in
the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and in the Cambridge History of India. In the
books in the somewhat imposing list of the Bibliography, page 650, to Chapter xii
of the Cambridge History of India, vol. III, which deals with the history of the
kingdom of Kashmir, there is only one mention of the name of the man; and
this is on page 130 of the Introduction in Sir Aurel Stein’s translation of
Kalhaňa’s Rājātarangini, vol. I (1900). In this place he is called Shāh Mīr,
so it is difficult to find where Sir Wolseley Haig, who compiled the account in
the Cambridge History of India got his authority for calling him Shāh Mīrzā.
In the J.R.A.S., vol. L (1918, pp. 451–468) there is a paper called “the Chronology
and genealogy of the Muhammadan kings of Kashmir,” which is also mentioned in
the Bibliography and which is also written by the same author, Lt.-Col. T. W.
Haig. In this paper he says, “My materials chiefly consist of the Ṭabaqāt-
i-Akbari, Colonel Jarrat’s excellent translation of the Ām-i-Akbari, and Firishtah’s
history.” But as regards Firishtah he says that he “is little more than a
copyist of Niţām-al-dīn Ahmad” and yet he has adopted the Shāh Mīrzā of
Firishtah in preference to the Shāh Mīr of Niţām-ud-dīn. It may be mentioned
that very probably there are MSS. of Firishtah, in which the man is called
Shāh Mīr, for Col. Briggs, as remarked above, calls him Shah Meer.

In Jonarāja’s Chronicle, already referred to in the preceding note, the name
occurs in line 137 and in different lines further down. It is there written as

2 The ancestry given in the text is given with slight differences in Firishtah
and also by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 452); but the latter in a footnote says
"it is surprising that a person of Firishta’s sagacity should have overlooked
the evident absurdity of the pedigree." The Cambridge History of India,
page 277, describes him as “an adventurer from Swāt”; and Firishtah says he
came in the dress of a faqīr. In the text-edition بن آل شاشب 1 has been retained
between بن کوشاشب and 9اموال.
Majesty, the Khalifā-i-Ilāhī, and has been called the Razm Nāma, who came and became a servant of the Rāja; and having served him for a considerable period, acquired some credit. When Rāja Sirdēv died, his son Rāja Rañjan made Shāh Mir his vazir; and left the charge of the work of the government with him. He also entrusted the guardianship of his son who had the name of 2 Chandar to him. When Rāja Rañjan died, 3 Rāja Adwan or (Aūdan) who was a relation of his came from Qandahār, and sat on the seat of authority; and made Shāh Mir, who was still the guardian of Chandar, son of Rāja Rañjan, his vakil (representative or agent). He placed reliance on his two sons, one of whom was named 4 Jamshid, and the other 'Ali Shēr;

1 The name is راجه رنجن in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and راجه رنجن in the other MS. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 452) calls him Raja Runjun the son and successor of Raja Sena Dew. The Cambridge History of India, page 277, however, says that the authority of Sinha Deva was overthrown and he was slain by Rainchan, a Tibetan, who had been in his service. This is correct, for according to Jonarāja, line 147 et. seq., the Bhoja (which is the name uniformly given to the Tibetan inhabitants of the Indus region) Ričhana usurped the throne of Kashmir. See also page 408 of Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. II. The name should be spelt as Rinchhan and not Rainchan, as in the Cambridge History of India. He is said to have reigned for three years and eleven days less than two months.

2 The name is written as چندار in both MSS. but it is in the lith. ed. It is also چندار in Jonarāja, line 221. I do not know whether it is a transformation of the Musalmān name of Haidar or an indigenous name.

3 The name is written as ہادی in the MS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 452) calls him Anund Dew. The Cambridge History of India, page 277, has Udayana Deva. Col. Briggs says he came from Kashghar, and the Cambridge History of India says he had found an asylum in Kishtwār, which appears from the Ain-i-Akbāri (Jarrat’s translation, vol. II, p. 310, footnote 7) to have been situated in “the Kashmir state latitude 33° 18’ 37” north, longitude 75° 48’ east, near the left bank of the Chenab.” Qandahār from which he is said, according to the text to have come must be taken to mean here and elsewhere the ancient Gandhāra and not the modern Qandahār.

He is called Udayanadeva in Jonarāja, line 223. He, however, appears to have been a mere figure-head, who acted entirely as Kotā Dēvi, who possessed all the power, ordered him. See line 226:—पौरिकाणांदरो दोन्ह एवं शकाककारिणी। राजा देव देवणां तदार्ज्ञत समाभरत। 4 Jonarāja calls them अच्छर and चाँदर, but elsewhere Jamshid is called अच्छर. He also says that Udayanadeva gratified them by giving them the government of Kramarāja and other districts.
and made them men of authority. Shâh Mir had two other sons also, one called Shêr Ashâmâk, and the other named Hindâl; and they also aspired to greatness.

When Shâh Mir and his sons became powerful and turbulent, Râja Adwan Dîv was annoyed with them in connection with certain matters, and forbade them to come to his house. Shâh Mir and his sons, having taken possession of all the parganas of Kashmir, made most of the servants of the Râja join them, and they acquired fresh strength and power day by day. Râja Adwan also became weaker till in the year 747 A.H. he passed away, and his widow Köpâ Dîvî took his place, so that she might rule with absolute power. She sent a message to Shâh Mir, to raise Chandar, son of Râja Râñjan to power. Shâh Mir did not agree with this, and did not obey her. So she advanced with a large army, but was taken prisoner; and the purport of the hemistich:

When death to the prey has come, it to the hunter goes, became apparent. After that she accepted Shâh Mir for her husband and became converted to Islâm. They passed one day and night together. The next day Shâh Mir seized and imprisoned her; and having raised the standard of the empire, and having had the public

1 The name is written differently and not very legibly. It is  in MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has . The name is not mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India (at this place), but further on is referred as Shirâshâmâk.

2 Firishtah also gives the same year; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 453) has 727 A.H., 1326 A.D. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the year.

3 The name is written in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has . Col. Briggs (p. 453) has Rany Kowlâ Devy and the Cambridge History of India (p. 277) has Kota Devî. Gopâ and Kûlâ (Kamâlâ) have some meanings in Sanskrit but Kota has none. Gopâ Devî, it will be remembered, was the name of the wife of prince Siddhârtha, or the Gautama Buddha, and it is quite probable that it should have been the name of the queen of Râjâ Udayana. As it happens however, the name is Koṭâ Devî in Jonarâjâ, line 214, etc.

4 There are variations in the readings. I have adopted that in the lith. ed. These in the MSS. are defective. One is the other is .
prayers read and the coins struck in his own name, gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn. As the commencement of the appearance of the Ḥanāfī religion in the country of Kashmir was from his time, the beginning of the section about Kashmir has been made from that time.

1 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN.

In short, when Sultān Shams-ud-dīn attained to sovereignty, he discontinued all the customs of oppression and tyranny, which had continued from preceding ruler. Having assured his mind from (the attempts of) the enemy, he rebuilt anew the whole kingdom of Kashmir, which had been devastated by slaughter and rapine of Diljū; and gave a written assurance to the ra’iyats that he would not take from them a larger revenue than the sixth part of the produce.

Verses:

The standard of the Bādshāh, the cherisher of the faith,
Cast its mighty shadow over all the world;
The messengers of the sky conveyed
The news of his justice to countries all.
The body of disturbance became weak and thin,
The house of oppression into ruin fell.

As the acclamation of the bravery and the good name of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn became noised about in all directions, he occupied himself in the work of the government according to the rites of the parties,

1 The heading in the text is that of one MS. The other MS. omits the heading altogether. The lith. ed. inserts حکومت after ذکر.

2 Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally. The Cambridge History of India (p. 277) is rather eloquent about the atrocities and tyranny of the Hindu rulers. They were very probably bad enough, but the Cambridge History of India does not give any authority for its distribute; and is altogether silent about the plunder and slaughter by Diljū which was the chief cause of the exactions and tyranny of the Rājās.

3 Like the Ṭabaqāt Firishtah calls him the Mir Baḵshī (or pay-master general) of Qandahār, but Col. Briggs calls him the chief of Kashkhar. He is called Daljū in the Āin-i-Akbari (Jarrat, vol. II, p. 387, note 1) and Zuljū by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 98).

4 The Śaṣṭhāṃśa of the ancient Hindu kings.
and seized a body of the 1 Lûn tribe who had become hostile to him in Kishtwâr and meted out punishment to them.

They say that Diljû was the Mir Bakhshî (pay-master general) of Qandahâr. He came with all the army to Kashmir, and turned the whole of the country upside down; and Râja Sirdîv, having collected a large sum of money as assessment from his subjects, sent it as a tribute to Diljû; and then secluded himself in a corner; and this ruined the entire country of Kashmir. And as Diljû could not stay there owing to excessive cold, he returned to Qandahâr.

After he had acquired stability and firmness, he left all affairs to Jamshîd and 'Alî Shîr, his two sons, and occupied himself with repose and worship, and 2 he passed away. The period of his reign was three years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÂN JAMSHÎD, SON OF SULTÂN SHAMS-UD-DIN.

When Sultân 3 Shams-ud-din accepted the summons of the just God; and Sultân Jamshîd ascended the throne with the concurrence of the chief men of the state, he always took every precaution (to guard himself) from 'Alî Shîr, who during their father’s lifetime had

---

1 These are the old Lavanyas, for an account of whom see Stein's Rajatarangini, vol. II, p. 306.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. and the Cambridge History of India, page 377, say he reigned for 3 years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 454) makes it 23 years by mistake. According to Jonarâja the exact period was three years and five days (see l. 315).

Firishtah mentions here a matter of some social and official importance which I have thought it necessary to note. He remarks az Barâm Din 'ulâleh Râ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ dâlânâ which may be translated as, among the people (of Kashmir) he made two communities great, one Chak and the other Bâkri; he decided that the amirs and the soldiers of that country should be (selected) chiefly from these two classes. This is also mentioned by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 99) who, however, transliterates the names as Chakks and Mâkaris.

I find that the Chaks were called the Cakreñas or Cakras in the Kashmir Chronicles. Kâji Chak, who was the first of Chaks to rise to some eminence, was mentioned as Kâcicana Cakreñas and elsewhere Kâca Cakra. I am not so sure about the name of the Mâkris in the Chronicles but they were probably the Margâsā.  

3 One MS. omits the name Sultân Shams-ud-din.
acted jointly with him in all affairs. In fact, the two were always trying to effect the destruction of each other. When Jamshid's soldiers collected round 'Ali Shēr, and raising him on the throne sat down at 1 Walipūr, which is a famous city, Jamshid marched against them with his army and summoned them in the first instance with mildness and courtesy, and tried to have an amicable settlement. 'Ali Shēr turning his head from the proposals of peace, marched on wings of speed, and made a night attack on Jamshid's army, and defeated it. When SULTĀN Jamshid after suffering the defeat, heard that Walipūr was unoccupied (by 'Ali Shēr's troops), he, with the intention of devastating it, advanced towards it. 'Ali Shēr's soldiers, who had orders to guard and defend it, met him in battle; but most of them were slain. In the meantime, when 'Ali Shēr, 2 after his victory arrived in those parts, SULTĀN Jamshid seeing, that he had not the strength to meet him, fled to the country of 3 Kamrāj; and

1 The name cannot be made out distinctly in either the MS. or in the lith. ed.; but appears to be 1 Walipūr or 1 & 2 Wanlipūr. Firishtah lith. ed. has Madnīpūr; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 455) has Mednypoor; but I cannot find either Walipūr or Mednīpūr as the name of any well-known city in Kashmir. Probably Utpalapura is meant (see Jonarāja, I. 323), or Avantipura (see Stein's Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 460). In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hoṣain has 1 & 2 & 3 Dāni pūr.

2 Both MSS. have 1, and I have adopted it; but the lith. ed. has 1.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have 1. Firishtah has 1; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 455) has Gujraj. I find Kamrāj and Kamrāz mentioned in Stein's Rājatarangini. Kamrāj, is Abū-i-Faḵīr's Western half of the Kingdom (pp. 436, 494) and Kamrāz or the territorial division the old Karamarājiya and consisting of 18 pargānas (p. 494).

Madava Rājya I find is written in Sanskrit as 1. It appears that according to the general prevailing notion Maraz comprises the districts on both sides of the Vitastā above Srinagar, and Kamrāz those below. In Akbar's time the old pargānas of Uṭtar Lalau Hamal and Mach'pur were embodied in the tāzi pargāna of Kamrāz (see Jarraṭ's Aḥn-i-Akbarī, vol. II, p. 371). In Moorcroft's and Baron Hügel's list, the pargāna Kamrāz includes Uṭtar Hamal and Mach'pur. Owing to frequent changes of pargāna divisions, the extent of the pargāna Kamrāz has also varied from time to time (vide Stein's Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 436, note 2). I have inserted Kamrāz in the text instead of Karāj. Haig does not mention Kamrāj either in the Cambridge History of India or in his paper in the J.R.A.S., vol. L (1918).
his vazir Siraj, who had the defence of Srinagar in his charge, summoned 'Ali Shér from the city of 1 Uchh and made Srinagar over to him. Jamshid, after this catastrophe 2 did not again gird up his loins; and after ruling for 3 one year and two months passed away.

4 An account of Sultan 'Ala'-ud-din.

When Sultan Jamshid passed away, his 5 younger brother, who had the name of 'Ali Shér, assumed the title of Sultan 'Ala'-ud-din and sat on the throne. He conferred full powers on his younger brother Shér Ashamak. In the beginning of his reign there was great plenty; 6 but towards the end there was a great famine, and an immense number of people perished. 7 He got hold of a body of Raturis, who had become hostile to him and had gone away to Kishrawar, by various devices, and bringing them into Kashmir imprisoned them. He raised the standard of his power and laid the foundation of 8 a city, which he called after his own name, near Yehiyypur. Among the rules

1 The name is made in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but أوجيه in the other MS. Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs mentions the place, I cannot find anything about Uchh or Ayodhya.

2 The readings are somewhat different. One MS. has كمر نست, the other has apparently by mistake كمر نست, while the lith. ed. has كمر نست, i.e., lived for a short time. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has كمر نست بسنده كمر نست، I have adopted كمر نست بسنده.

3 Jonaraja makes this period one year and ten months (l. 338).

4 The heading in the MS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has در ذکر حكومت سلطان علاء الدين.

5 One MS. and the lith. ed. have كنورش but the other MS. has كنور.

6 One MS. has by mistake فواشي بسبار شد after تلف شدند ودر اخر, and omits the sentence from تلف شدند. The famine is mentioned by Jonaraja (l. 358).

7 Firishtah also says this but does not mention the name of the tribe. I cannot identify it in Jonaraja.

8 I cannot identify the name of the city which appears to be يحيي پور Yehiyypur in the MS. and سحبي پور which may be anything in the lith. ed. Jonaraja, however, says the Sultan built a bridge near Suyyapura (see l. 340), probably a printer's mistake for Suryapura, and made Jayapidapura his capital (l. 357).
promulgated by him was one, that an unchaste woman should not inherit her husband's property.

The period of his rule was twelve years and eight months and thirteen days.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTăn 3 Shihâb-ud-din, son of SULTăn Shams-ud-din.

When Sultan 'Alâ'-ud-din had traversed the stages of life, his younger brother, who had the name of Shër Ashâmak attained to the saltanat after him. He was a man of resolution and bravery, and had pleasant manners and morals. Any day on which a report of a victory did not come from some direction, that day he did not count as one of the days in his life, and on such a day marks of pain appeared on his countenance. He made over the demarcated country to the old mâliks (owners); and marched with his army to the banks of the river Sind. They say that when the ruler of that country came and

---

1 Both the MSS. have ارث نبود. The lith. ed. has ارث نبود. This is better and I have retained it.
2 This agrees with Jonarâja (l. 359).
3 He is called माराबदेंज by Jonarâja, so that whatever the correct pronunciation of the name might be there can be no doubt as to what he was called. Shirasama, as has been pointed out, means a little milk-drinker, and was probably a childish nickname.
4 This fact is mentioned even more emphatically by Jonarâja, who says that any moment in which he did not gain a victory he counted as lost for nothing, and who further expatiates on his ambition for victory, and his numerous expeditions, which were as dear to him as a young wife is to an old man, and which neither cold nor heat nor evening nor night nor hunger nor thirst could interfere with. Neither a fawn-eyed fair one, nor the pleasures of wine nor the moonlight could charm his mind like a military expedition. No river was difficult to cross, nor any mountain difficult to climb nor any desert impossible to traverse (lines 365 to 368).
5 دانت in the text-edition.
6 The word is بَشَر which means the outer skin, the surface, and also humanity and constitution. Probably the word complexion would best express the meaning.
7 According to Jonarâja his first expedition was towards the north, and he entered Ub dahâdapura (Waihand or Und) on the Indus, the capital of Gandhâra (l. 372, etc.). It appears to me that when Nizâm-ud-din and Firâshâh speak of the residents of Gandhâr being in terror of him they refer
engaged him in battle, he was defeated; and the residents of Qandahār and Ghaznīn were always in terror of him. He marched as far as 1 Āshtnagar, which is now known as 2 Āshnagar and 3 Peshāwar; and slew an immense number of his enemies. He had gone as far as the 4 foot-hills of the Hindūkush, (but) on account of the hardships of the road, he, after undergoing much privations, returned. He then made an encampment on the bank of the river Sutlej. The Rāja of 5 Nagarkot, who had ravaged some of the estates appertaining to Dehlī, and was returning, rendered homage to the Sultān on the way; and having surrendered to him the whole of the vast quantity of the booty which he had seized, made his submission to him. The ruler of 6 Tibet also waited on him, and prayed that the Sultān’s army might not cause any injury to his territories.

After he had conquered all the surrounding countries he took up his abode in his capital. He made his younger brother, whose name

not to the present Qandahār, which was far away. As Udabhāṇḍapura was the capital of Gandhāra, they may very well have called it Qandahār. The ruler of Sindhu (Sind) gave his daughter in marriage to him (l. 374). In line 377 Gajināpuri (Ghaznīn) is mentioned as being frightened on hearing the lion-like roars of the lion-king’s army. Then he marched southwards and refreshed his tired horses by (bathing them in the cooling) waters of the Satadrī or Sutlej (l. 382).

1 The name looks like āšt nākār and bašt nākār in the MSS. and the lith. ed. has šab nākār. Firihtaḥ lith. ed. has āsop nākār and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 458) has Ashnaggar.

2 The name here looks like bašt nāghr in the MSS., and bašt nāghr is the same as nāghr in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. of Firihtaḥ has bašt nāghr. Col. Briggs does not give the more recent name. I have not been able to identify the place.

3 The name is written as bašt nāghr in the MSS., and as bašt nāghr in the lith. ed.

4 I have not been able to find anything about his marching to the Hindūkush mountains in Jonarāja.

5 The encounter with the Rājā of Nagarkot appears to be referred to in the somewhat curious lines (383, etc.) according to which the Rājā Udakpati is said to have pillaged Dhilli (दिल्ली), which may be a misprint for दिल्ली, but I have not been able to find any account anywhere in Jonarāja of Rājā Udakpati or any connection between him and Nagarkot.

6 The MSS. have तिब्बत and the lith. ed. has तिब्बत, little Tibet. Firihtaḥ has तिब्बत; little Tibet.
was Hindāl, his heir; and he banished Ḥasan and his brother, who were both his legitimate sons, towards Dehli, at the dictation of another wife of his who had ill-feeling with their mother. He founded two cities called Lachminagar and Shihāb pur; and then passed away. The period of his rule was twenty years.

3 An account of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, son of Shams-ud-dīn.

When Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn rolled up the bed of his life, his brother, who was named Hindāl, succeeded him on the throne. He was possessed of pleasant manners and morals; and made very good arrangements for compliance of his orders. He sent a sardār of the name of Loār for the conquest of the fort of Loharkōṭ, which was in the possession of some of the amirs of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn. After several great battle had taken place between the two sides, the sardār

1 Firishtah calls them Ḥasan Khān and ‘Ali Khān. There is no mention, anywhere, of the reason for their banishment. Jonarāja (l. 438) says:

राजी सहोदरवादिन्या तथा देवा प्रबोधितम।
विवाधात्र खंडेशात् भ राजसुलान वर्णितम।

2 I cannot find anything about Lachminagar or Shihābpur; in the text-edition the former is Lajhumagar.

3 The heading in both MSS. is as I have in the text. The heading in the lith. ed. is as I have in the text. The name Quṭb-ud-dīn has been transformed by Jonarāja to Kusmadīn, Kumbhadīn (l. 462).

4 The readings here are somewhat different and obscure. One MS. has لوار نام سرداری را. This I consider the best reading and have adopted it. The other MS. has را سرداری لوار نام بیاودو نام سرداری را which cannot be correct, as this is stated in the beginning of the account of the reign. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 460) following Firishtah says, “In the latter part of his reign he deputed an officer.” The Cambridge History of India, page 278, says, “A rebellion of some of his predecessor’s officers obliged him to send an expedition which was successful, for the recovery of the fortress of Lokarkot.” I can find no authority for the statement that the expedition was successful. Both the Tabaqāt and Firishtah say that the commander sent by Quṭb-ud-dīn was alain.

As to the position, etc. of the fort of Loharkōṭ (Loharakottom) or the castle of Lohara which the expedition was sent to conquer, see Rājatarangīṇī, vol. II, p. 993. بوداو is the name of the sardār in the text-edition.
was slain. And he sent for his nephew Ḥasan, son of Shihāb-ud-din, from Dehlī; and wanted to make him his heir and successor; but envious people made him repent of this decision and incited him to seize him. One of the amīrs of the Sultān, who was named 2 Rāy Rāwal, informed Ḥasan of this; and 3 he fled to Loharkōt with Ḥasan by way of Kashmir. After that the zamīndārās seized both of them; and sent them to the Sultān. Rāy Rāwal was executed, and Ḥasan was cast into prison.

In the later years of his life two sons were born to the Sultān. One was called 4 Sikār and the other Haibat Khān. Both these sons were young when the Sultān 5 passed away from the world.

The period of his rule was fifteen years and five months.

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بر کشتِ اُو بر کشتِ اُو to seize him; but the other MS. has بر کشتِ اُو بر کشتِ اُو to slay him, which appears to be a mistake; this, however, has been adopted in the text-edition.

2 The name is written as رازی راول in one MS. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. it is رازی ول راول. Firishtah lith. ed. has by mistake رازی ول راول. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 460) has Ray Rawul. The Cambridge History of India, page 278, does not mention his name, but calls him a Hindu courtier. Both Niğām-ud-din and Firishtah say that the Sultān attempted to seize Ḥasan at the instigation of envious people. Col. Briggs (loc. cit.), however, says, "He became so popular as to excite the King's jealousy"; while the Cambridge History of India says his "impatience exceeded his gratitude, and he conspired with a Hindu courtier against his patron."

3 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have وَا حِسَن از راگ کُبیع فراز شده بلوثر کوت رتت. With this difference that the lith. ed. has in place of the شده نموده; this is adopted in the text-edition. The other MS. omits the first word, from which it would appear that Ḥasan alone fled to Loharkōt, but this is not correct as this MS. as well as the other and the lith. ed. also say that the zamīndārās seized both of them and sent them to the Sultān.

4 The name is سکار, and سکار in the MSS. and سکار in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has شکار. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 461) has Sugga and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, Sakār or Sankār. It appears from Jonarāja, line 531, that he was called Śrīṅgārā and (not Sikandar, as suggested by Haig on p. 454 of the J.R.A.S., vol. L, 1918), of which Sikar, etc., are corruptions. The other was named Haibat Khān according to the MS., etc.; and Haibata according to Jonarāja, line 533.

5 Firishtah lith. ed. gives 796 a.h., as the year of his death, while Col. Briggs has 799 a.h., 1396 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 279,
An account of Sulṭān Sikandar, the Iconoclast, the son of Quṭb-ud-dīn, the son of Shams-ud-dīn, who had the name of Sikār.

In concert with the wazīrs and amīrs he sat in his father’s place; and taking up the management of affairs into his own hands, has 1394. Firishtah also says that Mr Saiyid ‘Ali Hamadānī came to Srinagar in the reign of Quṭb-ud-dīn; was received with great honour and respect; and many people of the country became his true disciples. Firishtah also says that, according to Mirza Haidar Dughlat’s book, he remained in Kashmir for a little more than forty days, and then went back to his cherished native place; but Firishtah thinks that the great Khānqā, which was built by him in Srinagar, could not have been completed in forty days, and, therefore, if he remained there for only forty days its foundations alone might have been laid down in his presence and it must have been completed after his departure.

The statement of Firishtah about Mr Saiyid ‘Ali Hamadānī’s stay does not appear to be correct. From the Tarikh-i-Rashidi (Elias & Denison Ross, 1895, pp. 432, 433) it appears, that he was expelled from Persia by Timur and it appears from Mr. Beale’s account (Oriental Biog. Dictionary, p. 238) that he came with seven hundred Saiyids to Kashmir in 1380, and died in Pakhlī in 1386. Mirza Haidar Dughlat in the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, however, says that Kutb-ud-dīn died in less than forty days, which is somewhat ambiguous, but which really probably means that he died less than forty days after the arrival of the Saiyid.

1 The heading in the MSS. is as I have in the text. That in the lith. ed. is different; it is ذكر حكومت سلطان سکدر که سکانام داشت. The Sanskritised form of the name as given by Jonarāja is चेककर (I. 539).

2 According to Firishtah, however, Sikandar’s mother acted as the regent in the early part of his reign. I cannot find the mother’s name in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 462) calls her Soorut Rany, and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, Sūra. According to Jonarāja, however, see lines 539, 543, her correct name appears to have been Subhaṭā or Šobhā. She is called Subhaṭā Devī or Šri Šobhā Mahādevī. She appears to have been an extremely stern, if not a cruel woman; for finding that her son-in-law Muḥammad Shāh (called महेश्वर महादेव in I. 540 in Jonarāja), was against her son, she caused him and his wife, her own daughter, to be murdered. At her instigation also, probably Rāy Mādārī, a leading nobleman caused prince Haibat Khān, Sikandar’s younger brother, to be poisoned. The name of the nobleman is Rāy Mādārī (with slight variations) in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 462) has “the prime minister Ray Makry” and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, has Rāi Mādārī, which however is incorrect, the correct transliteration being Rāy Mādārī. I cannot find any name in Jonarāja which
sent Rāy Mādārī, the vazīr who possessed much power to Tibet. He conquered that country, and having collected a large army rebelled against his master. There was a battle in the neighbourhood of Bhimbar; Rāy Mādārī was defeated and captured and thrown into prison, where he killed himself. Immense armies collected round the Sultān, and all the surrounding countries were conquered by him.

At this time, when His Majesty, the Lord of the Conjunctions, Amir Timūr sent an elephant for the Sultān the latter was very

has any resemblance to Rāy Mādārī. There are two ministers mentioned by him called Uddaka and Sāhaka (l. 539); and it was Uddaka who killed Muhammad Shāh and his wife (l. 540), and poisoned Haibat Khān (l. 543), and afterwards killed his colleague Sāhaka (l. 545).

1 According to Firīshṭāh Sīkandar and Rāy Mādārī distrusted each other. Rāy Mādārī, becoming aware of Sīkandar’s feeling towards him, suggested that he might be allowed to march to conquer little Tibet, his object being that he might in this way be safe from the fire of Sīkandar’s anger; and Sīkandar agreed, as he hoped that Rāy Mādārī might be slain in the war. Accordingly Rāy Mādārī invaded Tibet, and gradually conquered the whole country. Having in this way become very powerful, he rebelled against Sīkandar. The latter marched against him and a battle took place near the boundary of the two countries. Rāy Mādārī was defeated and fled, but he later fell into the hand of Sīkandar’s troops. He was thrown into prison; and after a time killed himself by taking poison. Jonarāja, however, says he cut his own throat in the text-edition is apparently a misprint.

2 The name of the place where the battle took place is written as Binbar in one MS. In the other it is not very legible but looks like Jazsar. In the lith. ed. it is written as Binbar. It is not mentioned by Firīshṭāh or any other historians as far as I have seen, except Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 463), who calls it, “the town of Nere”. The battle, the flight of Rāy Mādārī or Uddaka and his capture are mentioned by Jonarāja (l. 549 and the following lines), but I cannot discover the name of the place where the battle took place.

3 The MSS. do not give the number of the elephants, they are very imperfect. One has without any mention of the person for whom it or they were sent. The other is better; it has. The lith. ed. has from which it would appear only one elephant was sent. Firīshṭāh however says Timūr sent his emissaries with two elephants. Jonarāja also says that Timūr, whom he describes curiously enough as
proud of this fact, and sent a petition to the Lord of the Conjunctions, containing expressions of his devotion and service. He also wrote that he would wait upon His Majesty, whenever he might be ordered to do so. He sent back the ambassadors after showing them very great favours. When (the expression of) the relation of this attachment and service was reported to the Lord of the Conjunctions, the latter declared his friendship for him, and sent a robe of honour of gold embroidery with a horse and a jewelled saddle; and ordered

sent two elephants to the King of Kashmir, being afraid of the latter. The whole passage (lines 559, 560) is so curious that I have thought it best to quote it:

\[
\text{नदेि} \text{दीमभारणम्पाक्षकया} \text{गुिया}} \]
\[
\text{वेष्ट्राखो} \text{वध्यु} \text{विज्ञी} \text{विग्रासिन वाणुषयन}} \]
\[
\text{तन:} \text{प्रवारकन वेष्ट्राख:} \text{कम्पीरभुपद:} \]
\[
\text{शाकसमो गणिन्त्रो} \text{हधुपवयमचोिकत्} \]

In another place Dehli was spelt as विज्ञी and here it is spelt as विज्ञी; and the comparison of Dehli with a widow, who being without a ruler had only poor and wretched ornaments; and a great world-conquerer Timur being afraid of the King of Kashmir are extremely curious. I have looked in Jonarâja for further references to Timur but have not been able to find them.

Firishtah and Col. Briggs’s account of the correspondence between Timur and Sultân Sikandar agrees with that in the text; but they increase the amount of the tribute, which Timur’s vazîrs had stated would be required, to three thousand horses and one hundred thousand ‘Alâ‘i ashrafis. The Cambridge History of India, page 279, does not say that Timur sent any elephant to Sikandar; but it says (following the Zafarnâma) that his grandson Rustam and Mu’tamad Zain-ud-din who had been sent to Sikandar from Dehli as envoys (with what object does not appear) arrived and joined Timur’s camp near Jammû. They reported that they had been well received, and had been sent back with Maulâna Nûr-ud-din as the envoy of Sikandar. The latter was informed by Timur’s courtiers that Sikandar would be required to send thirty thousand horses and one hundred thousand golden Dirhams. This is perfectly correct, but the Zafarnâma does not use the word Dirham but the words

\[
\text{صद फरार दरस्त जर} \]

It is difficult to say which of these various accounts is correct. It may be noted that it is said in the Āin-i-Akbari (Jarrat, vol. II, p. 387) that Sikandar on his way to Taimur’s camp, heard that it was reported in the camp, that he was bringing a present of a thousand horses; and concerned at the untruthfulness of this report he went back and sent his excuses. In Rodger’s account (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 101) it is said that Sikandar was informed by some of Taimur’s servants, that he must give at least three thousand horses and one hundred thousand ashrafis.
that when the great standard should return from Dehlí towards the Punjáb, he should come and wait upon him. In accordance with this order, Sultán Sikandar started with much tribute to attend on him when His Majesty was advancing towards the Punjáb from the Siwâlîk hills. On the way he heard that some of the amîrs of the Lord of the Conjunctions had said, that it was proper that Sultán Sikandar should bring a thousand horses as his tribute. The Sultán became distressed in his mind on hearing this news, and turned back and sent a petition, that as a tribute fit for the offering had not been got together, his departure has been postponed for a few days. His Majesty, on becoming aware of the circumstances, reprimanded the men who had said that Sultán Sikandar should present a thousand horses as a tribute; and having shown favour to the emissaries of Sultán Sikandar told them that the vazîrs had made an altogether unreasonable demand, and the Sultán should come and wait upon His Majesty without any anxiety. When the Sultán heard this news from the ambassadors he came out of Kashmir with great pleasure with the determination to wait on His Majesty; but when he passed Bâramûla, he heard that His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunctions had crossed the river Sind, and had proceeded towards Samarqand. He then sent his ambassadors with much tribute to wait upon His Majesty, and turned back towards Kashmir.

And as he was extremely liberal, the learned men of ‘Irâq and Khurâsân and Mâwarâ’-un-nahr came with hopeful faces to his threshold; and the Islâmic religion became prevalent in Kashmir.

Verses:

His noble spirit such generosity proclaimed
That even to the hopeless despair forbidden became.
When Islâm such resplendence gained
His door the sacred shrine of high and low became.

Among the learned men he showed very great honour, to 1 Saiyid Muḥammad, who was the chief of the wise men (of the age); and

---

1 It is not quite clear who this man was. Was he Mir Muḥammad the son of Sayyid Ali Hamadâni, who led a batch of five hundred Sayyids into
made complete arrangement for breaking images and pulling down the temples of the Kāfirs. Among the temples there was a great one at 1 Bahrārah, which was dedicated to Mahādev. The Sultan had it demolished. Although they dug under it, and went down up to the water, they could not find its end. They also pulled down another temple which was at 2 Jakdar, and (when they did so) great flames burst out, which the Sultan (himself) saw. (It is said that) 3 Rāja Lalitādat Devharah had built it outside the sacred city Kashmir in 1381, following his father who had led seven hundred the year before after the expulsion of the Sayyids by Timur? (See note 2, p. 432 of Tarikh-i-Rashidi by Elias & Denison Ross).

1 The MSS. have بحراة Bahrārah, and the lith. ed. has بحراة Bajwārah, and the lith. ed. has بحراة Bajwārah, and the lith. ed. has جندر Jakdar and the lith. ed. has جندر Jakat. Firishtah which Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 465) has translated, "the temple dedicated to Jug Dew". According to the Ḫun-i-Akbari (Jarbat, vol. II, p. 364, note 3), this temple was at Parihāsapura, pronounced by the Kashmiris as Poraspur. It was the ancient Parihāsapura which was built by Lalitāditya who reigned a.d. 723–760. It was, writes General Cunningham, situated on the river bank of the Jhelum near the present village of Sumbal." The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of the temple. سن پور Sanpūr is the name of the place in the text-edition.

2 The name is written as البات in the MS. and البات in the lith. ed. Firishtah also has للنادات Col. Briggs has "Raja Bulnāt"; and Mr. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 101) has Lilitāwat. The king referred to may be Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa, who according to the Chinese Annals of the T'ang Dynasty sent an embassy to China in the reign of the Hiuen Tsang. a.d. 713–755. He did not live 1,100 years before the Iconoclast 1393–1450 a.d., but his name is the nearest I can get to Lilitāwat. Firishtah ed. in the corresponding passage has راہج للنادات بیش از ظہور اسلام دیو دو در غات عظمت و انصوکم در ترس پیپ ساخنہ بود This does not throw much light on the matter except for the similarities of the name of the Rāja to that of Lalitāditya. The name Taraspūr is apparently a mistake for Paraspūr or Parihāsapura (see end of the preceding note).
of Dārāpūr; and had learnt from astrologers, that after one thousand and one hundred years, a Bādshāh of the name of Sikandar would demolish it and would break up the image of Mercury, which was in it. This matter he had caused to be engraved on a plate of copper, which he had put into a casket and had caused it to be buried under the edifice. At the time of demolishing it the inscription was discovered. The Sulṭān said, "Would that they had left this inscription on the face of the building, so that I should not have issued the order for its demolition." ¹ All spirituous liquors and duties were entirely abolished in his kingdom.

In his old age he suffered from a burning fever. He sent for ² Mîrân Khān, Shāhī Khān and Muḥammad Khān who were his three sons, and gave them testamentary directions. He conferred the title of 'Ali Shāh on Mîrân Khān and bestowed the kingdom on him. The period of his rule was twenty-two years and nine months and six days.

¹ The MSS. have which is incorrect. Firishtah lith. ed. has . It was natural that as zealous, not to say a bigoted Musulmān, Sulṭān Sikandar should have gone in for a dry Kashmir, but his reason for the abolition of the Tamāghā cannot be so easily understood; nor the exact nature of the tax which he abolished. Col. Briggs translates Tamāghā as export duties. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the prohibition of the use of spirituous liquor, or the abolition of the Tamāghā; Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 102) mentions that Sikandar prohibited the use of wine but says nothing of the abolition of the Tamāghā. The word, as I have said elsewhere, means a stand or a seat; and I suppose it came to mean a tax because the payment of taxes was denoted by the affixing of a stamp.

² The names of the sons are as I have them in the text in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed has Mîr Khān as the name of the eldest, but the names of the other two are as in the Tabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 466) has Ameer Khan and Shady Khan as the names of the two elder sons. The Cambridge History of India, page 280, has Nūr Khān as the name of the eldest, and Shāhī Khān of the second. Jonarāja, line 584, gives the names and they are described as ; and their mother is called (l. 585); so Mîr Khān of Firishtah appears to be correct. He appears to have had another son called Piruja or Firûz by another queen Šobhā Devī (l. 586).
AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN 'ALI SHAH, SON OF SULTAN SIKANDAR BUTSHIKAN, WHO HAD THE NAME OF MIRAN KHAN.

In spite of the fact that he was young, his greatness and an awe of him having found place in men's hearts, the people of the country were obedient to him. In the early years he left the management of affairs to Siyah Bhat, who having become a Musalmān had been the vazir of Sultan Sikandar. During the period of four years in which he was the vazir, he perpetrated various kinds of oppressions and tyranny on the people. Most of the Hindūs left the country, and some killed themselves. When Siyah Bhat died of a hectic fever, the Sultan selected his younger brother Shahī Khān, who was famous for his bravery and intelligence, for the post of vazir; and the latter took charge of all affairs. After that the Sultan made his locum tenens and directing his younger brother Muḥammad Khān to obey him, left Kashmir with the object of travelling about; and went to the Rāja of Jammū, who was his father-in-law.

1 The headings are slightly different in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. omits the word Butshikan. The lith. ed. inserts the word حكومت before the name of Sultan 'Ali Shāh. One MS. omits the كه before Mirān Khān. The lith. ed. substitutes كه for كه. In the text-edition the heading ends with سکندر بیت شکن.
2 According to Firishtah the grandeur was of Sultan Sikandar, and the awe was felt for him, and not for the young prince.
3 The name is سلطان بیت and سلطان بیت in the MSS. and سلطان بیت in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has سلطان بیت and سلطان بیت. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 467) has Seeva Dew Bhut. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 103) has Syah But; and the Cambridge History of India, page 280, has Sinha Bhut.
4 In the text-edition he is stated to have died of مرش دق or tuberculosis.
5 One MS. rather unnecessarily and tautologically inserts كه بشعاءت موسوم بود.
6 One MS. has برادر خوردو نیتا را.
7 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have برسر راجه جمو كہ خسار أو بود رند Firishtah explains further by saying that he went to the Raja of Jammū to bid him farewell. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 467) has "of travelling in foreign countries". In all these there is no mention of a pilgrimage; but the Ain-i-Akbari, Jarrat, vol. II, page 387, says that 'Ali Shāh set out for Hijāz; and Haig (J.B.A.S., vol. L, 1918, p. 455) says he "resolved to perform the pilgrimage to Makkah"; and the Cambridge History of India,
At this time some interested persons made him repentant of his having made Shāhī Kān his successor. The Rājas of Jammū and Rājauri, having gone to support ‘Ali Shāh, he again brought Kashmir into his possession, Shāhī Kān retired from Kashmir to Sīllkōt. During this time Jasrat Khōkhar, who had been seized by the Lord of the Conjunctions (Timūr), but after His Majesty’s death had fled

page 280, says, desired “in an access of religious zeal to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca.” Jonarāja also supports this, for although Mecca or Hijāz is not specifically mentioned, the anxious of ‘Ali Shāh for नीर्देवनुभुत, and नीर्देवनसुतकुष्ट्रात् are mentioned in lines 693 and 699; and in line 704 it is said निवृज्जैरिष्टुर्म न। युवाराज दर्दाक्षणमारमहाराजाशिराट। His enthusiasm for pilgrimage, however, appears to have been very short-lived, for it appears from line 708 that the privations and the probable small result of the pilgrimage soon removed all his enthusiasm for it and the king of Madra (Jammū) took him back to Kashmir (l. 710). The new king Shāhī Kān was displeased at his brother’s return; and followed by the thāvkurs he went away from Kashmir (l. 714). Then we come to Jasrat called Jasratha by Jonarāja (l. 730). And in line 734, we read of the march of ‘Ali Shāh against Jasrat, but it is said that his enterprise was censured by his army, which was astonished at his own poverty. Afterwards when he came to a place called Mudgaravyāla, (l. 738), a messenger came from the Rājā of Madra telling him not to begin the war with the Khokhars, although there were great warriors in his army, as he (the Madrarāja) alone knew the खुराराज रणश्रेष्ठम्. Then ‘Ali Shāh was defeated. There is no mention, however, of Kābandhs or headless bodies. Zain-ul-‘ābidin (वोज़ीन मसबदिन) entered first the hearts of the inhabitants and then the capital.

पौराणिक प्राक मना पवाराजधारिणी वण्टीविश्वा (l. 751).

As to the general history of ‘Ali Shāh’s reign Fīrishtah agrees generally with the Tabaqāt, but he says that the Rāja of Jammū and Rājauri reproved ‘Ali Shāh about his making Shāhī Kān his heir, and he repented of what he had done; and they sent troops with him to attack Shāhī Kān. The latter went to Sīllkōt, and sought the help of Jasrat Shaikha Khokhar. Then there was a battle. There is no mention of any headless body. ‘Ali Shāh was defeated, as his troops were fatigued after the long, rapid march, and the enemy did not give them any time to rest and recover. As to ‘Ali Shāh Fīrishtah says that according to one account, he fell alive in Jasrat’s hands, and according to another, Shāhī Kān pursued him, and drove him out of the kingdom.

The Cambridge History of India, page 280, adds nothing new; but according to it, the final battle took place near the Tattakutī pass. I have not been able to find anything about this pass. There is a Tattakutī pass, which is almost due east to the entrance of the Lohara Valley, but it cannot be identified with the Tattakutī pass.
from Samarqand, coming to the Punjab had acquired great power. Shahi Khan joined Jasrat Khokhar and having obtained reinforcements from him, brought them to attack 'Ali Shah. The latter advanced against Jasrat with an immense army, and a great battle took place and many were killed on both sides. They say that certain headless bodies had risen up and had moved about in the battlefield. It is a fixed belief among the Indians, that in any battle, in which ten thousand are slain, a headless body, which is called the Kabandh in Hindi, rises and moves about. In the end 'Ali Shah having no strength (to continue the fight) fled; and Shahi Khan entered Kashmir in pursuit of him. The men in the city rejoiced at his coming.

The period of the rule of 'Ali Shah was six years and nine months

3 An account of Sultân Zain-ul-âbidîn, son of Sultân Sikandar Butshikan, which is another name for Shâhi Khân

Sultân Zain-ul-âbidîn, after his brother sought a place on the throne of the empire. Jasrat Khokhar aided by the Sultân's power brought the whole of the Punjab into his possession, although he could not conquer Dehli. Tibet and the whole country which is situated on the bank of the river Sind came into the Sultân's possession. He made Muhammad Khân, his younger brother, a councillor and left the decision of all affairs to his judgement. He himself took great pains for ascertaining the truth in all cases and disputes. He cultivated the society of all classes. He had acquired much learning and skill in arts; and in his assemblies men of intellect, both Hindûs

1 جسروت in the text-edition here is apparently a misprint for جسروت.
2 One MS. has هندی هندی and the other has هندی کند. The lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. Kêndah in the text-edition.
3 The name of Zain-ul-âbidîn appears to have been too much for the writers of the MSS. One calls him Sultân Zain-ud-din, and the other Sultân Al-âbidîn. The lith. ed. has the name correctly, but it inserts the words ذكر حكيم before Sultân Zain-ul-âbidîn.
4 The relation between Sultân Zain-ul-âbidîn and Jasrat is somewhat differently expressed by Jonarâja (l. 760), वमम दूत बालमह भुपेनवन् सदा | खुम्बराहिष्पतिसम्भ भले भलंधिविषिय |
5 This is rather finely described by Jonarâja, who says:

भोज मधु नये सन्ती विजेन्द्रा ग्रामणिये | यीमदभादवानोऽभुत् कामारेष्या भोदरः | (l. 758).
and Musalmāns, were always present. In the science and art of music he had very great skill. No other ruler of Kashmir had the success which he had in settling and increasing the population, in expanding the cultivation, and in excavating canals and water courses.

Couplet:

To every one does not come that with the cloud of his resolution,
He can keep the young plants of his time verdant and green.

Wherever a robbery took place in his kingdom, there was a mulct or fine fixed from the chief men of that village; and for this reason robberies and thefts became completely unknown. In his time the writing of the rates of the prices of different commodities was ordered. These were engraved on thin copper plates and were left in all cities, 1 to indicate that all customs of tyranny had been rooted out in the kingdom of Kashmir; and (to point out) 2 that whoever came after him and did not act according to his practices, God and he would know (the effect of such conduct).

On the prayer of 3 Sri Bhat, who in the science of medicine was unrivalled in the age, and had received various kinds of favours from

---

1 This is the translation of the passage as it is found in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but it is not at all clear how the fixing of the prices of commodities would remove all tyrannical customs. It appears to me that some words have been omitted here. Firishtah in the corresponding passage, has in addition to the fixing of prices, about which, however, the meaning of what Firishtah says is not at all clear, for what he says about it is قصعة نوپسی که در زمان او شده بود در عهد سلطان سابق نبود دور کرده و قدامد و ضوابط خدود را بر تخته‌هاست مس کند و در هر شهروی و دیبی گذاشت نا رسوم ظلم از ولايت کشیده بر افزاد. This has some meaning, but even the leaving of the rules and regulations of government engraved on copper plates in every city and village would hardly be sufficient to eradicate all customs of tyranny and oppression.

2 This somewhat cryptic adjuration to his successors is thus expressed by Firishtah گوند بر تخته‌هاست مس نوشته بود که هر که بیاید و بدين دستور گوار تکذى بعلط خدا گرونارد بان.

3 The name is سویر پت in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and سویر پت in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The name does not appear to be mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 103) calls him Sri Bihut. His correct name according to Jonarāja (l. 823) was निमादेश शива बह्ष्टा.
the Sultān, other Brahmans, who during the reign of Sultān Sikandar had, on the accusation of Siyāh Bhat been banished, came back and took up their quarters in the temples, and places which had been allotted to them; and stipends were granted to them. The Sultān took an agreement from Brahmans, that they would not 1 act in contravention of what was written in their books. After that he revived all their customs, such as the making of sectarian march, and 2 the burning of women with their (dead) husbands, etc., which Sultān Sikandar had abolished.

He also excused the ra’iyats from paying all fines 3 and tributes, and all payments of grain (i.e., in kind). He issued an order that merchants bringing commodities from different directions should not hide them; and refraining from all wicked storing (cornering ?) should sell them at a small profit. He released all persons who had been imprisoned in previous reigns. 4 He allowed the treasuries of all countries, which were conquered, to be plundered; and assessed the revenue on them on the same scale as that of (the country round) the capital. He chastised the turbulent people, and kept a watch over them according to the necessary standard.

He showed favour to faqirs and the aged and helpless; and did not permit that they should perish. He never looked at the face of a strange woman or at another’s wealth with an avaricious and dishonest eye. 5

1 Both MSS. have نقل تکنند. The lith. ed. has نقل تکنند. I do not know that نقل تکردن conveys this meaning; فعال کردن may do so; but فعال کردن is better. I have, however, retained نقل تکنند. In the text-edition it is فعال تکنند.

2 In this matter Sultān Sikandar was very much ahead of his time. Neither Akbar nor any other emperor ordered this and it was not till Lord William Bentinck’s time that the practice of Sati was abolished.

3 This is too vague. All fines were not abolished. As we have seen, the Sultān established one for putting down thefts and robberies. Firishthah is a little more definite. According to him یسکش و چرمانه و دیگر مصادرات که شکداران از ععالمی گرفتند بر انداخت. Even this is not precise; but if Firishthah is correct, it was the fines, etc., imposed by the provincial governors which were abolished.

4 The meaning of this is obscure. Firishthah makes it clear by saying که انوا بر عساکر قسمت می‌نمود, that is, he distributed it among the troops.

5 Only جیسی in the text-edition.
measure and of the chain beyond what had been customary.) The necessary amounts for the Sultân’s household expenditure were provided for from the produce of the copper mines which had been discovered, and where miners were always working. As in the time of Sultân Sikandar images of gold, silver, copper and other metal had been melted down, and the metal had been coined, and there was depreciation of those coins, an order was passed that coins should be struck of pure copper that was produced from the mines, and should be made current.

The Sultân was so pleasant and affable in his ways, that when he was annoyed with anyone, and externed him from his kingdom, he did it in such a way that a man did not know, for what reason the Sultân had become annoyed with him; and it was the same in the case of anyone who was the subject of a bad augury. People lived in his reign in any way, and followed any religion that they wished. Most of the Brahmans, who had become Mushmâns in the reign of Sultân Sikandar apostatized again, and none of the (Mushmâns) learned men had any power or hold over them. (He brought a canal near the Mârân hill, and founded a city there, the populated portion of which extended over five farâhs. He also founded other cities, and settling learned and wise men and also poor men in them, was always careful to enquire about their condition. He did not try to hoard treasure, but in fact whatever came into his hand was spent on useful objects.

Couplet:

As the cash of life thou canst not keep,
Why over other cash should’st thou keep guard.

1 The words are و در باب هرك تجاول بد برآمد حمیل نان میشد the meaning of which is not at all clear. In the text-edition Tjaal is a better reading.

2 I have not been able to identify the Mârân hill. Firishtah also has a ماران but Col. Briggs does not appear to mention it. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 103) refers to this where he says, “The king brought a canal from the mountain; and built a city five koss in circumference.” The Cambridge History of India, page 281, says “he founded a city, bridged rivers, restored temples and conveyed water for the irrigation of the land”, but neither it nor Rodgers makes any attempt to identify the locality. Jonarâja mentions Mandaragiri (l. 858) as a locality where he made the waters, which had hitherto been useless, useful and fruitful; and Nandaśaila (l. 860) as a hill from which he brought down a canal; but I have not been able to find out anything more about these places.
And in his time, a man of the name of Sultan Muhammad was born, who was both a poet and a wise man. He could compose extempore verses in any form and meter he wished. He also immediately and without any consideration solved any literary difficulty that was propounded to him. The Sultan showed honour to the learned men of Islam, and said, "They are my preceptors." He also showed honour to Yogis on account of their poverty and austerity; and he did not look at the defects of any community. As he had great intelligence he immediately solved every difficult problem, in the solution of which other men were unsuccessful. Among such problems (there was the case of) a woman who had a grudge against one of her servants, and having killed one of her own children, threw the body into the servant's house. Early the next morning, when the accusation fell upon the latter, she went to the Sultan praying for justice. The vazirs, after much enquiry, confessed their inability to find out the truth of the matter. The Sultan himself turned his attention to its decision. He first of all summoned the servant, who had been accused, to his private chamber; and there threatened her in various ways, and left no stone unturned in the matter. As the woman was innocent of the act she made no confession of any kind. At last the Sultan said, "If you become naked, and in the presence of men go to your own house, that might be a proof of your innocence." The woman cast her head down in shame, and said, "For me it is better to die than to act in this way. I consent to my punishment, but I cannot consent to behave in this way."

The Sultan then withdrew his hand from her, and sending for the other woman, who was making the accusation, said, "If you are honest in making this complaint make yourself naked in the presence of men." The woman without any hesitation wanted to become naked. The Sultan told her not to do so, and said, "The guilt of this act is yours, you made a false accusation against your servant;" and after they had struck her a few strokes, she confessed her guilt.

1 The reading in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is as I have it in the text, except that the last word in the lith. ed. is and not شدوه.

2 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. say that جرم أبي كار لوست. I think the first word should be محرم. In the text-edition جرم is retained.
The Sultān did not direct thieves and robbers to be executed, but he ordered that they should work every day with chains on their feet on public buildings, and should be supplied with their food. He also forbade all hunting, so that animals might not be killed. He did not eat any meat in the month of Ramadān; and, owing to his munificence, many performers of vocal and instrumental music came from various places to Kashmir. Among these was Mullā ‘Udī, who was one of the 1 poor pupils of Khwājah ‘Abd-ul-qādir and came from Khurāsān. He played on the ‘Ud (some instrument like a lute or a harp or a lyre) in such a way that it was a source of great pleasure to the Sultān; and he was exalted with various favours. Mullā Jamīl Ḥāfiz, who was unrivalled in versification as also in elocution, also received great favours from the Sultān. 2 His drawings (naqshkhān) are celebrated to this day in Kashmir; and Ḥabib a maker of fireworks or of guns, who (first) manufactured muskets in Kashmir, lived in his reign, and had no rival in his art. The Sultān in concert with him wrote a book containing questions and answers; this work is of very great value. There were many dancers, 4 rope-dancers and natwahs (actors?) in his time. There had also been men in Kashmir who sang one tune in twelve different modes or variations.

At certain times, when the Sultān wished to be gay and cheerful, he ordered that 5 Rubābs and Bins and other musical instruments

---

1 The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are حلب حلب حلب حلب حلب حلب in both MSS., and as حلب حلب حلب حلب حلب in the lith. ed. Firishtah ed. has جب جب جب جب جب, and Rodgers also has Jab.

2 Rodgers (p. 104) translates this sentence as “his name is a proverb in Kashmir for excellence in poetry.” The word about which I am doubtful is naqah, which ordinarily means a drawing. I wonder whether it means a tune here. The word occurs again a few lines further down, where one naqsh is said to have been rendered in twelve modes or forms.

3 The word is غندم باران in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; Rodgers has “acrobat”. The next word is آندو in the other and آندو in the lith. ed. There is no corresponding word in Firishtah; and I cannot find آندو or آندو or آندو in the dictionary. It may be that آندو or آندو is a corruption of the Sanskrit नात, an actor.

4 A Rubāb is four-stringed instrument in the form of a shortnecked guitar, but having a surface of parchment instead of wood. I cannot find بين bīn
should be made of gold and adorned with gems. There was a very
intelligent man of the name of 1 Sahím, who composed verses in
the dialect of Kashmir, and in the 2 sciences and literature of India was
the leader of the age. He wrote a book called 2 Zain Harb in which
he narrated all the events of the Sultán’s reign in detail. He had
memorised the whole of the Shaikhnáma; and he wrote a book called
4 Mánik in the science of music, and dedicated it to the Sultán; and
owing to this received many favours. The Sultán was himself

in the dictionary, but the name is a form of Sanskrit Víñá, also a stringed
instrument. Firishtah has  Tánbúr instead, which is a kind of lute or
guitar with a long neck. Rodgers does not mention any of these instruments.

1 The name is سوم in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and سوم in the other
MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has سوم. Rodgers (p. 104) has Dasám, but I think this
is a mistake. He has changed the conjunction و into د and has prefixed it
to the name سوم. It is سوم in the text-edition. Neither Col. Briggs nor the
Cambridge History of India gives the names of the various artists, though the
latter mentions some of their achievements. Jonařája, however, gives accounts
of other achievements of the Sultán. Jonařája died in the reign of Zain-
ul-‘ábidín; and his work was continued by his pupil Šrívara. I have
not, however, been able to find any mention of these matters in their works.
I have already noted the appointment of the Sultán’s brother Muḥammad Khán
to be his chief minister. See page 652 of the text and note 5 on the same page.
He appointed Tilakácápíra to a high appointment (l. 822). He conquered
Gándhár, Sindhu and Madrá (l. 828). He ordered the release of Málađevá,
the Rája of Madrá, who had been defeated and taken prisoner by Jaarat, the
Khokhár (l. 829). He also defeated the Rája of Rájapuri and the king of
Udbháñápura (Waihand or Und), and Bhauṭabáñúmí (little Tibet) (lines
830-2). I need not give further particulars.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have علم but the other has علم.

3 The name is فرم حرم in both MS.; and فرم حرم in the lith. ed. In
the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is فرم حرم; and Rodgers has Zain Harb. I have
adopted Zain Ḥarab on the supposition that it means the war(s) of Zain.

4 The name of the book is بانک Bának in one MS. and the lith. ed., and
Máñik, which may be Mábak or Mánik or Mâyak as there is no dot above or below
the third letter, in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has something different, viz.,
بودن بگ که شاهنامه فردوسي نام باد داشتی زین نام کتابی در علم موسيقی بلال
شال پیانو نامه بعضاش شا بخوانند نه so that according to him it was not Sahím but
Būdī But (Buddhi Bhāṭṭā?) who wrote the treatises on music, and it was called
Zain and not Mánik. مانک Mánik has been adopted in the text-edition.
acquainted with Persian, Indian, Tibetan and other languages; and many books in the Arabic and Persian languages were translated by his orders into the Hindei language; and the 1 Mahābhārat which is a most famous book, and the book called Rājatarāṅgiṇī, which is the name of a history of the Bādshāhs of Kashmir, were translated into Persian by his order.

The pardonéd (late) Sultān Abū Saʿīd sent 'Arab horses and Bactrian camels from Khurāsān as presents to the Sultān. The latter was highly pleased at this, and in reply sent donkeyloads of saffron, 2 paper, musk, shawls and cups of glass or crystal and other wonderful products of Kashmir for the acceptance of the Khāqān (sovereign) who has since attained to Divine mercy. Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī and Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī sent the finest things of their respective kingdoms, and strengthened the relations of affection. The rulers of Mecca, the revered, and of Egypt and Gilān and other countries also sent fine and beautiful presents, and maintained similar relations. The Bādshāh of Sind sent many equipages and other 3 things 4 with one of his servants, with an ode in praise of the Sultān. The latter was highly pleased on reading the ode. When Dūngar Sēn, the Rāja of Gwāliar, came to know the Sultān's great love for the science of music and singing, he sent two or three valuable treatises

1 The MSS. are very imperfect here. One of them leaves out the entire passage from ترجمة كردندا و كتاب مبادرت to كتاب عست و كتاب. The lith. ed. is more correct, but it and the second MS. both call the Rājatarāṅgiṇī the Rājatarangī and describe it as a history of the Bādshāhs of Hind or India. Firishta has Rājatarangī and calls it the history of the Bādshāhs of Kashmir.

2 The word is variously written. In the MSS. it is قنالس, and in the lith. ed. it looks like قنالس. I cannot find any meaning of any of these words except "paper", which might be sent as a present. Rodgers (p. 105) translates the word as "pepper".

3 The lith. ed. has اسپلن اشلیئی ; but as neither MS. has the word I have omitted it.

4 The MSS. and the lith. ed. appear to be imperfect here. The MSS. have بمصعر بکی باو قصیدة, and the lith. ed. has بمصعر بکی از بمصعر بکی باو قصیدة; neither of which makes sense. I think the correct reading should be بمصصر بکی از مالزمان خرون با قصیدة; and I have interpolated the necessary words, which have been adopted in the text-edition.
on these sciences; and his son Rāja Gōp Singh also after him kept the relations of sincerity and attachment intact. The Rāja of Tibet got hold of two wonderful animals of an elegant shape, which are called Hans in the language of the people of India, from the place called Mānsārwar, the water of which is subject to no change, and sent them to the Sultān. The latter was exceedingly pleased on seeing them. Among their other characteristics one was, that when milk mixed with water was placed before them, they separated the milk from water with their beaks and drank it and pure water was left behind.

The Sultān, in the beginning of his reign, made Muḥammad, his brother, his successor, and left all affairs in his charge. After his death he confided in his son Ḥaider in his place, and left all affairs in his charge. He also distinguished his two foster brothers, named Masʿūd and Shēr, by great proximity to his person; but in the end they fell out, and Shēr killed Masʿūd, who was his younger brother, and in retaliation the Sultān had him executed.

The Sultān had three sons, one, Ādām Khān, who was the eldest, but who always appeared wretched in the eyes of the Sultān, and Ḥāji Khān, and Bahārām Khān; he was the youngest of all, but had an extensive jāgīr. And he conferred the title of Daryā Khān on a

---

1 The name is differently written. One MS. has Gōp Singh while the other has Gōp Singh and the lith. ed. has Kōb Sing. The name can, I think, be only Gōp Singh or Kōb Sing. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted Gōp Singh.

2 Firishtah says the animals were called rājhanes by the people of India, and the place, where they were obtained, was the haud called Sarwar and not maula called Mānsārwar.

3 One MS. calls the elder foster brother Masēr by mistake, while further down it calls him Shēr.

4 According to Jonarāja he had four sons by the daughter of the king of Madra, named respectively Chādaṁ Khān, Deśa Khān, Āswar Khān and Dedā Rām Khān (lines 855 and 856), of whom only the 1st, 2nd and 4th are named in the Persian histories. In the Rājatarangini of Śrivara (1st taraṅga, line 56) he is said, however, to have had only three sons, whose names are somewhat differently written, viz., Chādaṁ Khān, Deśa Khān and Dedā Rām Khān.

5 The MSS. have Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa instead of Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa instead of Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa instead of Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa instead of Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa instead of Qādir Bahānī ḍerīa.
man of unknown descent called Mullâ Daryâ, and placed him in charge of all affairs, and occupied himself with pleasure and enjoyment.

1 When Sri Bhat, who was the vazîr, departed from the world, the Sulṭân dedicated, in memory of him, one krûr of the gold of Kashmir, which is equivalent to four hundred ashrâfîs or gold mohurs, to his sons.

The Sulṭân was an adept in the (occult) sciences of the Yogîs; and men had seen 2 his spirit leaving his body which is called 3 Simiyâ.

---

1 Shiva Bhatta, see note 3, page 653. I have translated this passage as it is found in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has, however, a different version, and Col. Briggs another, while Mr. Rodgers has a third and from it draws an inference which does not appear to be quite justified. The passage is not well connected with the context, and it is, therefore, difficult to judge whether Nizam-ud-dîn's or Firishtah's version is more likely to be correct. In the Tabaqât it occurs just after the mention of the Sulṭân's sons, but there can be no doubt that the man, who died and for the good of whose soul the money was paid, was Sri Bhat or Siva Bhatta, the vazîr. In Firishtah also the passage occurs immediately after the mention of the Sulṭân's sons; but here the person for the good of whose soul the gift is made is شهروود کوهک, i.e. the Sulṭân's foster brother Shârîd or Shârîdî, though earlier he had been called Shârî. The foster brothers and their mutual quarrel and the execution of one of them had been mentioned by Nizam-ud-dîn and Firishtah before the mention of the Sulṭân's sons. Then the amount of the gift is بک کروزز کشیوری که جهار صد اشرنی باشد. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 470, 471) calls the foster brother Sheeroo and the amount, 400 seers of solid gold. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 105) follows Firishtah and makes the amount a kror pieces of gold, 400 camel loads. I think Firishtah is right as to the person for the good of whose soul the gift was made, for the vazîr had not done anything for which his soul would require such a heavy ransom. As to the amount of the gift it would be useless to enter into any calculations, without knowing even approximately the weight of the value of the zar. Rodgers's assumption is that the Sulṭân was extremely rich, and a sum of four hundred gold pieces would not be too high a sum for his gift for the salvation of his foster brother's soul. Four hundred camel loads of gold would of course be another matter.

2 The words are صلّى سدید in the lith. ed. and صلّى بدین in one MS. In the other MS. they are rather indistinct. The other word, which is apparently the name given to it in the language of Yogîs, is written as سمیا سمیا in the MS. and سمیا اسمیا in the lith. ed. The same word occurs again, where it is called علم سمیان in one MS., علم سمیان in the other and علم سمیان in the lith. ed. The word is not to be found in Firishtah, where, however, the Yogî is said to have said that he knew a science by which he could take the Sulṭân's illness on himself, so that the Sulṭân would recover completely.

3 See the preceding note.
They say that on one occasion the Sulṭān became so ill that he was about to die; and people washed their hands (i.e., despaired) of his recovery. At this time a Yogi appeared in Kashmir; and said "I know the science of the transmigration of life; and excepting that there is no other treatment for the Sulṭān, who has contracted an extremely severe disease. The treatment is that I should separate my soul (or life) from my body, and should put it into the Sulṭān's body." The Sulṭān's attendants, considering this a great boon, took the Yogi with one disciple of his to the bedside of the Sulṭān, and left them there by themselves. The Yogi bringing out his soul out of his body, by a science, which he knew, put it into the Sulṭān's body after the latter's soul or life had become separated (from his body). He had previously instructed his disciple, to take his body, which would become lifeless, to the Āsan, which is the name of the dwelling-place of Yogīs, and to guard it. When the disciple came out, carrying the body of the Yogi, the Sulṭān's attendants hastened to the latter's side, and found him healthy in body; and they rejoiced exceedingly.

After some time the sons of the Sulṭān becoming hostile to one another rose in conflict among themselves. Adam Khan, who was the

---

1 See note 2, page 661.
2 One MS. has یا بنا alone or here by themselves.
3 One MS. has یا عملی, the other MS. and the lith. ed. have یا عملی. I prefer the first reading.
4 The word is یس in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. I wonder, however, whether it is not a mistake for یس.
5 Firishtah has something of an anti-climax, where he says از اسم سگ, i.e., and guard it from injury by dogs, cats and other animals. Firishtah also tries to explain the Yogi's power and says that the Yogi's by their mental exercises probably acquire such powers; and gives instances of similar cures effected by descendants of His Holiness Khwājah Muḥammad Ḥusain Pārsā; and says that the two cases may probably be placed in the same category but ends with the pious ejaculation of و الله اعلم بالصواب God knows the best!
6 It appears that they were misled by evil advices. See lines 60–64 of Śrīvara's Rājatarangini (canto I). It also appears that the Zain-ul-Abbīdīn being afraid of some catastrophe (बबार खंड घाट पाप ) sent Adam Khan towards little Tibet (बबार खंड ) (l. 71).
eldest, left Kashmir; and with a great army invaded the country of (little) Tibet. He conquered the whole of that country; and brought an immense quantity of booty to the Sultān; and became the recipient of favours. 1 Ḥāji KHāN, under the Sultān’s orders, marched to attack Lōharkōt. Owing to the intemperate behaviour of Ḥāji KHāN, the Sultān always kept Ādam KHāN near him. At last, at the instigation of some of the people of Lōharkōt, Ḥāji KHāN advanced towards Kashmir (i.e., the capital). Although the Sultān sent written and verbal messages to him that he should not come, they had no effect. Having no other alternative the Sultān left the city with the intention of engaging him in battle and encamped in the plain of 2 Pallasīlā. Although Ḥāji KHāN repented of his conduct, yet

1 Lines 82, 83 say that when Ādam KHāN returned after conquering the Bhuttas, Ḥāji KHāN marched to the Lōhāra mountain (Lohkote according to Col. BRIGGS, vol. IV, p. 471), by the Sultān’s order, and as the latter knew that two knives could not be placed in one sheath, he ordered their coming and going. Šrīvara then describes the way in which Ḥāji KHāN’s adherents incited him to return to Kashmir (lines 85–108); and in line 110 he says that the king quickly left the city with his army on hearing of his son’s approach.

2 The name of the place is written in the MS. as بیلهل, and which may be anything; and تلیل Till in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has بالیل. In the text-edition it is بیلهس. Col. BRIGGS (vol. IV, p. 471) has Buleel and Rodgers has Pulpul. Šrīvara Panḍit calls the place where the two armies met and whence the Sultān sent a Brahmin as ambassador to Ḥāji KHāN, بیرمزیکو (l. 117), but where that was I cannot find out, except that if it was on the route between Srinagar and Lōharkōt, it was somewhere to the east of the former place, and probably near the Pir Panjāl range. The ambassador’s message and speech are also given at some length (lines 119–128) and ending with the threat, “Your commanders would be slain like sparrows!” Ḥāji KHāN’s adherents were of course angry but he said that he would go and fall at his father’s feet, and whether he was pleased or angry he could do to him whatever he liked (line 132 et seq). His adherents, however, adjured him to go on with what he had begun. They said, “Let us fight, if we are victorious, you get the kingdom. If we die, you die; wait only till we fight; if we are slain, do as you think proper.” Hearing these words Ḥāji KHāN was sunk in a sea of thought (l. 142). The Sultān on hearing what the ambassador had to say, ordered his army to begin the battle. After the battle had gone on for the whole day, Ḥāji KHāN turned back (l. 164).

It appears, however, from the end of the first tarānga of Šrīvara’s poem, that he calls it the سکھنہاپa

So the name of the battle-field was
at the instigation of adventure-seeking men, he arrayed his army
and marched to the field; and the battle went on from morning till
evening. In the end, the army of Hājī Khān was defeated. Many
deeds of bravery were performed by Ādam Khān in the battle. Hājī
Khān fled towards Hirpūr and Ādam Khān hastened in pursuit
and tried to seize him; but the Sultān did not allow him to do so.
Hājī Khān came from Hirpūr to Bhimbar; and occupied himself
with the treatment of the wounded. After the victory, the Sultān
returned to Kashmir and ordered the erection of a high minaret
of the heads of his enemies and had the men belonging to Hājī Khān’s
army, who had been taken prisoners, put to death. He also inflicted
great tortures on their families and descendants. On account of
this most people separated from Hājī Khān, and came to Ādam Khān.

Mallaśilā, but whether Pallaśilā and Mallaśilā are two places or whether Pallaśilā
is a mistake for Mallaśilā or vice versa, I cannot make out.

1 The name is written as नेबर in the MSS. and नादिया in the lith. ed. Firishta
does not use the word ब्रेज in the text-edition, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 472) has Heerpoor.
Both Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India say Hājī Khān fled to Bhimbar, but according
to the Tabaqāt and Firishta, he came to Bhimbar from the place mentioned
in this passage. In Śrīvara, I, line 166, mention is made (apparently) of Ādam Khān’s
ferocity in the neighbourhood of Śūrapura. It appears that Hirpur (Hirpūr) or Hurapar
is the modern name of Śūrapura which is often described as the entrance station to Kashmir. I think, therefore, I will not be far wrong
in calling the place Hirpur.

2 The name is written as ब्रेज in one MS. and नेबर in the other and नेबर in the lith.
ed. of the Tabaqāt. नेबर is adopted by M. Hidayat Husain in the text-edition.
It looks like ब्रेज in Banr or Nābr in the lith. ed. of Firishta, and Col. Briggs
(vol. IV, p. 472) has Nere. Rodgers has Bhimbar and so has the Cambridge
History of India. Śrīvara in his Rājatarangini (1st tarānga, I. 109) says
शान्तार नामापरिचय त्रिंभित अभासः. I cannot find out where Citra-deśa was.

3 As regards this, see Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, 1st tarānga, lines 171-174.
It appears that kārṣṭik or merciful Sultān was दु:खित, and he was thoroughly
dissatisfied with himself and his servants; it is not therefore likely that he
should make a minaret of the heads of the slain, who are described as the
मृतमंतृकोस विरंचित; though I cannot make out what the मृतमंतृक was, that he
made of the rows of the heads of the warriors who were killed in the battle.
Was it a rest chamber, a sort of Valhalla? But even in that case the rows of
heads would be a grisly decoration.
After that Ādam Khān ruled (the country) with full authority for six years. Later on there was a terrible famine in the country of Kashmir, so that a large number of men died of hunger. Owing to this the Sultān became very sorrowful, and distributed most of the grain in the royal treasuries (granaries) among the people; and reduced the land revenue in some places to one quarter, and in others to one-seventh (of the fixed amount). And Ādam Khān having acquired

1 Firishtah says Ādam Khān was at this time declared to be the Sultān’s successor, and he ruled for six years. Col. Briggs and Rodgers also say that he was made the heir to the throne. The Cambridge History of India does not say distinctly that he was declared to be the heir to the throne, but it says that he participated for six years largely in the administration of the kingdom. Śrīvara (I, l. 182) says नीर्वराजे सूक्ष्म तद्दशुमुदे वश्य: शमाम्.

2 The famine is described at some length by Śrīvara, I, lines 184–213; in fact the whole of the 2nd canto of the 1st tattvas which is called दुर्भिष्मवर्षम is a description of the famine which occurred in the 26th year of the reign. He mentions the fact that the Sultān fed the people with his own paddy, i.e., with the paddy in the royal granaries, but he does not appear to mention the reduction of the various demands.

There were, according to Śrīvara, heavy rains and great floods after the famine, though this is not mentioned by the Musalmān historians. The heavy clouds frightened the people as enemies are frightened by showers of arrow (I, l. 217), and the Viśnud (the Jhelum), the Ladarī (the Lidar river), the Sindhu a tributary of the Viśnud, which flows into the latter at Prayāg or the Viśnud-Sindhu-Samghama, a place of considerable sanctity and the Kaśti (the canal in Sīnarān, now the Kutakul) and other rivers submerged the villages on their banks as if in a terrible rivalry of one another (I, l. 221). According to the Tarikh-i-Rashidi (Elias and Dennison Ross, p. 223) flows from the Zoji pass down towards the Jhelum and was called the Lar. Stein does not give any modern name for it, but says the two Sinds are distinguished by the Indus being called the Būd Sind. He also says that the valley of the other Sind forms the district of Lar. The merciful Sultān went round in a boat inspecting the damage caused by the rains and he greatly sympathised with the people in their privations (I, lines 239, 240). After that everyone was happy with a full harvest (I, l. 243).

3 How he acquired the power is not quite clear. Firishtah does not give any information, but he only says he acquired the power to plunder and ravage. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 472) says “At this time he deputed Ādhum Khan with a force to march and attack the fort of Gujraj”, which is not at all correct. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 106) begins with, “In his government of Kamrāj” Ādam Khān was very oppressive, but he does not say
power in the country of Kamrāj, committed 1 various acts of oppression. And 2 many people came to the Sulṭān, and complained against him. He refused to receive all farmāns which were sent by the Sulṭān; and finally collecting a large army marched to attack the Sulṭān; and 3 halted at Quṭb-ud-dīn-pūr. The Sulṭān acting on the purport of the couplet;

Couplet:

Attack not an army, larger than on your own,
For 4 on a lancet thou canst not strike thy fist.
satisfied him by 5 various devices and sent him back to the country of Kamrāj; and 6 sent for Ḥāji Khān with great quickness.

that the Sulṭān appointed Ādam Khān to that government. The Cambridge History of India, page 283, says "After the famine Ādam Khān was entrusted with the government of the Kamrāj district". But it appears from I, line 273 of Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, that his mind having become vitiated on account of his jealousy of his younger brother, he suddenly attacked the country; and from I, line 278, that one day being excited by the intoxication of being the Yuvarāja (heir to the kingdom) he went to the Kramarāja.

1 One MS. omits by mistake the words from 10 to 155.

2 His and his followers' atrocious acts are described by Śrīvara in I, lines 280–290; and it is said in line 291 that when the king’s messenger told his followers not to commit such oppression, they replied, “Let the king, if he is vexed, go on crying.”

3 Śrīvara says in I, line 293, that having collected and equipped his forces at Kuddadepurua (Quṭb-ud-dīn-pūr) he came to attack the Sulṭān’s forces at Jainanagara. Firištah also mentions Quṭb-ud-dīn-pūr. I cannot however find anything about its situation. About Jainanagara or rather J(Z)ainanagara, it appears from Jonarāja, line 871, that Zain-ul-ḥābidin carried the canal called Jainaganā on which his new town Jainanagarā was built (see the notes on pp. 111 and 112 of Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. I) as far as Raṇasvāmin. This J(Z)ainanagarā was not far from the capital.

4 The reading in the MSS. which I have accepted is زیشت ْبِر نَشَار. The lith. ed. has زِد اَنکَشَت ْبِر نَشَار.

5 I cannot find out what these devices were. Śrīvara (I, l. 297) also has مَنْنِشِبِسِ، i.e., by politic measures.

6 Śrīvara mentions the sending of the letter to Ḥāji Khān in I, lines 299-300. The letter contained a rather piteous appeal. "चन मन्यवदेष मनिशाम्या भया विना |"
Adam Khan on arriving in Kamrāj advanced from there without any delay, and attacked 1 Suyyapūr. The governor of the place, who had held that position from before the time of the Sultan, came out and engaged him, and was slain; and the whole of 2 the city was destroyed. The Sultan hearing this news, sent a great army to attack Adam Khan; and there was 3 a great battle. Many were killed in both the armies, and Adam Khan was defeated. When the bridge which had been erected at Suyyapūr across the river Bihat (Vitastā or Jhelum) broke down, 4 about three hundred of the chief men on Adam Khan’s side were drowned, as they were crossing the river in their flight.

Adam Khan crossed the river and saw a place (for resting) on that bank. The Sultan came out of the capital, and coming towards Suyyapūr, comforted the ra’iyats. At this time Ḥājī Khan, in compliance with the farrān which had been sent to him, arrived by way of 5 Punch to the vicinity of 6 Bāramūlā. The Sultan sent his

---

1 Suyyapura, the modern Sōpur, the chief place in pargana Zainagir, which lies a short distance from the point where the Vitastā leaves the Wular Lake.

2 Both MSS. have تلام شهرو ولابت باغادت رفيت but the lith. ed. has تلام شهرو ولابت باغادت رفيي. I have omitted the words ولابت باغادت رفيي.

3 Śrivara does not, as far as I can make out, mention the attack of Suyyapura by Adam Khan, and the latter’s battle with the governor of the place; but he mentions the battle between the Sultan’s and Adam Khan’s armies (I, lines 304–306).

4 This is also mentioned by Śrivara (I, l. 308).

5 The name of the place is سمح and سمح without any dots in the MSS. They cannot, therefore, be pronounced or translated with any certainty. In the lith. ed. it is Banjah and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is بانجه, Panjah or Punjah, and this has been followed in the text-edition. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the place, and I cannot find any place like Banja or Punja near Bāramūlā. In I, line 322, Śrivara says that Ḥājī Khan arrived at this time at Pārōtsa, which (corresponding to the modern Punch, or Prwts, the Kashmiri form) seems to have been included in Lohara and have been situated in the lower valley of the Tēhī (Taus, vide Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 433). Punch is sufficiently like Punjah which is the name of the place in Firishtah. I have accepted Punch.

6 This agrees exactly with Śrivara (I, l. 323), Bāramūlā being called Varāhamūla. The name is derived from the ancient Tirtha of Viṣṇu Ādi Varāha.
youngest son Bhrám to welcome him. A great affection grew up between the two brothers. Ádam Khán fled from the place where he was, and went to the Niláb (the Indus) by way of Sháhbang. The Sultán taking Háji Khán with him returned to the capital, and made the latter his heir and successor. The latter girded up his loins in devotion to his father, and left no minitude in his service unobserved. He recommended his own servants, who had been his companions and friends during his travels in India, for all the high appointments in the government; and obtained these for them from the Sultán; and allotted to them fine jāgirs. The Sultán gave him a jewelled gold belt from the Sultán; and was always pleased with him.

1 Compare Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, I, line 324.

2 The name looks like Sháh Mank and Sháh Bilk in the MSS. and Sháh Nik in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Sháh Mank and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 470) has Shahabad. In the text-edition it is Sháh Mank. Rodgers says the Sultán with the aid of Háji Khán drove Ádam Khán out of the valley, without mentioning the name of any place and the Cambridge History of India, page 233, says Ádam Khán “fled to the Indus”. It appears from Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, I, line 326, that he Shāhbandar, Khande rāgaḥ, i.e., crossing the Sindhu by way of Shāhbandar arrived with his army in the country of the Lord of the Sindhu. It should be noted that the first Sindhu is not the Indus, but a tributary of the Vitastá and the second Sindhu is the Indus or the Nila. The Shāhbandar of Śrīvara appears to be identical with the large village of Shādīpaur which is opposite to the junction of the Vitastā and the Sindhu. Shādīpaur appears to be an abbreviation of Shāhāb-ud-dīn-pūr, but when and why it got the name of Shāhband or Shāh-bānγa is not clear.

3 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has Kār svaru, while the other has Kār svaru. The readings in the MS. are manifestly incorrect, but if the mistakes are corrected, they would mean, who were his companions and friends in his travels in India. The reading in the lith. ed. is more correct, but I cannot find any meaning of svaru.

Śrīvara describes at some length (I, lines 336-387) the various pleasant journeys of the Sultán and his son through the flower-adorned country, with musical and other entertainments and calls the canto, which is the fourth in his first tarango, the ñaśñakoṣa, i.e., the description of the flower.
At last Háji Khán contracted dysentery owing to constant drinking, and there was great confusion in the government. The carnival. Then he adds another (the fifth) canto (I, lines 387–494), which he calls the अम्सरोपयाञ्जायक, in the course of which he describes the Sulṭān’s visit to the Karamarasas, now called the Kaonsar Nag a mountain lake two miles long situated at the foot of the highest of the three snowy peaks (15523 feet) and which is connected with the Indian deluge story, and the peak to which Viṣṇu in his fish auṭāra had bound the ship (nau) into which Durgā had converted herself to save the seeds of the beans from destruction (see Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 393). Then he has another canto (the sixth), which he calls the विज्ञापत्सवितवर्षिणि, which runs from line 495 to line 527. In this he first describes the excavation of the new lake called the Jainaras near Padmapura, now called Pāmpūr, the chief place of the Vihi pargana, and the erection of a palace on its bank; and then describes the different presents sent to the Sulṭān by various princes; and finally the advent of artists and artisans who introduced various beautiful kinds of silk weaving. He next mentions the arrival of a राजसम्राष्ट्रिकर्म यवन, a Yavana rope-dancer (l. 528). After all this prosperity and advance came a period of adversity, line 534 et seq. There was hail, a comet made its appearance and continued to shine for two months, then the dogs were always whining, and there were eclipses of the sun and the moon both in the course of a fortnight. Then came the news (l. 576) of the death of his nephew, Śri Kyāmdena, lord of Sindhu, who was like a son to him, and who was killed in battle by Ebbarāhima. Śri Kyāmdena may be Ekrān-ud-din and Ebbarāhima was certainly Ibrāhīm; but I have not been able to find out who they were. According to Śrīvara (I, l. 581) Zain-ul-ābidīn was at this time remembering his departed friends, servants, and companions whom he loved like his own life, he knew himself like an elephant who had gone astray from the herd (केतीसान्ता जातवनां अस्तान् जयसीम प्रायधस्तान् क्षरस् | स्वामिन्दिवधाक युष्मालिव दिमयुं ;). 1

1 Firishtah’s account is somewhat different. He says the Sulṭān was displeased with Háji Khán on account of the latter’s excessive drinking, and his not listening to the Sulṭān’s admonitions; and the Sulṭān himself began to suffer from dysentery; and as the Sulṭān was displeased with Háji Khán, the work of government remained unattended to. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 43), however, agrees with the Tabaqat, and says that Háji Khán and not the Sulṭān “was seized with a bloody flux” i.e., had an attack of dysentery. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India, however, follow Firishtah. The former says, “The king was seized with dysentery, and the latter more vaguely, “the king fell sick”. A reference to Śrīvara (I, l. 582) shows distinctly that the Tabaqat and not Firishtah is correct. It is said there that चारावानया राजाः | मारकुलुरुपरिवारवान। The Sulṭān’s admonitions are given in lines 585–599. In line 600 it is said that Háji Khán promised not to drink again
1 amirs secretly sent for Ādam Khān. He came according to their suggestion; and saw the Sultān. The latter was displeased at his coming, and was annoyed with the amirs. In the end the brothers mutually agreed, and Ādam Khān was honoured. After some time, the weakness of old age overwhelmed the Sultān, and besides that he became ill. The amirs and the vazirs all in concert submitted to him that if the duties of the government be entrusted to one of the Sultānzādas, this would be the cause of peace and good government in the country. The Sultān did not show any favour to this suggestion, and did not select any of his sons for the duties of the sultānat. Mischief-makers then intervened, and held various meetings. Bahrām Khān acting treacherously and speaking in a mischief-making way made the two grown-up brothers hostile to each other. Ādam Khān, becoming suspicious, went and took up his residence in Qub-ud-dinpūr. When the Sultān became extremely feeble, the amirs taking precautions against all disturbances did not allow his sons to come and enquire about his health; and sometimes they seated the Sultān with some trouble at an elevated spot; and had drums except by his father’s orders; but going back to his own house he continued to drink (see l. 603).

1 See Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, I, line 604 मनिष्कु। शादमणासात्त्वनदिवेदभी-विदिषारत्।

2 There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have नामदेव नोदेव नोदेव; while the other MS. has नामदेव नोदेव नोदेव Firishtah in the corresponding passage says सल्तना नाम तत्त्वानेका साथी। Śrīvara in I, line 606, says प्रज्ञे ज्ञाता हतोपशुक्लो नाथोवसर।

3 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have बैबमारी बैबमारी बैबमारी। This appears to me somewhat imperfect.

4 This is somewhat differently stated by Śrīvara in I, lines 626-27: नक्षत्रभवन स्वश्री श्रामभादुशाधिन। राजसुब्रात्रि देशो राजसुब्रात्रि दुनियावर। एकसेव निश्चरा राजगि निश्चरा निश्चरा निश्चरा निश्चराब्धिन। This appears to me somewhat imperfect.

5 Śrīvara in I, lines 630-33, says that the Sultān pointed out the bad qualities of his sons, and declared that he would not bestow the kingdom on any of them; but गँगे सीधि गँगे यस्ता राजासोपतिति मे मतम्, i.e., after my death let him who has the strength get it.

6 One MS. has नफात मेजः but the other and the Lith. ed. have नफात।

7 This is mentioned by Śrīvara in I, lines 685-689.

8 One MS. omits तन्न by mistake.
beaten to inform the people that the Sultan had recovered. By this plan they managed to keep the country on its feet (i.e., safe from disturbances). At last when the Sultan's illness became very serious, and he remained unconscious for a whole day and night, one night 1 Adam Khan came alone from Quṭb-ud-dinpur to see him, and left his army outside the city, so that it may keep watch on Hajji Khan and other enemies. On that night Hasan Kachhi, who was one of the great amirs, had taken the promise of allegiance to Hajji Khan from the amirs in the audience hall of the Sultan. On the following day the amirs got Adam Khan out of Kashmir by some plan; and summoned Hajji Khan with great promptitude. 2 Hajji Khan came in compliance of the summons of the amirs, and took possession of all the horses in the Sultan's stables, and a large army collected round him; but on account of apprehensions of disturbances and the treachery of his enemy, 3 he did not go inside the palace.

When Adam Khan heard this news he became frightened; and retired to Hindustan by way of Nāwil. Many of his retainers

---

1 Firishtah's account is slightly different. According to him Adam Khan left his soldiers in the environs of the city and he himself passed the night in the audience chamber of the Sultan. Hasan Khan Kachhi also took the promise of allegiance to Hajji Khan from the amirs that same night in the audience chamber. The account of the behaviour of the three princes and of their movements, which agrees generally with that in the text, is given by Śrivara, I, line 717 et seq. Hasan Kachhi is described in line 724 as भाग्यवतिकान्त: or Hasan, the treasurer. He is also described as लालोधी मोहत्य गरान, i.e., deceiving others blinded by his selfishness. Adam Khan is said to have gone to Quṭb-ud-dinpur (I, l. 725).

2 This is also mentioned by Śrivara, I, line 728. I do not understand why so much importance was attached to the possession of the horses.

3 Śrivara, I, line 731, says he was unable to go to see his father for fear of treachery although he was anxious to do so (मोतकोपि हरिचश्च). Zain-ull-ʿabidin died later इदमाल शेषमामस प्रवासी, i.e., at midday on the 12th lunar day in the month of Jyaiśtha (I, l. 744).

4 I cannot find anything about this place. It is written like راول in one MS. and راول in the other and راول in the lith. ed. Firishtah has Bāramūlā the well-known pass. M. Hidayat Ḥossain has adopted راول in the text-edition.
separated from him. 1 Zain Badr, who was one of the trusted chiefs of Ḥājī Khān, hastened in pursuit of him. Ādam Khān fought bravely, and having slain many of his near relations escaped. Ḥasan Khān, son of Ḥājī Khān, who was at 2 Punch, came to his father; and the affairs of Ḥājī Khān were splendidly arranged.

The Sultān (i.e., Zain-ul-ʿābidin) passed away from the world. 3 The period of his rule was 52 years.

AN ACCOUNT OF 4 Sultān Ḥaidar Shāh, son of Sultān Zain-ul-ʿābidin, who had the name of Ḥājī Khān.

Three days after his father’s (death) Ḥājī Khān took the latter’s place and assumed the title of Sultān Ḥaidar; and having ascended the throne in the manner of his father at 5 Sikandarpūr, which is

---

1 I cannot find anything about him also. The name is written as ابن بدر in the MS. and ابن بدر in the lith. ed. Firishtah has ابن بدر Zain Lārak. He is not mentioned by Col. Briggs or Rodgers or in the Cambridge History of India. In the text-edition ابن بدر has been adopted.

2 See page 667, note 5. It will be seen there that the name of the place was Parnota. It will be seen also from Śrīvara, I, line 607, that one of Ḥājī Khān’s sons hearing of the arrival of his uncle (i.e., Ādam Khān), wishing to fight with him left the capital, and went to Parnota.

3 Nīgān-ud-din does not mention the date and year of Zain-ul-ʿābidin’s death. According to Firishtah he died at the end of 877 A.H., in his 69th year. Col. Briggs has 877 A.H., 1742 A.D. The last-mentioned year is of course wrong, the figures having been transposed and 1472 being made into 1742. The Cambridge History of India, page 284, says Zain-ul-ʿābidin died in November or December 1470. In this it follows Haig (J.R.A.S., 1918, p. 456). Śrīvara, I, line 744, says that the Sultān in धादाल ज्यातिम्यां ज्यातिम्यां ज्यातिम्यां ज्यातिम्यां The month of Jyaistha corresponds with June, July and not with November or December. It appears also from Śrīvara, II, line 4, that Ḥājī Khān assumed the sovereignty on the 1st day of the 2nd lunar fortnight of Jyaistha, (वेदर-सतति) It appears also, that, according to Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 107) the coins of Ḥaidar bear the year 874 A.H., so we are as much in the dark as ever.

4 Śrīvara in line 4 of the 2nd tarahga of his Rājatarangini says चय रेदर-माणां आपनबुठ्ठिकापणे: ज्यादातपशोधितमें बालसिद्धिपदिते |

5 Neither Sikandarpūr nor Naushar appears to be mentioned in Rājatarangini; but “Nau Shahr” is mentioned in the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, page 483, as being on the route by which Ḥaidar Dughlat entered Kashmir.
famous as Naushahr he gave away to deserving men the gold which was scattered over him. His brother Bahram Khan and his son Hasan Khan placed the crown of the empire on his head; and continued to serve him.

Couplet:

When death casts away the crown from one head,
The sky (providence) places it on another’s head.

He allotted the country of Kamraj as the jagir of Hasan Khan; and made him the Amir-ul-umara and his heir and successor. He allotted Nagam as the jagir of Bahram Khan. He permitted the Rajas of the different districts, who had come to offer condolence on the death of the late Sultan, and congratulations to the new Sultan on his accession, to return to their territories after bestowing on them horses and robes of honour. He also bestowed on most of the amirs jewelled swords and robes.

He had innate generosity, but was always drunk, and as he had a vindictive temperament, most of the amirs, being aggrieved with him, went away to their jagirs. As he was careless about the state of the kingdom, the vazirs perpetrated various acts of oppression on the ra’iyats. He distinguished a barber of the name of Boli by proximating him to his person; and acted according to what he said to him. The barber took bribes from men, and turned the Sultan’s disposition.

1 Naamah in the text-edition.
2 See line 7 of the 2nd taraunga of the Rājataraṅga of Śrīvara where it is said that his younger brother and his son standing before the Sultan were like Sūkra and Bhāsapatī shining in front of the moon.
3 The allotment of Kamraj as the jagir of Hasan Khan does not appear to be mentioned by Śrīvara; but he says (l. 10 of the 2nd taraunga) Vaśyā-maṇḍalā
dhāntaḥ 
Nāgrām or Nāigrāma was a district of considerable extent in southern part of Mañavārājya.
4 The name is Boli in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is rather difficult to decipher it in the other MS.; and it is Boli in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. He is mentioned repeatedly by Śrīvara in the 2nd taraunga, see lines 35, 47, etc.), but I cannot find his name. He is called Lūlū by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 107) and Lūlū in the Cambridge History of India, p. 284.

1 Boli in the text-edition.
against anyone with whom he happened to be on bad terms. 1 Ḥasan Kachhī, who before all others had endeavoured to secure the allegiance of the amīrs to the Sultān, was put to death on the accusation of the barber Bōlī.

Before this 2 Ādam Kḥān had collected a large army, and had arrived in the country of Jammū in order to fight the Sultān. When the news of the murder of the amīrs reached him, he turned back and went to Jammū. He then went to fight some Mughals, who had come to that neighbourhood to aid and reinforce the troops of Mānik Dēv Rāja of Jammū, was struck by an arrow in the mouth and died of that wound. 3 The Sultān was sorrowful on hearing of his death, and ordered that his dead body might be brought from the battlefield, and buried near that of his father.

At that time owing to his (excessive and) continual drinking several serious diseases attacked the Sultān. 4 The amīrs conspired secretly with Bahrām Kḥān, and wanted to place him on the throne. When this news reached 5 Ḥasan Kḥān, who had conquered many

1 The name is بركجی Bar Kachhī in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and is rather indistinct in the other MS. Firistah lith. ed. has Ḥasan Khan Kachhī. He was called Ḥasan Kachhī before this in the Ṭabaqāt. And Ḥasan Koṣṭa or Ḥasan the treasurer by Śrīvara. As to his murder see line 79 of the 2nd taraṅga of Śrīvara’s Rājatarāṅgīṇī.

2 See line 107 of the 2nd taraṅga of the Rājatarāṅgīṇī of Śrīvara where the Rāja of Jammu or Madrāmaṇḍala is called Maṇikya Deva and the Mughals are called the Turuqkas. Firistah agrees, but he calls the Rāja Malik Mulk or Malik Dēv. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives his name.

3 See line 110 of the 2nd taraṅga of Śrīvara’s Rājatarāṅgīṇī, where however the dead body is said to have been buried near that of his mother (सद्योचन्त-भाषी अन्वीयधियो नाथाः) ।

4 I cannot find the mention of any actual conspiracy of the amīrs or ministers to place Bahrām Kḥān on the throne in Śrīvara’s Rājatarāṅgīṇī. It is only said in line 160 of the 2nd taraṅga ताब्दुब शास्त्र-शाली दामिश्वाल: । खाकानमविन्याशो शाला विश्व रत्न ।

5 Firistah, who is followed by Col. Briggs and Rodgers, says that it was Fath Kḥān, son of Ādam Kḥān who was making these conquests, but the Cambridge History of India, page 284, agrees with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that it was Ḥasan Kḥān the Sultān’s son who was raiding the Punjab. According to Śrīvara, line 144 of the 2nd taraṅga, he (i.e., Ḥaidar Shāh) sent his son
fortresses in India, and had acquired much booty; he with his victorious army returned to Kashmir by forced marches. As his return was without (the Sultan’s) permission, interested and malicious persons having said words, (as if) from his side, turned the disposition of Sultan Haidar (from him). The latter being annoyed with him did not allow him to make his qurnish; and none of his services was accepted.

2 One day the Sultan climbed to the polished terrace roof of a palace and occupied himself in drinking. In his drunken condition his foot slipped, and he fell down and died.

3 The period of his sovereignty was one year and two months.

4 An account of Sultan Hasan, son of Haji Khan Haidar Shahr.

He ascended the throne sixteen days after the death of his father, with an army outside the kingdom for a (conquering expedition). Then in line 159 it is said करदीरकत्वानां च शान्तास्वरूपितालमः बच्चवेचरमधानार्यमीराममोक्खः। अ. e., having made many kings his tributaries, and having stayed for six months, he became anxious to return to Kashmir at the end of the month of Caitra, and then in line 162 he goes on to say that the wicked ministers shrivelled up on Hasan Khan’s arrival, as lotuses are shrivelled up on the rising of the full-moon.

1 The Sultan’s behaviour towards his son as described by Srivara Paṃḍita cannot be clearly understood. He was apparently afraid of Bahrām Khan, and so, as is said in line 166, he gave his son, who had returned from his conquering expedition merely a sight of himself याचारमार्थुवाथ ददी दशेनमात्स्यर्थं and in the next line it is said that he was certainly afraid of Bahrām Khan, otherwise how was it that he did not honour his son with giving him robes of honour नृण खानांभोजोस्चुऽसनालं चौम्याद रथं। परिभाषादितिकारं नृत्तेवक्षेत्रायद्वन्द्वेऽ। At the same time he was secretly very angry with Bahrām Khan like the Sami tree with the fire concealed in it, fearing that the latter might injure the son. ब्रह्मानास्वाधनं नृण अश्वस्वरूपित रामिस्त। च सत्त्वदनकष्टि शक्तिः। ।

2 The scene and the nature of the accident and subsequent treatment are described by Srivara in lines 160–73 of the end tarāṅga.

3 Neither the Tabaqāt nor Firishta gives any indication of the date of Haidar Shahr’s death, nor does Srivara; but seeing that the death of Sultan Zain-ul-‘abidin occurred in the month of Jyaṅgtha, and Haidar Shahr reigned for one year and two months, his death very probably took place in the month of Srīvara in the year 878 A.H. or 1473 A.D.

4 The heading is incorrect in both MSS. One gives the name as Sultan Husain, the other omits the name altogether. I have adopted the heading in the lith. ed.
by the exertion of 1 Aḥmad Aswad. On the 10th day (after his accession) he imprisoned some people about whom he had suspicion. He 2 went away from Sikandarpūr to Naushahr, and took up his residence there. He gave away the treasures of his grandfather and uncle to (deserving) people; conferred the title of Malik Aḥmad on Aḥmad Aswad; and 3 entrusted the administration of the affairs to him; and made his son named Naurūz Aswad his chamberlain.

Bahrām Khān came out of Kashmir with his son; and went away towards Hindūstān. All his soldiers separated from him; and all his affairs will be narrated later. 4 The Sultān again revived all the rules and regulations of Sultan Zain-ul-ābidin which had been abolished in the time of Sultān Haidar; and directed that all affairs should be carried out in conformity with them. At this time, some people, who wanted to create disturbances, went to Bahrām Khān; and incited him to declare war against the Sultān. The amirs also wrote letters to him and summoned him. Bahrām Khān returning from

1 The name is written as احمد الابن in the MSS., and احمد ابن in the lith. ed. It is in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Ahmad Ahoo in Col. Briggs’ History (vol. IV, p. 477). Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 107) and the Cambridge History of India, page 286, call him Ahmad Aswad; and Rodgers has (the black) in brackets after Aswad. احمد آشور has been adopted in the text-edition. Sūrvara in the 2nd taraṅga of his Rāja-taraṅgī calls him जाश्मदपुरक in line 178, and बानुआश्मदपुरक in line 197. I cannot make out how Āyukta could be transformed into Aswad or vice versa. Aswad besides ‘black’ means ‘powerful’, ‘illustrious’. Sūrvara describes the contention between Ḥasan Khān and Bahrām Khān about the succession; and then after it had been decided in favour of the former, describes the burial of Haidar Shāh (lines 211 et seq. in the 2nd taraṅga). This chapter he calls एकतीतदर्ष एकतिष्ठतायांकामस्य

2 Sūrvara in line 7 of the 3rd taraṅga says—the Sultān left चक्रवर्तिणि, and went to his विषाणाशासनमिति जीतनभय. Then he describes the coronation ceremonies, which were highly Hindu in their character, and in which जाश्मदपुर्ख विषय नित्यक्रियाणि: हृदयमन्युबत्तेऽः (l. 9); then there was दुर्गमभूमि in the जघन्य (line 12).

3 This is mentioned by Sūrvara in line 23; and the appointment of Aḥmad Aswad’s son भैरवना in the दरप्रार्थित्य (line 25).

4 See Sūrvara, line 33 in the 3rd taraṅga, where he says विशेषाश्रमाचार प्रारंभेतमथले ।
the district of 1 Karmā, arrived, after traversing the hills in the district of Karmā. The Sultan had at this time gone to 2 Walipūr on a pleasure trip. On hearing the news, he went to Suyyāpūr in order to fight with him. 3 Some people tried to persuade the Sultan to go away in the direction of India; but Malik Ahmad Aswād inciting him to fight, did not allow that he should retire towards India. The Sultan approved of the Malik’s opinion and sent 4 Malik Tāj Bhat with a large army against Bahrām Khan. The latter had hoped that

1 The name is كرما Karmā in one MS. and looks like كرما Karma in the other. It is كر، which cannot be clearly deciphered, in the lith. ed. Firishta’s ed. has كرمار Karmar. The text-edition has كرما Kamraj. Śrīvara in line 41 says راجامنارا: ‘سفرا’ کرما Kamraj, which means that he wanted to seize Kamarajya. He arrived at Kamarajypura from Karnaḥbhyantara after crossing the hills. This is clear and agrees with the Tabaqat except that we cannot find what Karnaḥbhyantara means. Ordinarily it would mean from the interior of Karna, but I cannot find any locality of the name of Karna. Now taking the European authorities I find Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 477) says Beiram Khan came by the route of Kurmar; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 108) says he came “by way of the mountains to Kamrāj”; while the Cambridge History of India, page 285, says he “took refuge in the hills of Kama to the west of Kamraj”, and he apparently came from there. I cannot find anything about the Kama hills; and the names do not agree with that in the Persian chronicles or in Śrīvara’s work.

2 It appears from line 42 of the 3rd tarānga of Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini that Ḥasan was at that time at Avantipura and he returned from there on hearing the news of the return of Bahrām. This probably indicates the identity of Avantipura now called Vantipur on the Fitastā, which was in old times probably the most important place in the district of Holada, with Walipūr. Ḥasan’s return to Suyapūra is also mentioned in line 43. دیناپور Dinapur in the text-edition.

3 See Śrīvara, line 48, from which it appears that some of the leaders of the ministers said, تبتن Kolamāmasyāṁśīヴァला विलक्तम, though the sentence appears to be somewhat incomplete.

4 The name is rather indistinct in one MS., but it is ملک تاج Bhat in the other. The lith. ed. has ملک تاج Bhat. Firishta has only ملک تاج Bhat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Mullik Taj Bhut. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the commander of Ḥasan’s army. Śrīvara in line 54 has سکھیپंडरायाकोशभयाहित Dānihā from which it appears that Tāj Bhatta or Tāj Bhat was the name of one of the commanders.
the Sultan's troops would come over to him; but in the end the contrary happened. There was a severe battle in a village of the name of Dūlāpūr; and Bahām Khan was defeated and fled, and came to the village of Zainagir. The Sultan's troops hastened in pursuit of him and seized him. An arrow struck him on the face, and all his equipage and other things having been plundered, he was brought before the Sultan in a wretched condition. The Sultan ordered that both he and his son might be put into prison. After a time a blinding needle was drawn across his eyes, and after remaining in prison for three years, he passed away from the world.

Sultan Hasan (at this time) had Zain Badr, who had been the vazir of Sultan Zain-ul-Abidin and the rival of Malick Ahmad Aswad.

1 The name is Lūlū, in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is in the other. Firishta lith. ed. has Torok Pūr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Lookoopoor. The reading in the first MS. is adopted in the text-edition. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the place. Śrivara in line 55 ताब्रिह्माण्डक्ष मसूर दुलापुरानां! Dulapura is so near Tulapūr the name in Firishta, that I have no doubt it is the correct name of the place where the battle took place, though I cannot find out anything about it. It may be that Lūlū is a corrupt form of Lōlua, the Kashmiri name of the pargana Lōlaš (see Stein, Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 487).

2 The name of the place is Zainkar in both MSS. and Ratankara in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. has Marhanapūr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Zeinpoor. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India furnishes any further light on the matter. Śrivara in line 59 says बश जैनमिरि यावद यो तम्भकुरः from which it would appear that he came to Jainagiri dismayed with the result of the battle. Jainagiri or the pargana of Zainagir appears to comprise "the fertile Karēwa tract between the Volur and the left bank of the Pöhur River". (Stein, Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 487).

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have سل three years. Firishta lith. ed., however, has روز 3 three days and Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India following him have three days also. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 108) says, "He remained in prison for three years after this and then died."
The Tabaqat, however, appears to be right, for Śrivara in line 125 says रत्स बत्तकार ताब्रिह्माण्डक्षवाक | निकसिध्वानः जैनमिरिश्च ययस् ययस् i.e., there suffering great agonies for three years, and being reduced to a skeleton from his privations he died.

4 This is also mentioned by Firishta, almost in the same word as the Tabaqat, but is not mentioned by Col. Briggs. It is mentioned by Rodgers,
and who had exerted himself in the matter of the blinding of Bahrām Khān, and whom Sultān Zain-ul-ʿābidin had on many occasions, owing to being annoyed with him, wanted to put to death, but had not been able to do so, seized. And it so happened that on the very day on which Bahrām Khān was deprived of his eye-sight, the needle was drawn across Zain Badr's eyes; and he also died in prison after three years.

Couplet:

Who'er in some one's eyes put the thorn of tyranny,
It behoved that his own eyes were soon destroyed.

1 Malik Ahmad having now become the vazir with full authority, sent Malik Yārī Bhat, who was his favourite with a large

who says that he was blinded with the same needle with which Bahrām Khān had just before been blinded. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matter. It is mentioned by Śrīvara in lines 133 et seq. at some length and the particulars appear to agree with those in the Tabaqāt, but the name of the man does not agree with that given in the Tabaqāt or by Firishtah. M. Hidayat ʿHosain has adopted ʿīsīn Bādhr in the text-edition, but it was ʿīsīn Bādhr earlier on p. 678.

1 The MSS. and the lith. ed. are rather obscure, and it is not quite clear whether Malik Yārī reinforced the Raja of Jammū or vice versa; and which of them invaded the Punjāb. Firishtah appears to say that Malik Yārī reinforced the army of the Rāja of Jammū who led the invasion of the Punjāb; and he looted the country, and devastated the city of Siālkot. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) says that the invasion was undertaken at the instigation of the Raja of Jammoo, called Ajeet Dew, and that the latter took the command of the allied army, that he was defeated by Tatar Khan, who penetrated into Jammoo and sacked the town of Siālkote. He calls the commander of the Kashmir army Mullik Taj Bhut. Rodgers calls him Malik Bārī Bhut, and says he was sent to assist the Rājāh of Jammū against Tātār Khān, who was harassing the borders of Kashmir; and that they plundered some part of the Punjāb, and destroyed the town of Siālkot. The Cambridge History of India, page 285, says that Hasan Shāh “sent an expedition under Malik Yārī Bhat, to co-operate with the troops of the Raja of Jammū in ravaging the northern districts of the Punjāb, where Tātār Khan Lodi represented the military oligarchy over which his cousin Buhālī presided at Dehli. The town of Siālkot was sacked, and Malik Yārī Bhat returned with as much plunder as enabled him to form a faction of his own.” It does not say whether the Rājā of Jammū commanded or even accompanied the troops.

It will appear from the above, that there is great deal of discrepancy about the facts of this expedition. I am afraid Śrīvara's account does not clear it
army in the direction of the territory of Delhi by way of Rājauri; and 'Ajab Dēō the Rāja of Jammū came and met him, and reinforced him with an immense army. Malik Yārī advanced and fought with Tātār Khān, who was the governor, on behalf of the Bādshāh of Delhi, of the foot-hills of the Punjāb, and plundered the whole of his territory; and devastated the town of Sīlktūt.

1 The Sulta'n had a son by Ḥayāt Khatūn, who was a descendant of the Saiyids. The Sulta'n gave him the name of Muḥammad and entrusted him for his education to Malik Yārī Bhat. His 2 second son was named Husain; and was entrusted to Malik Nūr, son of Malik Aḥmad, so that he might bring him up. Some enmity having occurred between Malik Aḥmad and Malik Yārī Bhat, they tried to destroy each other, and differences having also come about among the amīrs, there were 3 great battles, till one night (the amīrs?) collected their men, and getting into the palace of Sulta'n created

up. It appears that although Ahmad Aswad or Ahmad Ahmādulketa had at first befriended Yārī Bhat (Tājī Bhaṭṭā), he and his sons were now jealous of him (l. 310 of the 3rd taraṅga). He insinuated that it was no good obtaining the kingdom, if the outskirts were being raided by the enemies (l. 314). Tājī Bhaṭṭā then prayed that he might be entrusted with an army to lead an expedition (line 315). He was accordingly provided with it. All the kings who were in the Madramāṣṭala (Jammu) headed by Atyābha Deva ('Ajab or Ajeet Dēō) abandoned Tātār Khān and joined him (lines 319, 320). He caused much damage (चपड़म) in Tātār Khān's country, burning down mosques built by the Khān in गुगुल कोटान्डी i.e., in Sialkot, etc. (l. 321). Then he quickly returned (line 325). From this it would appear that the expedition owed its origin to a political intrigue arising out of the jealousy of the minister, and more specially of his sons against Tājī Bhaṭṭā.

1 2 3 in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for 2 3 4.

1 Compare line 222 in the 3rd taraṅga of Śrīvara's Rājataraṅgiṇī, which is

Her son was named Muḥammad Khān (l. 226), and was made over to Tājī Bhaṭṭā for the purpose of being looked after (रचवास).

2 This is mentioned in lines 328-329 of the 3rd taraṅga, where it is said, somewhat curiously, that he was for being suckled or supplied with milk entrusted to Malik Nauroz पयोद्धामाय मल्यनकोविद्यम पदार्थम.--

3 One MS. omits 2 3 4. Firistiṭṭhā agrees generally as to these troubles. Both Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India note that the two factions were constantly quarrelling with each other.
various disturbances, and set fire to the palace; and there was very
great trouble in the work of the government. The Sultan imprisoned
Malik Ahmad Aswad and a number of his relatives, and his
property was given up to be plundered, and he died in prison.

The Sultan sent for Saiyid Nāṣir, who had been highly esteemed
by Sultan Zain-ul-ʿābidīn, who had in his assembly accorded him
precedents even before himself, but who had later been banished from
Kashmir, and had gone to the territory of Dehlī. Saiyid Nāṣir
died when he arrived near the valley of the Pir Punjāl. Then (the
Sultan sent for Saiyid Ḥasan, who was the son of Saiyid Nāṣir,
and was the father of Ḥayāt Khāṭūn from Dehlī, and made over the
reins of authority to his hands. The Saiyid turned the mind of the
Sultan from the Kashmirī amīr; and a large number of the chief
men of the state were put to death at his instance and by
his endeavours. Malik Yārī was put into prison. The other nobles
fled out of fear, and went to different places. 2 Jahāṅgīr Mākri, who
was a great nobleman fled to the fortress of Lōharkōt. After some
time, the Sultan was attacked by a 3 severe form of diarrhoea, and
he became extremely weak. He made a will that as my sons are too
young, Yūsuf Khān, son of Bahrām Khān who is in prison, or Fath
Khān, son of Ādām Khān, who is in the country of 4 Ḥaswās be

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have دمست اندارزیہ, while the other MS. has
دمست درازیہ; the latter is adopted in the text-edition.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 285, describes him, by mistake,
2 as the chief of the Mākū clan. In the text-edition it is جهانگیر بناکری
instead of جهانگیر ماقروی.

3 Firishtah says از کئیت جماع بسیار مرض اسپتال طاری شدة , where the word
بسر is translated by Rodgers (J.A.S.B.,
vol. LIV, p. 108) as "over uxoriousness", and by the Cambridge History of
India, page 285, more correctly, I think, as debauchery.

4 The name of the place is خلوس Ḥaswās, in one MS.; and looks like خلوس
in the other and in the lith. ed. It is خسوس in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and is
(vol. IV, p. 479) does not mention the place, but he says that Hussun directed
that either Yooseof Khan or Futteh Khan should succeed him. The Cambridge
History of India does not mention any testamentary direction by Hasan Shāh.
The name of the place does not appear to be mentioned by Śrivara who
describes the king’s illness in somewhat poetic language without specifying any
particular disease from which he suffered (line 541 et seq.).
placed on the throne; and Muḥammad Khān should be declared as the next heir. Saiyid Ḥasan outwardly accepted this. The Sultān died of the illness from which he was suffering.

1 The period of his reign is not known.

2 An account of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, son of Sultān Ḥasan Shāh.

Muḥammad Khān was aged seven years, when he attained to sovereignty by the exertions of Saiyid Ḥasan. 3 On that day all articles of gold and silver, and arms, and valuable stuffs, and viands, etc., were placed before him. He did not pay any attention to any of these things, but took up a bow. Those who were present inferred from this act of his that he would be a great and brave man, and said that he would endeavour to rule wisely and well.

The power of the Saiyids attained to such a height, that they 4 did not permit any of the amīrs and vazīrs to go near the Sultān. The Kashmirīs, being much annoyed at this, 5 one night, in concert with Parasrām, Rāja of Jammū, who for fear of Tātār Khān had taken shelter in Kashmir (i.e., Srinagar) treacherously slew Saiyid Ḥasan with thirty of the chief Saiyids in the garden at Nau Shahr. They

1 According to Śrīvara he reigned for twelve years and five days (l. 560). According to the Cambridge History of India, page 698, his reign extended to eighteen years from 876 a.h., 1472 a.d. to 894 a.h., 1489 a.d. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 80) is inclined to believe that he must have reigned for about 19 years, but as Heidur, his father, did not die till 878 a.h., and he died in 891 a.h., the period of his reign could not be more than 13 years in any case.

2 There are slight differences in the heading. I have taken that in one of the MSS. The other MS. has Ḥusain instead of Ḥasan as the name of the preceding Sultān, and omits the word Shāh after the name. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MS. but omits the word Shāh after Sultān Ḥasan.

3 This is mentioned by Firīshthāb and by Col. Briggs and Rodgers. Śrīvara (4th taraṅga, lines 4, 5) says something slightly different नन्ददेव नेवलनाथाले जानिता वजयदासारं; तत्तर भोजवियारं पूर्व श्रावंपत्तकरं; राजदेव सदा युग्म भविता मण्डलारं; हत्या श्रकुमारवि; कान्यमुद्राविचक्षिताित;।

4 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have हीरकेक श्रामरा ज रोज़ा नी यदान्यम्। It appears to me that the word यो should be inserted after रोज़ा; and I have done this. Firīshthāb lith. ed. has यो after रोज़ा।

5 The attack on and the slaughter of the Saiyids is described by Śrīvara n lines 37–49 of the 4th taraṅga of his Rājatarāṅgini.
then crossed the river Bihut (Jhelum), and broke down the bridge; and collecting their men sat down on the other side of the river. Saiyid Muhammad, son of Saiyid Hasan, who was the maternal uncle of the Sultan, collected his men and took up his quarters in the palace in order to guard him.

One of these nights, when a great disturbance was going on, and every one was in fear and distress, Abd Zinā wanted that he would take away Yūsuf Khān, son of Bahram Khān, who was in prison. But one of the Saiyid amirs of the name of ‘Ali Khān, becoming acquainted with the plan, slew Yūsuf Khān, and he also slew Bāji Bhat, who was making lamentations at the murder of Yūsuf Khān. Yūsuf Khān’s mother who was called Sān Dēvi, who from the time when she had become a widow, did not eat more than three mouthfuls of barley meal when breaking her fast, kept watch for three days in her house over the coffin of her son; and after it had been buried, had a chamber built for herself near his mausoleum, and lived there till the time when she passed away.

In short Saiyid ‘Ali Khān and the other Saiyids collected their retainers and sat down on the bank of the river in order to fight their enemies. They spent much money and collected an immense army. The people of Kashmir came from all directions in a large

---

1 The name looks like عیدنی زینا and عیدنی اما in the MSS. and عیدنی اما in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. has عبد زینا. In the text-edition it is عیدنی زینا. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name. According to Srīvara, Yūsuf Khān was killed by a man of the name of ‘Ali Khān, when he was being taken away by some of his partisans who are described as वराकानकादि (the exact meaning of which I cannot make out), who had released him from the prison (see lines 77–79 of the 4th tārāṅga).

2 The name is written as बाजी हेत and बाजी हेत in the MSS. and बाजी हेत in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. has श्रीवरा नाम. Srīvara calls him पाजावह (4th tārāṅga, l. 83). It is माजी हेत in the text-edition.

3 The name is written as देबो सान सान देबो in the MSS. and सान देबो in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. has संतान देबो. Srīvara has सन्तान देबो (l. 88 of the 4th tārāṅga). The facts of her living on गाव and her living नामक (without life) and in मार्गे (place of cremation) are also mentioned. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted सान देबो in the text-edition.
body and joined the latter. Skirmishes took place with arrows and muskets; and every day large numbers were slain on both sides. Robbers came into the city openly and plundered and looted. The Saiyids dug a trench round the city so that they might be safe from the robbers. They also razed to the ground the houses of their enemies in the city and the villages wherever they might be; and having plundered their property and cattle, did not, because of great pride, guard their own property. At this time, 1Jahängir Mākri, who was at Loharkōt, came to the capital at the summons of the Kashmīri party, i.e., those opposed to the Saiyids. Although the Saiyids made overtures of peace to him he did not agree. One day Dāūd the son of Jahāngīr Mākri and 2Saifī and Ankī crossed the bridge and fought with the Saiyids. Dāūd and most of his companions (they are called Mukhālisān i.e., enemies of the Saiyids) were killed. The Saiyids became 3joyful, and beat drums and made minarets of the heads of their enemies. On another day the Saiyids went to cross the bridge. The enemies met them and there was a great fight near the middle of the bridge. Then the bridge 4broke down, and many people of the two parties were drowned in the river.

---

1 The invitation to Jahāngīr (जोगांगिर सिंह) is described in lines 137–42 of the 4th taraṅga; and his arrival by प्रचारतान्काम in line 145. The overtures of the Saiyids to him are mentioned in lines 147–154 and Jahāngīr’s reply in 155–162. The Saiyids were angry on receiving the reply; and prepared for war (lines 163–165). Then भारतरोजराजाभक्षक cross the bridge and came to the capital to fight with the Saiyids (line 166).

2 The names appear to be सिक्की and अकरी in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of the ठाकुवारतान्काम और अकरी। In the lith. ed. of Firistaḥ there is only one name येश आकरी। Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers have any of the names mentioned in the ठाकुवारतान्क or in Firistaḥ. In the text-edition the name is सिक्की। Dāūd is called दाओड़, and his death is mentioned in line 178 of the 4th taraṅga.

3 I cannot find any mention of minarets being made of the heads of the slain but in line 190 it is said that the corpses were placed on the road इस्तम- मकान द्वारा। Dāūd’s head was also cut off and placed राजपतारा (l. 187). The Saiyids also made विजयोकेन वादः (l. 193).

4 The breaking down of the bridge and the falling of राजपतारा: टानलकुः that day in the Vītastā is mentioned in line 196 of the 4th taraṅga.
After that the Sayyids wrote letters to Tātār Khān, the governor of the Punjāb, and asked him to come to their help. He sent a large army to help them. When his army arrived in the neighbourhood of Bhimbar, the Rāja of the place named Hans fought with them, and slew their best men. The enemies (of the Sayyids) on hearing this news made great rejoicings, and for a period of two months there were constant skirmishes between the Sayyids and the Kashmiris. At last the latter divided themselves into three troops, crossed the river and seized the environs of the hills. The Sayyids came to meet them and fought with great bravery; but as the number of their enemies was double their number, most of their leaders were slain, and the rest fled into the city. The Kashmiris pursued them, and entering the city, stretched their hands for slaughter and rapine. They set fire to the city, and in the conflagration the Khāngāh of Mir Sayyid ‘Ali Hamadānī was burnt down, and from

1 Neither the Tabaqāt nor Firishtah mentions it; but it appears that after this Jahāngīr, Jyāllāla, Saiphaḍāmara and others thought of various plans of defeating the Sayyids, (l. 202). There were frequent skirmishes and they frequently degenerated into mutual abuse in indecent language (line 210).

2 The sending of a तौस्थान पुक्क सम्बाज़ by Tātār Khān is mentioned in line 217 of the 4th taraṅga.

3 The name is written as Bahaz, and as Bahtar in the MS. and as بهتار in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Banir. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 183) has Bhimbar and Rodgers Bhimbar. In the text-edition it is بختار.

4 The name looks like Pēsh in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Hans in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has Hansh and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 483) Howns. Firishtah lith. ed. has Firishtah in the text-edition. Śrīvara does not mention the arrival of Tātār Khān’s army at Bhimbar; but says that on their arrival at Sastragalaśāhāna they were met by Habbābhodana Rājā and others (l. 218).

5 It appears from Śrīvara, line 223 of the 4th taraṅga, that two thousand were slain near the camp of Tātār Khān’s army; and then the Kashmiris being delighted determined on a war (कामारिक भत्तज स्वयं चूक्तमानसा).

6 According to Firishtah the fire was extinguished on reaching the Khāngāh; and that edifice was not damaged in any way. Śrīvara in line 319 says that the fire reached the Khāngāh of चौमहादःमाहान but it is not quite clear.
there the fire was extinguished. The number of the slain in the
course of the day was two thousand. This happened in the year
892 A.H. Saiyid Muhammad, son of Saiyid Hasan got into the
house of a man named Gadāl of the Rāwat tribe, and fortified
himself.

The enemies (i.e., the party opposed to the Saiyids) then all
collected together in the palace or audience hall, and went to offer their
homage to Muḥammad Shāh. They got him to join them, and
he banished Saiyid ‘Ali Khān and other Saiyids from Kashmir.
They now sent back Parasrām after presenting him with various
gifts. As everyone of the Kashmiris claimed to be the sardār (chief),
in a very short time enmity made its appearance among them; and
the administration of the government fell into confusion.  
Fath Khān son of Adam Khān, who after the death of Tātār Khān, had
become the governor of the Punjab arrived in Rajauri from Jālandar,
and took up his quarters there in an endeavour to regain his ancestral
dominions. As he was the grandson of Sultān Zain-ul-ābidin,
people, who sought for adventures among the amirs and the Saiyids went
to him in large numbers, and he giving rewards to each one of them gave them hopes (of further favours). He hoped that Jahāngīr
Mākri would come before all others, and would see him; but Jahāngīr
imagining that his enemies had gone before to see Fath Khān, did not
join the latter; and dissuaded him from attempting to conquer Kashmir.

Sultān Muhammad Shāh came out of Kashmir (i.e., Srinagar),
being persuaded by Jahāngīr Mākri to do so; and encamped in the
whether that was burnt down or not. Firishtah also says that the number of
persons slain that day was not less than ten thousand.

1 The word is written as Rāwāt in both MSS. In the lith. ed. and the
text-edition it is Rāwan, while in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is 

2 Śrīvara in line 347 says यथऽ परंपरायायः नदेरें ग्रामस्थियाः: i.e.,
Parasurāma (Parasrām) and others went to their own country after receiving
honours.

3 The account of his birth, etc., is given by Śrīvara in lines 406–410 of the
4th tarāṣa.

4 This is mentioned by Śrīvara in line 419 and the following lines. Then
the negotiations between Fath Khān and Jahāngīr Mākri are described at some
length.
plain of 1 Karsawār. Fathā Khan also arrived in the neighbourhood of Aūdan by way of Hirpūr; and placing a spring of water between the two armies, settled down in front of the Sultan's army. Then the lines of the troops having been arranged, the flame of battle blazed up. At first Fathā Khan made an onset, and it appeared probable that the Sultan's army would fall into disorder. But Jahāngir Mākri placing his feet firmly slew about fifty of the best men of Fathā Khan's army; and that army being discomfited Fathā Khan was about to be seized, when one of the enemies raised a (false cry), that Sultan Muhammad Shāh had been taken prisoner by his enemies. Jahāngir becoming disturbed in his mind refrained from further pursuit of Fathā Khan.

The Sultan came to Kashmir, (i.e., Srinagar) after the victory, and sent Malik Yārī Bhat to ravage the villages, which had given shelter to Fathā Khan. 2' Ādam Khān and Fathā Khan having disappeared for sometime again raised their heads in the neighbourhood of 3 Bahārmgāla; and for a second time having collected a number of men advanced to conquer Kashmir. Jahāngir Mākri advanced with an immense army to meet them, and encamped in the village of 4 Gosawār in pargana Nāgām. Zirāk, a servant of Fathā Khan, availing himself of an opportunity, went into the city (Srinagar); and released the large number of amirs who were in prison there.

---

1 The name of the place is written as Karsawār in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the other MS. it is written as Kāshmār. Kishtwār, and in the lith. ed. it is written as Gārsawār. Col. Briggs and Rodgers do not mention the name of the place. Śrīvara mentions two names; but I cannot find any place mentioned as the camping ground of Muhammad Shah's army, which at all resembles the names mentioned in the Tabaqāt or by Firishtah.

2 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have Ādam Khān and Fathā Khan; but Ādam Khān had died earlier, and so the mention of his name is a mistake. Firishtah lith. ed. does not mention him.

3 The name is written as Bāhirmār Kālam or Bāhirmār Khāle in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. There is a place mentioned in Śrīvara's Rājatarāṅgiṇī, 4th tarāṅga, line 589, called Bhairavagala of which Bahārmgāla is the modern name. (See Stein's Rājatarāṅgiṇī, vol. II. p. 398.) I have, therefore taken Bahārmgāla as the correct name. The text-edition following the second MS. has Bāhirmār Kālam.

4 The name is written as Kāsawār and Kāsawār Kāswalabū in the MSS. and Kāswār Gosawār in the lith. ed.; and as Kāswār Kāhwāk in the
Among them were Saifi and Ankri. Jahāṅgīr was sorrowful at Saifi and Ankri having obtained their release, and determined to make a treaty of peace with Fatḥ Khān. He sent a message to the Rāja of Rājauri, by whose help Fatḥ Khān had invaded the country that he might create disaffection in Fatḥ Khān’s army. The Rāja of Rājauri and other amirs separated from Fatḥ Khān, and joined Jahāṅgīr. Fatḥ Khān in great dismay turned back, and Jahāṅgīr pursued him as far as Hirāhpūr. Fatḥ Khān went to Jammū and conquered it; and bringing great army from that country again advanced to conquer Kashmir.

Jahāṅgīr now gave assurances of safety to the Saiyids, whom he had before this banished from the country, and summoned them; and a great battle took place between the Sultān and Fatḥ Khān. Saifi and Ankri on the side of the latter fought with great gallantry; and on the side of the Sultān the Saiyids made fine efforts, and behaved with great bravery and courage. A large number of them attained to martyrdom, and the rest who survived obtained the confidence of the Sultān and Jahāṅgīr. On this occasion Fatḥ Khān was defeated and retired. But he again collected an immense army and invaded Kashmir; and after fighting several battles, became victorious.

Couplet:

If the flower of joy thou seest, from the thorn of sorrow draw not thy skirt;

If treasure thou seest, thy foot into the mouth of the serpent place.

lit. ed. of Firishtah. In the text-edition it is Khaswār. Various names are mentioned by Srivara in lines describing this meeting, but I cannot find any which at all resembles any of the names mentioned in the MSS. of the Tabaqāt or the lit. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah; but in line 398 the battle is called the battle of Gāzikofḍāra (गुजिकोड़ा). (See also Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 474 and also note 1 on p. 657).

1 The meaning is not clear. The MSS. as well as the lit. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah all say ارادات صلٰح بنلفج خان نمرود; but apparently it was only a stratagem, and there was no real intention of making a treaty with Fatḥ Khān.

2 This is mentioned by Srivara in line 579 of the 4th t araṅga of his Rājatarangini.

3 See line 596 of the 4th t araṅga.
Things now came to such a pitch, ¹ that no one remained with the Sultān, and all his treasure was gone. ² Jahāngir, who was wounded, secluded himself in a corner and Mir Saiyid Muḥammad son of Saiyid Ḥasan joined Fath Khān. ³ After some time, some zamindārs seized Sultān Muḥammad Shāh; and surrendered him to Fath Khān. At this time Muḥammad Shāh had reigned for ten years and seven months. ⁴ Fath Khān kept him in the palace with his own brothers; and gave orders that articles of food and drink and all other necessaries should be provided for him; and Saifi and Ankri always showed all honour and respect to him, and were always at his service.

AN ACCOUNT OF FATH SHAḤ, WHICH IS ANOTHER NAME FOR FATH KHĀN.

He sat on the throne of power in the year 894 A.H., assuming the title of Fath Shāh, and made ⁵ Saifi and Ankri respectively the superintendent and administrator of all his affairs.

At this time ⁶ Mir Shams, one of the disciples of Shāh Qāsim, came from ʻIrāq to Kashmir; and many people accepted him as their

¹ See line 614 of the 4th taraṅga.
² See line 632 of the 4th taraṅga.
³ See line 643 of the 4th taraṅga.
⁴ See line 644 of the 4th taraṅga.
⁵ In the text-edition it is only  ذكر سلطان فتح شا荿. According to the Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarangini समरालामकः, अभयपरिवेश्रूपकः प्रार्थिःपिताधिकारियः were his three ministers (see lines 16–19). It is impossible to identify any of them with the plain Saifi and Ankri of the Ṭabaqat and Firistah, or with Suffixy and Runga Ray of Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 489), or with Saifi Vāṅkari or Saifdār as Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 110) joining the two names jumbles up two persons into one. I cannot find anything about Somarāja or Prathara; but Adhvapati or Adhvapa seems to be the same as Mārgēsa, or a lord or keeper of the road. Stein thinks that a mārgēsa was equivalent to the Malik of the Muḥammadan period; but I do not think that there is any connection between the two names.

⁶ He is called माघातिनन्दन बाज़ः दराकर्मः स्वर्णिनाशनिकर्मः, but it is also added भवे भागपदविन्नेया गुरु, the meaning of which is not clear to me (see l. 21). Some person of the name of Somacandra probably the same as Somarājānaka is said to have made over to his servants the lands appertaining to temples (l. 22) and his followers called Suphas cut down very tall trees on the pretext of getting fire-wood (l. 23).

Firistah gives some account of the tenets of Mir Shams, from which it appears that they were the same as those of the Shīʿa in the guise of Sūfī;
religious teacher; and all the endowments and property of the religious establishment of Dēvharah were allotted to his disciples; and his Sūfī followers endeavoured to ruin and destroy all the temples of the Kāfār; and no one dared to forbid them. In a short time disputes arose among the amīrs and they came to the palace and slew one another. 1 Malik Ajhī and Zinā, who were among the chief amīrs of Fatḥ Khān, combined with a number of others, and taking Sultān Muḥammad Shāh out of prison, brought him to Bārāmūla; but as they did not find any marks of wisdom in him, they repented of what they had done, and wanted to seize him again, and surrender him to Fatḥ Khān. Muḥammad Shāh having got information of this, made his escape one night to another place.

After that, 2 Sultān Fatḥ Shāh divided the country of Kashmir into three equal parts, among himself and Malik Ajhī and Sankar; and made Malik Ajhī, the vazīr with full powers, and Sankar the Diwān or revenue officer of the whole territory (Diwān-i-kul). Malik Ajhī had wonderful skill in the decision of cases. Among the cases was this: two men had a dispute about an 3 invoice of fine silk.

and says that in a short time the people of Kashmir specially the Chaks became his disciples; and some, who were ignorant, and did not understand his esoteric doctrines, became mulāhīds or heretics, after his death. For other accounts of his doctrines see the Tarikh-i-Rashīdī (Elias and Ross, pp. 435-436).

1 The names are written as ملک اجہی و دانو منک اجہی و روان in the MSS. and ملک اجہی و روان in the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah respectively. In the text-edition the names are ملک اجہی و روان. I cannot find any name in Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini which at all resembles them but see the next note from which it appears that Malik Ajhī was called मल्ककालाम.

2 See lines 70 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini from which it appears that one share was allotted to Fatḥ Shāh (धनसवान), another to Malik Ajhī (मल्ककालाम), and the third to Shankar (राजा नागर). The reason of this division is not at all easy to discover. It also appears from line 73 that दत्तमकक had the मुख मन्दिर and राजा नागर had the मिलादन.

3 The words are بسیمک باریک اپنے, Col. Briggs does not mention the matter. Rodgers says that the dispute was about a bale of silk. بسیمک in the dictionary is said to mean an invoice, a list. But this meaning does not quite fit in with the context, where the judge is said to have inquired whether the بسیمک had been wound with the finger, or on his finger. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has بسیمک.
Each claimed the invoice to be his; and they both agreed as regards the weight and the colour. When the dispute came before Malik Ajhi, he asked whether the silk had been wound on the finger or on a spindle. The owner said on the finger; and the opposite party said on a spindle. When the silk was unwound it appeared that it had been wound on the finger.

1 After some time had passed after the accession of Fath Shâh, Ibrâhîm son of Jahângir Mâkri, on whom the position of his father had been conferred, went to Muhammad Shâh, and having persuaded him to come from Hindûstân, brought him to invade Kashmir; and a great battle having taken place between him and Fath Shâh in the neighbourhood of Khôlâhûyâh, Sultân Fath Shâh’s army was defeated. He retired to Hindûstân by way of Hîranpûr. He had reigned for nine years, when this happened.

After that Sultân Muhammad sat on the seat of government for the second time; and made Ibrâhîm Mâkri his eazîr with absolute powers; and named Iskandar Khân, who was a descendant of Sultân Shihâb-ud-dîn, his successor to the throne. 4 The sons of Ibrâhîm went into the prison and put Malik Ajhi, who was their brother-in-law, to death. After some time Fath Khân having collected an immense army again invaded Kashmir; and Sultân Muhammad Shâh, not having the power to oppose him, fled without a fight. On this

---

1 From line 90 of Prâjyabhattâ’s Râjatarangini it appears that Fath Shâh ruled the country for nine years, after which Muhammad Shâh regained the kingdom, under the protection of the mîrgéda (Ibrâhîm).

2 The name is written as Kôhrâmûyâh and Kaharlâmûyâh in the MSS. It is Kûhâmûyâh in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât and in the text-edition, and Kômawül in the lith. ed. of Firistâh. Col. Briggs says that the battle took place near Baramoola, while Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 111) says it was at Kohâsâla. I cannot find any name in Prâjyabhattâ’s Râjatarangini, which at all resembles any of these.

3 This is mentioned in line 91 of Prâjyabhattâ’s Râjatarangini.

4 Firistâh lith. ed. has by mistake Nâzîr, near for Nâzîr, brother-in-law. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 488) says that it was the sons of Mullik Atchy and not himself that were put to death. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 111) says correctly that the sons of Ibrâhîm Mâkri put Malik Ajhi to death in prison, but he does not mention the relationship between them. Lines 92-94 of the Prâjyabhattâ’s Râjatarangini agree with the Tabaqât.
occasion the period of Sultān Muḥammad's reign was nine months and nine days.¹

Sultān Fatḥ Shāh again took possession of Kashmir, and made Jahāngīr, who was of the tribe of Badrah his vazīr and Sankar Zinā his revenue minister (Dīwān-i-kul). He ruled justly. Muḥammad Shāh after his defeat went to Iskandar Kakhar, and the latter sent a large force to help him. Jahāngīr Badrah was also aggrieved with Sultān Fatḥ Shāh, and joined Muḥammad Shāh; and brought the latter into Kashmir by way of Rājaurī. Sultān Fatḥ Shāh made Jahāngīr Mākri the commander of the vanguard of his army; and sent him to oppose Muḥammad Shāh. But his army was defeated, and Jahāngīr Mākri together with his son was killed in the battle; and some chief amīr of his such as ‘Alī Shāh Bégī and others joined Muḥammad Shāh. Sultān Fatḥ Shāh being utterly helpless fled to Hindāstān, and died there. ² His rule this time lasted for one year and one month.

Sultān Muḥammad Shāh sat on the seat of authority again for the third time, and had the kettledrums beaten. ³ He imprisoned

¹ See line 99 of Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarāṇīṇi.
² See line 100 of Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarāṇīṇi. This Jahāngīr is called in it Pratihara or Rājānaḍīgūra. I cannot find anything about Pratihara or Rājānaḍīgūra.
³ One MS. and the lith. ed. have گہی Iskandar Kakhar; the other MS. Iskandar Kākī. Firishtah lith. ed., however, says that he went نرد شاک سنگر شاہ لوہتی پدی دلی and he is followed by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 489) and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 111). The Cambridge History of India is silent on this point, and so is Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarāṇīṇi.
４ One MS. and the lith. ed. have وزرا جیری, but the other MS. has وزرا جیری, which is correct, and which I have adopted. Firishtah lith. ed., also has وزرا جیری. The return of Muhammad Shāh is described in lines 120–123 of Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarāṇīṇi.
⁻¹ Compare line 127, which says that Fath Shāh advanced from the capital to fight Muhammad Shāh, aided by only one of his ministers پنیوزاراجہک.
₆ These facts are mentioned by Firishtah, who, however, calls 'Ali Shāh Bākī, 'Ali Shāh Bég, but they do not appear to be mentioned in Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarāṇīṇi.
⁷ Compare line 130 of Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarāṇīṇi.
⁻² Compare lines 135, 136. Kājī Chak is called kājī Chak in line 136. He is also called کیلے elsewhere (see l. 194).
Sankar, who was among the great and trusted amirs of Fatḥ Shāh, and selected Kājī Chak, who was noted for his wisdom and bravery, to be his vazīr. This man had wonderful cleverness in the decision of disputes. Among the disputes one was this: A writer had a wife. It so happened that he remained at a distance from her for some time. The woman in her passions married a second husband. After a time the writer again appeared; and there was a dispute between him and the second husband (of his wife). They appeared before Kājī Chak. As neither of them had any witnesses in support of his claim, the decision of the matter appeared to be difficult. At last Malik Kājī Chak said to the woman, "You are telling the truth, and the writer is a liar. Come, pour a little water into this inkstand of mine, so that I may write a bond (judgement ?) for you, so that he may have no further dealings with you. The woman got up, and put as much water in the inkstand as was required. The Malik said, "Pour more". Again she put a little water, so that it might not spill the ink; and in doing so she showed the greatest caution. The Malik said to those who were present, "From the great caution shown by the woman, it is evident that she is the wife of the writer." In the end she also acknowledged it, and the dispute was settled.

As the government of Sulṭān Muḥammad acquired greater stability, he ordered the execution of most of the amirs of Fatḥ Shāh, such as 1 Saifī, Ankri, and others; and Sankar Zīnā died a natural death. The servants of Fatḥ Shāh brought his dead body from India. Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh went forward to meet it and ordered it to be buried in the neighbourhood of the tomb of Sulṭān Zain-ul-ābidin. These events happened in the year 922 A.H. (1516 A.D.).

In the same year, Sulṭān Sikandar Lūdī, the Bādshāh of Dehli, died; and his son Ibrāhīm sat on the throne. At this time Malik Kājī imprisoned 2 Ibrāhīm Mākri. Abdāl Mākri, the son of the

---

1 Compare lines 165, 166 where the execution of धैर्याबलैंतादि is mentioned in the first and the death of राजापदर, or rather his following Fatḥ Shāh to the grave owing to the great love he bore him are mentioned in the second.

2 Compare line 171 of Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangini, from which it appears that Ibrāhīm Mākri is there called सीपरआजानक. He is, however, called राजापदर.
latter, in concert with some people from Hindūstān, made Iskandar Khān a claimant for the throne, and brought him to Kashmir. Sulṭān Muhammad and Malik Kāji advanced to meet them in battle at 1 Lūlpūr in pargana Bāngil. 2 Iskandar Khān not having the power to meet them retired into the fort of Nākām. Malik Kāji besieged the fort; and 3 for some days there were skirmishes between the two parties. 4 At this time, a number of the amirs of the Sulṭān rebelled against him, and went to Iskandar Khān. Malik Kāji sent his son named Mas'ūd to attack them; and he fighting bravely against them was slain, but the victory remained on his side, Iskandar Khān left the fort of Nākām and escaped; and the Malik entered it. The Mākris in distress and disorder followed Iskandar Khān; and Sulṭān Muhammad Shāh returned to the city joyful and happy. These events happened in the year 931 A.H. (1524 A.D.).

It was in that year, that His Majesty, Firdūs Makānī Bābar Bādshāh attacked Ibrāhīm Lādi, and slew him in the battle of Panīpat. At this time the disposition of Muhammad Shāh at the insinuations of his enemies turned against Malik Kāji 5. He became suspicious, went to Rājauri and made the Rājas of the various parts of the

in line 173; and his sons मल्लोकान्दांकान्ताकाण्डार are said to have brought फतिशराक्ष क्षामेस्तराचारित्र from outside Kashmir (बाञ्गल) (l. 174).

1 The name is written as بودور, and لوپور in the MSS. and as بودور in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has بودور, but the name is not very distinct. Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini, line 175, has लोपूरुरेजणार्णम. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 490) calls the place Alwarpoor in Fankul district; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 112), apparently following Firishtah, has Nolpin in the pargana of Māhekāl. The name of the pargana is राजपूर, or पालकल, or पालकल in the MSS. and पलकल in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat. The correct name is Bāngil (No. 31 in the list of Kashmir parganas on page 494 of Stein's Rājatarangini, Vol. II).

2 Compare line 176 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini.

3 Compare line 178 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini.

4 The account in Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini is somewhat different. It is said there that प्रतीपारपतिं ज्ञािश्रं with others (who were the rebels) entered the fort of Luhara; and the Cakrapa, i.e. Kāji Chak, finding two armies on his two sides (क्वतं: बिदित बज्रंमन्दस), sent his son मल्लोकांक to attack Luhara (lines 179, 180). The fight of Mas'ūd's army with the Lohara garrison and Mas'ūd's death are described in lines 182-190.

5 This appears to be mentioned in line 218 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini.
country obedient to himself. At this time Iskandar Khan, who had
gone away, after being defeated by the Sultân, came back with a
number of Mughals; and took possession of Lôharkôt. 2 Malik
Yârî, brother of Malik Kâji, hearing of it went and attacked him;
and having fought with him, seized him, and sent him to the Sultân.
The Sultân, being pleased with Malik Kâji on account of his loyal
services, again entrusted the post of the vâzûrat to him. 3 He had
Iskandar’s eyes blinded by drawing the needle across them.

At this time Ibrahîm Khân, son of Sultân Muḥammad Shâh,
who had gone with his father to Sultân Ibrahîm Lûdî, when the
latter had furnished Sultân Muḥammad Shâh with a large army, and
had given him permission to return to Kashmir, but had kept Ibrahîm
Khân in his service, came to Kashmir owing to the catastrophe which
had overtaken Sultân Ibrahîm Lûdî. Malik Kâji, who was annoyed
with the Sultân on account of his having blinded Iskandar Khân, put
him and his immediate attendants, by every pretext that he could
think of, into prison. After having imprisoned him, 4 he raised
Ibrahîm Khân to the throne.

1 Firishtah says that these Mughals belonged to, or were sent by Firdûs
Makânî Zahir-ud-din Muḥammad Bâbar Bâdshâh.
2 He is called Tâjacakra in line 230, in which it is said that he and his
other heroic brothers slew the Mughals in a battle in जीवरानिडुम.
3 This is mentioned in lines 236, 237 in Prâjyabhaṭṭâ’s Râjatarâṅgini.
4 The matter of the deposition of Muḥammad Shâh, मद्गोदमागाराक्षानबाथ, as it is called in Prâjyabhaṭṭâ’s Râjatarâṅgini, begins in line 245, where the author
exclaims on the strange act of Providence (विष्टुः) by which Muḥammad Shâh
lost his kingdom by the act of his own son. In line 248 it is said that on Ibrahîm
Lûdî’s defeat, Ibrahîm Khân came to Kashmir, cherished by his father’s
affection (पितारथतिविविधित). In the following line, it appears that Kâji Chak’s evil
intention towards the Sultân made its appearance on account of his wish to
seize the kingdom (राजसिहोपंथ); and he in his anger cast the राजांराष्ट्रान
मेरेरयमदबापदोण into prison; and from line 252 it appears that the चक्काक्ष,
swallowed up the मद्गोदमागारानाम, i.e., the sun called Muḥammad Shâh. It
would appear, therefore, that, according to the chronicle, it is not true that
Kâji Chak cast Muḥammad Shâh into prison, because he was annoyed with him
for having caused Sikandar Khân to be blinded, but he did so to gratify his own
ambition. It is true that the chronicler after stating the fact moralises, that
धम: फलति कलेन मद्गापकृते वि मोरमति। यानांवाहायास्य लाभदमाहनावपस्य स
(l. 254).
The period of the reign of Muḥammad Shāh was, on this occasion, \(^1\) eleven years and eleven months and eleven days.

**AN ACCOUNT OF SULṬĀN IBRĀHĪM SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH.**

When he sat on the throne, he made Malik Kājī his permanent vazir according to previous custom. \(^2\) Abdāl Mākri, son of Ibrāhīm Mākri, who had gone to India to escape the tyranny of Malik Kājī, having at this time entered the service of His Majesty Firdūs Makānī, submitted to him, that he had sought an asylum at that threshold, from the violence of his enemies. If His Majesty would help that slave with an army, he would conquer Kashmir for the servants of His Majesty in the easiest possible way. His Majesty, \(^4\) after obtaining the necessary information, about his appearance and character, said in kind language, that \(^5\) even in jungles such men could be met with. He honoured Abdāl Mākri with the gift of a horse and a robe of honour, and detached \(^6\) a large number of troops to accompany him. He made \(^7\) Shaikh ‘Ali Bēg and Muḥammad Khān and Maḥmūd Khān the commanders of the detachment.

---

1. This agrees with Firishtah and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 113); but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 491) says that Mahomed had reigned for nineteen years, when he was deposed, but it is not clear whether this was the period of his reign in the third term. Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Ṛājatarāṅgiṇī (l. 253) makes it eleven years, ten months and ten days (एकादशाध्यान्त दश मासान दिशाति च).

2. Compare lines 257 and 258 of Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Ṛājatarāṅgiṇī.

3. Compare line 260 of Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Ṛājatarāṅgiṇī where Bābar is called दिनियाँ गुरुलेखरम्।

4. This is stated by Prājyabhaṭṭa as खाकारिःश्वाक्षेत्रामृण वैवाख सागरं | सचाँ तुस्यक्रिाग्मैःमिश्रित्यायतञ्जमरः। (l. 261) from which it would appear, that Bābar was greatly impressed by what he saw of and heard from Abdāl Mākri.

5. It is rather difficult to understand the mention of jungles but Firishtah also has the same word. The idea probably is that Bābar was probably surprised that a country like Kashmir, which he thought was covered by forests, could produce such a fine-looking and able man. As the Ṛājatarāṅgiṇī, in the line I have quoted, says, he lowered his head in astonishment.

6. Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Ṛājatarāṅgiṇī (l. 262) says भवस्थाः वीराणां वेंशाणे प्रतिपादितम्।

7. All the three names appear in both MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah lith. ed. omits the second name, and he is, of course, followed by Col. Briggs and Rodgers. Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Ṛājatarāṅgiṇī (l. 265) also has the first and third
As Abdāl Mākri perceived, that the Kashmiris would 1 hate the coming of the Mughals, he advanced towards Kashmir, having, for political reasons, given the name of Sultān to 2 Nāzuk Shāh, son of Fatḥ Shāh. On the other side, Malik Kāji took Ibrahim Shāh with him; and made the village of 3 Sullāh in the pargana of Bāngil his camping ground. The two armies encamped in front of each other. Abdāl Mākri sent the following message to Malik Kāji. 4 “I waited on Bābar Bādshāh, and have brought reinforcements from him. The power and grandeur of that Bādshāh are so great, that he made Sultān Ibrahim, the Bādshāh of Dehli, who had five hundred thousand men, in the winking of an eye, like the dark dust. Your welfare lies in this that you should come into the band of his loyal adherents. But if this great fortune is not in your lot, come quickly and fight with this army. There is no time left for remedy or hesitation.” Malik Kāji made 5 Saiyid Ibrahim Khān and Sarang and Malik Yārī the

names, which it transforms, almost beyond recognition into निशाबुद्धि and मिस्सुद स्वार.

1 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 113) I think, quite incorrectly translates the words نفر خواهند جست by the words “would despise”.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. incorrectly calls Nāzuk Shāh, the son of Ibrāhīm, and he is followed by Col. Briggs and by Rodgers. The Cambridge History of India, page 287, agrees with the Tabaqāt, and calls him the second son of Fatḥ Shāh. Pṛajyabhaṭṭā’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī (l. 266) has फलारणाम शायान भाषा कालीन. वान यान शास्त्र विजय विषय में.

3 Both MSS. and the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah have موضع و موضع سلāح as بركان بالعن. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 492) has “Sullah in the district of Fankul” and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 113) has “Sullah in the pargana of Bāngul”. The Cambridge History of India, III, page 287 says the battle took place at Naushahra (Nowshera), but does not give any authority. According to Pṛajyabhaṭṭā (l. 267) the Cakrapa, i.e., Qāḍī Chak, placed his army at Nilāsva. The place is mentioned in various places of Kalhana’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī as a district of Kashmir. In the text-edition it is changed to موضع while in the English translation, following Stein (vol. II, p. 481), Bāngul has been adopted.

4 A part of this adjuration of Abdāl Mākri appears in lines 269–271 of Pṛajyabhaṭṭā’s Rājatarāṅgiṇī.

5 The commanders are called स्वायत्तवान सिरक्कर and मानक्ष तालाक in line 273; and those of the other army are called मानक्ष लेखर, रिमारक्ष मानक and
commanders of three detachments, and began the battle. A great fight took place between the two armies, and many were slain. And of the renowned nobles of Ibrāhīm Shāh, Yārī Chak, and Sarang and others, each of whom had large number of followers, were slain. Malik Kājī in great distress fled to the city, but he could not stay there also; and went away towards the hilly country. Nothing is known about Ibrāhīm Shāh, as to what happened to him, and where he went.

The period of his rule was eight months and twenty-five days.

<AN ACCOUNT OF 1 NĀZUK SHĀH, SON OF FAṬH SHĀH>

After the victory, 2 he ascended the throne in the city of Srinagar, and gave assurances of safety to the Kashmiris, who were afraid and suspicious of the Mughals. The Kashmiris then made rejoicings at his accession. And he then left the city, and took up his abode in Nau Shahr, which from ancient time was the capital of the Sultāns. He selected Abdāl Mākri to be his vazir and representative (vakil). Abdāl went as far as the 3 country of Jamalnagarī in pursuit of Malik Kājī; but whom he found that it would be impossible to seize him, he commenced to make a division of the country. (Leaving aside the Khālsa or the crown lands, the country was divided into

---

1 See the latter part of note 7, pages 696, 697. The battle is described with some spirit in line 275 and the following lines and the death of Yārī Chak (called मखक तामक) is mentioned in line 282, and that of Sarang in the next line. The flight of Qāḍī Chak to the city is mentioned in line 284. In the text-edition सूरनक has been adopted in place of सूरङक.

2 He is also sometimes called Nādir Shāh, as the name is Nādir on all his coins (Rodgers, J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) but all the histories call him Nāzuk Shāh.

3 Compare lines 285–287 of Prājyabhaṭṭa.

4 The words are त न सोद जहल नगर or सोद हमल नगर in the MSS. and in the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 492) has “The town of K’hulnagry”, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) has “the confines of Jahalnagarī”. In line 288 of Prājyabhaṭṭa it is stated that जहल नगर though it is not said there, that they went there in pursuit of Malik Qāḍī. In the text-edition it is जहल नगर.
four shares. 1 One share was allotted to Abdāl Mākri, the second to Mīr ‘Ali, the third to Lōhar Mākri and the remaining to one of the Chaks. Abdāl Mākri then sent back the servants of Firdūs Makānī to Hindūstān, after giving them many presents and valuable gifts. They sent an angry message to Malik Kāji, and summoned Muḥammad Shāh to come to them; 2 and going to Mīr ‘Ali, brought Muḥammad Shāh out of the fort of Lōharkōt; and they all came together to Kashmir (i.e., Srinagar). They did not permit Malik Kāji to come.

Sultān Muḥammad Shāh then sat for the fourth time on the throne, and he made Nāzuk Shāh, 3 who had governed the country for twenty years, his successor. At this time His Majesty Firdūs Makānī departed from this transitory world; and His Majesty Jīmat Ashānī Muḥammad Humāyūn Bābdshāh sat on the throne of the empire. This happened in

---

1 The division is mentioned by Firishtah and Rodgers, with some differences and also in Prājyaabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangini, lines 288, 289; but no one gives any reason for the division. The division as given in Prājyaabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangini agrees with that in the Tabaqat, the four shares being allotted in it respectively to Sāliṣmā, Shāhānshāh, Mādār, and Riṣmah. It is curious that, according to Mirza Haidar Dughlāt (page 441, Elias and Ross’s translation of the Tarikh-i-Rashidi), he found the following four Maliks in Kashmir; “Abdāl Makri, Kājīchak, Lāhūr Makri and Yakchak.” Three of these names appear to agree with those who got three of the shares. The fourth Shāhānshāh or Ali Mīr had been killed in an engagement with the Mirza himself.

2 Firishtah’s account is somewhat different. According to him Shāikh Mīr ‘Ali went to Lōharkōt and brought Muḥammad Shāh with him. According to Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) Abdāl Mākri recalled Muḥammad Shāh “from his prison of Lāharkōt” and the two, i.e., Abdāl and Muḥammad Shāh entered Kashmir as friends. This does not appear to me to be quite correct. Prājyaabhaṭṭa in lines 290–296 mentions the message sent to the Cakresa, the sending back of the Mughals, and the going of ‘Ali Mīr to Muḥammad Shāh.

3 Firishtah says he had governed the country for twenty years and eight months. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) has “20 years and 20 months”; the number of months is of course incorrect. Prājyaabhaṭṭa in line 298 has राजन रक्षारा वर्यं साम मित्रोत्त माखिको वधः। अन्यु शुद्धः यथार्थ योवरायो मयादान्। i.e., the King Nājika (Nāzuk) having reigned for one year, obtained the position of heir apparent from King Muḥammad. The period of Nāzuk’s reign certainly was not twenty years; he ascended the throne in 933 A.H., 1527 A.D., and was deposed and made heir apparent, in 935 A.H., 1529 A.D., so he reigned for a little more than a year as stated by Prājyaabhaṭṭa.
the year 937 A.H. When one year of the reign of Sulṭān Nāzuk Shāh had elapsed, Malik Kāji Chak, who had gone to the hilly country collected a vast number of men there, and came to the neighbourhood of Kahrār. Malik Abdāl came and confronted him, and fought with him. Malik Kāji fled and went to Hindūstān.

At this time, Mirzā Kāmrān had absolute power on the Punjāb. Shaikh 'Ali Bēg, Muhammad Khān and Mahmūd Khān, who had, after the conquest of Kashmir returned with the permission of Abdāl Mākri, represented to Mirzā Kāmrān, "As we have acquired a knowledge of the whole country of Kashmir, if you pay a little attention, the whole country can be conquered with the greatest ease." Mirzā Kāmrān appointed Māhrām Bēg to be the commander of his army, and sent him to conquer Kashmir in concert with the nobles who had joined them. When the Mughal army arrived in the neighbourhood of Kashmir, the inhabitants in great terror left all their property and things in their houses, and fled towards the hills. The Mughal army

---

1 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have Nāzuk Shah, but this is clearly a mistake. Firishtah has إز़ाहायِي محمد شا, i.e., of the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, which is correct.

2 Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have كيار Kahrār. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has بندبیار Punǰhrār. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) has Kahrār. Prājyaḥatṭa has ضمیعتندیبگی سانے یودبع کاچانگ: 1 لیڈیاں مہاراشٹری دیگن دار (l. 301) which does not, however, make one much wiser as to the locality.

3 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) says, "Shaikh Ali Beg and Muhammad Khān the leaders of the allies who had helped Abdāl Mākari, and who had left him without permission." This is totally incorrect. As a matter of fact they were sent back with many presents and valuable gifts. In the particular passage under translation both Nişām-ud-dīn and Firishtah say بخصت and not بخصت. In the text-edition it is بخصت.

4 This is mentioned by Prājyaḥatṭa (l. 303) Mahram Bēg being transformed into महाराष्ट्रियां, and Mirzā Kāmrān into निरेक-काव्हा and the following facts are mentioned (lines 304-308) that मिशालिखित, महाराष्ट्रियां and other Mughals accompanied the Mughal army; that Muḥammad Shāh and others quickly brought back the Cakreṣā, i.e., Qādi Chak to help him, that the Mughals having invaded the city with thousands of horses and elephants, the Kashmirīs took shelter in the fort, and the Mughals burnt down and looted the houses and cities, etc.
then looted the city, and set fire to it. Some of the Kashmīris who had returned from the hills to fight with the Mughals were slain. Abdāl Mākri had a conviction at first that Malik Kāji; was with the Mughals; but when he knew at last of a certainty, that he was not with them, he showed friendship and attachment towards him; and summoned him with his sons and brothers; and they made promises and bound one another by oaths. This became a source of strength for the Kashmīris; and they set their heart on a battle; and combined together and engaged the Mughals in a big fight. The latter, considering it advisable to do so, went back to their own country.

2 After some time, Malik Kāji, having seen the treachery and pride of Malik Abdāl, did not consider it desirable to remain in the country and went to Hindūstān. It was in this year, that is, in 939 A.H., that Sultān Saiyid Khān, the Bādshāh of Kāshgār, sent his son Sikandar Khān, in company with Mīrzā Haidar Kāshghāri, with twelve thousand men, by way of Tibet and Lār to invade Kashmir. The Kashmīris (frightened) at the rumour of their power and grandeur evacuated Kashmir; and without any battle fled in different directions, and sought shelter in the hilly country. The Kāshghār army, having entered the Kashmir territory, razed the grand edifices, which had been built by the old Sultān, to dust; and set fire to the city and the villages; and having searched for the treasures, which were buried under the ground, seized them; and all the soldiers loaded themselves with the booty; and went everywhere to find the Kashmīris who had

1 This appears to be described in a very metaphorical language in line 311 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's Prājatarangini.

2 Firishtah agrees, but says Malik Qādī Chakk went to Bhir. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) says, "Malik Gājī Chakk could not endure the prosperity of Abdāl (which is not at all correct) so he betook himself to Bhir." Prājyabhaṭṭa gives (l. 312) the reason and the fact of the departure of Qādī Chakk very succinctly, namely सर्मिगनारकास्का काश्चातः कवित्ययो, i.e., being alarmed at the scanty regard shown to him by the Mārgeṣa, i.e., Abdāl Mākri, Kāca Cakra left the country.

3 Firishtah agrees almost verbatim. The invasion of the Kāshghār army is mentioned Prājyabhaṭṭa in line 314, etc. It is said to have been commanded by Mīrzā Haidar (मीरहाद), and Sikandar Khān is not mentioned in the beginning, but is mentioned further on in line 331.
hidden themselves, and slew them and took them prisoners. This state of things went on for 3 three months.

And Malik Kājī Chak and Malik Abdāl Mākri and other renowned sardārs went to and took shelter in 2 Chakdhar; but as they did not consider it advisable to remain there, 3 they descended from the mountains in the direction of Khāwaryārah, and having resolved

1 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) contrary to both Niẓām-ud-din and Firishtah has six months. Prājyabhāṣṭa (l. 325) also says that the Kashmir chiefs fought with the Mlecchas for three months.

2 The name is written as  in both MSS., and as  in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has  . Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 494) has "the town of Chukdura," and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) has Chakdara; but no attempt has been made by anybody to identify the place, and I also have not been at all successful. Prājyabhāṣṭa (l. 324) has  , the commanders of the Kashmir army, fearing the Mlecchas, obtained asylum in the Bhāpabhūmis (whatever they might be) which were covered with water; but I have no idea as to what the Bhāpabhūmis were and where they were situated. The next line, however, mentions three places, Ciroḍḍāra, Hajyeṅakotta and Cakradhara, but the line goes on to say  , if  is a mistake for  , then the line would mean that taking shelter in Ciroḍḍāra, Hajyeṅakotta and Cakradhara, they carried on the war with the Mlecchas for three months; and then Chakdara or Chakdhar would probably be Cakradhara; but unfortunately I cannot find anything about Cakradhara also; and I cannot alter  for  . In the text-edition it is .

3 The readings here are different. One MS. has  , the other has  , while the lith. ed. has  . Firishtah lith. ed. has  . Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 494) has (they) "retreated to Baramoola living occasionally in the hills." Rodgers says that from Chakdara "they went to Khāwara and Bāradar. From this place by the way of Bādah they descended from the mountains." Prājyabhāṣṭa does not give much help. He says (l. 330),  , if Cakradhāra is identical with Cakradhara, then we find that the Kashmiri leaders coming from Cakradhāra or Cakradhara encamped near Bhimādevi after crossing the Lodar, for a battle; but there is no mention of any places like this in Niẓām-ud-din or Firishtah. In the text-edition  is apparently a misprint for  .
to engage the Mughals in battle, went forward from there by way of Mārbāwah. The Sultānzāda Iskandar Khaṇ and Mīrzā Ḥaidar also came forward with an immense army to meet them. ¹ There was a great battle, and Malik 'Ali and Mir Ḥusain and Shaikh Mir 'Ali and Mir Kamāl among the Kashmīrī commanders were slain. Of the Kāshg̱arīs also, some good men met their death. The Kashmīrīs wanted to turn their backs on the battle-field; but Malik Kājī and Abdāl Mākri placed their feet of bravery firmly, and, persuading and encouraging the others, did justice to their bravery and gallantry. So many men were slain on the two sides that they were beyond all calculation. Some headless bodies rose up and moved about. The reason of this has been mentioned on a former occasion. The battle between the parties went on from morning till evening. When night came on, the two armies taking note of their plunder, went back to their respective places. Both sides coming out of the battle agreed to a settlement. The Kāshg̱ar men sent ² camelot, the warm woollen cloth (purpet), and other beautiful things to Sultān

¹ The account of the battle as given by Firishtah agrees with that in the text, except that Mir Ḥusain is called Mir Ḥasan. He is also called Mir Ḥasan in one of the MSS. of the Tabaqāt, but he is called Mir Ḥusain in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Col. Briggs and Rodgers generally agree, but the statement made by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) that, "the prisoners were numbered on both sides, and were liberated" does not appear to me to be correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 287, only mentions the battle briefly, but the statement made in it, that "the army of Kashmir fought so fiercely from morning until evening, that the invaders were fain to make peace", is also not correct. The advantage, if any, lay on the side of the invaders, as the Kashmīrīs at one time, were about to retire; and in any case both sides were anxious for peace. The battle is described by Prājyabhāṭṭa, in lines 331 to 337; and here we have not only the headless bodies mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah, but कबाबमनौभा यक्षनरा वेलालाणश्याय | मध्यमाणाश्वनयाण | i.e., the dancing headless bodies, Yakshanaras, Vetālas and Rākṣasas eager to feed on human flesh.

² The presents according to the MS. were صرف و سقرلاست و ساپور نجاس مصدوم; the lith. ed. has سقراط instead of سقرلاست according to the dictionary. Firishtah agrees with the MSS. but changes ساپور to دیگر. Col. Briggs does not mention the presents; but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) has "wool, hawks and precious things". Neither the Cambridge History of India nor Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarāṇī mentions the presents.
Muḥammad and 1 agreed to a relationship. Sulṭān Muḥammad also in concert with Malik Kāji and Abūdāl wrote a treaty of peace; and sent it with the wonderful products of Kashmir to the Kāshghar people. 2 It was also settled that Sulṭān Muḥammad’s daughter should be given in marriage to the Sulṭānzāda Sikandar; and the Kashmiri prisoners still in the custody of the Mughals should be released. The Kāshgharīs agreed to this treaty, and turned towards Kāshghar; and the disturbances which had been caused in Kashmir became changed to peace and prosperity.

During this 3 year two comets or stars with tails rose above the horizon. A terrible famine took place in these days, so that most of

1 For an explanation of this see the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, p. 441, where it appears that, “everyone, according to his rank, formed a connection (mulākāt) with one of the Sultāns or Malikhs of Kashmir.” Mirzā Haider became connected with Muhammad Shāh, and according to “the Moghul practice we called each other ‘friends’.” Similar relations were formed between the other Moghul leaders and the Kashmir nobles.

2 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) gives what appears to me to be a quite incorrect account of these terms. He says, “the Kāshghar party taking with them presents of wool, hawks and precious things, went to Muhammad Shāh, and asked his daughter in marriage to Sikandar Khān, and desired that the women whom the Mughals had in their hands, should there remain”. Neither Niẓām-ud-dīn nor Firishtah says that the Kāshghar people went to their presence, and asked for Muḥammad Shāh’s daughter. They both say that it was settled that the marriage would take place. Prājyābhaṭṭa in line 342 makes a curious statement about the marriage of the princess, चन्द्रमुनि समुद्य यशुः। निषादु पोरिन्यां भाठान्य राजस्थानामिन। This would mean that the princess was taken away by conciliatory methods.

3 The comets and famine are mentioned by Firishtah and Col. Briggs. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, mentions the famine but not the comets. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 116) mentions two comets and the famine; and with reference to the latter, he makes the curious statement, “The massacre of Zuljīr was regarded no less severe than this famine in its effect,” which is very different from what Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah say about the matter, as would appear on a comparison of my translation. He had also apparently forgotten that he had called Zuljīr Zuljū on page 99 of his paper. According to Prājyābhaṭṭa (l. 344) there were not two comets, but there was a rain of meteorites everywhere on the ripe paddy fields, and then a comet made its appearance. The line is पक्षालिवेंद्रस्तपलिन्युक्तेषु स्वच्छ। समुद्यार्कोः।
the people died of hunger; and the remainder who survived, abandoned their native land and went away to distant places; and the story of Diljū, who had perpetrated a general massacre, having sunk into oblivion in people's minds, appeared as of no importance in comparison to this catastrophe. These hardships continued for ten months, and then ceased; and as the fruit season also drew near, some happiness made its appearance among the people.

During this period a disagreement occurred between Malik Kāji and Abdāl Mākri; and the former coming out of the city took up his residence in Zainpūr. Malik Abdāl continued to be the Suṭṭān's vazīr; and the governors and the officers perpetrated every kind of oppression that they wanted on the ra'īayats; and no one was there to attend to their complaints. 2 After some time, Suṭṭān Muḥammad Shāh suffered from a burning fever; he gave away all the gold that he had to the poor and needy, and passed away from the world as a result of the same illness. The period of his reign was 3 fifty years.

---

1 Compare line 360 of Prājyabhātta. The place where Qādī Chak took up his residence is called Jainapura in this line. Zainapūr is mentioned in the Index of Stein’s Rājatarangini, but the page reference, vol. II, page 472, against it is incorrect; on page 471, however, it is stated that “From the small town of Jainapuri founded by him, the new subdivision took the name of Zainapūr or Jainapura.”

2 The illness and death of Muḥammad Shāh and his adjurations to his ministers are described in Prājyabhātta’s Rājatarangini, lines 365–373. He seems to have suffered from various complaints and not from the same alone mentioned by Niẓām-ud-din and Firishtah; as it is said نب ملحق | مسلمانی تخریب | ہئیریا | خلیفہ زہیری | | Niẓām-ud-din and Firishtah.

3 Firishtah also says he reigned for fifty years; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 116) explains this by saying that, “The fifty years must reckon from 891 A.H. and include all the reigns of Fath Shāh and Nāzuk Shāh.” It is noteworthy, however, that Prājyabhātta (l. 373) says that he reigned for five years. His last or fourth reign extended from 935 to 941 A.H., 1529–1534/35 A.D., which is about 5 years, so that the fifty of Niẓām-ud-din and Firishtah may be a mistake for five.
1 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÁN SHAMS-UD-DIN, SON OF SULTÁN MUHAMMAD SHÁH.

2 Sultán Shams-ud-din sat on the throne of the empire after his father, and divided the whole country, in agreement with his vazír, among the amírs. The people of Kashmir made rejoicings on his accession. But in a very short time there were disputes between Malik Kájí and Abdál Mákri; and the former carried the Sultán away in the direction of Góswá to fight with the latter. Abdál also came forward to meet him with a complete army. But in the end a peace having been determined upon, Abdál went away to Kamráj, which was his jágír, and the Sultán and Malik Kájí returned to Srinagar. Again after some time Abdál Mákri turned his head from allegiance; and commencing to make disturbances created confusion in Kamráj. This time also the disturbance was quelled with ease. Nothing more than this can be gleaned from the Tárikh-i-Kashmir about Sultán Shams-ud-din; and the period of his rule

1 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. omit the word بن the son, after Shams-ud-din, Firístah lith. ed. has it. I have inserted it.

2 Firístah agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 496) following the Towaríkh-Kasheery calls the successor of Muhammad Sháh, Ibrahim, and not Shams-ud-din. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India follow Nižám-ud-din and Firístah. Prájyabhaṭṭa devotes some lines (374–376) to the people's lamentation on the death of Sultán Muhammad, and calls the new Sultán Sínipá (l. 380) a very abbreviated form of Shams-ud-din Sháh. It also mentions the rejoicings of the high and the low (भक्ति: पांडव: सभा) and their blessings in line 382. Then we suddenly come to the disputes between the two factions, but it is difficult to discover any reason for them. The two armies were stationed at गंगोपुर and अमिनदारिक, and then Rígacakra went as an intermediary; and concluded a settlement to the effect that Kácaakra (Qádi Chak) should remain at the capital and the Múrgapás (Mákris) in Kamráj (l. 389).

3 Ba استعداد تعلم in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for با استعداد تعلم

4 As to the account of the latter part of the reign of Shams-ud-din and the reign of Názuk Sháh, Firístah agrees almost word for word, and so does Rodgers. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, says that Shams-ud-din II died in June or July 1540, when Názuk Sháh was restored. The account in Prájyabhaṭṭa's Rájatarangíni is very confused. It mentions the intrigues of the leaders and the incursions of the Mughals (l. 403) but I have not been able to discover anything about Shams-ud-din or Názuk Sháh.
cannot be ascertained. After him his son Názuk Sháh sat on the seat of government; but five or six months had not passed, when Mirzá Haidar having acquired power in the country took possession of it. During the period of his rule, public prayers were read and coins struck in the renowned name of His Majesty, Jinnat Ashíání 1 Humáyún Bádsháh.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF MIRZÁ HÀIDAR.

In the year 948 a.H., at the time, when Jinnat Ashíání having been defeated by Shér Khán had come to Láhóre, Abdal Mákri and 2 Régí Chak and some other of the chief men of the Kashmir sent a petition, through Mirzá Haidar, containing expressions of their loyalty, and incitements to him to seize the country. His Majesty (i.e., Humáyún) gave Mirzá Haidar permission to go; and also decided to follow him himself. When Mirzá Haidar arrived at 3 Bhimbar,

---

1 One MS. omits by mistake the passage from جدّت اشيماني بادشاہ بود, including the heading about the rule of Mirzá Haidar.

2 He is called Zangi Chak in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, Zungy Chuk by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498), and Zangí Chakk by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 117) and the Cambridge History of India; and the translators of the Tarih-i-Rashidi also call him Zangi Chak; but the name is رگی چک in both MSS. of the Tabaqát, and more distinctly رگی چک in the lith. ed. Of course there is very little difference between رگی and رنگی as written in Persian. رنگی or رنگی is mentioned by Prájjyabhaṭṭa in lines 388, 393 and elsewhere. Rípa Cakra may be transformed to Régí Chak, but cannot be changed to Zangi Chak. Régí Chak is, therefore, the correct name and I have kept it. رنگی چک in the text-edition is incorrect.

3 The name looks like بھیمار in the MS. The lith. ed. has بھیمار and Firishtah lith. ed. has بھر. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498) has Mein, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 117) has Bhir. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the name of the place. I consulted the fountain head for the correct name, but Mirza Haidar is delightfully vague in the Tarih-i-Rashidi, page 483, where he says, "when I arrived at the foot of the pass (leading to) Kashmir, Kâchí Chak ascended (?) by one road and we by another, and without further contention or discussion, we (all) arrived at (Kashmir)." I cannot find any place of the name of Bhir, but Bhimbar or "Bhimbar" lies at the foot of the outer hills, in the centre of the tract between the Vitastá and the Cinab, note 180, page 33, Stein's Rájatarānigí. So I think Bhimbar is correct, and I have kept it.

In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has بھر.
Abdāl Mākri and Rēgi Chak came and joined him. There were not more than four hundred horsemen with Mīrzā Hāidar. When he arrived at Rājauri, Kāji Chak, who was (then the de facto) ruler of Kashmir, came with three thousand horsemen and fifty thousand foot soldiers to the Karmal pass, and strengthened it. Mīrzā Hāidar abandoned that route, and started by way of Punuj. Kāji Chak in his great pride did not guard that road; and Mīrzā Hāidar, crossing the hill, arrived in the Kashmir plateau; and suddenly took possession of the city of Srinagar. Abdāl Mākri and Rēgi Chak having secured a footing, took charge of all affairs; and allotted some parchanas as the Mīrzā’s jagir. It so happened that about this time Abdāl Mākri’s days came to an end; and he died after recommending his sons to the Mīrzā.

After the arrival of Mīrzā Hāidar in Kashmir, 2 Kāji Chak went to Shēr Khān Afgān in Hindūstān; and brought five thousand horsemen, who were commanded by Husain Sharwānī and 3 Ādīl Khān.

---

1 Firishtah has كُنْتُل and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498) has Kurmul pass. In the text-edition كُنْتُل has been changed to كُنْتُل. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV) p. 117, has transformed Katal Kartal to “Khabal Kartal (it is called Karmal by Erskine)”; and he has transformed بنج, which is written as بنج in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and as بنج in Firishtah lith. ed., out of all recognition to “Pabhaj (the Pamij of Erskine).” Col. Briggs comes very near the correct name and calls it Punnuj. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, does not give the name of the place, where Kāji Chakk was stationed; but gives the correct name (Púnch) of the pass, by which Mīrzā Haidar crossed the hill. It makes the statement that Mirza Haidar’s allies “engaged Kāji Chakk’s attention by threatening a frontal attack”; but I cannot find any authority whatever for it. Both the Tabaqāt and Firishtah simply say that he abandoned that route, and Mirza Haidar (whose words I have quoted in the preceding note) whatever he says or means, does not mention any threat of a frontal attack by his allies on Kāchi Chak.

2 According to Mirza Haidar (Tarikh-i-Rashidi, p. 485), there was an interval of some months between his arrival, and Kāchi Chak’s bringing the troops from Shīr Khān. Mirza Haidar crossed the pass into Kashmir on the 22nd of Rajab. Then the winter came on, and it was not till the beginning of spring that Shīr Khān’s troops arrived. Just then Abdāl Makri was attacked by paralysis and died.

3 The name is ‘Ālāwul Khān in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; but it is ‘Ādīl Khān in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
and two elephants, to reinforce his own troops. Mirza Haidar in
cost with Ragi Chak, advanced to meet him in battle. The two
parties arrayed their forces between the villages of Datarbar and
Kawah; and the breeze of victory having blown on the plumes of the
standards of Mirza Haidar, the amirs of Sher Khan and Kaji Chak
were routed. Kaji Chak took up his residence in Bahramgalah. Mullab
Muhammad Yusuf the Khaṭib (preacher) of the Jama' Mosque of
Srinagar obtained the date of the victory in the words "Fath-i-
Mukarrar".

In the year 950 A.H., Mirza Haidar took up his residence in the
fort of Indarkot. Owing to Mirza Haidar having entertained
suspicions about Ragi Chak, the latter fled and went to Kaji Chak;
and the two united together, and in the year 951 A.H., advanced towards
Srinagar with the object of destroying Mirza Haidar's power.
Bahram Chak son of Ragi Chak reached Srinagar. Mirza Haidar
ominated Bandagan Koka and Khwajah Haji Kashmiri to crush

---

1 The names are and in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and
and in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has and .
The Tarikh-i-Rashidi gives various particulars which are not to be found in the
Tabaqat or in Firishtah, but does not give the names of these villages.
Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 499) has Dhunuj and Gava, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol.
I, p. 117) has Danahdyar and Kaway. The Cambridge History of India does
not give any name. In the text-edition the names are and .

2 Bahramgalah has wrongly been changed to Parmkalah in the

3 The meaning is not clear, some words having probably been omitted.
I have, however, supplied the omission by a reference to page 485 of the
Tarikh-i-Rashidi.

4 According to the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, page 485, Mirza Haidar is said to have
placed his and his followers' families in the fort of Andarkul, when he was going
to fight Kach Chak and Shir Khan's armies. The translators say in a note that
this must be the Indrakot of Firishtah. Firishtah, however, would not dream of
writing Indrakot, he has Indarkot. It may be noted, however, that there is a
pargana called Andarkoth among those of the Kamrāj tract (Stein, vol. II,
p. 494). So Indarkot may be correct.

5 Firishtah agrees, but Col. Briggs makes various mistakes. Rodgers's
account follows Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India, page 288,
apparently follows Col. Briggs about Zangi (Ragi) Chak's becoming suspicious
of Haidar's attitude, instead of Haidar becoming suspicious of him.
him, and he was unable to meet them, and fled. When the Mirzâ's troops pursued him, Kâji Chak and Rêgî Chak, considering flight the safest course, took up their quarters at Bahramgalah. Mirzâ Ḥaidar left Bandagân Kôkah and others at Srinagar and advanced to conquer Tibet; and seized the fort of ¹ Kôsûr, among the great forts, and some other forts.

In the year 952 A.H., Kâji Chak and his son Muḥammad Chak died of a ² shivering fever. Mirzâ Ḥaidar passed the year in peace. In the year 953 A.H., Rêgî Chak fought with the amirs of Mirzâ Ḥaidar, and was killed; and his head with that of his son Ghâzî Khân was brought before Mirzâ Ḥaidar.

In the year 954 A.H., an ambassador arrived from Kâshgâr. Mirzâ Ḥaidar went to Lâr to welcome him. Újh Bahram, son of Mas'ûd Chak, who for seven years had fought bravely in Kamrâj and had defeated everyone there, made proposals of peace to Khân Mirak Mirzâ, and made conditions and engagements. Khân Mirak Mirzâ summoned him after making promises and taking oaths. But when Újh Bahram came to his majlis, he drew a dagger out of his boot, and stabbed him in the stomach. The man, wounded as he was, fled and got into the jungle. Khân Mirak Mirzâ hastened in pursuit of him, and seizing him cut off his head, and brought it to Mirzâ Ḥaidar at Lâr, believing that Mirzâ Ḥaidar would be pleased.

3 ¹Idî Zinâ, after the food had been brought in, rose up in great

¹ The name of the fort is كوسور in the MS., and كوسور in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. has كوسور; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 499) has Looshoo, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 117) has Lansûr. The Tarikh-i-Rashidi is of no help, as it ends with Mirzâ Ḥaidar's victory.

² It is not clear who he was. He was apparently someone in authority, for Mirzâ Ḥaidar thought it necessary to excuse himself on the ground of his ignorance of Mirak Mirzâ's acts (Jân Mirak Mirzâ in the text-edition). He is, however, named, a few lines below, as one of the leaders of the vanguard of the army sent to conquer Kishtwâr. Both the MSS. say بعد ار حاضر ساخن جام. The lith. ed. omits the word جام. Firishta says nothing about anything being brought. If the reading in the MSS. is correct, the production of the head was delayed till the food was brought in, apparently with the object of giving it a special relish. In the text-edition the name is عدبی زین. ²Idî Rainâ, but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) has Idê Zinâ.
anger and wrath on seeing the head; and said "It is not right to kill a person after making conditions and engagements." Mirzâ Ḥaidar said, "I had no information of these happenings."

After this, Mirzâ Ḥaidar advanced from Lâr to Kishţwâr. He made 1 Bandagâñ Kôkâh, Muḥammad Mâkri, Makna Mughâl, Mirzâ Muhammad Yaḥiyya and 1 Idî Zinâ the commanders of his vanguard; and himself remained in the village of 2 Jhâlû near (the boundary of) Kishţwâr. The vanguard, after traversing marches of three days in one day, arrived in the village of 3 Dûhût which was on their side of the river Mârmâ. The Kishţwârâ army was on the opposite side of the river. There was a skirmish of arrows and musket shots, but neither party could cross the river. The following day Mirzâ Ḥaidar's army, turning from the right road, wanted to get into Kishţwâr. When they arrived in the village of 4 Dâr, a strong wind

1 The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât, with slight variations. Firishtah lith. ed. omits the third and makes Mirzâ Muḥammad Yaḥiyya Zinâ one man. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 500) only gives the name of Bandagan Koka, and adds "with other officers." Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) follows Firishtah, but calls the last man there Yaḥi Zinâ. The Cambridge History of India does not give any name.

2 The name looks like Jhâlû in the MS. and Jhâlû in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât. Firishtah lith. ed. has Jhâlû. Col. Briggs does not mention the place, but Rodgers, following Firishtah, calls it Jhâpûr. The place is not mentioned on page 21 of the Introduction to Elias and Ross's Tarīkh-i-Rashidi where the editors speak of the expedition against Kishţawâr. In the text-edition it is Jâlû.

3 The name of the village looks like Dûhût and Dûhût in the MSS. It is Dûhût in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât, and Dûhût in that of Firishtah. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) has Dahlot. No name is given in the introduction of the Tarīkh-i-Rashidi, but it is said that the advance guard came up with the enemy on the banks of the Kishţawâr river. The name of the river is 4 Ma ra, or Ma ra Ma ra, or Ma ra in the MS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât. Firishtah lith. ed. has Ma ra Ma ra. Col. Briggs does not give the name; and Rodgers says, "where the river winds". In the text-edition Dûhût is adopted as the name of the village.

4 The name of the village is Dar in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and in the other MS. It is Dâr in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118).
rose, and it became dark. The Kashmiris came bravely in crowds and attacked them. Bandagan Kokah, who was the leader of Mirza Haider’s army, was slain with many others. When they started from there, Muhammad Mahr and his son with twenty-five principal men were slain on the road. The rest, who had escaped death from the sword, came and after suffering much privations, joined Mirza Haider. The Mirza coming back from there in the year 995 A.H., advanced towards Tibet and conquering Rajauni from the Kashmiris made it over to 1 Muhammad Nazir and Sabr Ali. He gave Pakhi to Mullâ Abd-ul-lah and little Tibet to Mullâ Qasim; and conquering great Tibet appointed a person of the name of 2 Muhsin to be its governor.

In the year 956 A.H., Mirza Haider turned his attention to the fort of 3 Danil. Adam Kakhar came there; and prayed for the pardon of the offences of Daulat Chak, nephew (brother’s son) of Kaji Chak. Mirza Haider granted the prayer; and sitting with Adam in his pavilion, summoned Daulat Chak to come there. The latter became angry, and rose up, and taking the elephant which he had brought with him as a tribute, went away. Some persons wanted to pursue him, but Mirza Haider forbade them.

---

1 The first name is Muhammad Nazir in both MSS. and the lith. ed. The second name is Sabr Ali in one MS. and جبر علي which may be a mistake for بدر علي in the other, and Mir Ali in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Muhammad Naṣr and Naṣir Ali. Col. Briggs does not mention the names, and Rodgers gives the names after Firishtah. No names are given in the introduction (p. 21) to the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, which contrary to Nizam-ul-din and Firishtah’s account, that he seized Rajauni, Pakhi, Little Tibet and Tibet in the order mentioned, says that he conquered Little Tibet (or Baltistan), Tibet (or Ladak) and subsequently Rajauni and Pakhli.

2 The name is معاسين نام in both MSS. and معاسين نامي in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Mullâ Qasim.

3 The name is دملي in the MSS., and دملي in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Deebul, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) has Danel. In the text-edition it is دملي.

4 Firishtah surmises that as the probable reason for Daulat Chak’s anger.
After some time, Mirzä (Haidar) returned to Kashmir. 1 Daulat Chak and Ghazı Khan and Hasan Chak and Bahrám Chak went to Haibat Khan Niyâzi, who having been defeated by Islam Khan, had come to Râjaurl. Islam Khan had also come to 2 Madwâr, belonging to the Naushahrah area in pursuit of the Niyâzis. 3 He sent Saiyid Khan 'Abd-ul-mulk one of his trusted servants to Haibat Khan; and Saiyid Khan, having introduced matters about an amicable settlement, brought the mother and sister of Haibat Khan to Islam Khan. The latter then turned back, and coming to the village of 4 Ban, in the neighbourhood of Sâlkâot, took up his quarters there. The Kashmîris mentioned above took Haibat Khan to 5 Bârâmûla, and wanted to take him to Kashmir, in order to do away with Mirzâ Haidar (with his help). He, however, could not make up his mind to do so; and sending a Brahman to Mirzâ Haidar, made proposals for peace. Mirzâ Haidar sent ample funds by the hand of that Brahman; and Haibat Khan, leaving the place where he was, went to the village of 6 Bîr, which is a dependancy of the territory of Jammû. 7 The

---

1 Firishtah substitutes Jai Chak for Hasan Chak, and is followed by Rodgers. Firishtah, however, has the name of Haibat Khan correctly, but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) converts it to Haidar Khan, though a few lines further down, he has Haibat Khan Niyâzi.

2 The name is Madwâr in one MS. and Badwâr in the other and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Madwâr. The article 1 appears to have been omitted before 2 in the MSS. and the lith. ed.

3 Firishtah (and following him, Col. Briggs) and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) say that it was Haibat Khan who sent Sayyid Khan Niyâzi to Islam Shah.

4 The name is Ban in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It looks like Man in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. and Rodgers have Ban, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 502) has Bhumbur.

5 The MSS. have 2, and the lith. ed. has 3, but Firishtah lith. ed. has 2 which, I think, is correct. It is in the text-edition.

6 The name is in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has . Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 502) has "the town of Subzeea," while Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 119) has Hîr, and says that it is Nir in MS. No. 6571, in the British Museum. has been adopted in the text-edition.

7 Firishtah and Col. Briggs and Rodgers agree. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 119) says that he has seen two coins of Islam Shâh of this time,
Kashmiris separated from him, went to Islâm Khân, but Ghâzi Khân went to Mirzâ Haidar.

In the year 957 A.H., Mirzâ Haidar, becoming assured in his mind of the condition of the outskirts of the country, sent Khwâjah Shams Mughal, with a large quantity of saffron, as an ambassador to Islâm Khân; and in the year 958 A.H., Khwâjah Shams returned with many presents, and much rich stuffs; and Yâsîn Afghân came from Islâm Khân with Khwâjah Shams; and Mirzâ Haidar gave (many) shawls, and much saffron to Islâm Khân’s ambassador, and gave him permission to return.

He then appointed Qârrâ Bahâdur Mirzâ to the government of Baharmal; and sent ‘Îdî Zînâ and Nâzuk Shâh and Hûsain Mâkri and Khwâjah Hâjî from amongst the Kashmiris with him. 1 Qârrâ Bahâdur and the Kashmiris left Indarkût, and took up their quarters at Bârâmûla, and commenced to create disturbances on the ground that the Mughals looked down on them. The Mughals represented this to Mirzâ Haidar, but the latter did not believe it; and said that the Mughals were not in any way better than the Kashmiris in the matter of creating disaffection and disturbance. 2 Hûsain Mâkri sent his brother ‘Ali Mâkri to Mirzâ Haidar, to make him acquainted

and adds that the Kashmiris were tired of Mirzâ Haidar, and wanted to have Islâm Shâh as their king, and the coins were struck in anticipation of his conquering the country, or they might have been struck by Mirzâ Haidar himself in compliment to Islâm Shâh.

1 Firîstah agrees, but Rodgers wrongly translates the words which are in the lith. ed. of Firîstah as well as in the Tabaqât, by the words “came back to Indarkôt.” The sentence, as it stands, means that Qârrâ Bahâdur and the Kashmiris all commenced to create disturbances, but apparently it was the Kashmirîs who did so. Rodgers’s translation of the words by the words that “the Mughals (the forces of Mirzâ Haidar) were not acceptable to them” also appears to be incorrect.

2 Apparently Hûsain and ‘Ali were not acting in concert with the other Kashmiris. There are slight differences in the wording of the sentences. I have adopted the reading quoted by one of the two MSS., which makes most sense, but I have had to change the last word which is in both MSS. to . Firîstah lith. ed. has . Rodgers’s translation (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 119) in which he reads the word (excuse) appears to me to be incorrect.
with the treachery of the Kashmiris, so that he might decide to recall
the army. Mirzā Ḥaidar took no notice and refused to listen to him;
and said "What cause of jealousy should the Kashmiris have against
you that they should act treacherously towards you," and did not
summon the army back.

On the 27th of the Ramādān there was a great conflagration in the
Indarkōt; and most of the houses were burnt down. Qarrā Bahādur
and all the men sent the following message, "Our houses have been
burnt down; if you will give an order we would come and repair
our houses and turn our attention next year to Baharmal." Mirzā
Ḥaidar did not at all agree to this; and the army had to proceed to
Baharmal, whether they liked it or not.

ʿĪdi Zinā and all the Kashmiris then combined together; and
when night came they separated themselves from the Mughals,
and came to the pass of Baharmal. They also separated Ḥusain
Mākri and ʿAlī Mākri from the Mughals, and took them with them-
selves, so that they might not be slain with the Mughals. In the
morning, there was a battle between the Mughals and the men of
Baharmal, and the former were entangled and confined in the hills.
Saiyid Mirzā, however, fled to 1 Dabil. About fifty renowned
Mughals were slain, and Muḥammad Naẓr and Qarrā Bahādur
were taken prisoners. The rest, who escaped the sword, came by
way of Punch to Bahramgalah. Mirzā Ḥaidar was deeply grieved
on hearing this news and ordered that the broken silver 2 dēgs (sauce-
pans), which are now current in Kashmir, be coined. He also made
Jahāṅgīr Mākri his trusted agent, and bestowed the jāgīr of ʿḤusain
Mākri on him. He also gave horses and money to many of the craftsmen,
and made soldiers of them. Just after this news came that
Mullā ʿAbd-ʿul-lah on hearing of the rising of the Kashmiris

---

1 The name looks like دهل and یمل دهل in the MSS. and in the lith ed. and appears therefore to be identical with Danīl, see page 712 and note 3. Firistaḥ ed. however has دهلی مل. قلعہ بہرامل. in the text-edition is certainly incorrect.

2 There is a word which looks like سهمی or سهمی Sahī, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. which I cannot make out, but which may be "made of copper." Firistaḥ ed. has زنگی in the corresponding passage. سهمی has been adopted in the text-edition.
was coming to meet Mirzā Ḥaidar; but when he arrived near Bārāmūla the rebels who had collected in large numbers slew him; and Khwājah Qāsim was slain in little Tibet; and Muḥammad Nazr was taken prisoner in Rājaurī; and the Kashmirīs having collected in large numbers had come from Bahramgalah to Ḥirāhpūr. Mirzā Ḥaidar, having no other alternative, came out of Indarkōt, with the intention of engaging them. The total number of men with him was only a thousand. Among the Mughals men like ʿAbd-ur-rahman and Shāhzāda Lang, and Khān Mirak Mirzā and Mīr Makta and ʿṢabr Ḥalī and others, who were altogether about seven hundred men, joined him; and they took up their quarters at Shihāb-ud-dīnpūr.

Daulat Chak and Qhāzī Khān and other notable leaders in concert with ʿĪdī Zīnā collected their men, and came to Ḥirāpūr, and leaving that place came to the village of Khānpūr. Mirzā Ḥaidar encamped in the plain of Khālidgarh, which is close to Srinagar. Fath Chak, whose father had been slain by the Mughals, raided Indarkōt with Rāja Bahrām and three thousand men, in order to avenge his father's death, and burnt down the buildings erected by Mirzā Ḥaidar in the Bāgh-i-Ṣafā. When Mirzā Ḥaidar heard this news, he said, “I did not bring these edifices from Kāshgāh. With Divine favour similar ones can be built.” Ṣabr Ḥalī burnt down the edifices of Sultān Zain-ul-ʿābidin, which were in Suyyāpūr, in retaliation of the burning down of Mirzā Ḥaidar’s buildings, but the Mirzā was not pleased at this. (They) also burnt down the houses of ʿĪdī Zīnā and Naurūz

---

1 The name is clearly Ḥirāhpūr in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtaḥ lith. ed. has what looks like Ḥabzāpūr. Col. Briggs’s account (vol. IV, pp. 502, 503) is very sketchy, the whole of the incident from the appointment of Qārā Bahādur (called Kīran Bahādur) to Baharmal (called Bheerbul) to the death of Mirza Heidur being narrated in the space of eight or nine lines; and the name of the place under consideration is not mentioned. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 120) calls the place Hambarapūr.

2 Rodgers translates اُخر کوئٹ برم امیدہ as “came to Indarkōt.”

3 The name is clearly میرک میرک in the text-edition is a misprint for خان میرک میرکا. اُخر کوئٹ برم امیدہ in the other MS. Firishtaḥ lith. ed. has جر علیَ, but Rodgers has Jai ʿAll. In the text-edition اُخر کوئٹ برم امیدہ is a misprint for میرک میرکا.
Chak in Srīnagar. After this Mirzā Ḥaidar came and took up his residence in Kẖānpūr. In this village there is a plane tree, in the shade of which two hundred horsemen can stand; and it has been found by trial, that whenever a single branch of it is moved the whole tree shakes. The writer of this history Nizām-ud-din Aḥmad was in attendance, when the sublime standards of His Majesty the Khalifā-i-Illāhi went on a visit to Kashmir for the second time; and he saw the tree, and examined it. In short, the Kashmiris moved from Kẖānpūr and came to the village of Adanpūr; and the distance (between the two armies) was not more than two karōhs.

Mirzā Ḥaidar then decided that he should make a night attack on the enemy; and he gave direction that Mirzā ‘abd-ur-raḥman, his brother, who was adorned with the attributes of piety and purity, should become his heir; and took the allegiance of his men to him. Then they all mounted, and started for making the attack. As decreed by fate, there were heavy clouds that night. When they arrived near the tent of Khwājah Ḥājī, who was the cause of the disturbance, and also the vākīl (agent or representative) of the Mirzā, nothing could be seen owing to the darkness. Shāh Nazr a cuirassier says, “At this time I shot an arrow. The voice of Mirzā Ḥaidar came to my ears, which said ‘thou hast done an evil thing.’ I knew that my arrow had hit the Mirzā.” It is also narrated that a

---

1 The name is in one MS., and بید in the other. The lith. ed. has چنار and خبازی may be mistakes for Chinār or the plane tree, while بید is a willow. Firishtah lith. ed. has بید and Rodgers has willow. Both plane trees and willows grow in Kashmir, but I should be inclined to think that the tree in question was a plane tree which is a tall spreading tree.

2 Both MSS. have ادب پیور. The lith. ed. has ادبی پور and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 120) has Adnīpūr.

3 It should be noted, however, that just before this, apparently the two armies were both in Khānpūr.

4 The readings in the MSS. are تباهت نیزدی and تباهت بدلدی and in the lith. ed. صاحب نیزدی. These are all incorrect, unless نیزدی is same word in the dialect of Kāshgār. Firishtah lith. ed. has تباهت کردی which I have adopted. The whole affair is mysterious. Although it was dark the cause of the death could have been ascertained. Then, why was the corpse, or in fact the man, who was on the point of death left lying where he had fallen.
butcher hit his thigh with an arrow. Another tradition is that 1 Kamāl Kōkah slew him with the sword; but there was nothing (visible) on his body except a wound caused by an 2 arrow. In short, when the morning came, it was bruited about, that a Mughal, who had been killed, was lying there. When Khwājah Ḥāji and his son arrived at the spot, they saw that it was Mirzā Ḥaidar. They raised his head from the ground. There was no more than breath left. The dying man opened his eyes, and surrendered his life to the creator. The Mughals fled to Indarkōt. The Kashmiris going in pursuit of them 3 took up the corpse of Mirzā Ḥaidar to the Darbadū Mausoleum, and buried it.

The people were sorely grieved at the death of Mirzā Ḥaidar. The Mughals got into Indarkōt, and fortified themselves in it; and fight went on for three days. On the 4th day Muḥammad Rūmī 4 shot Kashmiri coins from mortars, and every one, who was hit, was killed. At last, 5 Khānām, the widow of Mirzā Ḥaidar, and his sister said to the Mughals, “As Mirzā Ḥaidar has gone away from us, it is better to have peace with the Kashmiris.” The Mughals accepted this, and sent Amir Khān, the architect, to the Kashmiris to conclude a pact. The Kashmiris agreeing to a peaceful settlement gave a letter containing engagements and oaths to the effect that they would not cause any trouble to the Mughals.

The period of Mirzā Ḥaidar’s rule was ten years.

---

1 The name is Kamāl Dōnī in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. I cannot find any meaning of Dōnī. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kamāl Kakah and I have adopted it. The reading in the MSS. is followed in the text-edition.

2 One MS. has ziḵr yāb ‘u ḥānādī diyā, which is of course incorrect. The other has ziḵr yāb ‘u ḥānādī diyā, which appears to be correct. The lith. ed. is also incorrect; it has ziḵr yāb ‘u ḥānādī diyā. Firishtah lith. ed. has the same reading as the second MS., and this is followed in the text-edition.

3 It is curious that the Mughals did not even attempt to carry away the Mirzā’s dead body; and it was left to the Kashmiris to bury it. The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say that they buried the body in Dar Bīdū ‘awr. I cannot find out what this burial place was. Firishtah only says that the Kashmiris seeing the body of the Mirzā buried it.

4 There are slight differences in the readings.

5 She is so called in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls her Khānāmī and it calls the Mirzā’s sister Khānāmī.
When the gates of the fort (of Indarkot) were opened, the Kashmiris entered the apartment containing valuable furnitures, etc. belonging to Mirzā Ḥaidar and carried away fine and delicate goods. They brought the family and dependants of Mirzā Ḥaidar to Srinagar, and placed them in the house of Hasan Matū. They divided the country of Kashmir among themselves; and pargana Dēvsar was allotted to Daulat Chak, and that of Wahī to Ghāzī Khān and that of Kamrāj to Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak. One lakh of donkey-loads of paddy (or rice in husks) was allotted to Khwājah Ḥājī, the vakil, of Mirzā Ḥaidar. Daulat Chak gave pargana Dēvsar, which was his jāgīr to his son Ḥabib Chak, and the daughter of Īdi Zinā was married to the latter. The amīrs of Kashmir, and more specially Īdi Zinā, having gained complete power, raised Nāzuk Shāh on the throne, and kept him as a puppet; but in fact Īdi Zinā was the Bādshāh.

1 The word is توشک خانه which according to the dictionary is a wardrobe, and which Rodgers calls the treasury. It is really what I have called it in the text. There is or at least was some years ago, what was called a Toshakhanā correctly Tushakhanā of the government of India, in which the articles offered to the Vicereoy at the Durbars were kept.

2 I have not thought it necessary to point out all the mistakes in Rodgers's paper, but I cannot pass this over. The words both in the Tabaqāt and in Firishtah are اهل و عيان غريبًا رأ در سربى نگارودان و در حویلی حسی متوجا دادند but متوja of the Tabaqāt is मतो in Firishtah. My translation is based on this text, Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 121) has, "the family of the Mirzā was taken to Srinagar, and placed in the hands of Manūjā."

3 Given as one of the S.E. parganahs, see list on page 369 of the Āin-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II).

4 It is written as رمی in both MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has رومنی, and I have taken this in preference to رمی, as it is probably identical with Vihi, one of the parganahs east of Srinagar (Āin-i-Akbari, Jarratt, vol. II, p. 368).

5 Kamrāj is called a tract containing 16 Mahals, page 370 of the Āin-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II) but there is a parganah also of the name of Kamrāj included in the S.W. parganas of the Kamrāj tract.

6 i.e., a lakh of donkey-loads of paddy is transformed into "a läkh of shawls" by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 121).
In the year 959 A.H. Sankar Chak, son of Kağı Chak, wanted to go away from Kashmir (i.e., I suppose Srinagar), as Ghazi Khan who called himself the son of Kağı Chak and had much jāgir. The details of this statement are these; that Sankar Chak was the son of Kağı Chak without any difficulty or doubt, and Ghazi Khan although he was commonly known to be the son of Kağı Chak was not in reality his son; for Kağı Chak, after the death of his brother Hasan Chak, took the latter's widow, who was then with child (who was afterwards named Ghazi Khan); and after two or three months the child was born. Hence Sankar Chak on account of the envy (which he bore) to Ghazi Khan wanted to leave Kashmir and go to 1 İdī Zınā. When a rumour of this got about, Daulat Chak and Ghazi Khan sent 2 Isma'il Háyat and Harjū, with one hundred men to summon Sankar Chak. They told them that if he did not come with them they were to bring him by force. Sankar Chak did not come on their summons, and went to İdī Zınā. In the end İdī Zınā came to them, and made an amicable settlement; and the parganas of 3 Kothār and Khāwar and Māwar having been allotted to Sankar Chak the disturbance subsided.

At this time, there were four groups who had power in Kashmir (1) İdī Zınā with his group; (2) Hasan Mākri, son of Abdāl Mākri

1 It is not at all clear where he was.

2 The name is written as اسعیل زیابت in one MS, and in the lith. ed. In the other MS, the last half of the name is written as هادت without any dots above or below the second or third letters. This second part is distinctly written as هادت in Firishtah lith. ed., and Rodgers has Hanit. اسعیلهادت has been adopted in the text-edition.

3 The names of the parganas are not very easily decipherable. They look like كوهار و کهایدر و ماور in one MS. In the other they are the same except that the first is كوهار. In the lith. ed. there is apparently only one name كوهار در موار. Firishtah lith. ed. has كوهار and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. I.V, p. 122) has Kothār Khāwin and Madurū. In the list of parganas in the Aīn-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II, p. 369) there are two parganas Khatīr and Khāwarparah, and I think it very probable that Sankar Chak got these. In the tabulated list of Kaşmîr Parganas in Stein's Bājatarāqīnā (vol. II, pp. 493, 494) I find Kuţahār, but no trace of any of the other. In the text-edition the names are كوهار و کهایدر و ماور.
with his group; (3) the Kishtwâris whose leaders were Bahrâm Chak and Yûsuf Chak and others; and (4) the Kâmis of whom Kâji Chak, Daulat Chak and Ghazi Khân were the leaders. Yehayyi Zînâ gave his daughter in marriage to Hasan Khân, son of Kâji Chak; the daughter of Daulat Chak was married to Muhammad Mâkri, son of Abdâl Mâkri; and the sister of Yûsuf Chak, son of Rêgi Chak, Köpwârî by name, was married by a nikâh ceremony to Ghâzi Khân. These alliances became the cause of the strength and power of the Chaks; and they, in concert with one another, went away to different parts of the country. Ghâzi Khân went to the country of Kamrâj, and Daulat Chak to Sûyyapûr. The Mâkris went to Bânkál; and 'Idî Zînâ remained at Srinagar in a sorrowful mood, and devised plans for their destruction.

As the season for egg fruits or brinjals now came, 'Idî Zînâ ordered that fowls and brinjals may be brought so that they be cooked together. This was a dish much liked by the Kashmiris. Then Bahrâm Chak and Saiyid Ibrâhim and Saiyid Ya'qûb came at his invitation, but Yûsuf Chak did not come. 'Idî Zînâ had the three guests seized and imprisoned them. Yûsuf receiving information of this went away by way of Kamrâj with three hundred horsemen and seven hundred foot soldiers, and joined Daulat Chak. When 'Idî Zînâ saw that the Kashmiris had united with the Chaks, he released the

---

1 The name is written very differently in the different MSS., etc. The MSS. have Kîhtwârî, and while the lith. ed. has Cîhtwârî. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kîhtwârî. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 503) has Kapoories, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 122) has Kapûris. I prefer Kishtwâris as it means the people of Kishwâr, while the others have no meaning at all.

2 The name is written as Kivirâî and Kivirâî in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kivirâî. The name is not given either by Col. Briggs or by Rodgers.

3 Firishtah lith. ed. has Bânkál and Rodgers has Pâkül, but the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat have Bânkál, which is the name of a pargana in S.W. part of Kamrâj. See page 371 of the Ain-i-Akbarî (Jarratt, vol. II) where it is Bânkál, one of the south-west parganahs.

4 The word is Misprîc in both MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât. Firishtah lith. ed. has Lutif Unmur.
Mughals, such as ¹ Qarrā Bahādur Mīrzā, 'Abd-ur-rahman Mīrzā, Khān Mīrak Mīrzā, Shāhāzāda Lang, Muḥammad Naẓr, and Ṣabr 'Alī from prison; and showed favour to them; and giving each one of them a horse and ² armour and some money remained at ³ Chakpūr.

At this time, Saiyid ⁴ Ibrāhīm and Saiyid Ya'qūb, in concert with Jārūd, who was employed to guard them, fled; and going to Kamrāj joined Daulat Chak. Bahrām Chak could not escape. On the following day, Ghāzi Khān came to Srinagar with ⁵ three thousand horsemen. 'Idī Zinā sent the Mughals to fight with him; but he broke down the bridges, and so the Mughals could not do anything. At this time Daulat Chak also came, and joined Ghāzi Khān in Srinagar, and they joined together and took up a position in the 'Idgāh. There were constant skirmishes between the two parties, but Bābā Khalīl went to 'Idī Zinā in order to bring about a peace. He said, "You put your trust in the Mughals, and paid no regard to the Kashmiris. This was not right." Having said words like this he effected a peace

¹ The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., with slight differences. In the Firishtah lith. ed. some of the names are different.

² The word used is صرپā in one MS. and in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and Firishtah, and صرپā in the other MS. I cannot find either Sirpā or Siropā in the dictionary. Rodgers has translated the word as armour, and I have adopted his translation. There is a Bengali or Hindi word Siropā (शिरपा) which means an article of dress, e.g., a scarf, which can be worn as a mark of distinction; for instance, in certain places of pilgrimage various different kinds of Siropās are given to the pilgrims, according to the amounts offered by them to the presiding deity of the temple. Siropā may also mean something covering the head and feet.

³ The name is Chakpūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt it is چک پرتو Chakpartū.

⁴ This passage with which Firishtah agrees word for word has been translated by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 122) quite incorrectly as: "the Sayyids Ibrāhīm and Yaqūb by the help of the troopers escaped from prison, and joined Ghāzi Chakk at Kamrāj." The name of the officer-in-charge is incorrectly given as جارود Jārūd instead of جارود Jārid in the text-edition.

⁵ The numbers are very differently given. One MS. has ٣ سوار servidor. The lith. ed. has ٣ سوار كس. In the other MS. and Firishtah lith. ed. it is ٣ سوار; and this is followed in the text-edition. I am inclined to think that three thousand was the correct number.
between him and the Kashmiris. They then sent away the Mughals with their families and dependants by way of Tibet. 1 Khānāmji, the sister of Mirzā Ḥaidar went away to Kābul by way of 2 Pakhlī. The people of Tibet slew 3 Ṣabr ʿAli and the other Mughals; and Khānāmji reached Kashghar.

Following these events news came that Haibat Khān and 4 Saiyid Khān and Shahbāz Khān Afghans, who were of the Niyāzī tribe, were coming to conquer Kashmir; and had arrived in the pargana of 5 Bānihāl, and have entered the hills of 6 Lūnkūt. ʿIdī Zīnā, Ḥasan Mākṛī, Bahram Chak, Daulat Chak and Yūsf Chak combined together, and marched out to fight the Niyāzīs. The two parties confronted each other, and fought bravely. 7 Bibi Rābeʿa, the wife of Ḥaidar Khān, also fought manfully; and struck ʿAli Chak with her sword. In the end Haibat Khān and Saiyid Khān and Fīrūz Khān and Bibi Rābeʿa were slain and the Kashmiris returned to Srinagar with triumph and victory. They sent the heads of the Niyāzīs by the hand of Yaʿqūb Mīr to Islām Khān, in the village of Ban, which is near the river Chināb.

1 The name is خانم جی in one MS. and خانم in the other MS. and in the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah. It will be seen from page 718 and note 5 that in the account of the events which happened immediately after Mirzā Ḥaidar’s death, his widow was called Khānam in the Ṭabaqāt, but the sister’s name was not mentioned; but Firishtah lith. ed. called the widow Khānāmī and the sister Khānjī. I have, therefore, called the sister Khānamji following the MS. which gives her that name. It is خانمی in the text-edition.

2 The name in the text-edition is بکلی in Pakhlī. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) has Pagli.

3 The name looks like جر علی in one MS. and مبر علی in the other, and مبر علی in the lith. ed. The name is Ṣabr ʿAli in earlier passages.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. has سید خاں but later on he calls him سید خلیل.

5 Firishtah also has Bānihāl, but Rodgers has Bānhāl. There is a pargana called Banīhāl to the S.E. of Srinagar (see Aīn-i-Akbāri, Jarratt, vol. II, p. 369).

6 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have در کوہ لویں کوہت. Firishtah lith. ed. has در کوہ نوین. I cannot find anything about کوہ لویں کوہت or کوہ لویں کوہت. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) has “at the salt range”; but I do not know his authority for saying so. Of course it may be the Salt Range, which runs parallel to the Jhelum near Pind Dādan Khān.

After that, hostilities again commenced among the Kashmiris; and 'Idi Zinā, in concert with Fath Chak, Lōhar Mākri, Yūsuf Chak, Bahrām Chak, and Ibrāhīm Chak came to Khālidgarh, and took up residence there; and Daulat Chak, Ghāzi Khān, Ḥusain Mākri and Saiyid Ibrāhīm Khān and a band of Dūms joining together, took up their quarters in the Ḏgāh. When a period of two months had passed in this way, Yūsuf Chak, Fath Chak, Lōhar Mākri son of Sahu, and Ibrāhīm Chak separated themselves from 'Idi Zinā; and joined Daulat Chak. Then Daulat Chak mounted with a large force advanced against 'Idi Zinā; and he being unable to meet them, fled without fighting; and went to the village of Jharō. About this time he wanted to mount a horse, but by accident the horse kicked him on the chest, and he concealed himself in the village of Samnāk; and he passed away from the world on account of the pain of the accident. They brought his body to Srinagar; and buried it in

---

1 The name is Kohrād Mākri in one MS.; but two lines further down it is Lōhar Dānkri and is Kōhar Dānkri and Lōhar Dānkri in the other and in the lith. ed. In Firishtah it is Kōhar Mākri. I have accepted Lōhar Mākri.

2 The name is خالد كر Khālidkar and خالد كر Jālakar in the MS., and جال كر Jālakar in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Khālidgarh, but Rodgers has Khāgarh.

3 The MSS. have طایعہ مان طایعہ ما, and the lith. ed. of Firishtah has what also looks like دو نان طایعہ ما. The lith. ed. of the Taḥqāq has دو نان طایعہ ما. I do not know what the طایعہ مان طایعہ ما would mean. دو نان of course means base, vulgar, etc. and طایعہ مان may mean a group of the common people. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) translates طایعہ مان بیجہا شد as "joining themselves together."

4 See note 1 above. After لسنہ بھو words like ولہ دوھر دانکری and ولہ سہر in the MSS. The lith. ed. has ولہ سہر. Firishtah lith. ed. has no corresponding words. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed. The text-edition has ولہ بھو .

5 The name is جبھر, جبھر, and جبھر in the MSS., and جبھر in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has جبھر or it may be جبھر; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) has Merv. I cannot decide between these various readings, but I certainly do not consider that Merv is the correct reading. In the text-edition it is جبھر.

6 The name is سماک in the MSS., and the lith. ed. has سماک; but Rodgers has Simālā.
the mausoleum of Mūsā Zīnā. The amīrs then rebelled and excusing Nāzuk Shāh, who had nothing of the government except a name, from that also, determined on ruling themselves.

(Nāzuk Shāh) ruled nominally for two months, for the second time, after (the death of) Mīrzā Haidar.

4 An account of Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, who was the brother of Nāzuk Shāh.

As ‘Īdī Zīnā had passed away, Daulat Chak became the Madār-ul-mulk, and took up the management of affairs into his own hand. But when he saw, that there was no escape from having someone who should bear the name of Sultān, he raised Ibrāhīm Shāh to the seat of government, and kept him as a puppet. At this time Khwājah Hājī, the vakīl of Mīrzā Haidar, came out of the jungle; and went to Islām Kān. And seizing Shams Zīnā and Bahrām Chak put them into the prison. When the day of the ‘Id-i-fīṭ came, Daulat

1 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) translates as “in the village of Mūsā Zīnā”.

2 The MSS. are incorrect. One has arādah khūd kerdand and the other serī kerdand. I have adopted the reading in the lith. ed. which is correct, and which is also the reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have for the second time. Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs have two months, but Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India have ten months.

4 That is the heading in the MS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah however calls Ibrāhīm Shāh, the son of Nāzuk Shāh. Col. Briggs calls him brother of Nazuk Shah on one page, and his son in the next page. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India, page 289, say that he was a son of Nāzuk Shāh.

5 It is jungle in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah; but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) has Khaiyal, and he translates as “took refuge with Islām Shāh.”

6 This is the reading in the MSS. and also in the lith. ed. The sentence has no nominative, and the verb kerdand is in the plural. Firishtah lith. ed. has doris waqt ubdī Zīnā wa doris waqt ubdī Zīnā, then as in the Ṭabaqāt, which makes matters, if anything, worse, for the two defects pointed out remain, there is the additional difficulty that ‘Īdī Zīnā was dead. I think the nominative should be Daulat Chak and the verb should be in the singular. Rodgers tides over the difficulty, by saying that Shams Zīnā and Bahrām Chakk were thrown into prison, but he does not say by whom.
Chak having put his troops in order, came to the foot of the 1 Qabq (to practise archery). Yūsuf Chak also rode out to the foot of the Qabq. The runner or footman, who was collecting the arrows, came among the horse's legs. 2 The horse got entangled; and Yūsuf Chak fell from his horse, and his neck was broken.

In the year 960 A.H. hostility took place between Ghāzi Khān and Daulat Chak and there was very great dissension among the Kashmīris. Ḥusain Mākri and Shams Zīnā, who were in Hindūstān, came back; and in the year 961 A.H., joined Ghāzi Khān. 3 The sons of Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak went to Daulat Chak. These disputes and dissensions continued for two months; but at length a husbandman, 4 in a spirit of impertinent interference, came to Daulat Chak, and said in his ears; "Ghāzi Khān has sent me to you to enquire why you have collected these unprincipled 5 men round you, as they are all your enemies." In the same way, he went to Ghāzi Khān,

---

1 The word is قب in one MS. It looks like قب in one place and like قب in another in the second; and it is قب in both places in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firistah it is قب in both places. Whatever the correct word is it seems to be the name of a hillock near Srinagar. Rodgers's translation (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) is "outside the city."

2 The words are اسپ بندہ در شد in one MS. and the lith. ed., and اسپ منذ شد in the other MS. Firistah lith. ed. has no corresponding words. In the text-edition the reading اسپ منذ شد has been adopted.

3 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak; but Yūsuf Chak had broken his neck; and Firistah lith. ed. has the sons of Yūsuf Chak; so I have inserted the word sons before Yūsuf Chak in the translation. The text-edition has followed the manuscripts.

4 The words are بعنوان فصول which Rodgers has translated "assuming the garb of an ambassador." The meaning is somewhat doubtful, but I think my translation is correct. The second word is نصول in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firistah, but it is فصول in the other MS. In the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt the words from قفط to ای بن اختلاف are omitted, and in their place the words are و در لفظ او کفتند, according to which the meaning would be that it was the sons of Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak who spoke the words in Daulat Chak's ear.

5 There is an adjective ی تقرب to the noun ی جرم in both the Ṭabaqāt and in Firistah. Rodgers has omitted translating it. I think my translation is correct.
and said, "Daulat Chak intends to be at peace with you. Why are you quarrelling with him." Having said things like this he effected a settlement between them. Shams Zinā then fled and went to Hindūstān.

At this time, some Tibetans came and drove away the flocks of sheep of parganas 1 Khāwah and Bārah, which were allotted as the jāĝīr of Ḥabīb Chak, brother of Naṣrāt Khān. Daulat Chak sent Ibrāhīm Chak, Ḥaidar Chak, son of Ghāzi Khān and other chief men with a large army by way of Lār to invade great Tibet. Ḥabīb Khān himself advanced with great rapidity in pursuit of the Tibetans, by the road by which the flocks had been driven away. He suddenly came up to a fort of the Tibetans, fought with the garrison, and slew their commander by the sword. The rest all fled. Ḥabīb Khān encamped there, and said to Darvīsh Chak his brother, "Do you mount with the troops, and get into Tibet." Darvīsh Chak was negligent, and did not comply with his words. Ḥabīb Chak, in spite of his 2 wounds, which were still bleeding, mounted and got into the edifices and great mansions of Tibet. The Tibetans, being unable to oppose him, fled without attempting to fight. Forty of the men, who were clinging to the roof of one of the palaces, were seized. They made much importunities, and begged that they might not be killed. They also promised to give five hundred horses, one thousand 3 pieces of pattū (woollen cloth), fifty yāks and two hundred tolas of gold. Ḥabīb Chak paid no attention to their words, and hanged them all. He mounted and rode to another fort, and destroyed it also. The Tibetans sent three thousand horsemen, five hundred pieces of pattū, one hundred sheep and thirty yāks for his acceptance. He also

---

1 The name of the parganas are as I have them in the text in one MS.; in the other they are Ḍekhā and Dīvār, and in the lith. ed. Firashtah lith. ed. has ḵᵛāwah and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 124) has Khāwan and Bāra. I think, however, that the flocks were taken away only from one pargana that of Khāwarpārah which is one of the parganahs to the N.E. of Šrinagar (see Āin-i-Akbari, Jarratt, vol. II, p. 369).

2 One MS. inserts between Ḍekhā and Rāz an the phrase званمختل and Ṭakī has ʙارچ یا ژخم. Rodgers has pieces.
took from the Tibetans some 1 good horses of Kāshghar, which had come into their hands.

Haidar Chak, son of Ghāzī Khān, sent 2 Sūkhāi, his foster brother, to Habīb Chak (with the message): “The Tibetans had kept these horses for Ghāzī Khān; and it would be better that you should send them, that I may send them to him.” 3 Habīb Chak had Sūkhāi struck about two hundred times with a stick, and said, “What power does Ghāzī Khān possess that he should take these horses, which I have seized by the force of my sword.” They wanted to fight about these horses; but men intervened to effect a settlement, and did not allow them to fight. After that they came to Srinagar; and passed the winter there.

In the year 962 A.H., there was a great earthquake in Kashmir, and many villages and towns were destroyed. The villages of 4 Jhalū and Dāmpūr, with buildings and 5 trees, were removed from one bank of the Biḥat (Jhelum) to the opposite bank; and in the village of Mārwarah which is situated at the foot of a hill, owing to a landslip (lit. falling of the hill) 6 about sixty thousand people perished.

---

1 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 124) translates “some five Kāshgari horses”; apparently here five is a misprint for fine.
2 The name is in the MSS. and Sūkhāi in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Khānī; Rodgers also has Khānī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 506) does not mention the name; and his translation of the passage is quite incorrect.
3 Firishtah lith. ed. has a totally different account of what happened, but it appears to me less natural than that in the text.
4 One MS. has جلوو دامپور, the other has جلوو دامپور. The lith. ed. has تینلو و دامپور. Firishtah lith. ed. has بزر و دامپور. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 506) does not mention the first, but calls the other Dampoor. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 124) has Nilū and 'Adampūr.
5 Firishtah agrees. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 506) says the town was removed from the east to the west bank of the Behut river, and in a footnote he adds that it is not easy to say whether the text should be taken literally. Rodgers says that the villages were “washed away”. Dampor, with a spring, is mentioned by Stein. The earthquake is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (lines 513 to 521). There is no mention of the removal of Jhalū and Dampūr from one bank of the Biḥat, but it is said (l. 517).
6 The words are distinctly written in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah, however, has six hundred, and this is more probable.
1 An Account of Isma'il Shâh, Brother of Ibrâhîm Shâh.

When five months had elapsed from (the beginning of) the rule of Ibrâhîm Shâh, which was in reality the rule of Daulat Chak, the times became propitious for Ghâzi Khân, and 2 Daulat Chak was slain. Ghâzi Khân became fully independent, but for name's sake raised Isma'il Shâh to the throne in the year 963 A.H. In this year, Ḥabib Chak wanted to join Daulat Chak (it would appear that what was said about his being slain or defeated and blinded, as in Firishtah, was said in anticipation of a coming event) and with this determination he went towards 3 Mardâ Dûn. Ghâzi Khân said to Naṣrat Chak, "Your brother Habib has joined Daulat Chak. It is right that before he arrives we should seize Daulat Chak, for after his arrival the matter

1 That is the heading in one MS., in which however the name is instead of لااممحل. In the other MS. and the lith. ed. the words are added after Ibrâhîm Shâh; but it does not appear who 'Ali Shâh was. Ibrâhîm Shâh, according to the Tabaqât, was a son of Muhammad Shâh, and according to Firishtah a son of Nâzuk Shâh (see p. 725 and note 4).

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all say دولة چک بقتل رسید. Firishtah however says Daulat Chak گرہد, i.e., was defeated and fettered. Prâjyabhaṭṭa's Rājataraṅgiṇī has a curious story (see lines 523–533). It says दोषनख (the change from Cakra to Cakka should be noted) attempted to stop the flow of water in the जमालम. Thrown by the angry Vetâlas (some kind of supernatural beings) stones fell into his house. He then went to a मदशाह: गाँधु known as शालम, who lived in a village called Tâlamûla; and inquired of him, how the dominions could be rich and free from all fears. The Sâdhu said मदशाहा गाधिन्द हूँ ब्राह्मणकर निवारित. When Daulat Chak inquired how he could do such a thing, the Sâdhu became रोषाकृष्टम; and he cursed Daulat Chak. The curse also was curious महोधमविका चन्द्रागो ते पतितम; that is, the moon and sun will fall on your reaching the middle of the sea. After चम्ममधाम (i.e., I suppose Ibrâhîm Shâh) had reigned for one month, Ghâzi Khân himself in his avarice took his position (अपाक्ष नम्प पद ब्राह्मणवानम: लय). I have included this long quotation as it appears to me to show a great increase of superstition and a great deterioration in the historical sense of the chroniclers.

3 The name is written as مردار in the MSS. and مردار in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. also has مردار. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed., while the text-edition has مردار.
would be difficult.” 1 It so happened that Daulat Chak had got into a boat, and had gone to the Dal reservoir (lake) to shoot ducks. When he got out of the boat, Ghāzī Khān coming up seized his horses; and he fled and got on the Jāk hill. Ghāzī Khān pursued and seized him. Ḥabīb Chak arriving at Nīr, knew that Daulat Chak had been seized, and became distressed in his mind. Ghāzī Khān caused Daulat Chak to be blinded.

After that Ḥabīb Chak came, and saw Ghāzī Khān. The latter was not pleased with him. He sent for Nāzuk Chak, nephew (brother’s son) of Daulat Chak, and 4 wanted to give him the trouble of becoming his vākīh; but he did not agree owing to the anger he felt at his uncle having been blinded, and Ghāzī Khān wanted to seize and imprison him; but he being warned fled, and went to Ḥabīb Chak.

**AN ACCOUNT OF ḤABĪB SHĀH, SON OF ISMA’IL SHĀH.**

When two years had elapsed from (the beginning of) the rule of Isma’il, he died; and Ghāzī Khān raised his son to the government. At the end of the year 964 A.H., Naṣrūṭ Chak, Ḥabīb Chak, Nāzuk Chak, Sankar Chak brother of Ghāzī Khān, and Yūsuf and Hastī Khān all collected together, entered into an agreement, and determined to the following effect: “Today Ghāzī Khān has taken a medicine; his brother Ḥusain Chak is in prison. We will bring the

---


2 The name is जाक in one MS. In the other it is not decipherable. In the lith. ed. it is खाक. Firishtah lith. ed. does not give the name. The text-edition following the lith. ed. has खाक.

3 The name is नहान, and नह in the MSS., and मदन in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not give the name of the place.

4 The words are تکليف وکالت باو نمود in the MSS. as well as in the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah; the meaning of which is not quite clear. Rodgers’s translation (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 125) is “gave Nazūk Chakk the nephew of Daulat Chakk much inconvenience and trouble.”

5 The word in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. are داروي گارد خورده است. I cannot find any meaning of the word گارد which would suit the context. Firishtah lith. ed. has got the same words, but the word گارد is omitted. Rodgers
latter out of prison and kill Ghāzī Khān." This news reached Ghāzī Khān. He won over Yūsuf Chak and Sankar Chak, and summoned them to his presence. Ḥabīb Chak, Naṣrat Chak and Darvīsh Chak declared, that they would either go (to Ghāzī Khān?) or would make their escape, after engagements and promises have been made in the presence of Qudīs and learned men. Naṣrat Chak went to Ghāzī Khān without any engagements, and was thus thrown into prison. Ḥabīb Chak, in concert with Nāzuk Chak, broke down the bridges, and rose in rebellion. Ḥastī Khān came with a large force and joined them. Ghāzī Khān sent a large army to attack them; and a great battle took place. Ghāzī Khān's army was, however, defeated, and some of his men were taken prisoners. Ḥabīb Chak having gained the victory went to 1 Māmūn. After his men had been defeated, Ghāzī Khān himself rode out to attack Ḥabīb Chak. He went to 2 Dūmrah, and having got hold of three or four boats crossed the river.

He had three elephants and three thousand men with him. When he arrived at the plain of Khālidgarh, Ḥabīb Chak came forward with 3 two thousand men, and engaged him in battle. After much fighting, Ḥabīb Chak got into the 4 Jamjah river; and his horse could not cross it. Ḥastī Ṭariq, one of the servants of Ghāzī Khān, coming after

---

The word is ماهون in the MS., and بسون in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has ماهون, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has Hamoon; and Rodgers has mountains of Māmūn. I cannot find anything about any of these places, and have adopted Māmūn. The text-edition following the lith. ed. has بسون.

2 There are different readings here. One MS. has در دومرة رفنة, the other has در دومرة رفنة. Firishtah lith. ed. has دومرة رفنة. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has "marched on to Domra"; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. IV, p. 125) has "went to Badūmara", which is certainly incorrect, as he has prefixed the preposition بًا to Dūmra and has made one word of them, I have adopted Dūmra, though I have failed to find its location. In the text-edition it is دومرة رفنة apparently a misprint for دومرة رفنة.

3 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have بست گم 200, twenty men, but this is apparently incorrect. Firishtah has بست بد صد, and I have inserted hundred after twenty; but the text-edition has followed the MSS.

4 The name is سنجھ in the MSS., and سنجھ in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has سنجھ پل. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has "the
him, put his hand on his mouth, and brought him down. About that (time) Ghāzī Khān’s elephant came there and he was seized. Ghāzī Khān ordered his fillān to cut off his head. When the fillān put his hand on Ḥabib Chak’s face (or into his mouth), the latter caught his fingers firmly and bit them. In the end his head was severed from his body, and was taken to Kalahmāt, where his house was; and hung there from the gallows. Ghāzī Khān also seized Darvīsh Chak and Nāzuk Chak, and had them hanged. After some time, Bahram Chak came from Hindūstān to Ghāzī Khān; and the pargana of Kahunahamū was allotted as his jāqīr. He received permission to leave Srinagar, and went to Madanjah, in pargana Zaingar, which was his Muchbul”; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 125) has “at the bridge of Jamja.”

Rodgers’s translation (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 125) of Firishta’s version “he was compelled to flee. At the bridge of Jamja his horse stuck fast”, is not correct. The correct translation would be “his horse stuck fast in the river of the Jamja bridge”. Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangīṇī is rather difficult to follow in the later portions; but I think the following words refer to this incident (lines 551-52). It will be noticed that Ghāzī Khān is already described as Bhūpāla or king; and Ḥabib Chak is transformed into Hābbe Cakka and not Cakra. I hoped to be able to fix the locality by finding out something about the Sitā Nadi; but this has not been possible.

1 The words occur in only one MS., but not in the other or in the lith. ed., but as this was necessary before it could be sent to the place of his residence, and as Firishta has, I have inserted them.

2 The name is in one MS. and in the other, and in the lith. ed. and Kulanamut, and Rodgers has only Kala thinking that the latter part of the name in Firishta which is means the name. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. IV, p. 126) translates the words which follow immediately afterwards, “hung it there on the door.”

3 The name is in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. has. Col. Briggs has Kohtahamoon, and Rodgers has Khuba or Khoba Hāmin. The nearest I can get to these in the list of parganahs in Āṭa-i-Akbhari (Jarratt, vol. II, p. 370) is Khoibānā, in the N.W. part of the Kamrāj tract. The text-edition has followed the MSS.

4 The name is and in the MS., and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishta. This name has been adopted in the text-edition.
birth-place. Then Sankar Chak and Falṭ Chak and others went to Bahrām; and they all came together to pargana Suuypūr; and began to create disturbances. Ghāzī Khān sent his son and brothers to attack them. They were unable to meet them, and fled towards the hills. On the next day Ghāzī Khān went in pursuit of them; and when he arrived in the village of Madanjah, he selected two thousand men, whom he sent in pursuit of them, so that they might capture them. The next day news came that Bahrām, having been hit by an arrow, had gone away to some (unknown) place; and Sankar Chak and Falṭ Chak had separated from him. Ghāzī Khān went with great rapidity to 2 Kahunahānū, and for six days made great search to capture Bahrām. Ahmād Jaurīn, 3 brother of Haidar Chak, son of Ghāzī Khān, was entrusted with the duty of capturing Bahrām. Ghāzī Khān himself returned to the city. Ahmād Jaurīn went to Shērkot, which was the abode of the 4 Rīshis, i.e., Sūfis; and

1 There are different readings and the meaning is not quite clear. The MSS. have یہوبدت بھرم تبر (نیور د خوردن بجایی رنن) بھرم ار سر گوب رنن. The lith. ed. has instead of یور or یور. Fīrishtah lith. ed. has بھرم ار سر گوب رنن. Col. Briggs gives no translation of the passage. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 126) has "Bahram Chakk had escaped from Sarkob", taking Sarkob to be the name of a place, which I do not think is correct. It will be seen that a few lines further down the place is called Shērkot in the Ṭabaqāt, though it is called Sārkōb there also in Fīrishtah. Shērkot is apparently the correct name of the place.

2 See page 732 and note 3.

3 The MSS., as well as the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Fīrishtah all say ہرام حیدر چک ولد عائش خان. I do not know why Ahmād Jaurīn could not be called son of Ghāzī Khān, instead of being called the brother of his son. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has Ahmad Hoorain, a son of Heidur Chuk brother of Ghazy Khan. This is probably correct. The words brother and son have become transposed.

4 The name is written یشیلا in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Fīrishtah lith. ed. has یشیلا. I think the latter to be the more correct form. Col. Briggs calls (vol. IV, p. 509) them Russies; and he thinks they were the inhabitants of a "convent of Russian missionaries being in Thibet"; for he argues the philosophical and horticultural Russies can be no other, though their being there is a very extraordinary fact. Rodgers simply calls them Rīshis or Sūfis. I have no doubt also that they were some kind of Sufis, of whom there were apparently many sects in Kashmir (see Tarīkh-i-Rashīdī, p. 436). Mirza Haidar paints them in very dark colours, but some of them might have been peaceful rusties, as those mentioned here are described to have been.
seized them, and in order to make them produce Bahrām had them bastinadoed. The Rīshīs said “We took Bahrām in a boat to the village of Bādhal to the house of Amīr Zinā.” The Rīshīs are a community or a group of people, who always carry on agriculture and plant orchards, and they live in a society by themselves and do not marry. Aḥmad Jaurīn went to Amīr Zinā, and after much search, got hold of Bahrām Chak; and took him to Srinagar. He was there hanged by the neck; and Aḥmad Jaurīn received the title of Fath Khān.

4 At this time, Shāh Abū-ul-maʿālī, who was in the custody of the Khakars, came with fetters on his feet mounted on the back of Yūsuf Kas̱mīrī. When he arrived at Rājaurī, a band of Mughals collected round him. The blind Daulat Chak and Fath Chak and other Chaks and Lōhars and Ankris all came to him; and in the year 965 A.H., they advanced towards Kas̱mīr. When they arrived at Bārāmūla, Muḥammad Ḥaidar and Fath Khān, who guarded the road,

1 The name of the village is in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of the ġTabaqāt. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Baydāli. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 510) has Nādīly and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 126) Bādeli.

2 I am not sure whether my translation is correct. The words in the ġTabaqāt MS. and lith. ed. are ġtafīqu ǧumālīnī bīn ġjibrīl ǧ̱dhrawī. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has ǧ̱dhrawī instead of ǧ̱dhrawī.

3 The text in the ġTabaqāt (MSS. and lith. ed.) is imperfect here. I have inserted Āḥmad before Jaurīn, and have put in ġ_nombre āmīr ġ_jibrīl instead of ġ_nombre āmīr ĝ̱dhrawī. In the text-edition it is ġ_nombre āmīr ġ̱dhrawī.

4 Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājabarāṅgīṇī, which is very meagre and very incorrect in its later pages, has some account of Shāh Abū-ul-maʿālī’s invasion immediately after the mention of the death or slaying of Ḥabīb Chak in lines 551-52 (see note 4, pp. 731-32). It says गते बसबिधे काले गोविंदलालप्रचौदित: | गाययो सुमुक्षालो वीकायीरबामीषय। गाथ सबोत्तमसाओति नाम यस्यासाधवृवि। (lines 552-53). It is curious that Shāh Abū Maʿālī should be called the Lord of the Mughals, when he was fleeing from them. I cannot identify Nosmī Cakka. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, describes the raid of Shah Abū-ul-Maʿālī, as “the serious rebellion of Yūsuf Chakk who was supported by Shāh Ab-1-Maʿālī.” This does not appear to me to be correct. No Yūsuf Chak is mentioned in connection with the reign, except one, who is said to have carried Shāh Abū-ul Maʿālī on his back. If Yūsuf Chak should be identified with the Nosmī Cakka referred to in the early part of the note, there will be some foundation for the statement.
fled and went to the village of Bādūkhi. Shāh Abu-ul-ma‘āli, having adopted the path of justice, none of his soldiers had any power to oppress the ra‘iyats. When he arrived in the village of 1 Bārbakla, which is near 2 Pattana, he encamped on high ground. Ghāzī Khān also marched out from Šrinagar, and encamped in Pattana, in front of Shāh Abu-ul-ma‘āli. He made his brother named Husain, the commander of his vanguard, and stationed himself in 3 mauḍa Khōd. The Kashmīris, who were with Shāh Abu-ul-ma‘āli, attacked without his permission, the army of Husain Khān, and compelled him to turn back. Ghāzī Khān, coming to his aid, fought with great gallantry, and having slain many of the Kashmīris defeated Shah Abu-ul-ma‘āli. The latter seeing the state of things, without fighting turned his face to flight. When his horse became exhausted on the way, a Mughal came to him, and gave him his own horse which was fresh and strong. He then took hold of the exhausted horse, and stood on the spot, and kept back all the Kashmīris who were going in pursuit of Shāh Abu-ul-ma‘āli. When his quiver became empty, the Kashmīris advanced on him in a crowd, and slew him. During this time, Shāh Abu-ul-ma‘āli managed to make his escape. Ghāzī Khān then turned back and went to Pattana. He ordered every Mughal, who was brought before him, to be beheaded except Ḥafīz (one who has memorised the Qur‘ān) Ḥabshi, one of the readers of His

---

1 The name of the village is مار با يلة Mar Bāyal and in the MSS., and بارکل Bārakal in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. In the lith. ed. of Frīshṭah it is بار در برل Bār Ar Berl. The text-edition following the first MS. has مار با يلة Mar Bāyal.

2 Pattana or Patan is on the side of the ancient Šāmkarapura and lies on the direct road between Šrinagar and Bārāmūla. According to Prājya-bhaṭṭa (l. 555) वासाम त्व भापां विचारपुराणिक where I think Ghāzī Khān is referred to in the words व भुवाक. I cannot find out the distance between Parihāsapura and Pattana, but seeing that “Šāmkaravarman is said to have carried off whatever was of value in Parihāsapura” in order to raise the fame of his own town” of Šāmkarapura, where Pattan now stands (vide Stein’s Rājatarāṅgini, vol. II, p. 481), it could not have been very great. In the text-edition the name of the village is given as بیبن.

3 The name in both MSS. is کبود. The lith. ed. says incorrectly در بکونج استنا در κήπους. Frīshṭah lith. ed. has κήπους. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 510) has Gahwar and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 126) has Khanūd. In the text-edition the reading in the MSS. has been followed.
Majesty Jinnat Ashiānī, whom he did not slay on account of the beauty of his recitation.

After this victory (Gbāzī Khān) released Naṣrat Chak out of prison, and sent him to wait upon His Majesty, the asylum of the Ḵhilāfat (Akbar). Naṣrat Chak went, and saw the Khān Khānān Bahrām Khān, and the latter showed him all honour and respect.

In the year 966 A.H., there was a change in the disposition of Gbāzī Khān; and 1 he began to act with tyranny and oppression, and the people showed great detestation of him. At this time a report was conveyed to his ears, that his son, in concert with some people, wanted to seize the kingdom. Gbāzī Khān summoned 2 Muḥammad Ṣadūr, who was his vakil (representative or agent), and Bahādur Bhat, and said, "People say this." They said, "What they say is true." Gbāzī Khān told them, "Give him good advice, so that he may not again allow such a thought to enter his mind." Muḥammad Ṣadūr called Ḥaidar Chak to his house, and reasoned with him, and abused him. Ḥaidar Chak got into a rage, and forcibly took the dagger from Muḥammad’s belt, and struck it in his stomach and killed him on the spot. Men came in a crowd, and seized Ḥaidar; and Gbāzī Khān gave the order for slaying him. In the end he was executed and his head was taken to Zaingarh, and there hung from

---

1 Instances of his barbarity and cruelty are given in lines 558, etc. of Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarāṅgīt. Among these is mentioned the slaying of his son named Ḥaidar, but the circumstances surrounding the incidents are somewhat difficult to understand. It is said in line 560 मातुलं सं विधायोमानो योवमच्छति प्रतापिः। (वाशाध्राण सुपालं समुने देवरतिधिः।) This can only be explained on the supposition that जोदोर में खुशी (the next note) was the maternal uncle of Ḥaidar. Prājyabhāṭṭa goes on to say that there was a great wail of lamentation on the execution of Ḥaidar (पुराण | वन्दे पवैणति दायककारी भवानिवृद्धं | l. 561), which shows that the people were in sympathy with the son or at least were grieved over his death, and were hostile to Gbāzī Khān; and it is also said त्रायं भविष्यते सुपाकः भवानिवृद्धं | (l. 562) which means that Gbāzī Khān like a mad Rākṣasa had the eighteen councillors of the prince executed. I cannot understand the word त्रायं in this line. It may be a printer’s mistake for च नान। The description of Gbāzī Khān as a mad Rākṣasa shows the intensity of the popular hatred towards him.

2 The name is Muḥammad Ṣadūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. it is Muḥammad Junāid in Firishtaḥ.
a gibbet. Ghāzī Khān also had the men, who had conspired with him (Haidar), put to death.

In the year 967 A.H., Qarrā Bahādur came from Hindūstān with a large army and nine elephants; and he had with him 1 Naṣrat Chak and Fatḥ Chak and others from among the Kashmirīs and also a large body of Khakars. He waited for three months at 2 Lālīpūr. He had great hopes that the Kashmirīs would join him; but at this time Naṣrat Khān and Fatḥ Chak and Lōhāri and Ankri fled from him and went to Ghāzī Khān. Owing to this, great weakness crept into Qarrā Bahādur’s army. Ghāzī Khān came out of Kashmir and arrived in Naūrozḵōt. (He) sent some foot-soldiers against him and defeated him. Qarrā Bahādur fled and got into the fort of Dāiyarah. The following day he fled from the foot-soldiers; and his elephants fell into the hands of the Kashmirīs; and five hundred Mughals were put to death.

When a period of five years of the rule of Ḥabīb Shāh had passed, Ghāzī Khān concealed him in a corner, raised the standard of his own rule, did not allow even the name of sovereignty to another, and had the public prayers read and the coins struck in his own name, and gave himself the title of Ghāzī Shāh.

3 An account of the rule of Ghāzī Khān.

Ghāzī Khān, having ascended the throne according to the custom of the rulers of Kashmir, commenced giving himself the titles of Bādshāh and Sulṭān. Owing to 4 leprosy, with which he had before this been afflicted, his voice at this time underwent a change; and his

---

1 The name is Naṣrat Khān Chak in one MS. It is omitted in the other. In the lith. ed. both of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah it is Naṣrat Chak.
2 The name is Lālīpūr in the MS. as well as the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. It is Lālāpūr in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
3 The heading is as I have it in the text-edition, in both MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah has دکر حکومت عازی شاه, which is better.
4 The attack of leprosy and the death of Ghāzī Khān or Shāh are described in Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarangīṇī, lines 563–567. It, however, omits all the incidents which are mentioned in the Tabaqāt and Firishtah, as having occurred after his assumption of the royal title.
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fingers were about to drop off, and there were ulcers in his gums (dar dandān, i.e., in his teeth). In the year 968 A.H., Fath Khan and Lōharī and Ankri and other Kashmiris became suspicious of him, and fleeing got into the hilly country. Ghāzī Khan sent his brother Hūsain Khān with two thousand men in pursuit of them. As it was the season of snow, Hūsain Khān, on arrival at 1 Bāharārah, made a halt. The enemy getting warning, went to the village of 2 Aḥlan; and a large number of them, falling under the snow, perished. The rest, who survived, went to 3 Kishtwār, and in the year 969 A.H., they were in great distress there, and sought an asylum with Hūsain Khān. The latter prayed to Ghāzī Khān to pardon their offences, and he pardoned them, and gave them good jāgirs.

In the year 970 A.H., Ghāzī Khān left Kashmir, and took up his residence at Lār; and sent his son Aḥmad Khān in concert with Fath Khān and 4 Nāsīr Kiyānī and other renowned amīrs for the conquest of Tibet. When they arrived within five karōhs of Tibet, Fath Khān went into (invaded) Tibet 5 with the permission of Aḥmad Khān; and getting among the Tibetans 6 came out quickly. The Tibetans

---

1 The name is بحرارة in the MSS., Firishtah lith. ed. has left out a considerable number of words from مخالق خبردار بر بند, and Col. Briggs and Rodgers have followed it.

2 The name is Aḥlan in both MSS., and Aslan in the lith. ed.

3 The name is كنوار in both MSS., and كنوار in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, and كنوار in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

4 The name is ناصر كناتی in both MSS., and ناصر كناته in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has ناصر كناته, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 513) transliterates as Nasir Kutaby, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 128) has Nāsīr Kībatū.

5 The MSS., as well as the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt have برقخست, i.e., with the permission; but Firishtah lith. ed. has رقصت, without the permission; and the subsequent incident shows that the latter reading is probably correct.

6 The reading in the Ṭabaqāt is درمیانی در بند در امید زود بند, but in one MS. which I have adopted. In the other MSS. and in the lith. ed. it is بر. Firishtah lith. ed. has a different reading; it is زنه بعد بشهر د امید. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 514) translates this in the words, “proceeded to the capital”; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 129) has “went into the city” without specifying what city. It is very doubtful that Fath Khān reached as far as the Capital of Tibet.
were unwilling to fight, and sent much tribute.  

At this time the idea came into Ahmad Khān’s mind, “Fath Khān went into Tibet, and came out. If I do not do a similar deed, the people of Kashmir will all praise him.” Then he determined that he should go jaridah (alone, or with a small retinue). Fath Khān said, “It is not advisable that you should go; and indeed if you must go, go with a large force.” Ahmad Khān did not listen to his words, and went with only five hundred men. He left Fath Khān in the camp. When the Tibetans saw that he had such a small force, they attacked him. He was unable to withstand them, and fled; on coming to Fath Khān said, “Today thou be the rearguard. I am off.” He did not delay anywhere. When the men saw, that Ahmad Khān was running away, they all turned their faces in flight. Fath Khān, however, halted. The Tibetans came up to him; he fought single handed with them; and was slain. On hearing this news Ghāzī Khān got into a rage, and strongly critcised his son’s conduct.

The period of Ghāzī Khān’s rule was four years.

1 Firishtah agrees, except in the latter part, where he says تا برچم و او هیچ لوقف نکرده پیش شد تبتن باو رسیده چون تنا دیدن بجگ برجند و فقح خان از کمال غیرت تنا جنگ کرده کشته شد. The versions both in Col. Briggs and Rodgers are altogether wrong, but it would be useless to point out all their mistakes. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, gives a short summary, as follows: “His advanced guard was defeated, and instead of pressing forward to its support he fled with the main body of the force.” Every statement in this sentence appears to me to be incorrect. The advanced guard was not defeated, and in fact there was no advance guard; and Ahmad Khān could not have pressed forward to its support. He was, in fact, running away, the main body running away with him; and it was only Fath Khān, whom, when he was running away, Ahmad Khān implored or ordered to be the rearguard; and he fought bravely and was killed. It is unfortunate that a history which is believed to be a standard work should contain such a statement. The compiler, apparently, read neither the Tabaqāt nor Firishtah; and apparently not even the incorrect translations of Col. Briggs or Rodgers.

2 The word اعضا (honours, reputations) in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for اعتراف (criticism, animadversion).

3 The account of the reign of Ḥusain Khān appears to end thus abruptly both in the Tabaqāt and in Firishtah; but as a matter of fact it is continued in the earlier part of the account of the reign of Ḥusain Khān or Shāh.
1 An account of Husain Khan, brother of Ghazi Khan.

In the year 971 A.H., Ghazi Khan left Kashmir with the intention of conquering Tibet; and took up his quarters in Maukhadah Khār; but owing to an acute attack of leprosy he lost the use of his eyes; and adopted bad manners and perpetrated tyranny on the people, and extorted sums of money as fines from innocent men. The people being aggrieved at his conduct, divided themselves into two parties. One of them united with his son Ahmad Khan; and the other joined his brother Husain Khan. On hearing this, he came back to Srinagar; and as he had more affection and kindness for Husain Khan, he raised him in his place to the saltanat. The vakils and vazirs of Ghazi Khan all went to Husain Khan’s house, and began to serve him. After fifteen days Ghazi Khan divided all his equipages and rich stuffs into two portions. One share he gave to his sons, and made over the other moiety to tradesmen, and ordered that they should pay him its price. The tradesmen came to Husain Khan praying for justice. The latter forbade Ghazi Khan (to effect the sale and demand the price). Ghazi Khan being annoyed with him wanted to make his son his successor. Husain Khan, on being informed of this, summoned Ahmad Khan, son of Ghazi Khan, Abdal Khan and other chief men; and took pro-

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah has ذَارِ سُلطَانُ حسَن شا乍, which is better. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, says that the new ruler ascended the throne as Nāsir-ud-dīn Husain Shāh.

The accession of Husain Khan or Shāh is mentioned in line 575 of Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangini, and the following lines describe his impartial justice, his prosperity, his fame and his pleasure, in respect of which, it says दुःख नातुधान राज म च चकार न वास्तवः | (l. 578), i.e., even Indra did not have such pleasure in Svarga. The happiness of the people is described in line 583, which says दुःख चकार राज म च चकार न वास्तवः | i.e., famine, robberies and fear from kings having been prevented by him, the people thought Kashmir to be like Svarga.

2 The name is Maukhadah Khār in both MSS. It is Maukandah in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Maulad Khār. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 514) has Mokudkar and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 129) has Muladghār, which is, however, not a correct transliteration of the name as given in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, where the last syllable is कहार ghār, or may be ghār but not ghar.
mises and engagements from them, that they would remain obedient to him. Ghāzī Khān summoned and collected his own men and the Mughals. Husain Khān also prepared to meet him. The people and the Qādis intervened, and quelled the disturbance. Ghāzī Khān came out of the city, and took up his quarters in Zainpūr; but after three months he came back to Srinagar. Husain Khān 1 divided the country of Kashmir among men.

In the year 972 a.h., Husain Khān granted Rājauri and Nau Shahr jāġīr to Sankar Chak, his elder brother, and sent him there. Immediately after this news came, that Sankar Chak had risen in revolt. (Husain Khān) then allotted the jāġīr to Muḥammad Mākri, and sent a large force against Sankar Chak. 2 The commanders of the force were Aḥmad Khān, Fāṭḥ Khān and Khwājah Masʿūd 3 Nāyak. They went, and fighting with Sankar defeated him. Husain Khān advanced to welcome them, and brought them to Srinagar. After some time Husain Khān learnt, that Aḥmad Khān and Muḥammad Khān Mākri and Naṣrat Khān had made plans for murdering him and wanted to imprison them. They on learning this came to Husain Khān with a large number of followers; and he was unable to harm them in any way. When they left his presence, 3 he became anxious (knowing) that they had become acquainted with the true state of things. He,

---

1 Similar divisions have been made by other Sultāns also, but the reasons of such divisions is not clear. Firishtah prefaces the statement by saying Ḥusain چک استقلال کلی بهپرسانتیده, but I do not think it gives any sufficient reasons.

2 There are differences in the readings. One MS. has سرکردارائی, while the other and the lith. ed. has سرداران. Then one MS. has احمد خان و فتح خان, the other has احمد خان و مسعود و بامک, while the lith. ed. has احمد خان و فتح خواجہ و مسعود بامک. Firishtah lith. ed. has احمد خان و فتح خواجہ و مسعود بامک, احمد خان و فتح خواجہ و مسعود تامک. I was inclined at first to adopt the reading in Firishtah, but I found that the construction of the sentence in the Ṭabaqāt is different, so I have adopted the reading in the first MS., though I am not quite sure about the last word. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has مسعود نامک in place of مسعود تامک in the translation above.

3 The readings are slightly different. One MS. has متفرکر شد کہ, while the other and the lith. ed. have متفرکر شدند. I have adopted the first reading.
therefore, sent Malik Lūlī Laund to them, with the message, that they should all meet together; and make promises and engagements that none of them would attempt any hostility to the others. Malik Lūlī Laund went and made proposals of peace. They then all came together in the house of Aḥmad Khān, and agreed that they should take Aḥmad Khān to the house of Ḥusain Khān. Aḥmad Khān, after much pressing consented; and went with Naṣrat Khān and Malik Lūlī to Ḥusain Khān’s house. Qāḍī Ḥabbī, who was one of the chief men of Kashmir, and Muhammad Mākri were also sent for. They all met together in the Diwānkhāna, which is celebrated as the Rang Mahāl. When night came Ḥusain Khān said, “We are inclined to-night to have some natūah-bāzī. As the Qāḍī is puritanical, you go together to the first floor (bālākhāna) (and amuse yourselves); and I am also coming.” When they went upstairs, “Ḥusain Khān sent some men and had them imprisoned.”

After that, he sent ʿAlam Khān and Khān Zamān, whose original name was Fath Khwājā, with a large army to attack Sankar Chak, who was near Rājauri. They went there and defeated Sankar Chak;

1 The name is as I have it in the text, in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. Fīrishtāh lith. ed. has ملک لودنی لوند. Col. Briggs does not mention the name. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 130) has Lodnī Lond. Laund according to the dictionary means a soldier or an adventurer. It also, I think, means a Levantine, but I cannot understand how a Levantine should have made his way to Kashmir.

2 The text is imperfect and contradictory. One MS. has جوهر قانونی متفرع است است شما با اتفاق قانونی باالخانه رفته صحبت دارد که این هم می‌آم شما با اتفاق قانونی به پالخانه رفته صحبت بدارد که این هم می‌آم. The lith. ed. has جوهر قانونی متفرع است است شما با اتفاق قانونی باالخانه رفته صحبت بدارد که این هم می‌آم. The lith. ed. of Fīrishtāh has the same reading as the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, but leaves out the word Qāḍī. I consider this reading the best and have adopted it for the reason mentioned below.

I cannot find the meaning of بازی. Bāzī means a game or play. In a preceding note I have said that Natūah is probably a corruption of Sanskrit Naṭa, an actor or a mimic. As there is a reference to the Qāḍī’s being orthodox or puritanical, the natūah-bāzī in this case was probably some kind of indecent mimicry or acting; but according to the text in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, the Qāḍī was also invited to go to the Bālākhāna, where the game would be played. If the text of the lith. ed. of Fīrishtāh is adopted and the word Qāḍī is omitted then there would be no difficulty.
and returned with victory and triumph. Khan Zamân having acquired much credit, an order was passed that all the amirs should go every day to his house.

In the year 973 A.H., (people) slandered Khan Zamân to Husain Khan. The latter ordered that men should not go to his house. Khan Zamân wished to go away from Kashmir, and was arranging to get together the things that would be required for the journey. Then Husain Khan went away on a hunting expedition. Shams Dūbar came and said to Khan Zamân, “Why are you going away; Husain Khan is gone out for hunting, and his house is unoccupied. We should go there, and take possession of all his equipages and treasure.” Khan Zamân liked these words of his, and went in concert with Fatḥ Chak and Lōhar and Ankarī and others like them, and attacked Husain Khan’s house. They set fire to the door, and wanted to bring out Ahmad Khan, Muhammad Khan Mākī and Nasrāt Khan from prison. Bahādur Khan son of Khan Zamân and Fatḥ Chak then came there. Mas‘ūd Nāyak was in charge of the prison. He discharged water on the courtyard of the Divvānkhāna, so that it became muddy. Daulat Khan one of Husain Khan’s men was

---

1 One MS. has by mistake حسن شکاری امّه. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has حسن مکاری امّه. بختیار زمان گفت.

2 There are differences in the readings here. One MS. has حسن خان بسکار فرخزاده ای خالی است بختیار او باب رفت. The other MS., which has the incorrect reading mentioned in the preceding note, has بسکار خان دو پرایمره بختیار مال گفت چرا بدن میسوری حسن خان بختیار رفت خانه او خالیست بختیار او باب رفت. The reading in the lith. ed. is the same as the reading in the 2nd MS., but instead of شورش در نویز امّه there is بسکار دو پرایمره which appears to be incorrect. I have adopted the readings in the 2nd MS., though I am doubtful as to who Shams Dūbar was. In the text-edition it is Mکاری امّه حسن. Besides, it was not likely, that because Husain Khan had gone away hunting, his house should remain unoccupied. Prājyabhāta refers to this in line 585. The line runs بانیاد امّه دو پرایمره می‌رود چون رستگار. Then there are some lines which appear to be an interpolation; after which line 586 runs as شورش در نویز امّه بختیار مال گفت. These two lines (585, 586) mean that the king had a minister named Khan Zamân, who, when the king went out, seized the city in a moment. Then the king’s troops came and destroyed (him) at once. The king was like the morning sun which destroys the darkness.
standing with his quiver on his back. Bahàdur Khàn ran to him, and struck him with his sword. The sword fell on his quiver; and he shot an arrow into the eye of Bahàdur Khàn’s horse, which reared up, and threw the rider. Mas‘úd Nàyak and Ankri attacked him, and cut off his head with a dagger. Khàn Zamàn received information of this from outside and fled. Mas‘úd Nàyak pursued and seized him, and took him to Husain Khàn. The latter ordered that he should be carried to Zaingarh; and his ears and nose and hands and feet should be cut off, and he should be hung from a gibbet. He also gave the designation of son to Mas‘úd Nàyak, and honoured him with the title of Mubàriz Khàn, and allotted the 2 pargana of Bànkal as his jàgîr.

In the year 974 A.H., Husain Khàn ordered that the blinding needle to be drawn across the eyes of Ahmad Khàn, son of Ghàzî Khàn, Nasràt Khàn and Muḥammad Khàn. Ghàzî Khàn, on hearing this news, suffered great anguish, and as he was already ill, he passed away.

Husain Khàn then founded a college, and lived in the society of pious and learned men in its precincts, and he allotted them the pargana of 4 Zainpûr as their jàgîr.

In the year 975 A.H., Lûlî Laund informed Husain Khàn that Mubâriz Khàn says that as Husain Khàn had called him his son, he

---

1 These names are variously written. One MS has رخت ملک وابوری, the other has مانک وابوری. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqât has دلیک و اکوئی; while that of Firishtah has مسورک دلیک و اکوئی. The latter appears to me to be correct and I have adopted it.

2 One of the parganas in the S.W. part of Kamrâj. See page 371, Aìn-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II, p. 370).

3 This is also mentioned by Prâjyabhaṭṭa (l. 588) which runs विरूध्व तत्तन्तीमानिन्ये से विशेषायत्रां | प्रदुष्यानिकारीस्त्रयं वर्ष निरितान मिच्छि स: 1 i.e., he pulled out the eyes of Muḥammad Khàn and others who were determined to fight with him, and whose hearts were filled with enmity towards him.

4 The name of the parganah looks like سالوز بنیامیر in the MSS., and as بالوز in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Zaînpûr. In the list of parganahs in Aìn-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II, pp. 368-371) there is none that at all resembles any of the names in the MSS. or the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât. There is, however, a pargana called Zinapur among those to the S.E. of Srinagar. I have, therefore, substituted the name of Zaîpûr, and this is followed in the text-edition.
should give him a share of the treasure. Husain Khān was much
pained in his heart. One day he went to the house of Mubāriz Khān.
He saw many horses in his stables. The pain in his mind became
more acute; and he ordered Mubāriz Khān to be imprisoned. All
affairs were now entrusted to Malik Lūlī. But in a short time he also
was imprisoned on the ground that he had embezzled 1 forty thousand
donkey-loads of paddy belonging to the government; and 'Ali Kōkah
was appointed in his place.

In the year 976 A.H., Qāḍī Ḥabīb, who was of the Hanafi faith,
coming out of the Jāma' Mosque on a Friday 2 had gone to the foot
of Mārān hill on a pilgrimage to the tomb; when a 3 Rāḍī of the name
of Yūsuf Andāz drew his sword, and struck the Qāḍī. The latter
was wounded on the head. Yūsuf again struck him with the sword.
The Qāḍī shielded his head with his hand, and his fingers were cut off.
Except the bigotry that was due to the difference of their religions
there was nothing else between them. Maulānā Kamāl-ud-dīn,
the son-in-law of the Qāḍī, 5 who occupied himself with teaching in
Sīālkūṭ, was with him at the time. Yūsuf fled after wounding the
Qāḍī. When Husain Khān heard this news, he appointed some men
who found Yūsuf out, and brought him. Husain Khān then assembled
lawyers like Mullā Yūsuf, Mullā Firūz, and others like them, and
ordered them that they should state whatever might be in accordance
with the law (Shara'). They replied, that the execution of such a
person by way of punishment was legal. The Qāḍī said, "It would

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 517) incorrectly translates "forty thousand bales of shawls"; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 131)
also incorrectly has "40,000 ass-loads of shawls."

2 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 131) translates "came to the zārat in the graveyard of Yākoh Mārān."

3 A man belonging to a section of the Shi'a sect, who renounced their
allegiance to Zaid, the son of 'Ali, the son of Husain. Firishtah calls Yūsuf a
Shī'a.

4 That is the name in both the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is Yūsuf Tandōz.
Firishtah lith. ed. has only Yūsuf. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers has any
name. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted ""Yūsuf  ""

5 It is invidious to go on pointing out Rodgers's mistakes, but he translates
(J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 131) the clause - ""was also with him engaged in reading."
not be right to execute this man, so long as I am alive." In the end, they stoned him to death. Members of the sect, who were united with Yūsuf in religion and faith, said to Ḫusain Khān, "There has been too much haste in executing him." Ḫusain Khān said, "I acted in accordance with the verdict of the Mullās."

About this time Mirzā Muqīm, and Yaʿqūb, son of Bābā ʿAlī came to Kashmir as ambassadors from the threshold of the servants of the asylum of the Khilāfat. When they arrived at Hirahpūr, Ḫusain Khān sent men to welcome them, and he himself came to the plain of 3 Sālah; and erected a pavilion and awnings and all the furniture of an assembly. When he heard that the ambassadors had come near, he came out of the pavilion and greeted them. Then they all came into the pavilion, and sat down in one place. After that the ambassadors got into a boat, and Ibrāhīm Khān, the son of Ḫusain Khān, also went with them. Ḫusain Khān did not go in the boat, but went to Kashmir (Srinagar) on horseback. He allotted the house of Ḫusain Mākri to the ambassadors.

After some days Mirzā Muqīm said, "Send the Qāḍī and the Muftīs, according to whose decision Yūsuf was executed, to me." Ḫusain Khān sent the Muftīs to him. Qāḍī Zain who was of the same religion as Yūsuf said, "The Muftīs made a mistake in their verdict." The Muftīs said, "We did not give a decisive verdict for his execution. We said that the execution of such a person by way of punishment was lawful." Mirzā Muqīm insulted the Muftīs in the assembly; and made them over to Fath Khān Rāfīlī and tortured them. Ḫusain Khān embarked in a boat and went away to Kamrāj. Fath Khān had the Muftīs put to death, by order of Mirzā Muhammad Muqīm, and had their bodies dragged round the lanes and bazārs by ropes tied to their feet. Ḫusain Khān sent his daughter with fine gifts and presents with the ambassador for the service of the asylum of the Khilāfat. The ambassadors taking his daughter and the tribute with them went back to Āgra.

---

1 That is the name in both MSS. The lith. ed. has in the plain of Shāhzāda. Firishtah does not mention the name of the place.

2 One MS. inserts بیتشکش و هداىا and both have رسیدن instead of رسیدن. I think رسیدن is better and I have retained it. It is رسیدند in the text-edition.
1 An account of ‘Ali Shāh, brother of Ḥusain.

In the year 977 A.H., news came that His Majesty the Khalifa-i-I lähī had ordered Mīrzā Muqīm to be executed, in retribution of the unjust executions which he had perpetrated in Kashmir; and he had also rejected Ḥusain Khān’s daughter. On hearing this news, Ḥusain Khān had an attack of dysentery or bloody flux, and he continued to be ill for three or four months.

At this time, 2 Muhammad Bhat incited Yūsuf, son of ‘Ali Khān, to rebel against Ḥusain Khān. When this news reached Ḥusain Khān, he said to Yūsuf to go to his father, i.e., ‘Ali Khān, who was at Sūyyapūr and to remain there. When Yūsuf went to ‘Ali Khān, other men also fled one after another, and went to ‘Ali Khān. When the going of the people, and also of his son to ‘Ali Khān became a certainty, Ḥusain Khān sent men to ‘Ali Khān with this message: “What offence has been committed by me? I sent your son to you without any objection or censure.” ‘Ali Khān said: “I also am not guilty in any way. People come to me fleeing from you; and although I advise them, it has no effect.”

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. and the lith. ed. The account of Ḥusain’s reign ends abruptly, but some account of it is continued in that of the next reign. Prājayabhaṭṭa does not mention the incident of Qādī Ḥabīb or of the arrival of Akbar’s ambassadors. He describes some spring and Śrī Paṇeṣṭīr festivities of Ḥusain Khān (lines 589–594), and then, in lines 595–6, he says that he had जपमा[(भा)र्दोप; and चांनेखाप धोतामै चक्पाम्याराकेष।] दुर्भिचारान्मकारेभो अन्नो भोजाकुकोलेबन्। i.e., the Ḥusain Shāh Moon having been swallowed up by the Rāhu of epilepsy the people became frightened of the darkness of injustice. The next line describes, in somewhat curious language, that bestowing the kingdom on his brother the king Ḥusain went to paradise, which he had acquired by his bounty, as if incited by his curiosity. The next line says he was always happy in his reign, which extended to seven years.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. has incorrectly دریندخت محمد شاه و پیوست یوسف ولد داشت. Col. Briggs makes no mention of Muhammad Bhat or Yūsuf; he calls (vol. IV, p. 520) the place where “Ally Khan” was, “Shewpur.” Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 132) translates Firishtah correctly, but “Bihut Yūsuf” is curious. The place of ‘Ali Khān’s residence is called Sonpūr.

3 One MS. has Sūyyapūr, the other has Rasūlpūr. The lith. ed. is defective and omits a part of the sentence. Firishtah lith. ed. has Sonpūr.
In the end, 'Ali Kāhān advanced towards Śrīnagar, and encamped at a distance of seven karōhs from there. Malik Lūlī Laund now fled, and went to 'Ali Kāhān. Ḥusain Kāhān came out of the city, and went to 1Jahlah Hājām, which was one karōh from it. Āhmad and Muḥammad and Ankri, who were his door-keepers and amīrs, fled that night and went to 'Ali Kāhān. 2Daulat, who was one of his near relations said to Ḥusain Kāhān, "As all men are running away from you, it would be better that you should send the emblems of royalty, about which there is always dispute, to 'Ali Kāhān. He is your brother, and is not a stranger." Ḥusain Kāhān then sent the royal umbrella and the yāk-tales, and all other insignias of royalty to 'Ali Kāhān by the hand of his own son Yūsuf; and said, "My only offence was this that I became ill." After that 'Ali Kāhān came to Ḥusain Kāhān's house, and enquired about his health; and they wept together.

3Then Ḥusain Kāhān made over the city to 'Ali Kāhān; and he came to Zainpūr, and took up his residence there. 'Ali Kāhān assumed the title of 'Ali Shāh, and the duties of royalty devolved upon him; and 4Dūkha, who was the vakil of Ḥusain Kāhān was put in charge of the public affairs. After three months Ḥusain Kāhān departed from the world. 'Ali Kāhān went to meet his bier, and he was buried in the vicinity of Ḥairān Bazār.

1 The name in one MS. is Jalē Hājām without any dots, in the other it is Jalē Hājām. Firishtah lith. ed. has Jalā Hājām. Col. Briggs does not mention the place. Rodgers calls it Jalalājām.

2 There is no affix to the name in the MSS. or in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Daulat Chak.

3 Prājyabhaṭṭa is silent over all that happened prior to the transfer of the sovereignty; but line 600 reads लालेश्वामातिते राज्ये तुस्युः, धर्मः प्रक्रिया । जुर्यादिकरं ने धर्मं प्रातः कस्मिन्न यथा । i.e., the kingdom having devolved on 'Ali Kāhān, all the people were happy as in the morning the lotus (blooms) when the sun goes to the mountain of the dawn.

4 The name appears to be Dūkha, though there are slight variations. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 522) calls it Dookna. Rodgers does not mention the name. Dūkha meaning "sorry", "poor" is quite a humble name; and the man was apparently of humble origin.
At this time Shāh ʿĀrif Darvīșh, coming from Ḥusain Qūlī Khān at Lāhōre arrived in Kashmir. ‘Ali Khān gave him his daughter in marriage; and believed him to be the Mahdi of the end of the world. ‘Ali Chak, son of Naurōz Chak, and Ibrāhīm Khān, son of Ghāzī Khān, placing great faith in him, bowed in worship before him; and considering him to be fit (for such honour) decided to place him on the throne. When this news reached ‘Ali Khān’s ears, he became annoyed with him, and wanted to injure him. Shāh ʿĀrif, coming to know of this, gave out, that he would not remain there, and that he would go to Lāhōre or some other country in the course of one day; and hid himself, so that people might believe that he had disappeared (by some occult power). After two or three days, it became known, that he had paid two ashrafis to some boatmen, and embarking in their boat, had arrived at Bārāmāla, and from there had got into the mountains. Some men were sent, and he was brought from there, and was placed in the custody of guards. When he fled a second time, he was brought back from the mountain of Mehtar Sulaimān. This time ‘Ali Khān took from him a thousand ashrafis in exchange for the mīhr of his daughter, and obtained talāq (divorce) for her from him; and he was permitted to go away to Tibet; and the two eunuchs, that he had with him, were separated from him and kept under surveillance.

In the year 979 A.H., ‘Ali Chak son of Naurōz Chak, came before ‘Ali Khān and said, “Dūkha has come into my jāğīr and has created disturbance there. If you will not forbid him, I shall cut open the stomachs of my horses.” ‘Ali Khān understood that these words were a hint that he would cut open ‘Ali Shāh’s stomach. He became angry, and had him seized and sent to Kamrāj. He fled from there and went to Ḥusain Qūlī Khān, the governor of Lāhōre; but as at the interview he did not perform the ceremonies, which were customary, his going there was of no avail, and he fled from Lāhōre and returned to Kashmir.

1 The name is Ḥusain Qūlī Khān in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the other MS. it is Ḥusain Khān by mistake while it is Ḥusain Qūlī Khān in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Firishtah says he described himself as a descendant of Shāh Ẓāhmāsp Ṣafvī, and was a Shīʿa.
He was seized and brought to Srinagar, and was kept in prison. After some time he escaped, and fled to Nau Shahr. 'Ali Khan sent some troops against him, and he was again seized and brought before 'Ali Khan.

In the year 980, 'Ali Khan sent an army to invade Kahtwārah (Kishtwār); and, taking the daughter of the ruler of the country, made peace with the latter, and returned.

During this time Mullā 'Ishqī and Qāḍī Ṣadr-ud-dīn came as ambassadors from the threshold of His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī. 'Ali Khan sent the daughter of his nephew for the service of the fortunate prince Sulṭān Salīm, with Mullā Ishqī and Qāḍī Ṣadr-ud-dīn, with other fine presents and tribute; and the public prayers and the coins of Kashmir were adorned and embellished with the renowned name of His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī. These events happened in the year 980 A.H.

At this time Yusuf Shāh, son of 'Ali Khan, had Ibrāhīm Khān, son of Gḥāzi Khān, executed on the accusation of Muḥammad Bhat, without obtaining the consent of his father; and for fear of the latter he and Muḥammad Bhat fled, and went to Bārāmīla. 'Ali Khan, on hearing this, was much pained in his mind. But men prayed for the pardon of Yusuf's offence, and he was summoned; and Muḥammad Bhat, who was the cause of this disturbance, was imprisoned.

In the year 982 A.H., 'Ali Shāh sent an army to invade the country of Kahtwārah, which is also called Kishtwār; and taking the daughter of the ruler of that country (in marriage) for his grandson Ya'qūb made peace with him; and returned to the city.

In the year 983 A.H., 'Ali Khan went with his family and dependants to see Jamālnagar. Ḥaidar Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, one of the descendants of Sulṭān Zain-ul-ʿābidīn, who had been in Gujrat, and when the servants of His Majesty went there, had waited upon him and had come to Hindūstān at his stirrups. From Hindūstān he had come to Nau Shahr. There was a cousin of his, Salīm Khān, there. A large body of men joined him (i.e., Ḥaidar Khān). 'Ali Khān sent a large body of troops with Lōhar Chak to remain at Rājaurī. Muḥammad Khān Chak, who was at Rājaurī, was jealous of Lōhar Chak having been made the commander; he seized him and taking all the troops with him, went to Ḥaidar Khān at Nau Shahr, and said to
him "Send Islam Khan, who is a brave man, with me, so that I may go and conquer Kashmir for you." Haider Khan being deceived by his words, sent Islam Khan with him. When they arrived in the village 2 of Jaukash, Muhammed Khan, in the morning, treacherously slew Islam Khan, and returning from there came to Kashmir and going to 'Ali Shah became the recipient of favours from him. 3 'Ali and Ankri and Daud Kadjar and others, who had intended to help Haider Khan, were imprisoned.

In the year 984 A.H., there was 4 a great famine in Kashmir, and many people died of the great hunger.

In the year 5 986 A.H. (the Sulthan) climbed to the top (platform in front?) of the mosque, and joined in an assembly of learned and

1 Apparently the man who was described as the cousin of Salim Khan a few lines before. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 134) wrongly describes him as "his" (i.e., Haider Khan's) cousin Salim Khan.

2 The name is so written in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is Jaukash. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is مريد جعفر. Col. Briggs does not mention it. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 135) calls it "the town of Jakun." Rodgers translates اسم خان را بعدر كشت. "Leaving Islam Khan with an excuse." In the text-edition the name of the village is مريد جعفر.

3 The names are as I have them, in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah they are علي مكرى و داور كزار: 'Ali Makri and Daud Kadjar. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted علي دانکار و داور د کزار.

4 Prâjyabhaṭṭa mentions the accession of 'Ali Khân in line 600 (see note 3, p. 748) and then describes in the next five lines his impartial justice, and the happiness of the people; and then says in line 606 बकऱरवादगेयसत्तम वभूवाट दिखा हुँ | भाविर्भिन्सम्बारोरंकगाताघोषसंद्रम | i.e., suddenly the face of the quarters became red, like the fire of the terrible times indicating the destruction to be caused by the coming famine. The horrors of the famine are described in lines 607 to 614. All family ties were broken asunder, the people clamoured for the flesh of an elephant which had died at the king's gate, and even a boy was killed, and his flesh was sold for human consumption. Then there was a great storm and a great conflagration (lines 615–621). Then in line 622 it is said नवविङ्किरित स्वगात्म | भोजन मुखः | भरवोपिनि | तुमिंचपिपारविपरीति कर्तिमित्य यथे दिमि | i.e., the Lord of the world, having enjoyed all pleasures for nine years, went to heaven, as if to give information of the hardships caused by the famine.

5 The year is 985 in Firishtah lith. ed.
pious men. Then bringing a book called the \textit{Mishkuūt} to that assembly, he, in accordance with a tradition which had come down in respect of the excellences of repentance, repented of his sins, and after making ablutions occupied himself with offering his prayers and reading the Qurān. After he had finished these, he mounted with the intention of playing \textit{Chawgān} (polo); and going to the field of ‘Īdgāh engaged in the game. Accidentally he was hit on the stomach by a wooden bow of his saddle; and died of that injury.

\textbf{AN ACCOUNT OF Yūsuf Khān, son of 'Ali Shāh.}

When 'Ali Shāh passed away, his brother 2 Abdāl Khān did not, for fear of his nephew Yūsuf Khān accompany the funeral procession. Yūsuf sent 3 Saiyid Mubārak Khān, and Bābā Khalīl to him with the message, “Come and bury your brother. If you accept me as the Sultān then it is all right, otherwise you be the ruler and I shall be your subject.” When they took Yūsuf Khān’s message to Abdāl

1 The word is مشکوک in the MSS., and مشکوک in the lith. ed. both of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah. The correct name is مشکوک. It is a very popular collection of the Traditions by Al-Khaṭīb-At-Ṭabrizī, who was an eminent Traditionalist, and who flourished in the first half of the 8th century Hijra. The work is an enlarged recension of an older book by Al-Baghawi, who died A.H. 516, A.D. 1124, entitled \textit{Masābih-As Sunna}. The full title is مشکوکة المصلي \textit{Mishkuūt-al-Masābih} (Niches for the lamps).

2 According to Prājyabhaṭṭa, Abdāl Khān was enraged at Yūsuf’s succeeding his father 'Ali Shāh. He claimed that the succession should pass to the brother. Lines 623-24 say, ‘तथा प्रवाह दिवं ग्रंथं राज्य स्थायिति। तथा प्रवाह दिवं ग्रंथं राज्य स्थायिति। तथा प्रवाह दिवं ग्रंथं राज्य स्थायिति। तथा प्रवाह दिवं ग्रंथं राज्य स्थायिति।’ Then line 625 says there was a fight between Abdāl and Yūsuf, who is called योगोभाष, at Sokandarapura, about which place I cannot find anything; and the former \textit{धनंसिंह}। कुलपलीन दिनं ययो आदिप्रभय। (L. 626), i.e., after slaying the troops went to heaven as if with curiosity to see his brother.

Yūsuf Khān is said to have given away much treasure to blot out the memory of Kārnā, Māndāhātā (line 627).

3 Firishtah also has Saiyid Mubārak Khān and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 525). Syud Moobarak Khan, but Rodgers (\textit{J.A.S.B.}, vol. LIV, p. 135) has Sayyid Mubārīs Khān.

4 One MS. omits the word शाम. The other has instead of ताब शाम। ताब शाम। ताब शाम। ताब शाम। ताब शाम। ताब शाम।
Khān, the latter said, "I am coming relying on your words, and I am girding up my loins in your service. If I receive any injury that will be on your shoulders" (i.e., you will be responsible for it). Saiyid Mubārak, who was on bad terms with Abduł, said, "We have also to go to Yūsuf, and take promises and engagements from him." With this agreement, the meeting broke up. When (Saiyid Mubārak) went to Yūsuf, he said to him, "Abduł Khān did not come in compliance with your words." Abduł Bhat said, "We should go very quickly, and attack him; and then we could bury 'Ali Shāh." Yūsuf Khān mounted at once and marched and attacked him (Abduł Khān). The latter came, and met him, and was slain. Hasan Khān, son of Saiyid Mubārak Khān was also slain in the skirmish. The next day he buried 'Ali Shāh, and Yūsuf became the ruler in the place of his father.

After two months, ¹ Saiyid Mubārak Khān and 'Ali Khān and others crossed the river with the intention of creating a revolt. Yūsuf Khān advanced against them in concert with ² Muḥammad Khān, the murderer of Salīm Khān, and Muḥammad Khān, who was the commander of the vanguard, taking time by the forelock, came and confronted the enemy with sixty men, but was slain. ³ Yūsuf asked

1 See line 628 of Prājyabhaṭṭa which says सौमर्थनादृढ़ च विनियमपूर्वे, i.e., Mubārak Khān went away to a distance, wishing to fight (with Yūsuf); and line 629 says Muḥammad Khān, Yūsuf's servant fought with Mubārak Khān in the neighbourhood of Diddā Maṭha, which according to Stein's Bājataroṅgī, vol. II, page 448, is now the large quarter of Didamar, which forms the western end of the city of Šrīnagar on the right river bank. The Maṭha was built by queen Diddā for the accommodation of travellers from various parts of India. The fact of Muḥammad Khān being slain is mentioned in line 631.

2 See page 750 where he was described as Muḥammad Khān Chak. Firishtah lith. ed. has a different reading. It says نصف شاه بالنافق محمد مکرر کہ مر اول اور بو. The correctness of the Šaṭbaqāt is proved by Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 629). See the preceding note.

3 Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 633) says, Yūsuf after enjoying the pleasures of rule for two and half months, अमास यज्ञांशोकां च माम पर्यावरतुङ्गिम i.e., he went to the inaccessible mountains, the country of the Khāsas. These, it may be said parenthetically, belonged to a tribe, which is mentioned in the Bhata Samhitā of Varāhamihira (ca. 500 A.D.), and they have been identified with the
for quarter, and came to Hirahpür; and 1 Saiyid Mubārak Khān sat on the seat of authority.

After some time Muḥammad Yūsuf Khān, acting on letters sent to him by (some) Kashmiris, made an attempt on Kashmir. Saiyid Mubārak Khān on hearing this news arrayed his troops and started to fight with him. Yūsuf Khān was again unable to withstand him, and went to the village of 2 Barsāl, which is situated in the jungle. Saiyid Mubārak Khān hastened in pursuit of him, and a battle took place. Yūsuf Khān fled to the mountains round about; and Saiyid Mubārak Khān came to Kashmir with victory and triumph. He deceitfully summoned 'Alī Khān, son of Nauroz, and imprisoned him. The other Chaks, such as Lōhar Chak, Ḥaidar Chak and Hastī Chak did not come to him through fear. (Saiyid Mubārak Khān) sent Bābā Khalīl and Saiyid Barkhūrdār to them, and summoned them after making conditions and engagements. They all came to him, and having obtained his permission, went away to their respective places.

On the way 3 they settled among themselves, that Yūsuf should be sent for, and placed on the throne. They sent a messenger to Yūsuf Khān from the place where they were. Saiyid Mubārak Khān on hearing this was dismayed, and sent 4 Muḥammad Khān Mākṣī to Yūsuf, so that he might tell the latter, that he (Saiyid Mubārak

present Khaka tribe, to which most of the petty chiefs in the Vītastā valley below Kashmir and in the neighbouring hills belong.

1 The usurpation of Saiyid Mubārak Khān does not appear to be mentioned in so many words by Firishaṭah; but it is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa, line 634, and by the Cambridge History of India, page 292.

2 The name is Barsāl in the MS., and Barmāl in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and Parthāl in that of Firishaṭah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 525) has Hurunpal Nursak, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 136) has Parthāl. Prājyabhaṭṭa does not mention the place, but proceeds at once to mention Yūsuf's going to Akbar, who is called यम्बालकार पापचामाद सन्दीप्रभातमिति (l. 635).

3 Prājyabhaṭṭa in lines 636, 637 says that gradually the people became hostile to Mubārak Khān, and he died (यम्बालकार पापचामाद सन्दीप्रभातमिति) after having enjoyed happiness for one and a quarter month (यम्बालकार पापचामाद सन्दीप्रभातमिति).

4 The name is as I have it in the text in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. it looks like Muḥammad Khān Kasī, and this has been followed in the text-edition. The name is not mentioned in Firishaṭah or elsewhere.
Khān) would accept him as the Sultān, and was repentant of what he had done. Muḥammad Khān on leaving him joined his enemies- Saiyid Mubārak Khān became still more distressed, and determined that he would go with his sons and slaves to Yūsuf Khān, and with this determination left the city and went to the ‘Īdgāh. He took ‘Ali Khān, the son of Nauroz Bhat, whom he had imprisoned, with him. Daulat Khān, who was one of his amirs fled from him. He in greater confusion released ‘Ali Khān from confinement, and went alone to the Khāngāh of Bābā Khalil. 1 Haidar Chak said to ‘Ali Khān, “All our exertions and endeavours were for your release.” Yūsuf, son of ‘Ali Khān, said to his father, “Haidar Chak wants to act treacherously towards you”; but ‘Ali Khān refused to believe him and started in company with Ḥaidar Chak. Lōhar Chak and others like him had assembled together. When ‘Ali Khān came, they seized and imprisoned him; and 2 decided among themselves that they would place Lōhar Chak on the throne.

At this time Yūsuf Khān arrived at 3 Kākpur; and he then learned, that the Kashmiris had decided to place Lōhar on the throne. He came from there to the village of 4 Dhail, and taking all his men

1 Prājayabhaṭṭa (l. 638) says that Ḥaidar Chak and his companions defeated Mubārak Khān, and installed Lōhar Chak as the ruler of the country मोमरखान मिर्जाजल बहादुरकाद्य: | राजे निम्नमात्सा वीमधरकक्क | गुणों शानसिक सर्वत्र | वबलोपचार निम्न मिर्जाजल प्रापतिपन्न राजाह ये य वर्तियां रस्तदारहदिमितर: | विस्तारित: म म पिंदित्रे प्रियमाणिते भवति | (lines 639, 640).

2 One MS. omits by mistake the words from को होमर रा to केरार दादे. In the text-edition it is only instead of لومرهچک لومرهچک, as in the translation.

3 The name is काकपूर in one MS. In the other the clause in which the name occurs is omitted in the preceding note. The lith. ed. has का, while the lith. ed. of Firishtah has काकपूर, and this name is used by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 136). I cannot find anything about Kākpur or Kālpur but there is a village of the name of Kākapūr, which forms as it were a riverside station or port of Šupiyan on the Vitastā (see Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. I, p. 183, footnote 695 and vol. II, p. 474).

4 The name 52 निजल and 52 जिल in the MS., and 52 जिल in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, and 52 जाल in that of Firishtah. Col. Briggs does not give the name
with him, went to Saiyid Yusuf Khan Lahir by way of Jammu. He then went to Fathpûr with Saiyid Yusuf Khan, and Raja Man Singh; and was honoured by being allowed to wait upon His Majesty the 1 Khalifa-i-Illahi. From there 2 he sent his Ya'qûb to Kashmir. The government of Kashmir was confirmed on Lôhar.

In the year 987 A.H., Muhammad Yusuf Khan started with Saiyid Yusuf Khan and Raja Man Singh from Fathpur to conquer Kashmir. When they arrived at Siâlkot, he 3 without taking their help went to Râjauri, and took possession of it; and he then arrived at the station of 4 Thatha. At this time Lôhar sent Yusuf Kashmîri to fight with Yusuf Khan; and Yusuf Kashmîri, after leaving Lôhâr's presence went to Yusuf Khan and joined him. Yusuf Khan then went by way of 5 Jhavail, which was the most difficult route, and


1 Both MSS. have  battleground خلافت بنغلالي, but the lith. ed. has خلافة الي. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has دامم جلال الدين محمد اكبر بادشا.

2 Firishtah explains that Ya'qûb was sent ahead, so that he might gain the people over to his father's side, and create disturbances in Lôhar Chak's government.

3 One MS. and the lith. eds. of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah have مصدق نشيء, but the other MS. has by mistake مصدق شد.”

4 One MS. has بمولن تنهه, the other has بمولن تنهه, The lith. ed. has بمولن تنهه, and that of Firishtah has بمولن تنهه. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 526) has Lassa, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) has Thatta; but neither of them explains why or how he went to these distant places. Prâjyabhâta (l. 642) says निवालस्यवृंहितिपरम विश्रामलिङ्गमदलमयम् | निविवि व सत्योपात उपदातिसिनोत्मयम् | This is definite: he took shelter in Svayyapura, which was inaccessible on account of being surrounded by the waters of the Vitastâ. If Svayyapura be identical with Suyaypûr, the modern Sûpûr, it was situated a short distance below the point where the Vitastâ leaves the Volur. It is, however, very difficult to identify Svayyapura with Thatha or any other name like it.

5 The name is جهيبول in both MSS. and جهيبول in the lith. ed. In Firishtah lith. ed. it looks like جهيبول or جهيبول. I cannot find anything about this place; but the correct name appears to be Jhavail. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 526) has Jeebul; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) has Jhupul.
marched rapidly and entered the fort of Sūyyapūr. Lōhar came in concert with Ḥaidar Chak, Shams Chak and Hasti Chak and confronted Yusuf Khān. The armies encamped on the bank of the river Bihāt (i.e., the Jhelum). After some days there was a great battle. From the auspiciousness of the attention of His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī, the victory fell to Yusuf Khān.

After the victory, (Yusuf Khān) marched to Srinagar, and entered it. Lōhar came, through the intervention of Qūḍī Mūsā and Muḥammad Bhat, and saw Yusuf Khān. In the first meeting, the interview was satisfactory; but in the end Lōhar was put into prison. A large number of the rebels were also cast into prison. When Yusuf Khān’s mind was set at rest in respect of his enemies, he divided the country of Kashmir. He separated good jāgīrā for Shams Chak, son of Daulat Chak, and Ya’qūb Chak, and Yusuf Kashmiri, and made all the rest his own Khalīfa. On the accusation of some Kashmirīs he had the blinding needle drawn across Lōhar’s eyes.

In the year 988 A.H., Yusuf imprisoned Shams Chak and ‘Ali Shēr and Muḥammad Khān, on the suspicion that they were about to

---

1. The name is सौन्दर्य in one MS. In the other it is सौन्दर्य, and in the lith. ed. it is सौन्दर्य. Firistah lith. ed. has सौन्दर्य Sūnpur. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 526) has Showpoor and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) Sonpūr. I think Sūyyapūr is the correct name. See note 4, page 756.

2. The name is Shams Chak in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firistah; it is Shamal Chak in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt.

3. The battle is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (lines 645, 646), who says फरसीभूमिभाषाशास्त्रियोपिचन्द्रित् विन्दिकेश्वरस्व पुरुषः श्रवणांश हेतु। विधाय तमुख्यू युध्यमानां प्रायस्यविवाहस्य। मनोष्कमन्त्रो मन्यन्तर्वकुलरूपः प्रा जयमन्त्रास्य वर्गाद्रयावनेरकः।

4. This is also mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 648) श्रवणांश मन्यन्तर्वकुलरूपः प्राकृतिप्रतीतिविवाहस्य। मनोष्कमन्त्रो मन्यन्तर्वकुलरूपः प्रा जयमन्त्रास्य वर्गाद्रयावनेरकः।

5. There are some differences in the names. In one MS, Ya’qūb Chak is written as Ya’qūb Bēg. In the other Shams Chak, son of Daulat Chak, is converted to Shams Chak and Daulat Chak. Ya’qūb Chak appears, according to Firishtah, to be Yusuf’s son.

6. The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Firistah lith. ed., however, has the suffix of Chak to the name of ‘Ali Shēr, and calls the third man Muḥammad Sa’ādat Bhat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 527) calls the second man Ally Chuk and the third Mahomed Khan; while Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) transforms the third name to Muḥammad Sa’ādat Bihut.
rebels against him. Hābib Khān fled for fear and went to the village of 1 Kasr. Yusuf, son of ‘Ali Khān, who had been imprisoned by Yusuf Khān, effected his release, and with his four brothers joined Hābib Khān in the above-named village. From there they all went to 2 Ran Mal the Rāja of Tibet, and came back after obtaining reinforcements from him. When they arrived near the frontier of Kashmir, they, owing to the differences which developed among them, were unable to do anything, and parted from one another without doing anything. Yusuf and Muḥammad Khān were seized, and brought before Yusuf Khān; and their ears and noses were cut off. Hābib Khān concealed himself in the city.

In the year 989 a.h., His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, returning from the conquest of Kābul, made his grand encampment in Jalalābād. He sent 3 Mirzā Tāhir, a relation of Mirzā Yusuf Khān, and Muḥammad Šāliḥ ‘Aqil as ambassadors to Kāshmir. When they arrived at Bārāmūla, Yusuf Khān hastened to welcome them, and taking the (imperial) farāmān in his hand showed reverence for it. He came into Srinagar with the ambassadors and sent his son Ḥaidar Khān, with many rich presents to wait on His Majesty. Ḥaidar Khān remained in attendance for a period of one year, and then he, and Shaikh Yaʿqūb Kashmīrī obtained leave to return to Kashmir.

In the year 989 a.h., Yusuf Khān went on a visit to Lār and Shams Chak fled from the prison and went to 4 Kāhwār; and joined 5

---

1 The name looks like كَسْر Kasr in both MSS. It is Kashūr in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt; while Firishtah lith. ed. has كَپَر. The text-edition following Firishtah has كپر. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 527) has Gaheer and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) has to the town of Khū. I cannot find any place in Kashmir which resembles any of these names.

2 The name is رُوُنْدُل in both MSS., and روَنْدُل in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The name is not quite distinct in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and both Col. Briggs and Rodgers omit it. I think Ran Mal (Sanskrit Ranamalla) is better and I have adopted it. In the text-edition it is روُنْدُل.

3 According to Firishtah Mirza Tāhir was a relation of Mirzā Saiyid Khān Shahhīd.

4 The name is written as كَنْوَار and كَوْنَار, but it is the same as Kishkwār or Khatwārah. See note 3, page 758.

5 This is apparently referred to by Prājyaabhaṭṭa (lines 649, 650) where, however, it is said that Ḥaidar Chak took shelter in अच्छल रेग and there was a battle between him and Yusuf.
Haider Chak who was there. Yusuf receiving information of this event sent an army to attack them. They separated and fled; and Yusuf Khan returned victorious and triumphant towards Srinagar.

In the year 990 A.H., Haider Chak and Shams Chak advanced towards Kashmir from Kakhwar in order to fight with Yusuf Khan. The latter advanced to meet them; and made his son Ya qub the commander of the vanguard. He was victorious in the battle, and returned to Srinagar. He, at the intervention of the Ray of Kakhwar, pardoned Shams Chak's offence, and granted him a jagir. 1 Haider Chak came out of the place where he was, and went to Raja Man Singh.

In the year 992 A.H., Ya'qub, son of Yusuf Chak, was exalted by having the honour of kissing the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilahi. When the latter arrived in Lahoore with grandeur and good fortune, Ya'qub wrote to Yusuf, that His Majesty intended to go to Kashmir. Yusuf Khan determined that he should advance to welcome him. At this time information reached him, that Hakim 'Ali and 3 Bahah-ud-din having come as ambassadors from the servants of His Majesty had arrived at 4 Thatha. Yusuf Khan advanced to welcome them, and putting on the robes conferred on him by the emperor made repeated obeisances; and with a firm determination wished to present himself at the threshold. 5 Bahah Khalil

1 This is referred to in line 651, which says, आजाद लाईन धूप दो वैदर-चक: | भक्ष वर्ण चिन्नस्य भाक्षराय चर्मसः | ।
2 Compare Prajyabhat (I. 659) आजाद लाईन धूपार्जित्य चर्मसः | याजाराजलापित्य प्रविन्तीन घटना | ।
3 One MS. has Bahah-ud-din Kambu, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have Kambu after Bahah-ud-din. Firishtah lith. ed. omits the name of Bahah-ud-din altogether, and mentions Hakim 'Ali Gilani as the only ambassador.
4 See note 4, page 756. بنيت is the name of the place in the text-edition.
5 Prajyabhat (line 658 and the following lines) gives a different reason for the final breach of the friendly relations between Akbar and Yousuf. It says that the prince Ya'qub was sent by Yusuf to render service to Akbar, आजाद लाईन धूपार्जित्य चर्मसः. Akbar on seeing the rich presents placed before him by Ya'qub became anxious to conquer Kashmir, करगिरविजयत्तपा चन्द्रकुव चर्मसः | He accordingly gave orders to Bhagwan Dass and other commanders, (हलाटा भगवानप्रमुखानां महीभाषा). Coming to know of this, Ya'qub left Akbar's
and Bábā Mahdi and 1 Shams Dūbī 2 being perplexed about him kept him back from carrying out his determination; and resolved that if Yūsuf Khān went towards the threshold, they would put him to death; and would raise his son Ya‘qūb in his place. For fear of this, (Yūsuf) postponed the carrying out of his intention; and gave leave to the imperial ambassadors to return.

The servants of His Majesty then appointed Mirzā Shāh Rukh and Shāh Qulī Khān and Rāja Bhagwān Dās to invade Kashmir. Yūsuf Khān came out of Kashmir (Srīnagar), and encamped with his army at Bārāmūla. When news came that the victorious army had arrived at 3 Bhimbar, 4 Yūsuf Khān (separating himself) from the

service, and came secretly to Kashmir, नया भूपालतिवारम्। प्रमादयो शक्तिवर्जन- रेणा भाग्यदातिचित्तः।। He came and informed his father, and pointed out that the greatness of the great who are weak is of no avail (वधनो गंभरमालीय मदवर्य याटि निमानि। पर्यतसर्षिक्कारं कुष्ठर चन्द्रिक्केरी)। Then they all set out for war; but after this there was a long controversy between Yūsuf Khān, who argued that it was not within their capacity to withstand Akbar’s power, and his ministers who advised war. They even said, भवमा: समुद्रसय: कुभ्यक्षेत्रकार्यनिधिर्यं। आकर्ष रेषाशिवाय तोत्त्याय: प्रवाह वन्यं। (l. 677), i.e., you remain at a distance; we will decide your work; we will take shelter in the forest, and carry on daily skirmishes; but their arguments were of no avail; and he went to Rāja Bhagwān Dās, रति निविष्य भूपालो विकारविन्वने। चरणं शर्कोंद्रवं भववस्थमाच्छयं। (l. 691). Then Ya‘qūb ascended the throne, and he pleased the people by distributing the treasures collected by his father; but as usual, in the later history of Kashmir, there were mutual jealousies and quarrels. After that Akbar sent Qāsim Khān to conquer Kashmir. काव्यिककालाधारां चक्षुदरमेंविन। प्रेरणामय भूपाल: कामोयिकतिविविध्या। (l. 705).

1 The name is Shams Dūbī in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah; but the suffix is doubtful in the MSS., it is Dūl in one and Dūlī in the other. Col. Briggs omits the name, but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 138) calls the man Shams Dadī. शम्स दोली in the text-edition.

2 The word is मोत in both MSS. and the lith., ed. and मोदी in the text-edition.

3 There are differences in the readings. The MSS. have बेंदूर और बेंदूर; बेंदूर और बेंदूर; Firishtah lith. ed. has बेंदूर और बेंदूर के सरहदे को शहिद। The text-edition following the MSS. has adopted बेंदूर.

4 The sentence appears to me to be confused and incomplete. I have thought it necessary to insert the words जदाने शात्तू to complete the sentence.
army took up his station in the village of Nagar, with the intention of loyally serving His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhi in concert with Mirzā Qāsim, son of Khwājah Hāji, and Mahdī Kōkah and Usād Lāṭīf. Mādhō Singh came to the above-mentioned village in order to receive Yūsuf Khān; and took him with himself to Rāja Bhagwān Dās. The latter sent him a horse and a 1 Siropa after the meeting; and marching from there advanced towards Kashmir (Srinagar). The Kashmirīs received him peacefully, and agreed that they would send every year a fixed sum for the imperial treasury. 2 Rāja Bhagwān Dās returned from there after concluding the peace; and obtained the honour of kissing the dust of the threshold at Atak. Yūsuf Khān also came with him, and obtained the distinction of kissing the threshold, which is the semblance of paradise.

SECTION X. 3 THE SECTION ABOUT THE RULERS OF SIND.

It is narrated in the history of Minhāj-ul-Masālik, which is known as the Chach-nāma, that when the turn of the Khilāfat came to Walid, the son of ‘Abd-ul-malik, the son of Marwān, 4 Hajjāj, the son of Yūsuf, sent Muḥammad Hārūn towards India, and he advanced into the country of 5 Mekrān, in the early part of the year 86 A.H.; and commenced collecting revenue there. At this time news became

1 See note 2, page 722.
2 The history of Kashmir, after the treaty concluded by Rāja Bhagwān Dās and which Akbar refused to ratify, will be found in the history of Akbar’s reign in this volume. The Cambridge History of India, page 293, gives a summary.
3 The heading in both MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has ذكر علامة سلطن سند.
4 He is described in Muir’s Annals of the Early Caliphate (1883, p. 445) as “At this period (A.H. 71) the right arm of the Umayyad Caliphs” and who afterwards for twenty years was Walid’s Viceroy in the eastern provinces of the Caliphate.
5 “The ancient Gedrosia, that torrid region, extending in land from the northern shore of the sea of ‘Oman” (Cambridge History of India, p. 1). I think it would have been much simpler, and more intelligible to call it by its modern name of Bahūchistān.
current, in the capital city of Baghhdād that Malik 1 Sarandīp (who I suppose was the governor of Ceylon, but who is also called the king of Ceylon) had sent by sea a ship filled with rich and beautiful articles and male and female Ḥabshi slaves for the servants of the capital. When the Shaikh arrived in the neighbourhood of 2 Dēbul,

1 Sarandīp is usually identified with Ceylon, but Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 325) calls it Saran-Dip and identifies it with Kachchh Bhuj.

2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 403) says that Deebul is identical with "Modern Tutta on the Indus." The Cambridge History of India (p. 2) has Deubul "Dāhir’s principal seaport," and says further on that it was "about twenty-four miles to the south-west of the modern town of Tatta." دبلي

The exact position of Dēbul (though the correct transliteration of which appears to be the form of the name in Persian would be Dahil) is as doubtful as the correct pronunciation of the name. There is a very long note, No. 316, in Major Raverty’s paper in “The Mḥrān of Sind and its Tributaries” (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, 1893) which extends from page 317 to page 331, in which he says all that could be said about Debal, and perhaps a good deal more, if I may say so, and in the course of which he says (p. 324), “Having clearly shown that Debal or Dewal was not Tnaṭhah, nor ‘Bambura’, nor Lāhri Bandar, nor Karāchī, and stated that the latter was not founded for centuries after the ‘Arab conquest, I will now show, as near as possible, where it was.” The note goes on for pages, and although Debul is occasionally mentioned, as on page 326, where Sulṭān Mu‘izz-ud-Dīn Muḥammad-i-Sām is said to have marched against it in 578 a.h. (1182-83 a.d.), and again on the same page where Sinān-ud-Dīn Chanīsār of Debal is mentioned as one of the seven petty Rāṇās in Sind, when Malik Nāsir-ud-Dīn Kābā-jaḥ declared his independence and assumed the title of Sulṭān, I cannot find any indication of the exact situation of the place.

Earlier in the note (pp. 319-321), however, Raverty gives some information about Debal from the accounts of the early English travellers. One of the earliest of these, Walter Payntōn, who accompanied Captain Christopher Newport in 1612 says (p. 320) that, “Boats were sent from Dīul (Dewal) for conveying the Ambassadors goods and people. ………. Tāta a great Cōtie one dayes journey from Dīul, both cities standing in the Great Mogolla Dominions.” Subsequent to this W. Payntōn, then Captain Payntōn (p. 321) mentions “Dīul near the mouth of the river Indus.” He then mentions the account of Dīul in the narrative of Sir Thomas Roe’s embassy in 1615 and of Thevenot in 1663-66, and comes to the conclusion that “Debal or Dewal is said to have been in 1666, southermost town of Sind; and its position is plainly stated in the account of Captain Newport’s landing. ………. The distance given as fifteen miles from
the turbulent people of that place looted that ship and seven other ships, and took possession of all the property in them. They also seized, with the object of making them slaves, a number of Musalmān women, who had embarked in the ship, with the object of circum-ambulating the Ka‘ba. When these things were happening, a number of men fled and going to Ḥajjāj complained to him. Ḥajjāj, the son of Yūsuf, wrote a letter to 1 Rāy Dāhir, who was 2 the ruler of Hind and Sind, and sent it to Muḥammad Hārūn, so that he might send it by the hand of some of his trusted servants to Rāy Dāhir. When Muḥammad Hārūn sent the letter to him, he wrote in reply that the act had been committed by robbers (pirates); and their power and pomp were so great that they could not be destroyed by his exertions and endeavours.

When this reply reached Ḥajjāj, he solicited permission for the invasion of Sind and Hind from Walīd, the son of ‘Abd-ul-malik,

Thaṭlah by the river, would bring us very near to the Shrine of Pir Patho, at the foot of the Makkahli hills, and near the Bhāgar branch of the Indus” (p. 322). Debal, he, therefore, concludes, lay “in the vicinity of that Shrine, but a little further the south-westward perhaps.”

There are three maps in this paper, one without a date has Debal a little to the north of what is marked as Pir Patho and about twenty-four miles to the west and a little to the south of Tatta, a second which is said to be from Purchas about 1615 A.D., which places Diul some distance almost due south, but a little to the west on the same bank of what appears to be the main estuary of the Indus, and a third, which is described as an old map published about the year 1700, which places Dobul or Dioul on the coast some distance to the south-west of Thatta.

1 Rāy Dāhir, according to the old Arab historians, was the son of Chach, the Brahman minister of the Rāy dynasty founded by the white Huns who settled in Sind, whose throne he then usurped, and became the ruler of the country. He had his capital at Alor. The Chach-nāma, extracts from the translation of which are given in H. M. Elliot’s History of India (vol. I, pp. 140–152), contains a long account of Chach the father of Dāhir. It is said in the preface to the translation of the extracts from the Chach-nāma (p. 137) that Nizam-ud-dīn Ahmad, Nūru-1-Hakk, Firishta and Mir Ma’sūm and others have drawn their account of the conquest of Sind from it.

2 One MS. has وله سنن and ہند after it; and the other has وله سنن ہند. I have adopted the reading of the second MS. In the text-edition it is only وله سنن as in the first MS.
the 1 son of Marwān; and sent 2 Badīl with three hundred warriors to Muḥammad Hārūn, and wrote to him, that he should send three thousand great warriors (mard janqūṣū khāṇrēz) with him for the capture of Débul. When Badīl arrived in the neighbourhood of Débul, he after making great exertions, attained the good fortune of martyrdom. The heart of Ḥajjāj was distressed on hearing of this defeat and became very sad and sorrowful. Although 'Āmir, son of 'Abd-ūl-lah, had intended to take the command of the army for the invasion of Sind, Ḥajjāj in consultation with astrologers, who knew the niceties of their science, prevented 3 Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāsim, son of 'Aqīl Ṭhaqfī, who was the son of his uncle and also his son-in-law, and was in his seventeenth year, and sent him with 4 six thousand men chosen from the chief men of Syria for the conquest of Sind by way of Shīrāz.

1 One MS. omits ʿibn Muʿawān while the other has ʿibn Muʿawān but omits ʿibn. In the text-edition, however, as in the translation, the words ʿibn Muʿawān or the son of Marwān have been included.

2 He is called Badīl in the MSS. of the Ṭabaqāt and the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 403) calls him Būdmeen. Al Bilādūrī (vide Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) says there were two expeditions, one under 'Ubaidū-ūl-lah and the second under Būdāil son of Tahfā, both of which were unsuccessful and both the commanders were slain.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 2, insists on calling him Muhammad, and says that he should not be called Qāsim or Muḥammad Qāsim, as he is sometimes called by European historians and directs that "this vulgar error, arising from a Persian idiom in which the word 'son' is understood, but not expressed, should be avoided." It appears, however, that this error is shared by Musalmān historians. Both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah call him Muḥammad Qāsim, and as to the word 'son' being understood, it would appear that he was the son not of Qāsim but of 'Aqīl Ṭhaqfī. It must be noted, however, that Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 324) also calls him "Muḥammad, son of Kāsim." According to Al Bilādūrī (Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) his full name was Muḥammad, son of Kāsim, son of Muḥammad, son of Hakīm, son of Abū 'Ukāil.

4 Al Bilādūrī (Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) says, "Ḥajjāj ordered six thousand Syrian warriors to attend Muḥammad, and others besides. He was provided with all he could require, without omitting even thread and needle." According to the Cambridge History of India (p. 2), there were besides the six thousand Syrian horses, a camel corps of equal strength, and a baggage train of three thousand camels.
After traversing the stages and reaching the end of their journey they laid siege to the fort of Dēbul, and after a few days captured it, and an immense quantity of plunder fell into their hands. Among those there were four hundred slave girls of matchless beauty. Muḥammad Qāsim divided the booty among his soldiers, and sent the daughter of the Rāj of Dēbul, with a fifth part of the booty to Ḥajjāj. The 1 daughter of the Rāj of Dēbul fled and went to Jay Sinha, son of Rāy Dāhir, who was the governor of the fort of 2 Nīrūn. Muḥammad Qāsim advanced with a stout heart against him. Rāyzādā 3 Jay Sinha having placed the bridle of bravery and manliness in the hand of shamelessness, and making over the defence of the fort of Nīrūn to some trusted men crossed the 4 Mehrān river and went to the ancient fort of 5 Brahman-ābād. When Muḥammad

1 Firishtah does not agree with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that the princess was sent to Ḥajjaj. He says that seventy-five slave girls with the fifth part of the booty were sent to Ḥajjaj.

2 According to Ibn Ḥauḳal quoted by Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, 1893, p. 215) “Nīrūn is a city situated between Debal and Mansūriyah on the road thither, and is situated on the west side of the Mihrān.” According to Al Bilādurī (Elliot, vol. I, p. 121) the inhabitants of Nīrūn had, already before the arrival of Muḥammad, sent two Samanīs or priests to Ḥajjaj to treat for peace; and on Muḥammad’s arrival they furnished him with supplies and admitted him into the town, and they were allowed to capitulate. The Cambridge History of India (p. 3) says that Nīrūn was about seventy-five miles to the northeast of Debal and near the modern Haidarābād (Hydrābād). 


4 “The Sindhu, Nahr-i-Sind, Āb-i-Sind or Indus, from the time that we possess any authentic records respecting it, was a tributary along with the other rivers now forming the Pančh Nad or the Panj Āb, of the Hakrā or Wahindah, which having all united into one great river at the Degh-i-Āb (literally meeting of water or waters-meet) as related by the old ’Arab and Sindī writers, formed the Mihrān of Sind or Sind-Sāgar” (Raverty, J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 316).

5 The name is written حصار برهمینان باد in the MSS. and بقلمه برهمینان باد in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has بقلمه برهمینان باد. The correct name of the place, however, was Bahman-ābād or Bahman-ṇih, the Bahman-no of the Sindis. It was “founded centuries before, by Bahman son of Isfandiyār,
Qāsim arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Nīrūn, the residents of the city, being in the first instance frightened by the onsets of the arrival of the army shut themselves up in the fort; and later having arranged and provided for the necessaries of the army (i.e., I suppose Mūḥammad Qāsim’s army) joined it, shouting the word Al-amān (quarter or safety). Mūḥammad Qāsim granted them quarter, took the heads of the different groups of people with him; and leaving his own superintendent or commander in the fort of Nīrūn, advanced to conquer Siwistān, which is now known as Sīhwān.

1 A number of the inhabitants of Siwistān went to Baḫhrā, who was the ruler of the place, and was the son of the uncle of Rāy Dāhir, and said, “Our religion is safety, and to pardon is our faith, and according to our tenets, slaying and being slain are not allowed. It is advisable that we should petition for protection from the commanders of the army.” Rāyẓāda Baḫhrā relying on his strength and power uttered harsh and unfitting words (towards them); but in the end after enduring the siege for a week took the path of flight and

in the reign of Gushṭāsib sovereign of I-rān-Zamīn, who made conquests in valley of the Indus and western Hind, which were retained up to within a few years of the fall of the I-rān empire” (vide note 112, p. 196 of Raverty’s paper, J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i). In another note, No. 105, page 196, Raverty says “This place Bahmanābād or Bahman-ṇih, notwithstanding that more than one old author distinctly states by whom it was founded, European writers (and Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtā also) insist in calling ‘Brahmanābād’, because it is incorrect, seemingly.”

1 There are differences in the readings here. One MS. has مردم الولایات نود گاجی از سکت ان‌دی ای جمعی که حاکم انگا و این که علی دادر بود یک بحر اگر دید که حاکم انگا و این که علی دادر بود از سکت ان‌دی نود چونا که حاکم انگا و این که علی دادر بود. Firishtā lith. ed. has مردم سیستال که هم بودند نود حاکم خود کچورانی که این دادر بود. It appears from comparing these that the inhabitants, who, according to Firishtā, were all Brahmins went to the ruler of the place, who according to one MS. of the Ṭabaqāt was called; apparently incorrectly, Mūḥammad but according to the other and the lith. ed. Baĉehra and according to Firishtā Kachral, and said that they did not want to fight the invaders. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 405) calls the governor of Sehwān Kucha Ray; the Cambridge History of India (p. 3) calls him “Bajhrā, son of Chandra and cousin of Dāhir”; and Raverty also (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 233) has Bajhrā.
prayed for shelter to the Rāy of the fort of 1 Sisams. Early next morning Muḥammad Qāsim, in concert with the leaders of the different sections of his army, entered the fortress the Siwistān; and granted quarter to those who had not accepted the advice of or shown goodwill to Rāyzāda Bachhrā. He divided the booty and the fruits of the conquest of Siwistān among the troops, after setting apart a fifth part (to be sent to Ḥajjāj); and then turned his face towards the fort of Sisam. After the conquest of that fort he advanced to engage Rāy Dāhir, who was the head of the disturbance, and the chief of the disturbers.

While this was going on, there was a 2 dearth of commodities in the army of Muḥammad Qāsim; and most of the beasts of burden became lame (and unfit for work); and owing to this anxiety and distress regarding the condition of the troops became apparent. Ḥajjāj, son of Yūsuf, becoming acquainted with the true state of things, after making necessary preparations, sent to Muḥammad Qāsim two thousand horses from his own stables, and the soldiers having gained fresh strength advanced to attack Rāy Dāhir. After the parties met, a series of battles took place one after another. They say that while these things were going on, Rāy Dāhir sent for the astrologers to attend on him in his private chamber; and asked that the circumstances and the aim of the ‘Arab army to be explained to him. The astrologers, who knew the stars, said, “We have read in ancient books that in the lunar year 86, the ‘Arab army would take possession of the country

---

1 The name is written as بَشْا in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Firishtah lith. ed. has بَشْا, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 406) has Sulim. The Cambridge History of India (p. 4) has Sisam. Raverty calls it Sisam, Sahbān and Sālam of others (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 233). In the text-edition it is بَشْا.

2 This dearth is also mentioned by Arab historians (vide Raverty, J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 237). Muḥammad had to build a bridge of boats to take his army over to the Bahmanābād side of the Mihrān. The bridge was constructed, and the army crossed without much opposition on the part of Dāhir. Major Raverty also says that the writers do not mention the difficulties he had to encounter, such as the delay in obtaining boats, the want of food and forage, and the consequent loss of men and horses from disease, and months that elapsed in the meantime. It is not clear where he got the information about the delay and the difficulties.
round Dēbul; and that in the year 93 they would gain possession of the whole country of Sind." As he had repeatedly examined the astrologers, he knew that in forecasting the influence of the stars, they were sure and protected against all errors and mistakes, he grappled (with the difficulties of his position); and as the cup of his life had begun to overflow, he, on Thursday the 10th of the auspicious month of Ramaḍān in the year 993 A.H., turned the face of his spirit with the greatest vigour to the battle-field; and with the help of the greatest endeavour and exertion, shot every arrow, which he had in the quiver of his devices, at the enemy, and struck by the arrow of fate died. A summary of the circumstances attending the death of Dāhir Rāy is as follows: that on the day of battle he, riding on a white elephant, took his place in the centre of the line of warriors and exerted himself with great gallantry and showed himself to be an expert archer. While the brave men of the two sides and the warriors of the two armies were mingled with each other, a thrower of naphtha (or an archer) shooting arrows tipped with naphtha struck a flame of fire at the howdah of the white elephant on which Rāy Dāhir was seated. The elephant was frightened and began to run away; and although the driver struck it with the hooked goad it had not even the power of a whip with which one strikes an 'Arab horse. The elephant fled and got into the river. The warriors of Muhammad Qāsim's army pursued it from behind, and sent the message of death by the tongues of their arrows from different directions. After he had received many

---

1 The account of the battle in the Tabaqāt, which appears to be copied from the Chach-nāma (Elliott, vol. I, p. 170), is encumbered in the earlier part with Dāhir's consultation with the astrologers and much figurative language. The actual circumstances attending the death of Dāhir, due to the elephant on which he was riding being frightened are, however, described here clearly. Firishtah's account is somewhat different and more matter of fact. The account given in Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 239) is rather brief, and gives no details. The Cambridge History of India (p. 5) gives a circumstantial account, which agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah and may have been taken from it.

2 The words are in one MS. حكم نادرانه ندشت كہ بہ آسپ عوری بننند. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. are the same, with the difference that the word is داشت in one MS. and ندشت in the other and in the lith. ed. In the text-edition داشت has been adopted.
wounds, he returned to the bank of the river. The elephant came out in its own way and made the horsemen run away in all directions. At this time acting with great gallantry Rāy Dāhir, wounded as he was, descended from the elephant by such device as he could think of, and confronted one of the brave ‘Arab warriors. The latter with one blow carried to its end that half-finished life. The Rāys and Rājpūts, on seeing this, threw the dust of misery on their heads and took the way of flight; and the brave ‘Arab warriors mingling with the Rājpūts pursued the latter as far as the gate of the fortress. They cast down many of the infidel warriors after aspersing them of cowardice by the thrusts of their spears. So much plunder and booty fell into the hands of the soldiers that these were beyond one’s ideas and estimates.

Rayzāda Jay Sinha, after making the fortress strong by putting into it a garrison of brave warriors, wanted to come out and again engage in a drawn battle; but the representatives and ministers of his father did not permit that he should again fight a battle, and they carried him away to the old fort of Brahmanābād (Bahmanābād). Rāy Dāhir’s widow, however, disagreeing with her son, strengthened

1 The readings here are also different. The MSS. have دو گنار دریا شیر و شغب شد, while the lith. ed. has دو گنار دریا شیر و شغب شد. Firishtah has no passage, which is exactly similar to this. I cannot find any meaning of شغب شد or which will at all fit in with the context. The Cambridge History of India (p. 5) has “the driver arrested his flight in midstream, and induced him once more to face the enemy.” This seems to be the meaning but I cannot get the word to fit in. The account of the battle in the Chach-nama (vide Elliot, vol. I, p. 170) is “Dāhir and the driver were carried into the rolling waves.”

2 On the other hand, Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 5) say that he was struck by an arrow and fell from the elephant. For accounts of the events just before the battle see note No. 187 in Raverty’s paper (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 239), but it does not give any detailed account of the final battle. It only says, “the Arabs made a general attack on Dāhir and his forces; and he was finally killed near the fort of Rāwar, between the Mihrān river and the canals of Dadahāh Wāh, in endeavouring to reach the fortress, and his troops were overthrown with great slaughter, and pursued to the gates of that place.” These details do not agree with the accounts of the battle as given by Nīgam-ud-dīn or Firishtah or the Cambridge History of India.

3 The following account agrees with that in Raverty’s paper (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 239). The widow was named Rānī Bā’ī, and she is stated to have been a sister of Dāhir.
the gates of the fortress; and making fifteen thousand Rājūts join her prepared to defend it. Imād-ud-din Muḥammad Qāsim, considering the conquest of the fortress of Rāwar to be easy, and thinking that this should be done before the destruction of Jay Sinha, turned his bridle from the battle-field for the capture of the fortress of Rāwar, and surrounded it. After some days, when the people of the fortress were reduced to straits, they lighted a great fire and threw their women and children into it; and opening the gates of the city prepared for battle and slaughter. The Syrian warriors, drawing their blood-drinking swords from the scabbards, entered the fortress and slew six thousand Rājūts; and thirty thousand were seized as slaves. The daughters of Rāy Dāhir, who fell into the hands of the conquerors among the prisoners, were sent as a present for the service of the Khalifa. When they came before the latter's eyes, he made them over to the servants of the harem, so that they might attend to their wants for some days, and then had them brought to his presence. He wanted that he would have one of them to share his bed. She

1 The readings are different and none of them appears to be quite correct. One MS. has تَسْفَرَ حِصَارَةَ وَأَهْلُهَا حَصَارَةَ مَذْكُورَةَ رَاءَ إِلَى دُمَيْنَ اِبْنِ فُرَنَّد. The other has تَسْفَرَ حِصَارَةَ رَاءَ إِلَى دُمَيْنَ إِلَى دُمَيْنَ حَصَارَةَ مَذْكُورَةَ رَاءَ إِلَى دُمَيْنَ اِبْنِ فُرَنَّد. The lith. ed. has تَسْفَرَ حِصَارَةَ زَرَاءَ إِلَى دُمَيْنَ اِبْنِ فُرَنَّد. It would be seen that the 2nd MS. and the lith. ed. agree very much. If the reading in the lith. ed. may be accepted, after substituting for دُرَّ, and I have made my translation accordingly.

2 The name of the fortress is not mentioned in the text-edition.

3 The Jauhar could not have been very complete.

4 The words are: تَسْفَرَ حِصَارَةَ وَأَهْلُهَا حَصَارَةَ مَذْكُورَةَ. The circumstances of the accusation made by Dāhir's daughter, which she afterwards declared to be false, and which she said she had made to avenge the killing of her father are mentioned by Firishtah, but not by Al Bilāduri, who says (vide Elliot, vol. I, p. 124) that after Wallid's death his brother Sulaimān became the Caliph. He appointed Sālih to collect a tribute of 'Irāk. Yazid was made governor of Sind, and Muhammad was sent back a prisoner, and was kept in prison at Wāsit, where he was put to torture with other members of the family of 'Abū 'Ukail, until they
submitted, "I do not possess the status of being honoured with the association of the Khalifā’s bed, for ‘Imād-ud-din Muḥammad Qāsim had kept me for three nights in his own harem." The Khalifā, being overpowered by an access of rage, wrote an order with his own hand that Muḥammad Qāsim, wherever he might have arrived at the time (the order should reach him), should put himself (sew himself up) in raw hide, and should start for the capital. The helpless man had himself sewn up in a raw hide, and ordered that he should be placed in a box, and should be sent to the capital. He died in the course of two or three days. They carried him in the way described.¹

In short, when the country of Sind came, without dispute and hostility into the possession of the agents of the government of ‘Imād-ud-din Muḥammad Qāsim, he appointed his own officers and agents in each town and city.

Historical works are wanting and destitute of accounts of the events which happened in Sind (after this date), and in no history are the circumstances connected with the events and the people of the country narrated either as a whole or in detail. But the writer of the history called the Tabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhi has given the name of some of those who were engaged in the government of the country in certain years, and has written only this much in reference to each of them, that he was occupied with the work of government for some years. I, Niẓām-ud-din Ahmad, the compiler of this history, relying on the history of the Tabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhi,² follow in his service by expired, for Hajjāj (Muḥammad’s cousin) had put Adam, Sālih’s brother, who professed the creed of the Khārijis, to death. The Imperial Gazetāer (vol. XXII, p. 395, 1908) repeats the story of Dahir’s daughters. The Cambridge History of India, page 7, says that the story of Muḥammad’s death is related by some Chroniclers, and has been repeated by European Historians, but is without any foundation.

¹ The lith. ed. inserts here i.e., and the remaining booty might be estimated in accordance with this; but as these words do not appear in either of the MSS., I have not inserted them in the text.

² The meanings of the words اقدنا بغدمش مننابید are not very clear. It is not possible to be definite as to who is intended to by the pronomial ت unless it is Akbar.
narrating the names of some of them, and the circumstances which were included in the things known to the slave of the threshold of his Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilahi Akbar Sháh. And all help and all defence is from God!

The compiler of the history called the Tabaqat-i-Bahádur Sháhi says, that in the earlier times the government and the rule of the country of Sind were vested in the children of Tamim Anšári. Afterwards as among the zamindárs (land-holders or chiefs) of that country, the Súmrás were distinguished by great power and numbers of followers, they, in the course of time, having gained great power, became invested with the work of government. For five hundred years the government of the country remained with the house of Súmrás. But as it is incidental with the revolution of the skies, or rather as it is incidental with all governments, that they are transferred from one tribe to another, after five hundred years the chieftainship of the country of Sind was transferred from the Súmrás to the

---

1 The word بندى in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. is meaningless in reference to the context. I have ventured to change it to چندى, while in the text-edition بندى.

2 Tamim, the son of Dhaíd-ul-Utbá, succeeded Junair in Sind, when the latter was promoted to the Viceregalty of the eastern provinces of the Caliphate.

3 For an account of the Sumras see the translation of the extract from the Tárikhu-s-Sind or Tárikh-i-Ma’rí (Elliot, vol. i, pp. 215-223). It is described as an account of the Samma dynasty but is really an account of the Sumras. The account of the Sammas does not begin till page 223. It is said on that page that “some men of the tribe of Samma had previously come from Kachh and had settled in Sind.” M. Hidayat Hosain has زمرداران آن تاج بندی in the text-edition.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. has one hundred years, but Col. Briggs (vol. iv, p. 411) agrees with the Tabaqat and makes the period of domination of the Soomura five hundred years. The Cambridge History of India only mentions the Súmrás, on page 54, where it mentions Malik Sinán-ud-din Chatlsar, eleventh of the Sáma line, a Rájput dynasty the latter members of which accepted Islam, submitted and was permitted to retain his territory as a vassal of Ilutmish (commonly called Altamah). Wunár, another chief of the Súmrás, is mentioned on page 147 in connection with the account of Moorish traveller in his Tuhfat-un-Nassár fi Gharúb-Il-Ansár, who visited India in the reign of Muhammad Tughluq.
dynasty of 1 Sēmmas. Of this dynasty fifteen persons were engaged in the 2 government (of Sind).

AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF 3 Jām Ānār.

He was the man in the tribe of Sēmmas who was vested with the office of government and rule. The tribe of the Sēmmas considered themselves to be descended from Jamshid, and traced their genealogy to him. This word Jām, which they gave to their leaders and chiefs, preserves the memory of that connection. The period of the rule of this Jām was three years and six months.

4 Jām Jūnān.

When Jām Ānār drank a draught from the full cup of death, his brother, Jām Jūnān, in 5 virtue of a mandate or testament, became

1 They appear to be mentioned for the first time in the Chach-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, p. 191) as coming to receive Muhammad Kāsim “ringing bells and beating drums and dancing.” Kharim, the son of Umar, pointed out to Muhammad Kāsim they were submissive and obedient to the ‘Arab. Muhammad Kāsim laughed at the words and told Kharim, “You shall be made their chief,” and made them dance and play before him. They are called Sammās in the Cambridge History of India (p. 500), and are described there as a Rājput tribe of Cutch and lower Sind and who ousted the Sūmaras. On page 518, it is said that the “Sammā Rājputs of Sind fleeing from that country before the Sūmaras, who had superseded them as its rulers, found an asylum with the Chāvada Rājputs who ruled Cutch.” M. Hidayat Hosain has بطبخه سیمکان in the text-edition.

2 Firishthah inserts an account of Nāsir-ud-din Qubācha before giving an account of the Sēmmas. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 413–421) also devotes some nine pages to the reign of Nāsir-ood-Deen Kubbacha.

3 He is called Umar in the Tārikhu-s-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 224) and in the Imperial Gazetteer (vol. XXII, p. 396) and is described “as a Muhammadan with a Hindu name, a fact which seems argue recent conversion.” The Tārikhu-s-Sind gives an account of the conquest of Siwistān or Sīwān by him. He is called جام أفراد جام جام Jām Ānār in the lith. ed. of Firishthah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 423) calls him Jam Afra جام أفراد جام جام Jām Ānār in the text-edition.

4 The Tārikhu-s-Sind and the Imperial Gazetteer and Firishthah call him Jām Junā. In his reign Bhakkar was rested from the Turks or Arabs. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 423) calls him Jam Choban. In the text-edition the heading ذکر حكومت جان جونان is بعکوم ومامه Bābāwāh and Bāwādish while the lith. ed. has بعکوم ومامه Bābāwāh and Bāwādish, the other has بعکوم ومامه Bābāwāh and Bāwādish.
vested with the rule and chieftainship of the country of Sind. In the
time of his greatness the buds of the desire and hopes of the people
blossomed. The period of his rule was fourteen years.

AN ACCOUNT OF Jâm Malitha, son of Jâm Ánar.

When Jâm Júnān passed away Jâm Malitha rose to demand
the inheritance of his father's dominions and made the people combine
with him. And Sulţān Firūz Shāh came repeatedly to the country of
Sind with his army, and the above-named Jâm arranging his troops
in the field of battle attempted to withstand him. But at last, on the
third occasion, the country passed into the possession of his servants.
Sulţān Firūz Shāh took the Jâm with him to Dehli; and as the latter
performed praiseworthy services, the Sulţān conferred many favours
on him, gave him the (royal) umbrella, and again entrusted the
government of the country of Sind to him, and granted him permission
to return there. The particulars of these transactions have been
written in the section about (the Sulţāns of) Dehli.

The total period of his rule was fifteen years.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF Jâm Tamāči.

After the death of his brother he sat on the bed (Chahār bālish,
i.e., a raised bed with four bolsters round it) of rule and carried out


1 I think the last is the best reading, and this is followed in the text-
edition.

2 The name is in one MS. and in the other, and in the lith. ed.
Firishtah calls him Jam Bani. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 423) has
Jâm Bany. Neither Tārikhu-Sind nor the Imperial Gazetteer includes him in
the list of the Jâms. Both make Jâm Tamâči succeed Jâm Junâ. In the
text-edition it is,

3 See page 247 of vol. I of the English translation.

4 The name is Jâm Tamâči in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is Jâm Tamâji
in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 424)
has Jam Timmaj. The Tārikhu-Sind and the Imperial Gazetteer make him
the successor of Jâm Jûna. The former (Elliot, vol. I, p. 225) says that the
troops of 'Alâu-d-din took him prisoner and carried him with his family to Dehli.
the work of government for some time. He passed away after ruling for thirteen years and some months.

1 Jām Šalāh-ud-dīn.

He was vested with the duties of government after the death of Jām Tamāchī, and passed away after eleven years and some months.

2 Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, son of Šalāh-ud-dīn.

After the death of his father, he became the successor of the latter; and the great men and nobles of the country of Sind were pleased with his rule and chieftainship. He enjoyed the pleasures and delights of this great position for two years and some months.

3 Jām ‘Ali Shēr.

After the death of Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, ‘Ali Shēr, claiming the dominion of his father, Jām Tamāchī, rose up and made the great men of the kingdom, and the chiefs of his tribe join and unite with him.

---

After his death his son Malik Khairu-d-dīn who had been taken to Dehli returned to Sind and assumed the government. The Imperial Gazetteer (p. 396) says it was Fīroz Tughlaq who retook Bhakkar and carried Tamāchī and his son Khair-ud-dīn as prisoners to Dehli. After Tamāchī’s death, Khair-ud-dīn was released and was allowed to assume the government of Sind.

According to the Tārikhu-s-Sind, Jām Khairu-d-dīn was succeeded by Jām Bābaniya. He was defeated by Sultān Fīroz (Shāh Tughlaq), and was taken captive to Dehli, but was afterwards reinstated to the government of Sind. The Imperial Gazetteer does not give a list of the Jāms after Khair-ud-dīn, but only mentions Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, better known as Jām Nanda who was the most powerful ruler of the dynasty. جام نماجي Jām Tamāji in the text-edition.

1 The MSS. have only Jām Šalāh-ud-dīn. But the lith. ed. has: An account of the government of Šalāh-ud-dīn.

2 The MSS. have only “Jām Nizām-ud-dīn” but the lith. ed. has: An account of the government of Nizām-ud-dīn, son of Šalāh-ud-dīn, and this has been followed in the text-edition.

3 Both MSS. have the heading I have in the text. The lith. ed., however, has: An account of the rule of Jām ‘Ali Sher. According to Tārikhu-s-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 228) he was murdered by men headed by Sikandar Karan and Fatah Khān, sons of Tamāchī. In the text-edition the title is ذكر حكومت جام علي شير.

4 One MS. inserts بطلب ملك بدر خوئد، امرأ را يخون يار ومعاق ساخته before
Owing to this union the different sections of the people enjoyed the peace in (seats of) safety, during the time of his rule. He passed away after ruling for six years and some months.

1 Jām Karn, son of Jām Tamāchī.

When Jām 'Alī Schīr drank what was left at the bottom of the brimming goblet of death, Jām Karn, imagining that when a man's father was the king and ruler of a country he should, also, even without the help and favour of providence, attain to that greatness, sat with audacity on the seat of the great. But as time does not tolerate such acts, after a day and a half it poured a draught of failure and death into his throat.

2 Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān.

As the country remained vacant and unoccupied by the person of a ruler, the great men of the tribe and the nobles of the kingdom made Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, who possessed the necessary skill for that high office, the ruler of the country. He died of natural death after having occupied this noble position for fifteen years and some months.

---

1 The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. But one MS. has Karān instead of Karn. The lith. ed. prefixes جام کرمان before ذکر حکومت. According to the Tārikhu-s-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 228, 229) he was displeased with the nobles and the great men of the city, .................. to slay some, and confine the rest. On the day that he ascended the throne, or the day after, he held a public court, and summoned all men great and small to attend. He addressed them in conciliatory terms. Dinner was served, and after its conclusion he arose to retire to his chamber, when a party of men who had been employed for the purpose, met him at the door of his room and cut him to pieces. In the text-edition ذکر حکومت is added before the heading as given above.

2 The heading in the MSS. is what I have it in the text, but one MS. omits the word Khān after Sikandar. The lith. ed. prefixes Dhikr before Jām and also omits Khān after Sikandar. The Tārikhu-s-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 229) says that it was in Jām Fath Khān's time that Mirzā Pir Muhammad, grandson of Timūr, seized the towns of Mīltān and Úch. It also relates that one Saiyid Abū-l L'āls interceded with Mirzā Pir Muhammad for the people. Here again ذکر حکومت is added before the heading in the text-edition.
THE RULERS OF SIND

1 Jâm Tughlaq, son of Sikandar Khân.

When Jâm Fath Khân passed away, Jâm Tughlaq his brother was invested with the duties of government; and after twenty-eight years accepted (the summons of) death.

2 Jâm Mubârak.

When Jâm Tughlaq was overtaken by that which is unavoidable, Jâm Mubârak who was one of his relations, and to whom the office of his usher or chamberlain appertained, considering himself to be fit and deserving of that noble office, sat on the seat of the great; but he was not allowed to hold it for more than three years.

3 Jâm Iskandar, son of Jâm Fath Khân, son of Sikandar Khân.

When the field of the minds (of men) was purified of the dust of the rule of Jâm Mubârak, the great men of the country of Sind raised

1 According to the Târikhu-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 230) Jâm Sikandar succeeded Jâm Tughlik, but he was young in years, and his uncles whom his father had appointed to be the rulers of Siwistân and Bhakkar refused to obey him and quarrelled. Sikandar left Thatta and proceeded towards Bhakkar, when Mubârak, who had been chamberlain in the time of Tughlik, suddenly came into Thatta, and seized the throne; but his rule lasted only for three days, and Sikandar was sent for and reinstated on the throne. As in the case of the last reign the heading is again added in the heading in the text-edition.

2 The heading in the text-edition is ذکر حكومت جام مبارک and not only جام مبارک.

3 One MS. has ابرده داری while the other has ابرده داری and the lith. ed. has هرچه داری. Firistah in the corresponding passage has ابرده داری. I have adopted ابرده داری.

4 According to the Târikhu-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 230) Iskandar or Sikandar was succeeded by a man of the name of "Râî Dan" who had lived in Kachh, and "had a considerable body of tried men to whom he paid great attention." After Sikandar's death he came with his followers to Thatta; and although he disclaimed all desire for the throne, he was selected. In the course of a year and a half he conquered much territory. After he had reigned for eight years and a half Sanjar, one of his attendants, gave him poison in his drink; and on his death after three days Sanjar became Jâm (p. 231). The latter was a handsome youngman, and he was on friendly terms with an excellent darwesh, through whose prayers he became Jâm. The country was very
Jām Iskandar, who in addition to the rights of inheritance possessed the qualifications for the government of the empire, to be the ruler (of the country). He passed away after performing the duties of the government for one year and six months.

JĀM SANJAR.

When Jām Iskandar after partaking of worldly pleasures passed away to his appointed place (i.e., died), the chief men of Sind selected Jām Sanjar, who at that time was occupied in the performance of the duties of the government, to be their chief. He accepted the summons of death, after having been engaged with the performance of the work of government for eight years and some months.

JĀM NĪZHĀM-UD-DĪN, WHO IS KNOWN AS JĀM NANDĀ.

After Jām Sanjar, Jām Nīzām-ud-dīn who is known as Jām Nandā, occupied himself with the performance of the duties of the government. In his reign the country of Sind acquired new grandeur. He was contemporaneous with Sultan Husain Lankāh ruler of Multān. ¹ In his time also in the year 899 A.H., Shāh Bēg came from Qandahār, and having conquered the fort of Sēwī, which was in the charge of Bahādur Khān the Jām’s agent, returned to Qandahār, leaving his younger brother Sultan Muḥammad there. Jām Nandā sent Mubārak Khān to attack Sultan Muḥammad, and the latter being killed in the battle which ensued, Sēwī again came into the Jām’s possession. On hearing this news, Shāh Bēg sent Mīrzá ‘Īsa Tarkhān to avenge the death of his brother. Mīrzá ‘Īsa fought with the Jām’s army, and defeated it. After that Shāh Bēg also arrived there and took possession of the fort of Bhakkar, by the capitulation of Qāḍī Qādan, the agent prosperous in his time. He improved the judicial administration by increasing the pay of the Kāzīs, who had before been badly paid; and used to take money from both plaintiffs and defendants of suits they tried (p. 232). In the text-edition there is preceding before the heading of this Jām also.

¹ The account of Shāh Bēg’s invasion given in the Tārikhu-e-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 234) differs materially from that in the Tabaqāt, according to the former it was altogether unsuccessful, but Firishtah agrees with the Tabaqāt.

² The name of the Bhakkar fort in the text-edition is given as Bhakkar.

³ The name is Qāḍī Qādan in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah, but it is Qāḍī Dādan in both MSS. of the Tabaqāt. A Kāzī Kāzim is mentioned.
of the Jām, and left it in charge of Fādil Bēg Kōkaltāsh. At that
time the fort of Bhakkar was not so strong as it is now. He also
seized the fort of Sīhwān, and making it over to Khwājah Bāqī
Bēg returned to Qandahār. Jām Nandā repeatedly sent armies to
recover possession of Sēwī; but it was of no avail.

Jām Nandā, who had ruled for sixty-two years, now passed away,

1 An account of the government of Jām Fīrūz.

Jām Fīrūz the son of Nizām-ud-din succeeded his father, and
the duties of the vazārat became vested in Daryā Khān, who was one
of his near relations, and he acquired all power. Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-din,
who was a relation of Jām Fīrūz, and considered himself to be the

on page 310 of Elliot, vol. I., as a most distinguished scholar by whose strenuous
exertions the outrages which were being committed by order of Shāh Bēg's
soldiers on their entry into Thatta were put an end to. If this be the correct
name it would be written according to the rules of transliteration now followed
as Qādi Qāzīm.

1 Neither of the MSS. has the heading giving the name of Jām Fīrūz;
but after گذشت گو"سر او جام فیروزو the lith. ed. has usual
heading of ذکر حکومت جام فیروزو. I have followed the heading in the lith.
ed. according to the Tārikhu-e-Sind (Elliot, vol. I., pp. 234, 235). Jām Firoz was
of tender years, and Salāhu-d-din, who was the son of Jām Sanjar's daughter,
had pretensions to the throne; but Daryā Khān and Sārang Khān, who were
powerful slaves of Jām Nizām-ud-din, placed Jām Firoz on the throne, with the
consent of the nobles and the head men of Thatta. After Salāhu-d-din had gone
to Guzerāt, Jām Firoz gave himself up to low pleasures; and Daryā Khān retired
in disgust to his ḥagār. The nobles being on the verge of ruin, owing to Jām
Firoz's dissipation, sent a messenger to summon Salāhu-d-din. He came and
Jām Firoz's followers led the latter out of the city on one side, while Jām
Salāhu-d-din entered it on the other. Then Jām Firoz's mother took the latter
to Daryā Khān and he was induced to collect troops, and to advance to attack
Salāhu-d-din. The latter wanted to go out, and meet the enemy; but his vazīr
Hājī told him not to do so, and himself went up. He defeated Daryā Khān's
troops; and sent a messenger to inform Salāhu-d-din of the victory. The
messenger was intercepted by Daryā Khān, who substituted a letter, which
purported to come from the vazīr, and in which Salāhu-d-din was informed that
his army had been defeated, and he must leave Thatta at once with his family.
He did so, and Daryā Khān took Jām Firoz to Thatta where he reigned securely
for some years, until the end of 916 A.H. (1511 A.D.) when Shāh Bēg Arghūn
invaded Sind. A foot-note says that 916 A.H., is a mistake, and 926 A.H.
(1520 A.D.) is the correct year.
heir to the kingdom, commenced hostilities and warfare; but as he could not effect anything, he fled to Gujrat, and prayed Sultân Mużaffar Gujratî for help. As the wife of Sultân Mużaffar was the daughter of the uncle of Jâm Šalâh-ud-din, he extended the hand of his support, and spread the wing of his affection over his head; and sending a considerable army with him, gave him leave to go to Thatha. As Daryâ Khan, who was all-powerful and on whom everything depended, had now combined with Jâm Šalâh-ud-din, the country of Sind came into the latter’s possession without any dispute or fighting. Jâm Firûz betook himself to a corner, hoping for the blowing of the breeze of prosperity, and waiting for the rising of the star of good fortune. In the end Daryâ Khan, who had the reins of power of the kingdom in his hands, summoned Jâm Firûz, and raised him to the chieftainship.

Jâm Šalâh-ud-din, scratching the back of his head, went again to Gujrat. Sultân Mużaffar again made preparations to help him, and 1 in the year 920 A.H., sent him to Sind; and he turned Jâm Firûz 2 Khwažahdâr out of Sind and himself took possession of the country. Jâm Firûz had necessarily then to seek for help from 3 Shâhî Beg Arghûn. The latter sent his slave, who had the name of Sanbal Khan, to help him. He brought Shâhî Beg’s army with him and had a drawn battle with Jâm Šalâh-ud-din in the neighbourhood of Sihwân; and Jâm Šalâh-ud-din and his son Haibat Khan were slain in this battle; and the country of Sind again, as at an earlier time, came to the possession of Jâm Firûz.

At this time, which was the time of interregnum, Shâh Beg into whose mind a desire for the conquest of Sind had found its way, and who was watching for an opportunity, marched out from Qandahâr, and in the year 927 A.H., took possession of Thatha. The date of the capture of Thatha has been found in the words Kharâbi-i-Sind (the ruin of Sind). Daryâ Khan, who was in charge of Jâm Firûz’s

---

1 Both MSS. have 928 A.H., but the lith. ed. has 920 A.H. As Shâhî Beg Arghûn invaded Sind in 926 A.H. (see the last part of the preceding note) I think 920 A.H., is the correct year.

2 This word has occurred twice previously, but it has not been possible to find its exact meaning.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Shâhî Beg, but the other MS. has Shâh Beg.
government, was put to death. Jām Fīrūz being completely helpless abandoned Sind, and sought the protection of Sulṭān Muẓaffar Gujrātī. As at this time Sulṭān Muẓaffar died a natural death, Jām Fīrūz again came to Sind; but, as he saw, that he was unable to effect anything, he returned to Gujrāt. He gave his daughter in marriage to Sulṭān Bahādur Gujrātī; and became enlisted among the latter’s amirs. The power of the dynasty of the Sëmmas having been cut off, the duties of government now devolved on Shāh Bēg.

1 An account of Shāh Bēg Arghūn.

2 This Shāh Bēg was the son of Mir Dḥūalnūn Bēg, who was the Amir-ul-umrā (chief nobleman) and sipāhsālar (commander-in-chief) of Sulṭān Mīrzā, and atāliq (guardian) of the son, Bādī’-uz-zamān Mīrzā. From before (the time of) Sulṭān Husain Mīrzā he held the government of Qandahār. 3 Amīr Dḥūalnūn Bēg was slain in the battle with 4 Shāhī Bēg Uzbak, who was at war with the sons of Sulṭān Husain Mīrzā. 5 The government of Qandahār descended to his son

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other the word Arghūn is omitted. In the lith. ed. it is Dōḵr ḥokūmāt Shāh Bēg.

2 For a detailed history of Shāh Beg, and his father Amir Žū-n Nūn, see the Tarkhān-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 303-312). The Cambridge History of India, (p. 501) only gives the years of Shāh Beg’s invasion of Sind, and of his death.

3 The name is incorrectly written as Shāhī Bēg Uzbak in both the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has, somewhat more correctly, سبیک خان اوزیک. The name in the Tarkhān-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, p. 304) is Muhammad Khān Shaibānī Uzbek.

4 As a matter of fact, according to the Tarkhān-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 306-309) Shāh Beg who succeeded his father in 913 A.H. found his position in Kandahār precarious in 915 A.H., owing to his being threatened on one side by Shāh Ismā’l the second, who had conquered Khurāsān, and on the other by Bābar, who had seized Kābul, and had determined to seize the Siwi territory as a future asylum. Accordingly in 917 A.H., he defeated Sulṭān Purdīlī Birlās, who ruled there, and took possession of Siwi, and left a garrison there under
Shāh Bég, who became his successor, and having conquered the greater part of the country of Sind, gained great power.

1 He had great literary accomplishment also; and he wrote a commentary on the 'Aqā'id-i-Nasafi, and a commentary on the Kāfīā and a Ḥāshia (super-commentary) on the Maṭāli'i-Maṭṭīq, and was also a man of pure morals. In the lines (of battle), he always advanced in front of every one, and although people forbade him from doing so and said, "This kind of reckless bravery is not right for a leader," it had no effect. He always said, "At such a time I lose all control over myself, and it comes into my mind that no one should stand in front of me." 3 He died in the year 930 A.H., and his son Shāh Ḥusain took his place.

Mīrzā 'Isā Tarkhān. In 919 A.H., Bābar again invaded Kandahār, but went back to Kābul without conquering it. Shāh Beg did not, however, consider his position to be safe there, and resolved to conquer Sind. Bābar invaded Kandahār again in 921 and 922 A.H.; and Shāh Beg, wearied by these repeated invasions, made over Kandahār to Bābar by an amicable settlement. After that he passed two years in Shāl and Siwi in great penury and distress; but in 924 A.H., he invaded Sind; and after defeating Daryā Khān in a great battle occupied Thatta.

1 There is nothing about Shāh Beg Arghūn's literary works in the extract from the Tarkhān-nāma as given in Elliot.

2 The Sharh bar Aqā'id Nasafi is a commentary on scholastic theology called Al-'Aqā'id an Nasafiya. The full name of Nasafi was Najm-ud-dīn Abū Ḥafs ʿUmar bin Muḥammad-an-Nasafi; he was born in 460 A.H., and died in 537 A.H., 1142 A.D. (vide Brocklemann Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur, vol. I, p. 427, 1898).

The Ḥāshia bar Maṭāli'i Maṭṭīq is a super-commentary on the commentary of Maṭāli'i-al-Anwār. The first part of the work deals with logic. The author of the Maṭāli'i was Maḥmūd bin Abī Bakr-Al-ʿUrmavi, who died in 682 A.H., 1283 A.D. (vide Brocklemann, vol. I, p. 467).

The Sharh bar Kāfīa is a commentary on Ibn Ḥajib's well-known work on syntax called Kāfīa. The full name of Ibn Ḥajib was ʿUṯmān bin ʿUmar, who died in 646 A.H., 1248 A.D. (vide Brocklemann, vol. I, p. 303).

3 The year is 930 in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Fīrishtah. The Cambridge History of India (p. 501) agrees with this date and gives 1524 A.D., as the year of Shāh Beg's death. The Tarkhān-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, p. 312) however, says that he died in Sha'bān 928 A.H. (June, 1522) Shahr Shābān is given in it as the chronogram of his death. The Imperial Gazetteer (vol. XXII, p. 397) has 1522 as the year of Shāh Beg's death, and agrees with the Tarkhān-nāma.
A

AN ACCOUNT OF SHAH HUSAIN.

When Shah Husain succeeded his father, (he) acquired many followers and much power; he went and attacked Sultan Mahmoud the ruler of Multan, and took possession of that territory from him, and having now gained complete and undoubted possession of the

1 There are slight differences in the heading. One MS. has the heading as I have it in the text. The other prefixes Mirza before Shah Husain. The lith. ed. as usual inserts the word Hakumat before Shah Husain.

2 The Tarkhan-nama (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 313-323) gives a much longer account of the rule of Shah Husain Arghun. In the first place he marched against Thatta where Shah Beg had appointed Jam Firoz to be the governor. The latter on hearing of Shah Beg's death assumed a hostile attitude, but on Shah Husain marching against him, he fled to Kach, whence he returned with a large following. The force, however, was destroyed with great slaughter. In 931 A.H., he advanced against Uch, and on arriving near it he defeated the Multan army which met him there, and seized Uch. Sultan Muhammad Langah (he is however called Sultan Mahmoud further on) collected a large army. Shah Husain remained on the bank of the Ghara awaiting an attack. At this time the Sultan was poisoned by his son-in-law Shaikh Shujah' Bukhari, who was detected in an intrigue in the royal harem. The Langahs placed Sultan Mahmoud's son on the vacant throne, and sent a holy man to negotiate for a peace, and a peace was effected. But one Langar Khan came and asked Shah Husain to capture the city; and the latter then laid close siege to the fort. At length a great scarcity took place in the city; and after some time it was captured. Mirza Shah Husain then passed fifteen years in peace and tranquility. Then Humayun came to Sind in 949 A.H., fleeing before Shir Khan Afghun. He wrote to Shah Husain reminding him of the ties of amity and friendship between him and the emperor Babar. Shah Husain wrote to him that if he wanted to conquer Guzerat, he would accompany him with his whole army in the expedition. Shah Husain wanted to present himself before Humayun, but the Arghuns nobles dissuaded him; and Humayun unsuccessfully besieged Siwistan or Sihwân for seven months, after which he went away towards Jodhpur on the invitation of Raja Maldeo. After the birth of Akbar, he had again to return to Sind and took up his residence in the neighbourhood of the town of Jum. Then after some fighting with Shah Husain's army he determined to march to Kundahar.

Towards the end of his life, Shah Husain appears to have been attacked by a fatal sickness. The Arghuns and Tarkhans then combined against him; and chose Mirza Isâ Tarkhân governor of Fatâ Bâgh as their leader. A sort of civil war followed, in the midst of which Mirza Shah Husain became very ill. After further negotiations Shah Husain made Mirza Salih, the second
whole of Sind, he became very powerful. He also rebuilt the fort of Bhakkar, and also built a fort of Sihwān; and having occupied himself with the work of government for thirty-two years passed away in the 1 year 962 A.H.

2 An Account of Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān.

Sultān Mahmūd and Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān ruled at Bhakkar and Thatha respectively, independently of each other. There was sometimes peace and sometimes war between them. Mirzā 'Isā ruled for a period of thirteen years, and passed away in the year 975 A.H.

son of Mirzā 'Isā, the governor of Thatta; and returned towards Bhakkar and died in the way on the 12th Rabi‘u‘l-Awwal A.H. 961.

1 The year is 962 A.H., in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, Firāštah lith. ed. also has 962 A.H.; but as will be seen from the preceding note, the Tarkhān-nāma has 961 A.H., 1564 A.D. The Cambridge History of India (p. 502) gives 1556 as the year of Shāh Husain’s death.

2 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. The lith. ed. has Hukumat before 'Isā, and omits Tarkhān after it.

3 Firāštah’s account agrees with that in the text; and he very candidly admits that he does not know how the government was transferred from the Arghūns to the Tarkhāns.

The Tarkhān-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 323–336) says, that Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān appointed Mirzā Sālih his second son to be his successor, and made the government over to him, and only retained the name of king. Mirzā Sālih soon after marched against Siwistān; and wrested it from Mahmūd Khān Bhakkarī. After that Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān led a large force to conquer Bhakkar, but peace was affected, Bhakkar being left to Mahmūd Khān, while he surrendered Siwistān to Mirzā 'Isā. After that Mirzā Muhammad Bākī, 'Isā Tarkhān’s eldest son, rebelled against him. He was defeated, but afterwards a reconciliation was effected and Mirzā Muhammad Bākī was sent to Bhakkar. In 970 Mirzā Sālih was assassinated by a Bulūch named Murlī. Mirzā 'Isā then nominated Mirzā Jān Bābā, his third son, as the heir apparent. People interested themselves in favour of Mirzā Muḥammad Bākī, who was then granted Siwistān as a jagīr. Some of the Arghūns then rebelled against Mirzā 'Isā, but they were defeated, and fled to Bhakkar for succour. They were helped by Mahmūd Khān, and besieged Siwistān. Mirzā 'Isā advanced from Thatta, and defeated the rebels, and their allies, Mahmūd Khān’s men; and at last a peace was affected. Mirzā 'Isā died in 974, after reigning for fourteen years; and Mirzā Bākī succeeded him, through the help of Māh Begam, although Mirzā 'Isā had nominated Mirzā Jān Bābā as his heir.
AN ACCOUNT OF MIRZĀ MUḤAMMAD BĀQĪ, SON OF MIRZĀ ʿĪSĀ TĀRKHĀN.

His (Mirzā ʿĪsā Tārkhān's) eldest son Muḥammad Bāqī Khān, by 2 virtue of his rectitude, and of the number of his followers, defeated his younger brother Jān Bābā, and took the place of his father. 3 In the manner of the latter, he sometimes had peace and

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other the word Mirzā is left out before the name of Muḥammad Bāqī. In the lith. ed. the word Ḥukūmat is inserted after Dhūkr and the word Khān after Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqī; and the words بن امر عاد معنى از غفلة are omitted. The extracts from the Tārkhān-nāma (Elliott, vol. I, p. 326) ends with the account of Mirzā ʿĪsā Tārkhān; and there is no account of the succeeding Tārkhāns in that volume. The Tārikh-i-Tābīrī (Elliott, vol. I, pp. 282–284) contains an account of Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqī Tārkhān sending his daughter Sindī Begam to Akbar, and the latter's returning her.

2 Firisṭah's account is somewhat similar but he omits the word رشد. For the circumstances under which Mirzā Bāqī succeeded Mirzā ʿĪsā Tārkhān as told in the Tārkhān-nāma, see the latter part of note 1 above. The name of Jām Bābā is written as Khān Bābā in one MS. and in the lith. ed. and as Hān Bābā in the other MS. The Cambridge History of India (p. 502) says that Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqī crushed the revolt of his younger brother.

3 One MS. inserts here:

خزائن جمع ساکنتہ در وقت کشمیرون آگے اترے کہ باود استقلال مبودن غاز ساکنتہ بین دنگر کرزیندہ و قابلیت روز نرم نمونہ بودن متعلقہ سردر ایکان گذاشته بعضی نزد معصوم خان به بکر رنگید و جمعی گریخته بگجرات نزد راجہ کہیم نوکر شدند و از شامات خون ناہک در اخیر عمر ما خولیا بھوسانیند - و هر چ جزیر و آکبر بود را بعدگ و مکر بقتل جمیل کالا - اصل سیرد و هر جا گوز و اکثر بود هم را بعدگ و مکر بقتل جمیل کالا - اصل سیرد و هر جا گوز و آکبر بود را بعدگ و مکر بقتل جمیل کالا - اصل سیرد و هر جا گوز و آکبر بود را بعدگ و مکر بقتل جمیل کالا - اصل سیرد و هر جا گوز و آکبر بود را بعدگ و مکر بقتل جمیل کالا -
was sometimes at war with Sultan Mahmūd. He ruled for a period of eighteen years, and then passed away from the world in the 1 year 993 A.H., and the duties of the government devolved on Mirzā Jānī Bēg.

**An account of Mirzā Jānī Bēg.**

2 After Muḥammad Bāqī, the government became vested in Mirzā Jānī Bēg; and in the year 1001 A.H. he became enlisted among the servants of the threshold; and the country of Sind was added to the countries occupied (by Akbar).

3 **An account of Sultan Mahmūd.**

Sultan Mahmūd, the ruler of Bhakkar, sat on the masnad of rule for twenty years. He was insane and a shedder of blood. Whenever Owing to the bad luck, which follows the shedding of unrighteous blood, he, in the latter part of his life, suffered from melancholia, and (often) talked nonsense, and entrusted great appointments in his government to base men and men of low origin. Wherever there were noble and great men, he had them all put to death by deceit and treachery. For instance, he had Mirāk 'Abd-ur-Rahmān executed, and slew Shaikh ‘Abd-ul-wahāb with the unrighteous sword. He had such rigour and evil nature that no one spoke (or dared to speak) the truth to him. He summoned his brother Jām Bābā, under an oath on the sacred word (the Qurān), and bringing Mir Saiyid ‘Ali, who was one of the nobles and great men of the country, between them, kept him in fear of death for nights and days. At last his insanity becoming very severe he one night killed himself.

There are some slight verbal mistakes in the above passage, but it appears to contain some facts about Mirzā Bāqī, which are correct and which do not appear in the other MS. or in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt or in Firishtah. I have, accordingly, thought it fit to transcribe it in a note, though I have not inserted it in the text.

Firishtah also gives 993 A.H., and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 440) 993 A.H., 1584 A.D. as the year of his death. The Cambridge History of India (p. 502) says, he committed suicide in 1585 A.D., in a fit of insanity. His son Mirzā Pāyanda Muḥammad Tarkhān was also insane, and so the succession passed to his son Mirzā Jānī Bēg Tarkhān.

2 He was the grandson of Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqī Tarkhān. The final conquest of Sind by Khān Khānān ‘Abd-ur-Rahmān Khān, and its inclusion in Akbar’s dominion have been described in the history of Akbar’s reign.

3 One MS. has no heading. The other MS. has only the word Sultan Mahmūd. I have adopted the heading in the lith. ed. but have omitted the word Hukumāt. In the text-edition the account of Sultan Mahmūd forms a part of the description of the reign of Mirzā Jānī Bēg.
he had the least suspicion of anybody, he at once put him to death. He kept the roads of Sind \(^1\) closed from all sides.

SECTION XI. AN ACCOUNT OF THE DYNASTY OF THE SULTANS OF MULTAN.

Let it not remain concealed that the affairs of the country of Multan have not been written in any history from the date of the introduction of Islam, which resulted from the exertions of Muhammad Qasim in the time of Hajjaj, son of Yusuf. When Sultan Mahmud Ghaznavi took it out of the possession of the Mulahids (heretics), it remained for a long time in the possession of his descendants. When the power of the Ghaznavids became enfeebled, the country of Multan again fell into the possession of the Qaramiath sect. Then from \(^3\) the time, when it came into the possession of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-din Muhammed Saim, till the year 847 A.H., it remained in the custody and possession of the Sultans of Delhi. From that year, when there were rulers of different tribes in various parts of India, the rulers of Multan also began to act as independent rulers and Multan went out of the possession of the Sultans of Delhi; and a number of these rulers ruled in succession.

Shaikh Yusuf about two years.

Sultan \(^4\) Quutb-ud-din, sixteen years.

---

\(^1\) Firishtah relates, as in fact is mentioned in the history of the reign of Akbar, that Muhibb 'Ali Khan conquered the whole territory except the fort of Bhakkar. After that Sultan Mahmud sent a petition to Akbar that he would surrender the fort to anyone, except Muhibb 'Ali Khan, whom he might send. Akbar accordingly sent Gisuh Khan, but before he arrived, Sultan Mahmud died; and Gisuh Khan took possession of the fort without any opposition in the year 982 A.H.

\(^2\) The heading in the MSS. is طبقه ملکان and طبقه حکام ملکان. The lith. ed. has ذكر صلاطين طبقه ملکان. I have kept the heading in the lith. ed. as the rulers are called Sultans in the MSS. also. In the text-edition the heading is ذكر صلاطين ملکان.

\(^3\) I have adopted the reading of the MSS.; but the lith. ed. has سنه از ربع اهدي و سيعيين و خمسائه i.e., from the year 571 A.H., instead of سنه از ربع اهدي و سيعيين و خمسائه.

\(^4\) One MS. has Lankah after the name of Quutb-ud-din, but neither the other MS. nor the lith. ed. has it.
1 Sulṭān Husain, according to one statement thirty-four years, and according to another statement thirty-six years.
2 Sulṭān Firūz, the period of his rule is not known.
3 Sulṭān Maḥmūd bin Sulṭān Firūz bin Sulṭān Ḥusain, twenty-seven years.
4 Sulṭān Ḥusain, the period of his rule is not known. According to one statement it was one year and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SHAĪKH YŪSUF.

When in the year 847 A.H., the turn of the rule of the empire of Dehli came to Sulṭān ‘Alā-ud-din, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Farid Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, son of Khūṭr Khān, the work of government and the affairs of the empire fell into disorder; and in the country of India the chiefs of (different) tribes or bands came into existence. The country of Multān remained without a ruler owing to a succession of onsets of the wrath of the Mughals. As the greatness of the noble family of the Shaikh-ut-Tariqa (the Shaikh of the path of truth) Shaikh Bahā’-ud-din Zakariyā Multānī, may the Great God sanctify his soul! had made such an impression on the hearts of the residents of Multān and of the zamīndārs (petty chiefs), that nothing greater than it can be imagined, all the people high and low, and all

1 One MS. has 34 years; but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have what I have in the text.
2 This name occurs in one MS. only but not in the other or in the lith. ed.
3 The heading I have in the text is in one MS. In the other MS. it is Sulṭān Maḥmūd 27 years; while the lith. ed. has Sulṭān Maḥmūd 27 years and some months. Probably there was only one Sulṭān Maḥmūd. There is considerable divergence in the lists of the Sulṭāns of Multān given in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. has Shaikh Yusuf, Sulṭān Qutb-ud-din, Sulṭān Ḥusain, Sulṭān Maḥmūd and Sulṭān Firūz. The other MS. has the first four names, but has Sulṭān Ḥusain II, instead of Sulṭān Firūz. The list in the lith. ed. only consists of the first four names. Firishtah has after the first four Firūz Shah, and then Maḥmūd Shāh, then Shāh Ḥusain II. The correct names and the sequence of the rulers will appear in the course of their history.
4 This name occurs in one MS. only.
5 The MSS. have Farid Shāh, and the lith. ed. has Firūz Shāh. Both these are incorrect. Muḥammad Shāh was really the son of Shāhzāda Farīd, son of Khūṭr Khān, and he was adopted by Mubārak Shāh as his son. See page 322, vol. I, of the English translation of this work.
the residents and the inhabitants of that neighbourhood elected Shaikh Yusuf Zakariyya Quraishi, to whom the superintendence of the Khāngāh and the supervision of the surroundings of the sacred tomb of Shaikh Bahā'‐ud‐din Zakariyya appertained, as the ruler of the country; and had public prayers read in his name from the pulpits of Multān and Úcha and some other towns. He then engaged himself in the administration of the government and made a beginning by increasing the number of his retainers and by enlarging his army. He made the hearts of the zamīndārs or petty chieftains attached to him; and gave increased currency and splendour to the government of the country.

It so happened, however, that one day Rāy Sahrah, who was the chief of the tribe of Lankāhs, and to whom the town of Sēwī and that part of the country appertained, sent a message to Shaikh Yusuf that “As from the time of my ancestors, the relationship of discipleship and belief to your family has remained on a sound basis; and the empire of Dehli is not free from disturbances and disorder; and they say that Malik Bahlūl Lādī has taken possession of Dehli, and has had public prayers read in his name, if His Holiness, the Shaikh would with the utmost promptitude turn his attention to the tribe of the Lankāhs, and consider me among his soldiers, I shall not in every service and expedition, which may take place, consider myself excused from rendering loyal and devoted service, even to the extent of sacrificing my life. Also, at present, in order to strengthen the relationship of being disciple and of devotion and loyalty, I shall give my daughter to you (in marriage), and will accept you as my son‐in‐law.” The Shaikh on hearing these words was delighted in his heart, and took the daughter of Rāy Sahrah in marriage. He (i.e., Rāy Sahrah) sometimes ¹ came from Sēwī to Multān to see his daughter and ² brought fitting presents for the service of the Shaikh. The latter, as a matter of caution, did not allow that Rāy Sahrah should have a mansion in the town of Multān, and therefore, he took up his residence outside the town, and he went alone to see his daughter.

On one occasion, he collected all his men and started for Multān and wanted that with deceit, and the ³ power of trickery and fraud,

1 One MS. has مماد instead of مماد.
2 One MS. has براه براه instead of براه براه.
3 One MS. omits the word دستیاری.
he would seize Shaikh Yusuf and himself become the ruler of Multan. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city he sent the following message to Shaikh Yusuf, "I have this time brought all the Lankahs with me, so that after inspecting them, you might allot various services to them, according to their qualifications. The simple-minded Shaikh Yusuf had become careless of the fraud of the age and the deceit of the time, and met him with affection and kindness. Ray Sahrah, after displaying his grandeur and retinue, came one night to see his daughter attended by only a single servant. He had directed that servant to cut the throat of a kid with his knife in some corner of the house and to bring the blood after heating it, and pouring it into a cup. When the servant carried out the order, Ray Sahrah drank off the cup of blood. After a time he, acting with deceit and trickery, cried out that he had a severe pain in his stomach; and from time to time his groans and lamentations became louder. At about midnight he summoned the vakils (representatives) of Shaikh Yusuf to attend, so that he might give his last directions to them; and in their presence he vomitted blood. In the meantime, in the course of giving his directions, which were mixed with groans and lamentations, he sent for his retainers and adherents, in order to bid them farewell. As the representative of the Shaikh found the condition of Ray Sahrah so bad (lit. of another kind), they did not at all object to the coming of the Ray's relatives and adherents. When most of his men had entered the fort, he raised his head from the bed of illness with the intention of seizing the kingdom. He sent his trusted servants, and others who had his confidence to watch and guard all the four gates, so that they would not permit the servants of the Shaikh to come from the outer fort into the city. Then he went to the private apartments of the Shaikh and seized him.

The rule of Shaikh Yusuf lasted for about two years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN QUTB-UD-DIN LANKAH.

When Ray Sahrah seized the Shaikh, he had the public prayers (read), and the coins (struck) in his own name; and assumed the title of Sultan Qutb-ud-din. As the people of Multan were satisfied with his government, and rendered allegiance to him; he sent the Shaikh by the gate which was in the north, and near the tomb, which was the
recipient of rays of refugiance of the Shaikh-ul-Islâm Shaikh Bahá’-ud-dín Zakariyá, and gave him leave to go to Dehli; and gave orders that the gate should be blocked up with burnt bricks. They also say, that to this day, which is the year 1002 Hijrí that gate has been kept blocked up. He then raised the standard of sovereignty; and occupied himself with the work of government. When Shaikh Yusuf arrived at Dehli, Sulṭān Bahlūl received him with great courtesy and honour; and united his daughter in the bond of marriage with the son of the Shaikh, who bore the name of Shaikh ‘Abd-ul-lah and was better known under the name of Shâh ‘Abd-ul-lah. With his promises he always kept the Shaikh strengthened in his heart, and pleased and hopeful. Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dín ruled independently in the country of Multān, till, after a long time in the year 3 865 A.H. he accepted (the summons of) the just God.

The period of the rule of Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dín was prolonged to sixteen years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULṬĀN Husain, SON OF SULṬĀN Quṭb-ud-dīN.

When Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dín surrendered his borrowed life to the true owner of it (i.e., God), the amirs and the pillars of the state of Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dín, after the ceremonies of mourning, gave the title of Sulṭān Husain to his eldest son, and had the public prayers read in his name in Multān and the territories surrounding it. And he was

1 The word is in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, مستضفرد in the other MS., and مناظر in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. I have adopted the first.

2 In other words, with promises of helping him to regain the possession of Multān. The Cambridge History of India (p. 504) says, that Bahlūl twice set out for Multān, with the object of restoring Shaikh Yusuf’s power, once in 1452 A.D., and again after 1458 A.D.; but he was compelled to return on the first occasion, by the advance of Mahmūd Shâh of Jaunpur, and on the second by the menacing attitude of Husain Shâh also of Jaunpur.

3 The year is مشتیص and Shâh and in one MS. In the other the space for the year is left blank. In the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt it is 860 A.H., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is 874 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 384) has 874 A.H., 1469 A.D. The Cambridge History of India (p. 503) has 861 A.H., 1456 A.D.

4 Qطب الدين للكاتب in the text-edition.
extremely able, and always ready (for all emergencies) and 1 worthy of the descent of divine favours. In the days of his rule the status of learning and wisdom became exalted, and learned and wise men found support from him.

In the beginning of his reign he advanced to the fort of 2 Shör. They say, that at that time the fort of Shör was in the possession of Ghāzī Saiyid Khān. When the latter heard that Sultān Hūsain was coming to attack that country, he made his men ready, sallied out of the fort, and advancing ten karōhs engaged Sultān Hūsain in battle, and after doing justice to his courage and bravery, left the field of battle and turned his face in flight; and without reaching Shör went towards the town of 3 Behrah. The family and the retainers of Ghāzī who were in Shör occupied themselves in guarding and strengthening it, and were helping for the arrival of reinforcement from the direction of Behrah and 4 Khānāwāl and Khūshāb, which were in the possession of the Saiyid Khāni amirs. When the siege had lasted for some days, and they became hopeless about the coming of the reinforcements,

---

1 The text appears to me to be incorrect and imperfect here. One MS. has زود الطاف خداوندی بود, the other has زود الطاف خداوندی بود. The lith. ed. has زود الطاف خوانده بود. Firishtah lith. ed. has in the corresponding passage زود و خوانده بود. I think the insertion of the words زود و خوانده is necessary to complete the meaning; and this has been adopted in the text-edition.

2 The name is شور in the MS., but in one place it looks like شور Shěvar, though later even in that MS. it is Shör, and in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 385) calls it Sherevar. The Cambridge History of India (p. 504) calls it Shorkot. The Imperial Gazetteer also calls the tehsil and the modern town (which are situated in the Jhang district of the Punjāb) Shērkōt; but I doubt whether at the time of Hūsain Lankāh it was called Shērkōt. The name was evidently شور Shör or Shūr.

3 The name is written as پہرج in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and پہرج in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 385) has Bheemra. It is پہرج in the text-edition.

4 The name is written as جنوت and جنوت in the MSS., and جوٹ in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has جنوت. Col. Briggs does not mention the place. I have adopted Khānāwāl which is the name of a place which on the maps is situated ten or eleven miles to the N.E. of Multān. In the text-edition جنوت is adopted throughout.
they prayed for quarter, and surrendered the fort, and went away to Behrah.

Sultān Husain remained for some days in Shōr, in order to attend to matters connected with the country; and then advanced towards Khānawāl, and Malik Mājhī Khōkhar who, from before Saiyid Kān, was the Superintendent (dārōgha) of that place as a matter of honour endured the hardships of a siege for some days; and then asked for quarter, and surrendering the fort of Khānawāl, retired to Behrah. Sultān Husain, after regulating the affairs of the country, returned to Multān; and after resting there for some days marched towards the fort of Kōt Karōr; and brought the country near it, as far as the boundary of the fort of Dhankōt, into his possession.

As Shaikh Yūsuf had on many occasions complained to Sultān Bahūlū of the injuries he had suffered (from Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn), and had prayed for justice, at this time, when Sultān Husain had gone away to the fort of Dhankōt, Sultān Bahūlū, taking advantage of such an opportunity, sent his son Bārbak Shāh, the circumstances connected with whom have been narrated in the section about Dehlī and Jaumpūr, to conquer Multān; and he also directed Tātār Kān Lūdī to reinforce Bārbak Shāh with the army of the Punjāb. Bārbak Shāh and Tātār Kān marched by successive stages in the direction of Multān. It so happened, that at this time, the brother of Sultān Husain, who was the governor of the fort Kōt Karōr rebelled against him, and assumed the title of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn. Sultān Husain considered the suppression of the disturbance in the fort of Kōt Karōr as of primary importance, and betook himself there on wings of speed. He seized Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn alive, and placing iron shackles on his feet returned towards Multān. At this time his scouts brought him the news, that Bārbak Shāh and Tātār Kān had encamped in the neighbourhood of Multān near the mosque or prayer ground of the 'Id, which was situated to the north of the city, and were occupied with preparations of materials for seizing the fort and capturing the citadel. Sultān Husain crossed the river Sind in the course of a night, and towards morning entered the fort of Multān.

1 The name is in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firsiṭṭah lith. ed. has Kōt Karōr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 386) has Hoot and the Cambridge History of India (p. 504) has Karor.
He collected all his soldiers that very night, and told them, "I cannot hope that you will all be able to strike with your sword (i.e., fight boldly); there are some of you the large number of the members of whose family and their other dependants would interfere with fighting. These men, although they might not be of any use in the matter of actual fighting, yet in other matters such as the guarding of the fort, and increasing the number of the troops, etc. they would be of use." After emphasizing on this matter he said, "Everyone of you, who would strike with his sword should, without any hesitation, go in the morning out of the city, and the remainder of the troops should occupy themselves with guarding the fort." Accordingly ten thousand cavalry and infantry decided to go out (of the fort) to fight.

When the standard of the dawn rose in the east of the horizon, they beat the drum of battle, and, going out of the city, 2 stationed themselves so that they might have the Dehli army in front of them. Sultān Ḥusain then ordered all the horsemen to dismount. In the first instance he himself dismounted. Then he ordered that each one of the soldiers should in common concert shoot their arrows at the enemy. When in the first instance twelve thousand arrows leaped at once from the bow strings, great confusion and distress appeared in the enemy's ranks. On the second shot, they separated themselves from one another; and on the third they turned their faces to the desert of flight; 3 and (the fear of the enemy) had in such a way taken possession of their hearts, that when in the course of their flight, they arrived near the fort of Shōr, they did not at all turn towards it; and they did not draw the bridles of their horses, till

---

1 That is the number in both MSS., but the lith. ed. and Firishtah lith. ed. have twelve thousand; and this number is correct, as will appear a few lines further down.

2 The MSS. are incorrect here. One has سیاہ ابی پیش روی خود دادی سیاہ ابی را در پیش روی خود داد and the other has سیاہ ابی را در پیش روی خود کردن. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has سیاہ دھالی را پیش روی خود کردن. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted سیاہ ابی را در پیش روی خود کردن.

3 Here also the MSS. appear to be defective. They have بطری بدل در بطری بدل دشمن جانی گرفتہ بود and not حول بدل. Firishtah lith. ed. has راہ یافته بود حول بدل and not بدل. Firishtah's reading conveys the correct meaning.
they arrived near the town of Khānāwāl. From this defeat (or rather victory), the army of Multān acquired much ammunitions of war and power and prestige.

When Bārbak Shāh and Tātār Khān arrived at the fort of Khānāwāl, they induced the ṭhānadārs of Sulṭān Ḥusain with three hundred other men to come out of the fort by making promises and engagements, but they afterwards treacherously made them food for their swords. Sulṭān Ḥusain considering this defeat (of his enemies) a great boon, did not allow the intention of recovering Khānāwāl to enter his mind.

At this time Malik Suhrāb Dūdāi, who was the father of Isma‘īl Khān and Fath Khān, came from 2 Kach and Mekrān, with their tribesmen and dependants, and joined the service of Sulṭān Ḥusain. The latter, considering the arrival of Malik Suhrāb a matter of good omen for him, conferred the whole of the country from the fort of Köt Karōr to the fort of Dhankōt on him and his tribesmen as their jāqārs. After hearing this news many Balūchis (from Baluchistān) came to the service of Sulṭān Ḥusain; and the numbers of the latter’s adherents increased from day to day. Sulṭān Ḥusain then made over the remainder of the country situated on the bank of the river Sind, which was well cultivated and populous, to other Balūchis in lieu of their service. Gradually the whole country from Sītpūr to Dhankōt was allotted to the Balūchis.

It was also at this time that Jām Bāyazid and Jām Ibrāhīm, who were the chiefs of the tribe of the 3 Thathwas (?), being angry with Jām Nandā, who was the ruler of the country of Sind, entered the service of the Sulṭān. The particulars of this comprehensive statement are: that the greater part of the country which is situated between Bhakkar and Thatha appertain to the tribe of Thatha, who consider themselves to be the descendents of Jamsīd; and this tribe was distinguished above all the other tribes for bravery and

---

1 The word is شکست in the Tabaqāt; and if this word is retained, the word فتح should be inserted after it. The lith. ed. has شکست افغانستان after فیرسحت. Firishtah has فتح victory.

2 The name is كچی instead of كچی in the text-edition.

3 The name looks like سبینه and نینه in the MSS., and میسه in the lith. de. of Firishtah. In the text-edition سبینه has been adopted.
management. Jām Nandā, who was of the tribe of ¹Semmas, also considered himself to be a descendant of Jamshid, and was always hostile to the Thathwa tribe. It so happened that among the chieftains of the Thathwa tribe some differences and enmity took place. Jām Nandā, considering this to be a great blessing, took the side of those who were hostile to Jām Bāyazid and Jām Ibrāhīm who two were brothers. The latter becoming aggrieved in their hearts with Jām Nandā turned towards Sultān Ḥusain. As the mother of the latter was a sister of Jām Bāyazid, he welcomed his arrival with respect and honour; and allotted the country of Shōr to Jām Bāyazid, and that of Üch to Jām Ibrāhīm, and gave them permission to go to their jāgirs.

As Jām Bāyazid was not wanting in the accomplishments of erudition, he always associated with men of learning and wisdom. Whenever he heard of any learned man in that neighbourhood, he offered so much kindness to him that the latter was obliged almost without any power over himself to come to the majlis of Jām Bāyazid ²and was never again separated from him. They say that the affection of Jām Bāyazid for wise and learned men was such that with great earnestness he conferred the appointment of his vazir to Shaikh Jalāl-ud-din Quraishi, who was one of the sons of Shaikh Ḥākim Quraishi, and who had acquired various kinds of learning in Khurāsān although his eyesight had become destroyed; and making over his political affairs to him, passed his own valuable time in the society of learned and wise men. He carried out the divine commandments in such a way that on one occasion when he began to build a house in Shōr, it so happened that a treasure was found there. He withdrew his hands from the possession of it, and sent it whole and intact to Sultān Ḥusain. The latter on account of this act of his had very great faith in him.

When Sultān Bahlūl was united with the Divine mercy, and the term of sovereignty came to Sultān Sīkandar, Sultān Ḥusain sent a letter of condolences and congratulations with elegant articles and presents by the hand of ambassadors, and began a policy of peace and

---

¹ Semma instead of Semmas in the text-edition.
² The reading in one MS. is ٍوازو منقطع مديکست. The other MS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have ٍوازو منقطع مديکست i.e., he profited by him, which is somewhat sordid, and does not appear to me to be so good.
friendship. As the desire to follow the law of the Prophet and the fear of God were strong in Sultān Sikandar, he agreed to a specific settlement; and it was agreed that the two parties should follow the path of friendliness and attachment, and should be the well-wishers of each other; that the armies of neither should transgress their own frontiers, and whichever of them should be in need of help and assistance, the other should not consider himself excused from granting it. After the treaty had been written, and had been adorned with the signatures of the nobles and the great men of the kingdom, Sultān Sikandar granted robes of honour to the ambassadors, and gave them permission to return.

They also say that Sultān Ḥusain kept up a correspondence with Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh; and the doors of letters and epistles were opened from both sides. On one occasion Sultān Ḥusain sent a man of the name of Ḍādī Muḥammad, who was adorned with wisdom and accomplishment, as an ambassador to the court of Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrāt; and he told him, "At the time of obtaining the Sultān's leave to return you should ask him to send a servant with you so that you might go and see the various palaces of the Sultān." The object of Sultān Ḥusain in saying this was that he might build a palace in Multān like one of the palaces of the Sultāns of Gujrāt. When Ḍādī Muḥammad arrived in Ahmadābād, and presented the beautiful presents, he, at the time of his taking leave, made the prayer which he had been ordered to make. Sultān Muẓaffar sent a servant with him, so that he might show all the palaces to him in detail. When Ḍādī Muḥammad came back to Multān, he, after delivering the letter (he had brought from the Sultān of Gujrāt), wanted to describe some of the beauties of the palaces of the Sultāns of Gujrāt. He said that the tongue of description is dumb and the foot of its horse is lame; and in a spirit of arrogance said that if the entire revenues of the kingdom of Multān be expended in building one palace, it was not certain whether even that would be completed. Sultān Ḥusain became sorry and sad on hearing this. 1 'Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak, who was charged with the duties of the vazīrat, put forward the foot of daring, and said, "May the kingdom last till the day of resurrection!

---

1 It is عمان الملك بوبک in the text-edition.
I do not know the reason of your grief." The Sultān said, "The reason of it is this, that people have attributed the name of Bādshāh to me; and I am destitute of the meaning of Bādshāhī. And in spite of the fact that I shall rise up with the other Bādshāhs on the day of resurrection I shall not be their equal." ʿImād-ul-mulk said, "Let not the heart of the Bādshāh be pained and grieved on this account; for the great and holy God has distinguished each kingdom by some special excellence which is held in great respect and honour in other kingdoms. Although the kingdoms of Gujarāt, Deccan, Mālwa and Bengāl are very fertile, and the materials of enjoyments are found there in the best possible way, yet the kingdom of Multān produces men; for wherever the great men of Multān went, they were highly respected and honoured. May there be praise and thanks to God! that there are present in Multān some persons belonging to the noble family of the Shaikh-ul-İslām Shaikh Bahā’-ud-dīn Zakarīyā, may the mercy of God be on him! who are superior in all noble qualities to Shaikh Yūsuf Quraishi, to whose son Sultān Bahlūl has given his daughter in marriage, and whom he holds in great honour. In the same way there are some persons in Üch and Multān, belonging to the Bukhārī family, who in bodily and mental perfections are superior to His Holiness Ḥājī ʿAbd-ul-wahāb; and among learned men Maulānā Fath-ul-lah and his pupil Maulānā ʿAzīz-ul-lah have been produced out of the holy earth of Multān. (And these great men are such) that if the entire country of Hindūstān were to pride itself on their account, it would not at all be doing what would be called absurd." When ʿImād-ul-mulk said words like this, the constriction of the heart of the Sultān was changed to expansion.

An Account of Sultān Firūz.

When Sultān Ḥusain was overtaken by old age, he in his presence raised his eldest son, who had the name of Firūz Khān on the throne, and gave him the title of Firūz Shāh, and had the public prayers read in his name. He then occupied himself with devotion and the worship of God. The duties of the vazārat remained confirmed as before on ʿImād-ul-mulk Tawalak. As Sultān Firūz Khān was inexperienced and the emotion of anger was strong in him and dominated over all his other emotions, and as liberality was also wanting in his nature, he
was always envious of Balāl, son of 'Imād-ul-mulk, who was adorned with wisdom and liberality and other accomplishments. On one occasion he said to one of his slaves, who was in his confidence "Balāl has been embezzling the Bādshāhi property and wants to create a disturbance, and having got men to combine with him wants to usurp the throne. It befits my state that before the disturbance begin, I should take measures to crush it." The misguided slaves intending to murder Balāl waited for an opportunity. It so happened that one day Balāl went out on a boating excursion, and after the evening prayer was about to return to the city. That slave jumped out of a hiding place, and shot an arrow in his breast; it did not only lodge in the body but passed through it. The innocent and helpless Balāl surrendered his life to the Creator. 'Imād-ul-mulk within a short time caused poison to be administered to Sulṭān Fīrūz and avenge the murder of his son in the best way. When this calamity happened to the Sulṭān in his old age, he surrendered his bridle of patience into the hands of groans and lamentations, and wept with many sighs and exclamations of sorrow. In order to guard his kingdom, and avenge the murder of his son, he had the public prayers again read in his own name; and made Maḥmūd Khān the son of Sulṭān Fīrūz his heir; and, as before, kept the affairs of the government in charge of 'Imād-ul-mulk; and did not at all display any annoyance or pain. After a few days he sent for Jām Bāyazīd into his private chamber; and said, "You are my maternal uncle and you know the pain in my heart. You should make such a plan, that I should have my revenge of this faithless and ungrateful wretch." Jām Bāyazīd accepted this work with much eagerness and obtained permission to leave. At night he said to his crier or herald, that he should proclaim in his army, that his troops should appear in the morning fully armed and accoutred at the gate of the palace. Early next morning

1 The Cambridge History of India, p. 504, has Bilāl.
2 Both MSS. have جان بحالتان تسلیم نمود, but the lith. ed. and Farishtah lith. ed. have جان بحالتان از ماما تسلیم نمود.
3 The readings in the MS. and the lith. ed. of Farishtah differ a little from each other and the meaning is somewhat doubtful; but I think my translation conveys it fairly well. In the text-edition the clause كه سلطان از ما سامان على الصباح Nada بکندد and واجب طلیده is inserted between.
Jâm Bâyazid came to the gate of the palace with his men fully armed and ready (for any emergency). When the news reached the Sultân, he ordered ‘Imâd-ul-mulk to go and find out the exact facts of the preparations of Jâm Bâyazid’s and his retainers. When ‘Imâd-ul-mulk came before Jâm Bâyazid’s troops they immediately seized him, and put him in chains. Sultân Husain made over the duties of the vazârat that very hour to Jâm Bâyazid, and added the duties of the guardianship of Maḥmûd Khân, son of Firûz Shâh, to those of the vazârat. After some days Sultân Husain passed away on account of bodily ailments. His death took place on 1 Sunday, the 6th of the month of Ṣafar in the year 980 A.H., and according to another statement in 940 A.H., and the period of his reign was thirty-four years, and according to another statement 30 years. The writer of this history Nizâm-ud-dîn Aḥmad (may there be pardon for him!) submits, that in the accounts by the author of the Ṭabaqât-i-Bahâdur Shâhi, two or three errors have occurred in this matter. One is that he has called Sultân Maḥmûd the son of Sultân Husain; and the other is that he has placed the accession of Sultân Firûz after that of Sultân Maḥmûd. (As a matter of fact, Sultân Maḥmûd was the son of Sultân Firûz, and his accession took place after that of the latter.) Another is that he has described Sultân Firûz as the brother of Sultân Maḥmûd, but in fact Sultân Maḥmûd was the son of Sultân Firûz, and his accession was after those of Sultân Firûz and Sultân Husain.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÂN MAḤMŪD, SON OF SULTÂN FIRŪZ.

When Sultân Husain passed away on account of illness (i.e., died a natural death), on the following day, which was 2 Monday the 27th Ṣafar, Jâm Bâyazid, in concert with the nobles and the great men and men of high birth, raised Maḥmûd Khân, in accordance with the directions of Sultân Husain, to the seat of authority, and arranged for his accession. But as he was of immature years he associated

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sunday the 26th Ṣafar, 908 A.H., the other has Saturday the 6th Ṣafar 980 and, according to some, 904. This is incorrect. Firishtah lith. ed. has Saturday the 26th Ṣafar 908. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 391) follows Firishtah, but makes it Sunday instead of Saturday; and he gives 29th August, 1502, as the date according to the Christian era. The Cambridge History of India (p. 504) gives August 31st, 1502, as the date.

2 This is the date according to both MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
himself with low people and collected common and vulgar people round him; and his time was spent in jesting and buffoonery. Owing to this great men and men of good lineage kept at a distance from him. When people acquired an ascendency over him they devoted all their energy to turn his mind against Jām Bāyazīd. In order to gain their object, they made 1 wonderful plans. Jām Bāyazīd on hearing of this, did not come to Multān from the camp which he had established on the bank of the river Chanāb, at a distance of one farsūkh from Multān; and attended to the affairs of the State at that place; and passed his time in pleasant amusements.

While these things were happening, one day he sent for the headmen of some town, in order to collect revenue from them, and for other matters. As some of the headmen showed some turbulence, Jām Bāyazīd said, "Let the hair on the heads of these men be shaved off, and let them be paraded round the city." The slanderers went to Sultān Maḥmūd and told him that Jām Bāyazīd had commenced to punish and to insult even some of the servants of the Sultān, that he does not present himself in the Dīvān (or the royal court) and sends his son 'Ālam Khān. It is advisable on the score of the Sultān's greatness that 'Ālam Khān should be insulted in the Sultān's majlis, so that there might be a stain on the condition and dignity of the Jām, and he be disgraced and degraded in the eyes of men.

'Ālam Khān was a young man of ability, and was distinguished above the men of his rank for the elegance of his person and of his nature. It so happened that he came one day to offer his respects to Sultān Maḥmūd. He was totally unaware that the men who were envious of him had made a plan for humiliating him. When he arrived in the presence of the Sultān, one of the courtiers asked him, "What fault had been committed by such and such headmen, that Jām Bāyazīd should have had the hair of their heads shaved off and should otherwise have disgraced them. It would be just that in return for that, the hair of your head should be shaved off." As such words had never before been used to 'Ālam Khān, he protested and

---

1 The words look like تَفْقِيْشَةٌ مُعَجَّبٌ in one MS.; in the other the adjective is omitted but the other word looks like تَفْقِيْشَةٍ. Firishtah lith. ed. has the very simple word نَدْبِرُوهَا. In the text-edition it is تَفْقِيْشَةٌ.
said, "What has come to you, man, that you use such language to me in the majlis of the Sulṭān." He had not yet finished his words when twelve men fell upon him from all sides; and the first thing they did to him was to take off the turban from his head, and then cuffed and kicked him with great violence. At this time Ḍālam Khān with great difficulty drew his dagger from the scabbard and lifted up his hand. By accident the point of the dagger struck the forehead of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, who, standing at the head of the men who were wrestling together, was amusing himself; and he fell down on the ground groaning and lamenting and bleeding profusely from the wound. The men who had fallen upon Ḍālam Khān now kept their hands off him and turned to the Sulṭān. Ḍālam Khān, who had received many blows, fled bare-headed for fear of his life. When he reached the gate he found that it was locked; but exerting all his strength he broke the boards of the door and went out and taking a sash from one of his servants, bound it round his head, and proceeded on his way.

When he arrived in the presence of the Jām Bāyazīd and explained what had happened, the Jām said, "Oh my son, what you have done has become the cause of (our) shame in both the worlds; but as it is not possible to remedy it now, go to Shōr with all quickness, and send the whole of the army with all despatch; so that before Sulṭān Maḥmūd should have collected all his troops, I may send all my men to Shōr." He sent Ḍālam Khān immediately to Shōr, and when his army arrived from there, he struck the drum for the march, and started for Shōr.

Sulṭān Maḥmūd on hearing this news nominated some of the amīrs to pursue him. When the two armies approached each other, Jām Bāyazīd turned round, and took up a position and the war-like men belonging to the two armies went forward and fought bravely with each other. In the end, Jām Bāyazīd defeated the Sulṭān's army, and proceeded towards Shōr. When he arrived there, he had the public prayers read, and the coins struck, in the name of Sulṭān Sikandar, son of Bahīlū; and explaining all that had happened in a petition, sent it to him. The latter sent a farmān of encouragement, and a robe of honour to Jām Bāyazīd; and wrote another farmān to Daulat Khān Lūdī, who was the governor of the Punjāb to the effect, that "As Jām Bāyazīd has appealed to me for protection, and has read the public prayers in my name, it behoves you that you
should make yourself acquainted with all the circumstances, and should not hold yourself excused from helping and assisting him; and whenever he should be in need of any reinforcement, you should go yourself to give it to him."

After some days, Sultān Maḥmūd collected all his army, and advanced towards Shōr. Jām Bāyazīd and Ālam Khān, in concert with their men, came out of Shōr, and met them at a distance of ten karōhs from that place, and encamped with the river Rāvi in front of him. Jām Bāyazīd also sent a letter to Daulat Khān Lūdī, and notified him with what had happened. No battle had yet taken place between the armies of Sultān Maḥmūd and Jām Bāyazīd, when Daulat Khān came with the army of the Punjāb to reinforce Jām Bāyazīd; and sending men, in whom he had confidence, to wait on Sultān Maḥmūd began negotiations for an amicable settlement; and in the end through his exertions a settlement was effected on the basis of the river Rāvi being recognized as the boundary between the territories of the two parties; and neither party transgressing it. Daulat Khān Lūdī then sent Sultān Maḥmūd to Multān, and escorted Jām Bāyazīd to Shōr and from there he went back to Lāhore. But in spite of the fact, that a man like Daulat Khān Lūdī had intervened to effect the peace, it did not have any stability.

About this time 1 Mir Ḫākar Zand came to Multān from the direction of 2 Ṣewī with his two sons Mir 3 Allahdād and Mir Shahdād. Mir 4 Shahdād was the first man who promulgated the Shiʿa religion in Multān. As Malik Suhrāb Dūdāī was held in great honour by the

---

1 The name looks like مير ٤ Jākar Dand or Zand in one MS.; and برا جاكار دوزيد Bar Ḫākar Dūzdī in the other. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah the name looks like مير عماد كورتزي Mir `Imād Karwīzī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396) has Meer Jakur Zund, and he says in a footnote that the name Jakur occurs among the early Suljooj Toorks. It is ميرجاكراند in the text-edition.

2 The name is سوي in both MSS. It is سوي in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Solypo in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396).

3 The names are مير شهيد ٤ در مير الله داد and مير شهيد ٤ در Mīr Shēyād and Mīr Shēyād in the two MSS. Firishtah lith. ed. has what looks like مير زا در and مير زا در Mīr Zā Shēyād and Mīr Zā Shēyād. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396) calls them Mīr Sheheed and Mīr Shahida.

4 Firishtah takes exception to this statement of Niẓām-ud-dīn, and says that the latter does not say who Mīr `Imād was, and whence he came, etc.
Lankāhs, Mīr Jākar Zand could not remain there; and sought an asylum with Jām Bāyazīd. As he was the head of a clan, Jām Bāyazīd received him with much honour, and bestowed on him and his sons a part of the territory which was in the Khāţa or crown land.

Jām Bāyazīd was a man of high moral character and of a generous disposition; and showed much kindness to learned men and was generous to the men of piety. They say that at the time of the hostility (between Sultān Maḥmūd and himself), he sent gifts and arms to learned and pious men by boats from Shār to Multān, and one after another many favours were shown by him to the great men of Multān. Many wise men leaving their birthplace took up their residence in Shār, and he summoned a number of them with much eagerness. Among them he prayed His Holiness Maulānā ‘Azīz-ul-lah, who was a disciple of Maulānā Fath-ul-lah, with great solicitude to come to Shār. When the latter arrived near Shār, he met him with great respect, and bringing him with great honour into the city, took him with great courtesy to his own harem; and ordered his own servants that they should pour water over his hands, and he also directed that they should pour that water at the four corners of the house, for the sake of the good fortune which it would bring to it.

A wonderful story has been told of Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishi who was the vakīl (minister) of Jām Bāyazīd, which, though it has no bearing on the subject matter (of this history), but, on account of its miraculous nature and to guard it from the evil of neglect, is being written down here with the pen of musk-like fragrant writing. They narrate that when His Holiness Maulānā ‘Azīz-ul-lah came to Shār and was received with great respect and honour, greater than what the men of the age had expected, from Jām Bāyazīd and the latter took him into his own harem, and ordered the maid-servants to wait on him. Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishi sent a man to wait on the Maulānā with the message that the Jām Bāyazīd sends his prayers (for the Maulānā’s well-being), and his object in ordering the maids to attend before him was this that as he had come unattended by any one, if he would notify whichever of them finds favour in his eyes, she would be sent to serve him. The Maulānā sent a verbal reply to the effect that “God forbid! that any man should cast an evil eye on the maids in the service of his friend; and besides the age and years of this faqīr do not agree with such an insinuation.” When the servant
of Maulānā ʿAzīz-ul-lah went and gave the message to Jām Bāyazīd, the latter said, "I have no knowledge whatever of such a message." The Maulānā was ashamed, and said, "May the neck of the man who has done this thing be broken"; and without going to see the Jām he took his way to his own house; and before the news could reach the Jām, he had passed beyond the boundary of the latter's territory. In the end, it came to pass as had been said by the Maulānā, for when Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn returned from the service of Sultān Sikandar, and came to Shōr, one night his foot slipped, when he was on the terrace (of his house), he fell on his head, and his neck was broken.

When His Majesty Firdūs Makānī Zahir-ud-dīn Bābar Bādshāh Ghāzī took possession of the Punjāb in the year 930 A.H., and marched towards Dehlī, he sent a farmān to Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain Arghūn, the ruler of Thatha, that he had bestowed Multān and the neighbouring territory on him. Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain Arghūn crossed the river near the fort of Bhakkar; and the blast of the wrath of the God began to blow and inundation of arrogance began to flow. Sultān Mahmūd on hearing this news trembled for fear, and collected his troops, and coming two stages out of the city of Multān, sent Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Quraishi, who was the successor of the Shaikh-ul-Islām Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariya, may his soul be sanctified! as his ambassador to Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain; and he made Maulānā Bahlūl, who in the beauty of his diction and in the expression of his meaning was far in advance of the age, to be the assistant of Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn. When the latter arrived in the camp of Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain, the latter treated them with courtesy and respect; and after the former had performed his duties as ambassador, Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain said in reply, "My object in coming was to look after the training of Sultān Mahmūd and for making a pilgrimage to the tomb of Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn." Maulānā Bahlūl said, "What would happen, if the training of Sultān Mahmūd should be left to His Holiness the asylum of the Prophethood, may the benediction of God be on him and on his descendants! for he has given him the necessary spiritual training; and as to the second matter Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn has himself come to attend on you, and what necessity is there for your taking further trouble in the matter." When Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn came back to Sultān Mahmūd, the latter died the next night of an attack of colic. The surmise of some men was, that Langar Khān, who was a slave of the dynasty, had
administered poison to him. His death took place in 931 A.H.; and the period of his rule was twenty-seven years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN HUSAIN, SON OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD.

When Sultān Maḥmūd had passed away, Qawām Khān Lankāh and Langar Khān, who were the commanders of Sultān Maḥmūd’s army, took the path of flight and joined Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain. They received such favours as their hearts wished for, and brought the towns (appertaining) to Multān under the rule of the Mirzā. The rest of the amīrs of the Lankāh tribe, being discomfited, returned to Multān. There they gave Sultān Ḥusain, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, who had not yet passed the age of infancy, the title of Sultān Ḥusain; and read the public prayers in his name. Although they gave the name of Sultān to him, yet Shaikh Shujā’-ul-mulk Bukhārī, who was the son-in-law of Sultān Maḥmūd, assumed the name of vazīr, and took upon himself the administration of all matters of State. He was, however, without any experience, and although they did not have provisions sufficient for even one month in the fort of Multān he decided on defending it. Mirzā Shāh Husain considering the death of Sultān Maḥmūd the means of his conquering Multān gave the people of the city no time for preparation for defence; and galloped in, and laid siege to the fort. When the siege had lasted for some days, the soldiers distressed by hunger, came to Shaikh Shujā’-ul-mulk, who was the minister responsible for the ruin of the country of Multān, and said to him, “Our horses are yet fresh, and we find the strength of fighting in ourselves. It is better, that having divided the troops, we should advance to the field of battle. It may be that the breeze of victory and triumph would blow on us. The other alternative is to guard the fort in the hope of reinforcement and help; but there is

1 The readings are different. One MS. has كه عمدة ولايت مملک از بیش او بود while the other has كه عمدة ولايت مملک از بیش او بود. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has كه عمدة ولايات مملک از بیش او بود, None of the readings is quite clear. The word عمدة, one of the meanings of which is a minister, is the stumbling block. The reading of the first MS. and of Firishtah may mean: who was the minister who was responsible for the ruin of the country; and I have adopted this reading. In the text-edition the passage reads كه عمدا خرابی ولايت مملک از بیش او بود.
no such hope from any side." Shaikh Shuja'-ul-mulk gave them no reply at the interview; but he summoned some of the trusted leaders to a private conference, and said, "The rule of Sultān Husain has not yet acquired any strength or stability. If we go out of the city with the determination to fight, there is a very strong likelihood that most of the men would, in the hope of obtaining favour from Mīrzā Shāh Husain, go to him and render him homage; and the few who are bound by a sense of honour, would stand firmly in that field of battle, and would be slain."

1 It is related that Maulānā Sa'd-ullah Lāhōrī, who was one of the wise men of the age, said, "I was at that time in the citadel of Multān. When the siege had gone on for some months, the troops of Mīrzā Husain shut up all the entrances and exits in such a way that no one could send any help to the garrison from outside and nobody going out of the fort could betake himself to a nook or corner of safety. Gradually the subsistence and the life of the men in the garrison were reduced to such straits, that if by accident, a cat or a dog fell into their hands, they devoured its flesh like that of a kid or lamb. Shaikh Shuja'-ul-mulk appointed a 2 pāji of the name of Jādā to be a commander of three thousand infantry men of the town and nominated him to be the defender of the fort. That misguided man went to the house of any poor man, who he imagined had any grain in his possession, and without any enquiry plundered it. Owing to these improper acts of his, men raised their hands in prayer and according

---

1 The MSS. say here و مولانا سعد الله لأنه كهد أضل وقت بود ميگفت and then go on to say, what he said had happened during the siege. This cannot be correct, as the siege was yet going on, and the incidents mentioned by the Maulānā had not yet happened. I have accordingly substituted what is written in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, in which what the Maulānā had said has been recorded as a matter of tradition. The name of the Maulānā is Sa'd-ud-dīn in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have, however, retained the name of Sa'd-ullah, as that is also the name given by Col. Briggs. The text-edition has followed the MSS.

2 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. calls the man جادا نام پاجی while the other has جادا نام پاجی and Firishtah lith. ed. has بسدراري سرگار بیدادي قصباني. Then one MS. has by mistake بسدراري سه مزر بیاده قصباني instead of بسدراري سه مرز بیداد قصبانی as in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of both the Tabaqāt and the Firishtah.

In the text-edition it is جادا نام پاجی instead of جادا نام پاجی.
to the purport of the saying that: any change is for the better though it may involve our loss, prayed for the ruin of Shujā‘-ul-mulk. In the end 1 men having considered their being slain easier, threw themselves from the ramparts into the ditch below; and Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain having become aware of the terrible distress of the men in the fort, stopped his men from slaying them. After this when the siege had been prolonged for a year and some months, one night towards morning the servants of the Mīrzā entered the fort, and stretching out the hand of rapine from the sleeve of oppression began to slay and devastate. The residents of the city from the age of seven to that of seventy years, who escaped the sword, were taken into slavery; and every one against whom there was a suspicion of his having any gold, suffered much insult and torture. This calamity occurred about the end of the year 932 A.H.”

Maulānā Sa‘d-ul-lah has narrated the following about himself, “When the citadel was taken by the Arghūns, a number of men entered our house; and at first a man seized my father, who bore the name of Maulānā Ibrāhīm Jāma‘, and who seated on the masnad or carpet of teaching had for five and sixty years given lessons in various branches of learning; and had towards the end of his life become blind, and began to treat him with insult and contumely. Others came in, and suspecting from the cleanliness of the house, and the elegance of the buildings that the inmates were wealthy people, one of them seized me as a captive. It so happened that that man took me as a present to the vazīr of the Mīrzā; and it also so happened, that the vazīr was seated at that time in the courtyard of a house on a wooden seat. He gave orders, in compliance with which the man put a chain on my feet and tied the end of it strongly to a leg of the vazīr’s seat. The tears were flowing freely from my eyes, and I was weeping chiefly on account of the condition of my father. After a little while the vazīr sent for a 2 receptacle for pens, etc., and after mending his pen

1 Finishtah explains that as everyone who attempted to go out by the gate was killed by the besiegers, the men in the garrison threw themselves from the ramparts.

2 The word looks like مبشر in one MS. and in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and Finishtah, but it is قائمان in the other MS. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥossain has used the right word مبشرة, which is a synonym for قائمان.
wanted to write something. 1 At that time it entered his mind that he should again perform his ablutions, and then begin to write. He got up and went to a place for easing nature. As there was no one in the house I drew myself close to the seat, and wrote down this couplet from the Qasida’ 2 Burda ‘What has happened to your eyes, that when I ask them to stop weeping they start weeping more vehemently than before? What is wrong with your heart that when I order it to be calm, it gets more excited?’ on a piece of paper, which the vazir had brought out for writing on. Then I dragged myself back 3 to my own place and tears went on flowing from my eyes. After a little time when the vazir again sat down in his place and wanted to write something on the paper, he saw that a couplet was written on it. He looked round on all sides of the place. As he saw no one there, he turned to me and said, ‘Did you write this? ’ I said, ‘Yes.’ Then he asked me about my circumstances. When I told him my father’s name, he got up, and removed the chain from my feet, and put his own dress on me; and immediately mounting his horse, went to the audience hall of the Mirzā, and placed me before the latter’s eyes; and spoke to him about my father. The Mirzā gave orders, and his men made a search for my father and brought him. It so happened that at the time when my father was brought into the Mirzā’s majlis in a wretched condition, they were talking there about the Hidāya’-i-Fiqh (a treatise on law). The Mirzā ordered that a robe of honour should be bestowed on my father, and another on me. My father, in spite of the distress of his mind, began an address, and he stated the different heads of it in such a way that the people who were present became charmed and fascinated. The Mirzā in that very majlis asked my father to undergo

---

1 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. has
2 The couplet is from the Qasida called Al-Burda by Būṣṭri.
3 One MS. has
the trouble of accompanying him; and he ordered his officers that whatever the Maulāna should have lost should be restored to him; and if the whole of it could not be found the price of that portion should be paid to him. My father said to him in reply, ‘The days of life have come to an end. It is now time for my undertaking the journey to the other world and not of accompanying you’; and in the end what my father had said, came to pass; for after two months he was united with the proximity of the mercy of God.’

In short, when the citadel of Multān was captured, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥussain made over Sulṭān Ḥussain to the guards; and treated Shaikh Shujā‘-ul-mulk Bukhārī with much contumacy; and extorted large sums of money from him, till he came to an end in this matter. When the ruin and desolation of Multān reached a point, that no one could even think that it would again become populous and flourishing, the Mīrzā, considering the further administration of the affairs of Multān an easy matter, left a man of the name of Khwājah Shams-ud-dīn to guard it, and making Langar Khān his assistant returned towards Thatha. Langar Khān having encouraged men from all places again restored Multān. He combined with the people of the place and removed Khwājah Shams-ud-dīn bodily and took independent possession of the place.

When His Majesty Firdūs Makānī departed from the world, and the position of the Sulṭān of the great country of Hindūstān devolved on his Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī, the latter made over the country of the Punjāb to Mīrzā Kamrān as his jāgīr. The latter sent some of his men and summoned Langar Khān to wait upon him. When the latter arrived at Lāhōre, and was honoured by being allowed to wait on Mīrzā Kamrān, the latter bestowed the territory of Bābal

---

1 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have اخْرِ اَنْجِنَانُ شَدْ كَجِبْرُ جَفْنَهُ بَرَدَ وَمَيِّغْفَ كِكَ انْجِنَانُ شَدْ. I consider the latter the better reading and have adopted it; and this has been followed in the text-edition.
2 The words are نَ أَ بِر سِرْ عَابِن كَذَ ْرَقَتْ, the meaning of which is not very clear.
3 Here again as in several previous passages the word is خِيَاجَهُ دَارُ, the meaning of which I cannot find out.
4 خُطَةُ بَباَل in the text-edition.
on him, in exchange for Multān. He also appointed a place at the extreme end of the inhabited part of Lāhōrē for the residence of Langar Khān. This place is now known as the Dāi’rah of Langar Khān, and has become one of the residential areas of the city of Lāhōrē. From this time Multān again came into the possession of the Sultāns at Dehlī. After the death of Mirzā Kāmrān it descended to Shēr Khān and from him to Salīm Khān, and from them to the agents and servants of His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī, as each of these has been mentioned in its proper place.

A final statement.—In a description of the countries ruled over by the servants of His Majesty, let it not remain concealed, that the length of the country, which is to-day in the possession of this powerful State, from Hindū Kōn on the borders of Badakhshān to the country of Orīssa, which on the further side of Bengāl, from the west to the east is 1 one thousand and two hundred Akbar Shāhi karōhs by the Ilāhī yard measure, which is equal to one thousand six hundred and eighty karōhs Shara’i; and its breadth from Kashmīr to the 2 hills of Bardah, which are at the extreme limit of the country of Sūrath and Gujrat is eight hundred karōhs Ilāhī; another breadth from the Kumāyūn hills to the boundary of the country of Deccan is one thousand karōhs Ilāhī. The whole of this land is fit for cultivation. In each karōh there is a certain number of inhabited and cultivated villages. At present there are three thousand and two hundred towns; and one or two or 3 five hundred or a thousand villages appertain to each of these towns. The produce of this country is to-day 4 six hundred and forty krōrs of murādi tankas.) Out of these there are one hundred and twenty great cities, which are now well populated and flourishing. As the particulars of the towns cannot be

---

1 One MS. omits the length by the Akbar Shāhi karōh and gives it only by the Shara’i karōh.

2 One MS. has كوره بریده, the other has كوره بروچه, while the lith. ed. has كوره بریده. The text-edition has adopted the reading كوره بریده.

3 The lith. ed. ends abruptly at پانصد five hundred, only.

4 One MS. gives the produce at شمک مزار و چهار ادب و چهیر کورز نتیجه سمد و چهیر کورز نتیجه, while the other has چهیر ادب. I cannot make out what چهیر ادب means.
contained in this brief account the particulars of the city will be given and ¹ will be written in alphabetical order, if the Great God so wills.

¹ The sentence as given in the text is what it is in one MS. In the other MS. instead of شد حد تداریخ کتاب اکبر شاهی it has شد خرداد شد; and then بعین ملک الوهاب عز آسمه, which may be translated: Finish. Here is finished the history book Ͳabaqāt-i-Akbar Shāhī, by the help of the Lord of all gifts, may His name be honoured!

(END)
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I. PERSONS

A

Abdāl Bhat, his advice to Yūsuf Kān, p. 753.
Abdāl Khan, his promise to Ḥusain Khan, p. 740; a message from Yūsuf Khan, p. 752; was attacked by Yūsuf Khan and slain, p. 753.
Abdāl Mākri, son of Ibrāhīm Mākri, p. 699; his support of Iskandar Khan, p. 694; was honoured and reinforced by Bābar, p. 696; his advance towards Kashmir and message to Malik Kājī, p. 697; became vāzir of Nāzir Shāh, p. 698; his share in the division of Kashmir, p. 699; defeated Malik Kājī, p. 700; showed friendship towards Malik Kājī, p. 701; his defeat by the Kāshgāris and flight, p. 702; his fight with the Kāshgāris, p. 703; disagreement with Malik Kājī, p. 705; created disturbance in Kamrāj, p. 706; sent a petition to Humāyūn, p. 707; joined Mīrzā Haidar and his death, p. 708.
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'Abd-ul-ḥaẓīm, Shaikh, p. 621.
'Abd-ul-lah, Malik, reported about the treachery of the conspirators to Mahmūd Shāh and was asked to bring elephants to the darbār, pp. 239-40.
'Abd-ul-lah, Mūlā, Pakī was given to him by Mīrzā Haidar, p. 712; he was slain by the rebels, p. 713.
'Abd-ul-lah, Shāh, p. 791.
'Abd-ul-lah Jangāl, Shaikh, his tomb visited by Muẓaffār Shāh; he was called Pandey Brij in the time of Rāja Bhīj, p. 299.
'Abd-ul-mulk, Malik, attained martyrdom, p. 296.
'Abd-ul-mulk, Saiyid Khān, brought the family of Haiḥat Khan to Iṣlām Khān, p. 713.
'Abd-ul-qādir, Khwājah, teacher of Mūlā ʿUḍī in music, p. 637.
'Abd-ul-qādir, Shāhzāda ʿṢūr-i ud-ḍin, Sultān, Sultān of Mālwa.
'Abd-ul-wahāb, Ḥājī, p. 798.
'Abd-ur-rahmān, Mīrzā, joined Mīrzā Ḥaider, p. 716; direction of Mīrzā Ḥaider about him, p. 717; his release, p. 722.

'Abd-ur-Rahmān Jāmī, Maulānā, 108.

'Abd Zinā', wanted to take away Yūsuf Khān, p. 683; released Muḥammad Shāh, p. 690.

Abū-ul Fath, Ḥakīm, p. 628.

Abul Khair, Shāh, was left in Karnāl by Aḥmad Shāh to collect tribute, p. 196; was sent with Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 213.

Abu-ul-ma'āli, Shāh, his arrival and advance towards Kashmir, p. 734; his defeat by the Kashmiris, p. 735.

Abū Sa'īd, Mīrzā, sent an ambassador to Mahmūd Khāji, p. 541.

Abū Sa'īd, Sulṭān, his presents to Sulṭān Zain-ul-ʿābidīn, p. 659.

Abū Turāb, Mīr, was enlisted in the band of the loyal servants of Khaltfa-i-Ilāhī, p. 413.

Ādham Khāhār, requested Mīrzā Ḥaider to pardon the offenders of Daulat Chak, p. 712.

Ādham Khān, son of Sulṭān Zain-ul-ʿābidīn, his conquest, p. 663; pursued Ḥāji Khān, p. 664; his rule, p. 665; his revolt, p. 666; his attack and defeat, p. 667; went to Nilāb, p. 668; saw his father; went to Qūtb-ud-dīnār, p. 670; came to pay a visit to his father and retired to Hindūs-tān, p. 671; his fight, p. 672; fought against Mughals and died, p. 674.

Ādham Siλāhdār, was killed by Bahā-ul-mulk son of Aḥf Khān, p. 247.

Aḥf-ul-mulk, imprisoned Dāūd Khān, p. 219; was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to meet Rāy Bātālī, p. 272; was sent to Māhrāsā to stop Bahādur Shāh, p. 331; fled from Barōḍā, p. 335; joined Latīf Khān, p. 337; fled from the battlefield, p. 341.

Adham Khān, was sent to conquer Mālwa by Aḥfbar, p. 631.

Ādil Khān, commanded an army to reinforce Kājī Chak, p. 708.

Ādil Khān, Governor of Aṣīr, nephew of Sulṭān Bahādur, sent a letter to Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 344.

Ādil Khān, ruler of Aṣīr and Burhanpūr, his name was Malik Naṣīr Rāja; his rebellion and return to his country on hearing the advance of Zafar Khān, p. 178; on the arrival of Aḥmad Shāh he fled to Aṣīr, p. 197.

Ādil Khān, son of 'Ādil Khān Saywāl, helped Malik Barīd in acquiring the Sultanat from Sulṭān 'Āla-ud-dīn, p. 133.

Ādil Khān, son of Ḥasan Khān, his request to Mahmūd Shāh which was accepted, p. 282; was given the title of Āʿẓam Humāyūn and entrusted the government of Aṣīr and Burhanpūr, p. 284; summoned Ḥisām-ud-dīn, received Ḥisām-ud-dīn, honoured Ḥisām-ud-dīn with favour and permitted him to go to his camp, arranged for the murder of Ḥisām-ud-dīn, summoned Ḥisām-ud-dīn to fulfil his plan, p. 286; possessed the country of his enemy; sent a petition to Mahmūd Shāh with a description of the hostility of Shīr Khān and Saif Khān and the measures which were adopted to defeat the enemy, p. 287; determined to invade Kālna; permitted the amāra of Gujrāt to go back and returned to Burhanpūr, p. 289.

Ādil Khān, son of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Turk; slew the governor of the fort of Kehrā; went with the dead body of his father to render homage to Muḥammad Shāh, p. 96; the fief of his father was confirmed on him by Muḥammad Shāh, p. 97;
besieged the fort of Birākar; forgave Jay Singh Rāy; the territory of Jay Singh Rāy was conferred on him by Muḥammad Shāh, p. 100; killed Farhād-ul-mulk and Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk; shut up the Turkī amirs in their houses and murdered them one by one, p. 112; informed Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn how he had dispersed the rebels, p. 116; defeated the rebels and requested Muḥammad Shāh to pardon the offences of Dastūr-ul-mulk, p. 116; attacked Rām Rāj of Bijānagar, p. 141.

'Ādil Khān, son of Mubārak Khān, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, p. 283.

'Ādil Khān Fārīqī, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, hearing of the advancement of Muḥammad Shāh paid him tribute and prayed to be excused, p. 281; joined Muṣaffar Shāh, was sent by Muṣaffar Shāh to attack Rānā Sānkā, p. 304.

'Ādil Khānīya, list of Sultāns, p. 7.

'Ādil Muḥammad, was sent by Akbar to conquer Mālwa, p. 631.

Adwan, Rāja, his representative, p. 634; his order to the sons of Shāh Mir, p. 635.

Afjal Khān, refused the offer of Burhān and was killed by him, p. 390.

Afjal Khān Majīla-i-Karīm, took a message to Muḥammad Shāh, p. 577; was given a title and sent to put down Muḥtaṣ Khān and Iqbal Khān, p. 580; joined Şāhīb Khān, p. 583; joined Muḥammad Shāh, p. 584; was slain by the order of Muḥammad Shāh, p. 587.

Ahmad, son of Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahri, his ambition, his hostilities, p. 136; his accession; declared independence; period of reign, p. 137.

Ahmad, Malik, son of Shār Malik, revolted against Ahmad Shāh, p. 194.

Ahmad, Saiyid, was summoned by Muḥammad Khalji, p. 502.

Ahmad, Sultān of Bangāla, p. 433; succeeded his father; died; period of reign, p. 434 (and n. 1, p. 433).

Ahmad, Sultān of Gujrat, p. 394; his name was Raḍī-ul-mulk; amirs gave him the title of Ahmad Shāh; he was placed on the throne by Itmād Khān, who acted as Sultān and kept the (boy) Sultān under confinement; went to Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī; fought with Itmād Khān and was defeated, p. 395; wandered in the jungle; saw Itmād in his confinement; attack of Itmād-ul-mulk on Itmād Khān which ended in peace; was murdered, period of his reign, p. 396.

Ahmad Aswad, placed Sultān Ḩasan on the throne, bestowed title of Sultān Ḩasan on him, p. 676; opposed his retirement towards India, p. 677; in the post of suzir, p. 679; enmity of Malik Yārī Bhat, p. 680; was imprisoned and died there, p. 681.

Ahmad Ayāk, Malik Muqarrab, was summoned by Ahmad Shāh and given the task of commanding the Tārāpūr battery, p. 206; asked permission of Ahmad Shāh to attack the enemy, p. 207; asked Har Rāy to pay tribute, p. 212; was sent with Shāhzhāda Muhammad Khān by Ahmad Shāh for an enquiry, p. 213; fought with Qadr Khān and defeated him, p. 214.

Ahmad 'Azīz, Malik, went to Badr 'Alā by the order of Ahmad Shāh, p. 193.

Ahmad Jaurin, was entrusted with the duty of capturing Bahrām, p. 733; took Bahrām to Srīnagar, received a title, p. 734.
Aḥmad Kanbū, Shaikh, Aḥmad Shāh took advice of him, p. 191.

Aḥmad Khān, was sent by Maḥmūd Khāljī to crush Rāyzāda of Kehrla, p. 540.

Aḥmad Khān, son of Ghazi Khān, was sent to conquer Tibet, p. 738; his fight with the Tibetans, p. 739; his promise to Ḥusain Khān, p. 740; defeated Sankar Chak; his plans against Husain Khān, p. 741; his imprisonment, p. 742; was blinded, p. 744.

Aḥmad Khān, Shāhzāda, son of Hūshang Shāh, was pardoned by Maḥmūd Khāljī; was confined in the fort of Islāmābād by Maḥmūd Khāljī; his rebellion; confronted Tāj Khān, p. 499; refused to act according to the precepts of Aʿẓam Humāyūn; was poisoned and died, p. 500.

Aḥmad Khaṭṭū, Shaikh, pp. 242, 290, 292.

Aḥmad Sarkējī, Malik, revolted against Aḥmad Shāh, p. 194.

Aḥmad Shāh, son of Maḥmūd Shāh, was placed on the throne by Malik Barīd; the name of bādshāh was nominally added to his name; the amīrs lived independently in his reign, p. 132; period of his reign and death, p. 133.

Aḥmad Shāh, son of Tātār Khān, i.e. Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, Sultān of Gujrāt, sent the army which was summoned by Firūz Shāh, p. 43; sent a farmān to Shāhzāda Zafar Khān to help the Musalmān Rāya of Mahārām, p. 50; sent a message to Sultān Aḥmad Bahmani to leave the fort of Tanbūl, p. 54; was sent to recover Mālwa by Muẓaffar Shāh, made the country of Dīrār over to Sultān Hūshang, p. 187; was placed on the throne by Muẓaffar Shāh, and given the title of Naṣīr-ud-din Aḥmad Shāh, p. 188; accession to the throne; favours for the people; Firūz Khān became envious of his greatness; conferred the post of eẓār on Jīvan Dās Khattry; rebellion of Firūz Khān, p. 189; advanced towards Bahrūj; satisfied the rebels by sending a message to them; hearing the advance of Sultān Hūshang marched to the village of Wantaj; Bhīkam Ādām Khān Afgān, p. 190; met Aḥmad Shāh; sent ʿImād-ul-mulk in advance to engage Sultān Hūshang; Hūshang went back in shame, taking the advice of Shaikh Aḥmad Kanbū founded the city of Aḥmadābād; various material foundations in Aḥmadābād, p. 191; second rebellion of Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān; arrived in the town of Wantaj to destroy the rebels; sent Fath Khān in advance; Fath Khān joined Saiyid Ibrāhīm Nizām the Ḵaṣīrār of the town of Mahrāsa; advanced towards Mahrāsa; on arrival in the vicinity of Mahrāsa sent a message to Bādūr ʿAlā and Rukan Khān which was not responded to; sent another message to Bādūr ʿAlā and Rukan Khān, p. 192; Bādūr ʿAlā and Rukan Khān replied to the message stating that they would withdraw the idea of enmity when Nizām-ul-mulk, Malik Aḥmad ʿAzīz, Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk, and Safī Ḵhwājah would come and give them assurance of safety; ordered the above-mentioned amīrs to proceed to the fort of Mahrāsa; Bādūr ʿAlā and Rukan Khān had Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk seized and imprisoned in the fort, hearing the
treachery of the enemies attacked the fort; defeated the rebels; Firūz Khān and the Rāja, p. 193, of Idar fled; Râman seized the treasure of Firūz Khān and sent it to the Sultan; returned victorious to Ahmadābād, p. 194; sent latency Khān with Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk to punish Malik Shah Malik; advanced to crush Sultan Hūshang; sent Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk Samarqandī to fight with Sultan Hūshang from Bāndhū; on the retirement of Sultan Hūshang Shâh Malik attacked Latīf Khān; Shâh Malik could not defeat the Shâhzâda and fled to the Zamīndâr of Karnāl; thanked God and granted gifts to the people of Ahmadābād, p. 195; attacked and subjugated the Rāja of Karnāl; appointed Shâh Abūl Khair and Saiyīd Qasīm as tribute collectors of Karnāl; returned to his capital; marched towards Nadarbār to stop 'Ādil Khān; sent an army to capture the fort of Tambol, p. 196; flight of 'Ādil Khān; victory of the fort of Tambol; arrived in the vicinity of Mahmūs; after reproaching the Zamīndâr Sultan Hūshang returned to his own country, p. 167; nominated Mahmūd Khān, p. 198, to recover tribute from the Zamīndâr of Sūrath; sent Malik Mahmūd Barkī and Mukhīlī-ul-mulk to punish Naṣīr; Naṣīr prayed for pardon of his offenses; forgave Naṣīr with favour; advanced to conquer Māwā; left Niẓām-ul-mulk as the regent of the kingdom during his absence and to punish the Rāja of Mandal, p. 199; war between the troops of Sultan Hūshang and Ahmad Shâh, pp. 199-201; besieged the hill of Chāmpānīr; a petition of the Rāja of Chāmpānīr, p. 201, to the Sultan and its acceptance; conquered Sonkara; started towards Mandū, punished the inhabitants of the hill of Kântū; Maulâna Mîsa and 'Alî Ḥâmid coming from Sultan Hūshang, p. 202; prayed the Sultan not to oppress the Musulmans of Mālwâ; sent an affectionate letter to Sultan Hūshang; went back to Ahmadābād; laid the foundation of a fort at Jînūr; built a line of fortifications round the town of Dhâmîd, p. 203; exerted a tribute from Châmpānīr; advanced towards Sonkhera and laid there the foundations of Jâma' masjid, p. 204; hearing of the disappearance of Sultan Hūshang marched towards Mandū; besieged Mahīsra; encamped at the foot of the fort of Mandū; marched towards Ujjain; the division of the country among his amīrs; Sultan Hūshang entered the fort of Mandū, p. 205; went from Ujjain to Mandal and sat down in front of the Delhi gate; sent a farmān to Ahmadābād to summon Malik Ahmad Ayāz; advanced to Sârangpur; Sultan Hūshang submitted to him and agreed to pay tribute; the sudden attack of Sultan Hūshang on the Sultan's camp, p. 206; destructions caused by the attack of Sultan Hūshang; victory of the Sultan; flight of Sultan Hūshang with his army to Sârangpur, pp. 207-208; started for Gujrat; defeated Sultan Hūshang outside the fort of Sârangpur; advanced in the direction of Ahmadābād, p. 208; lived for three years in Ahmadābād for regulating the administration of his kingdom; sent an army to attack Pûnjâ; advanced into Idar; on the bank of Hâmtati laid the foundation of a fort, p. 209; Pûnjâ, till
his death, fought with the troops of Sultan, pp. 210-211; advanced to Idar; Har Ray, the son of Funja, begged for the pardon of his offences; forgave Har Ray, p. 211; conferred the title of Safdar-ul-mulk on Malik Hasan; plundered Kilwara; went to Ahmadabad, p. 212; Raja Kanha brought a force from Sultan Ahmad Bahmani and ravaged parts of Nadarbahr; Shahzada Muhammad Khan fought a battle with the Dakini troops and gained the victory, p. 213; Shuhzada Muhammad Khan fought with Sultan Alla-ud-din of Deccan and became victorious, pp. 213-214; on the petition of Qutb, the officer-in-charge of the island of Mahaim, sent Shahzada Zafar Khan to destroy Malik-ut-tujjar, one of the amirs of Sultan Ahmad Bahmani; Zafar Khan defeated Malik-ut-tujjar, pp. 215-216; Zafar Khan took possession of Mahaim and divided it among the amirs; Sultan Ahmad Bahmani marched against the country of Baghana; postponed the siege of Champa-nir; advanced towards Nadot; after plundering Nadot encamped in the vicinity of Nadarbahr; Sultan Ahmad Bahmani, on the arrival of the Sultan, had left a detachment on the boundary of his kingdom and had gone back to Gulbarga; turned back towards Ahmadabad; crossed the Tapti after successive marches, p. 217; Sultan Ahmad Bahmani besieged the fort of Tambol; advanced towards Tambol; encouragement and assurance of reward by Sultan Ahmad Bahmani to his soldiers, advanced towards him, Sultan Ahmad Bahmani started to meet him; a conflict between Sultan Ahmad Bahmani, p. 218; Sultan Ahmad Bahmani took the path of flight; entered the fort of Tambol; started towards Tailnir; gave directions to Malik Taj-ud-din and conferred a title on him; returned to Ahmadabad; marriage of Shuhzada Fatih Khan; the story of the siege of the fort of Tambol, p. 219; invasion of the Deccan; advanced to conquer the countries of Mewar and Nagor; encamped in the town of Dungarpur and Ganasa; Raja of Dungarpur and Ganasa paid tribute to the Sultan; ravaged the country of Kilwara; invaded Dilwara; raised to the ground the palaces of Rana Mukul, p. 220; left Malik Mir Sultan for collecting Firaj; turned to Rathors; Rathors chiefs behaved with loyalty; Firuz Khan offered tribute; gave back the tribute; returned to Ahmadabad, p. 221; advanced and took possession of the greater part of Malwa; intention to place Shuhzada Masa'ud Khan on the throne of his ancestors; plague attacked the army and made him return to Gujrat; gave hopes of help to Masa'ud Khan; date of his death, p. 222; period of his reign; place of his tomb; title after his death, p. 223; was sent by Sultan Muzaifar to help Sultan Hushang, p. 470. 

Ahmad Shah Bahmani, Sultan; with Firuz Shah succeeded in regaining the hereditary dominion from Sultan Shams-ud-din, p. 27; he performed feats of valour when Sultan Firuz Shah was fighting with Deo Ray, p. 34; prophecy of Saiyid Muhummad Gisudarz about his sovereignty, p. 38; attempt by the adherents of Firuz Shah to seize him; Firuz Shah attempted but could
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not crush him, p. 40; he was declared by Firuz Shah to be the heir of his throne, p. 41 (and also note 3, p. 40); succeeded his brother; assumed the title of Sultan Ahmad Shâh Bahmani; entrusted the reins of the government to the hands of Shir Malik, p. 42; being aware of the insult of Nasir-ud-din awarded mortal punishment to Shir Malik; returned the army of Sultan Ahmad Gujrati, p. 43; advanced towards Bijanagar, p. 44; commenced to ravage Bijanagar; Deo Ray sent gifts and asked pardon for his offences; forgave Deo Ray; sent a friendly farman to Deo Ray; came back to the capital; granted promotions to the amirs; allowed the amirs to retire to their thana; sent a proposal to Naasir Khan of Asir for the marriage of his son Alâ-ud-din; welcomed the guests of Asir, p. 45; summoned the Qâzîs and the great men of the city; arranged the marriage assembly; sent back the sons and the adherents of Naasir Khan; advanced towards Tilang, p. 46; certain forts were re-occupied; took tribute from the Kalântars and returned to Gulbarga; advanced to punish the Ray of Mâhür; defeated the Ray and took possession of every thing belonging to him, p. 47; appointed Shâhzâda Alâ-ud-din to be the heir apparent and made Muhammed Khan over to him; conferred the country of Mâhür with its dependencies on Shâhzâda Mahmud Khan; gave the fort of Raipur with its surroundings to Daud Khan, p. 48; appointed Khalf Hassan Arab entitled Malik-ut-tujjar to conquer the island of Mahâim, p. 49; the Musalmân Râys of Mahâim went to ask help from the Sultan of Gujrât; sent Shâhzâda Alâ-ud-din to reinforce Malik-ut-tujjar, p. 50; marched towards the territory of Narsingh Rây which was invaded by Sultan Hushang; besieged the fort of Kehrla; after defeating Sultan Hushang arrived in the city of Bidar, p. 52; selected the city of Bidar for his capital, laid the foundation brick of the fort; planned a grand mansion for the palace, p. 53; marched to capture the fort of Tambûl; Sultan of Gujrât sent a message to leave the fort of Tambûl in the possession of its owner; withdrew his forces from the fort, p. 54; went to Gulbarga; became ill; gave counsel and directions to Shâhzâda Alâ-ud-din, p. 55; his death; period of reign, p. 56 (and see note 1, page 56); sent Sultan Alâ-ud-din and Khan Jahân to fight with Shâhzâda Muhammad, p. 213; despatched forces to strengthen Malik-ut-tujjar, p. 216; marched against the country of Baghâna; hearing the arrival of Sultan Ahmad Gujrati went back to Gulbarga, p. 217; besieged the fort of Tambûl; encouraged his soldiers to fight the army of Gujrât; fought the army of Gujrât, p. 218; was defeated and fled from Tambûl, p. 219; rejected the request of Sultan Ahmad Gujrati; was defeated and destroyed by Sultan Ahmad Gujrati, p. 220.

Ahammad Silhâ, Malik, was sent to reconnoitre the roads, p. 505.

Aimana, p. 140.

'Ain-ud-din, Malik, one of the adherents of Mahmud Shâh, p. 239; was given a title of Nisâm-ul-mulk by Mahmud Shâh, p. 242.
'Ain-ul-mulk, Maḥmūd Shāh sent him to take charge of the fort of Panāla and its neighbourhood, p. 123; from Panāla he was sent to the island of Goa for its possession; came back, and presented Malik Sa'id to the Sultān; properties and territories of Bahādur Gilānī were conferred on him, p. 126.

'Ain-ul-mulk, joined Nāṣir Shāh, p. 567.

'Ain-ul-mulk, Ḥakīm, came to 'Alī Ādil Ḥūn from Khalīfa'-i-Ilaḥi, p. 163.

'Ain-ul-mulk, Malik, waited on Muzaffar Shāh; attacked the town of Mahrāsa; fight against the Rāja of Idrā; took the path of flight, p. 296; was given money by Muzaffar Shāh, p. 297.


Ajhī, Malik, released Muḥammad Shāh; his rank in the court of Fatḥ Shāh; his ability, p. 690; was put to death by the sons of Ibrāhīm, p. 691.

'Ālam, Shāh, p. 327.

'Ālam, Sultān, ruler of Kālpī, complained to Sultān Bahādur against the cruelty of the army of Jinnaṭ Aḥshāni, p. 367; reinforced the army of Gujrat, p. 373; was hamstrung by the order of Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 375.

'Ālam Kālpīwāl, Sultān, was appointed to govern Rāisīn by Sultān Bahādur, p. 616.

'Ālam Ḥūn, defeated Sankar Chak, p. 742.

'Ālam Ḥūn, son of Jām Bāyazid, an account of his insult in the court of Sultān Maḥmūd, p. 801; wounded Sultān Maḥmūd; his flight to his father; went to Shōr, p. 802.

'Ālam Ḥūn, son of Sultān Sikandar Lādī Bādshāh of Dehlī, his represen
tation to Muzaffar Shāh about the cruelty of Sultān Ibrāhīm, p. 319.

'Ālam Ḥūn, Ḥānẓāda, the father of Nāṣir Khān of Asīr, p. 57; was placed on the throne of Asīr and Burhānpūr by Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Maḥbūl, p. 283; advanced towards Burhānpūr, p. 284.

'Ālam Khān Lādī, struggle with Daryā Khān, p. 387; defeated Daryā Khān and took up the post of vażarat, p. 388; fled to Shīr Khān, p. 389; joined Sultān Aḥmad, p. 395.

'Ālam Shāh, Malik, surrendered his thāna to Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 284; was given the title of Qutb Khān; and was sent in attendance on A'ẓam Humāyūn, p. 285.

'Ālam-ul-mulk, shut himself in Daulātābād; Ḥasan gave safe conduct to him, p. 8.

'Alā-ud-dīn, Shaikhzāda, was sent with presents to Mīrzā Ābū Sa'id by Maḥmūd Khaliq, p. 541.

'Alā-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla, met Mukhlīs in battle and slew him; assumed the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; attacked Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn and put him to death; succeeded Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn; left a thāna at Lakhnauti; advanced towards Bangāla, p. 420 (and notes 1-2, p. 420); was slain by Malik Ḥājī Ilīyās 'Alā; period of reign, p. 421.

'Alā-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla, succeeded Muzzaffar Shāh Ḥabshi; showed favours to the amīrs, p. 442 (and note 2, p. 442); raised his special servants to high ranks; removed the pātka; summoned learned men; made efforts for enriching the country; allotted many villages for defraying the expenses of the alma houses; came every year
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from Ekdāla to Pandūlah; his reign; death; period of reign, p. 443.
‘Alā-ud-dīn, Sultān, son of Aḥmād Shāh Bahmanī; Aḥmād Shāh appointed him as the heir apparent and made Muhammad Khān over to him, p. 48; went to reinforce Malik-ut-tujjār; came back unsuccessful, p. 50; heard the counsels and directions of his father, p. 55; succeeded his father and gave himself the title of ‘Alā-ud-dīn Shāh; entrusted the reins of the government to Dīlawar Khān, p. 56; sent Kahlīf Ḥasan Malik-ut-tujjār to oppose Naṣīr Khān; sent Shāhzhāda Muhammad Khān, p. 58, to conquer Bijānagar; advanced to punish Muhammad Khān on receiving the information of the death of Malik ‘Imād-ud-dīn; defeated Muhammad Khān, p. 59; sent a ferman and conferred Mouzah Rājīr on Shāhzhāda Muḥammad Khān, p. 60; returned to the capital, p. 61; nominated Dīlawar Khān to conquer Kōkan; sent ferman to the amirs on the frontier to join Dīlawar Khān, p. 66; distinguished Dīlawar Khān for conquering Kōkan and the fort of Rāhal; turned against Dīlawar Khān, p. 67; received the information of plundering by the Rāy of Bijānagar, p. 67; advanced towards Bijānagar; besieged the fort of Mūdkal; excused the Rāy of Bijānagar, made an agreement and returned to the capital; arranged a great entertainment and conferred distinctions on the amirs, p. 69; came to save Māhūr from the hands of Muḥammad Khālījī and Sikandar Khān; became victorious; granted honour to the thānādār of Māhūr; gave him the title of Fakhr-ul-mulk; and confirmed him in the government of Māhūr; after making arrangements for the government of Māhūr returned to capital; forgave the offences of Sikandar Khān and exalted him, p. 71; his character and nature, p. 71; direction and precepts to his son, p. 73; his death, p. 75; period of reign, p. 76; was sent by his father to fight with Shāhzhāda Muḥammad of Gujṛāt, p. 213; arrived at Daulatingābad; received reinforcements; fled after the battle, p. 214.
‘Alā-ud-dīn, Sultān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, was made the bādshāh after the death of Aḥmād Shāh by Malik Barīd; planned to follow his great ancestors; in opposition of his plan Malik Barīd in concert with Niẓām-ul-mulk, ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and ‘Ādil Khān dethroned him; the period of reign which was passed in confinement was one year and eleven months, p. 133.
‘Alā-ud-dīn, Sultān, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmir; accession; imprisoned the Rasturis; laid the foundation of a city, p. 639; made a rule for unchaste women, period of reign, p. 640.
‘Alā-ud-dīn Ḥasan Shāh, p. 2; his rise in Daulatingābad, p. 3; his declaration as a descendent of Bahman, p. 4; came to Delhi, p. 7; went to the presence of Shāikh Niẓām-ud-dīn Dehlavi who predicted his future; turned towards the Dakin; killed the superintendent of Gulbarga and possessed its neighbouring tract, went to Daulatingābad; gave safe conduct to ‘Ālam-ul-mulk; possessed all the property belonging to Muḥammad Shāh in Dārāgarh; placed Ismā’īl Fath on the throne of Dārāgarh and gave him the title of Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 8; on the arrival
of Muḥammad Shāh marched away towards Gulbarga; slew 'Imād-ul-mulk, p. 9; went to Daulaṭābād; placed himself on the throne; assumed the title of Sultan 'Alā-ud-dīn; made Gulbarga his capital and changed its name to Ḥasanābād; his illness; his advice to his son Muḥammad Ḵān, p. 10; his death; period of reign, p. 11 (and see note 4 on page 9, and note 1 on page 10).

'Alā-ud-dīn Suhrāb, Malik, fled from Sultan Maḥmūd and waited on Sultan Quṭb-ud-dīn; was given the title of 'Alā-ul-mulk by Sultan Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 228; joined Maḥmūd Ḵaljī and was given a high rank and title by him, p. 522; went to Sultan Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 523.

'Alā-ul-mulk bīn Suhrāb, Malik, was sent by the amīra of Sultan Dāūd Shāh to Maḳḥdūma-i-Jahān to bring Shāhzāda Fatḥ Ḵān; brought Shāhzāda Fatḥ Ḵān, p. 237.

Alf Ḵān, son of Ulugh Ḵān, fled from Mahraṣa, p. 279; gave the elephants in charge of Sharf-i-Jahān and went to Mandū; was not favoured by Sultan Ghiyāṭ-ud-dīn; came towards Sultaṇpūr; fought with the men despatched by Sultan Maḥmūd; prayed for the pardon of his offences; waited on Sultan Maḥmūd; did homage and was favoured by the latter; murdered nāb-i-'urqū for which he was imprisoned and died there, p. 280; sent a message to Latīf Ḵān to leave Chāmpānīr, p. 336.

'Ali Ḵāmīn, came to 'Ali 'Adil Ḵān from Khallifa-i-Ilāhī, p. 163.

'Ali, Malik, was slain in the battle-field, p. 703.

'Ali 'Adil Ḵān, succeeded his father, p. 162; he blinded Tahmāsp and Ismā'īl; his character and habits; he brought Amr Fath-ul-lah Shārāfī; and made him his vakil; his possessions; his war with Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk; his relation to Khallīfa-i-Ilāhī, p. 163; he included the name of Khallīfa-i-Ilāhī in the public prayers and the coins of his realm; his religious inclinations; demanded the eunuch of Malik Barīd; Murtaḍa Niẓām-ul-mulk attacked Barīd; he reinforced the army of Barīd; Malik Barīd sent his eunuch to 'Ali 'Adil Shāh; his welcome of the eunuch; was killed by the eunuch; the period of his reign, p. 164.

'Ali, Shaikh Mīr, his share in Kashmīr, p. 699; was slain in the battlefield, p. 703.

'Ali Bēg, Shaikhb, as the commander of the army of Abdāl Mākri, p. 696; his representation to Mīrzā Kāmrān, p. 700.

'Ali Chāk, was slain by Bibī Rābe'a, p. 723.

'Ali Chāk, son of Nauroz Chāk, his faith in Shāh 'Ārif; his protest to 'Ali Shāh, went to Ḥusain Quṭb Ḵān and returned to Kashmīr, p. 749.

'Ali Hamadānī, Mīr Saiyid, his Khiṣqāḥ was burnt by the Kashmīris, p. 685.

'Ali Ḩāmid, p. 202; his request to Aḥmad Shāh not to fight with Sultan Husayn, p. 203.

'Ali Ḵān, was sent with a letter and presents to Sultan Maḥmūd Sharqī by Sultan Maḥmūd Khālīj, p. 455.

'Ali Ḵān, father of Yusuf, his release from Mubārak Ḵān; his imprisonment by the Kashmīris, p. 755.

'Ali Ḵān, uncle of Naṣīr, was sent with a tribute to Maḥmūd Khālīj by Naṣīr Shāh, p. 512; went as a messenger of
Maḥmūd Khaljī to Maḥmūd Sharqī, p. 516; fought against the troops of Kōnbhā, p. 529; his dismissal, p. 562.

'Ali Khan, Rāja, was ordered to help Burhān; advanced to support Burhān; fought a battle; sent Burhān to Aḥmadnagar, p. 158.

'Ali Khan, Saiyid, joined the army of Humayūn, p. 372; slew Yusuf Khan and Bāji Bhat; collected soldiers to fight his enemies, p. 683; was banished from Kashmir, p. 686.

'Ali Kōkā, was appointed in the place of Malik Lūlī, p. 745.

'Ali Mākī, took a message to Mīrzā Hāṣid, p. 714.

'Ali Mūbrāk, Malik see 'Alā-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla.

'Ali Shāh, brother of Ḥusain, Sultān of Kashmir, his reply to Ḥusain Khan, p. 747; advanced towards Srinagar; came to Ḥusain Khan's house; assumed the title of 'Ali Shāh and the duties of royalty devolved upon him, p. 748; his faith in Shāh 'Ārif Dareṣṭah; obtained divorce for his daughter; representation of 'Ali Chak; seized 'Ali Chak, p. 749; sent troops against 'Ali Chak; ambassadors for Akbar; sent the daughter of his nephew for the service of Sultān Salim; public prayers and the coins of Kashmir were adorned with the name of Akbar; forgave Yusuf Shāh; sent an army to invade Kishwār; went with his family to see Jamāhnagarī, p. 750; famine in Kashmir, p. 751; repented of his sins; occupied himself in performing religious duties; his death, p. 752.

'Ali Shāh, Sultān, son of Sultān Sikandar, Sultān of Kashmir, after the death of Siyāh Bhat selected Shāhī Kōhā for the post of suzir; went to the Rāja of Jammū, p. 650; a belief of the Indians; his defeat; period of reign, p. 652.

'Ali Shāh Bēgt, joined Muḥammad Shāh, p. 692.

'Ali Shēr, his struggle with Sultān Jamshīd, p. 638; his imprisonment, p. 757.

'Ali Shēr, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 775.

'Ali Shēr, Malik, sent to the fort of Rālsīn with Sīhādī, p. 366.

'Ali Shākār Aq Quyunlī, Mīr, p. 167.

Āl-i Tāhir, p. 632.

Allahadād, Mīr, arrival in Mūltān, p. 803.

Alp Khan Sanjar, Deputy of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Khaljī, p. 204 (and also n. 2 on p. 203).

Amin Khān Ghūrī, seized the fort of Junāgarh and Sōrath, p. 398.

Amin Naṣīr, brought Sīhādī by deceit, p. 356; was sent to bring Sīhādī by Sultān Bahādur, p. 615.

Amin-ul-mulk, father-in-law of Mīr Tāhir, p. 153; his decision; his proclamation; was put to death, p. 154.

'Āmir, son of 'Abd-ul-lah, his plan for the invasion of Sind, p. 764.

'Āmir Khān, went with a message of peace to the Kashmirīs, p. 718.

'Āmir Maḥmūd Barkūt, joined Fīruz Khān, p. 189; was directed by Aḥmad Shāh to command the force, p. 200.

'Āmir Zinā, Aḥmad Jaurīn came to his house in search of Bahrām, p. 734.

Amman, complained to Rūf Khurshād, p. 554; was sentenced to death, p. 564.

Ānār, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 773.

Ānchhā, Malik, his plan to place Shāhzāda 'Uṭmān Khān on the throne of Hūshang, p. 489; was
pardoned by Mahmūd Khaljī; was given a fīf by Mahmūd Khaljī; his rebellion, p. 499; was attacked and killed with all his men by the Gönds, p. 500.

Ankās Khān, foster brother of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, p. 152; was imprisoned by Mīrzā Khān, p. 153.

Ankri, fought with the Susiyds, p. 684; obtained release and fought against Muhammad Shāh, p. 688; treatment by Muhammad Shāh; his rank, p. 689; his execution, p. 693.

Ārīsh Khān, was sent with a message to Mēndīn Rāy by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 597.

Ārif Darvīsh, Shāh, married the daughter of 'Ali Shāh; faith of others in him; his flight; his imprisonment; divorced his wife, p. 749.

Arjūn, p. 633.

Arz-ul-mulk, his son was slain in the house of Qadr Khān, p. 336.

Asad Khān, devastated the country of the Rāysh of Kōkan, p. 67.

As'ad Khān, advanced from Junūr; joined Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 97; made Mālū Khān the Sultān; his repentance; went to Malkāpūr, p. 162.

Asad Khān Lūdī, on the advance of Sultan Ibrāhīm he fled from Sanbal, p. 451.

Asad Khān Rūmī, a vakil of Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh; had an interview with Pishrāu Khān, p. 148.

Āsaf Khān, was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to punish 'Ālam Khān and Ḥisām-ud-dīn; took Malik Lādān Khaljī with him and waited upon Sultan Mahmūd, p. 284; was killed by Barbān, p. 300; was appointed by Sultan Bahādūr to guard Mahmūd Shāh; made a martyr of Mahmūd Shāh, p. 614.

Āṣaf Khān Gujratī, was left with a large force by Muẓaffar Shāh to reinforce Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī, pp. 306, 605; his son was slain in a battle with Bīhī Man Karan Pārabā, p. 307; attained martyrdom, p. 607.

Ashja'-ul-mulk, Malik, fought with Udaya Singh, p. 314.

Āṣhtī Khān, was the title of Nizām Mufarrāb, p. 173.

'Askari, Mīrzā, was sent by Humāyūn and defeated 'Imād-ul-mulk, p. 376; was appointed to the government of Aḥmadābād by Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 377; relinquished the country of Gujrāt, p. 378; was left in Gujrāt by Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 616.

'Āṭān, Malik, defeated Yakān Khān, p. 560.

Aūhād Khān, was sent with tribute to Mahmūd Khaljī by his father, p. 520.

Aūliya, Shalīq, was sent by Bihjāt Khān to Mahmūd Shāh to ask for pardon of his offences, p. 595.

Āyāz, slave of Sultan Mahmūd Gujratī, fought with the Frangis and defeated them, p. 282.

Āyāz Sultānī, Malik; fought with the Rājpūts and defeated them, p. 275; stopped Muẓaffar Shāh and himself wanted to proceed to crush Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 312; was sent by Muẓaffar Shāh to chastise Rānā Sāṅkā; a representation to Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 313; besieged Mandisōr, p. 314; a message from Rānā Sāṅkā; his reply to the messenger of Rānā Sāṅkā; asked Sultan Mahmūd to come to his aid, p. 315; amīr of Gujrat plotted against him, agreed to make peace with Rānā Sāṅkā; a representation to Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī, p. 316; encamped at Ḥalijābār and honoured the emissaries of Rānā Sāṅkā; was permitted to go
heard the tyranny of the Râjpûts of Mandalgarh, p. 178; he marched towards Mandalgarh to take revenge for the tyranny of the Râjpûts; he crushed the power of the Râjpûts, made them humble, and excused their offences, he performed a pilgrimage to the tomb of Shâikh Khwâjah Mu'in-ud-din Hasan Sanjari and plundered the towns of that country; his march towards Dandwâna, plundered Dilwâra and Jalwâra; returned to Pattan, p. 179; issued an order for the rest of his troops, pp. 179-180; Tâtâr Khân came from Delhi to Gujrat owing to the violence of Mallû Khân; Tâtâr Khân prayed his father to help him in taking revenge from Mallû Khân; Mîrzâ Pir Muhammed Khân possessed Multân and seized Sârang Khân; arrival of Taimûr in the neighbourhood of Delhi; he comforted Tâtâr Khân and postponed the march to Delhi; he and Tâtâr Khân advanced towards Idar; plundered the country of Idar and disgraced the Râja, p. 180; returned to Pattan; after the attack of Âmir Taimûr people fled from Delhi to Pattan; flight of Sultân Mâhmûd from Delhi to Gujrat; he disgraced Sultân Mâhmûd; his victorious advance to Idar; his successful march to suppress the Hindûs of Sûmâth, p. 181; he demolished their temples, laid the foundation of Jâmi'a mosque, and appointed the religious servants; returned to Pattan; Tâtâr Khân asked favour of his father to take back the dominion of Sultân Mâhmûd from Mallû Khân; he instead of agreeing with the idea of Tâtâr Khân, made him his successor to the throne, p. 182; grieved at the

to the port of Dêp; sent a message to Rânâ Sânkâ, p. 317; his death, p. 318.

Â'zam Humâyûn, younger son of Sultân Nâsîr-ud-dîn see Mâhmûd Shâh, Sultân, son of Nâsîr Shâh, Sultân of Mâlwa.

Â'zam Humâyûn Zafar Khân (Gujrât) owing to the excessive cruelty of Nîzâm Mufarrah, Sultân Muhammed Shâh conferred the jâgir of Gujrat on him; he started for Gujrat, encamped at the royal reservoir, and heard the advice of Sultân Muhammed Shâh, p. 173; titles which were written to him by Sultân Muhammed Shâh, pp. 174-175; his delight on the birth of his grandson Âhmad Khân; in the neighbourhood of Nâgir men of Kânbâyat requested him to suppress the cruelty of Nîzâm Mufarrah, he sent a letter to Nîzâm Mufarrah, p. 175; the reply of Malik Nîzâm Mufarrah to him; rebellion of Nîzâm Mufarrah; a battle between Zafar Khân and Nîzâm Mufarrah; death of Nîzâm Mufarrah; victory of Zafar Khân, p. 176; he sent agents to all the parsânas; he advanced towards Asâwal; came back to the neighbourhood of Pattan; the death of Sultân Muhammed Shâh; the disobedience of the Râja of Idar; he advanced to punish the Râja of Idar; crushed the Râja of Idar, p. 177; took tributes from the Râja of Idar; advanced towards Sûmâth; advanced towards Nadarbâr to punish Malik Naşir Râja 'Adî Khân; returned to Pattan; invaded Jar and Tar; advanced for the destruction of Sûmâth; his behaviour towards the Râjpûts and their temples; arrival at Sûmâth and his activities; came back to Pattan;
death of Tātār Khān; transferred Shams Khān Dandānī to replace Malik Jalāl Kökhar; again ascended the throne after the death of Tātār Khān, p. 184.

Aʿzam Khān, was sent by Khalīfa-i-
Nāhī to conquer the Deccan; returned without accomplishing anything, p. 157.

Azdar Khān, son of Alī Khān, it was reported to Maḥmūd Shāh that he was the murderer of Qaṣīr Khān; order of his arrest issued by Maḥmūd Shāh; later order of his release, p. 271.

ʿAzīz Khān Muhammad, caused rebellion in Gujrat, p. 2.

ʿAzīz Khān Nāmī, brought a letter from Aḥmad Shāh to Naṣīr Khān of Aṣīr containing the proposal of mar-
riage of Sultān ʿAlā-ud-dīn, p. 45.

ʿAzīz Khān Turk, offered to sacrifice his life for Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 114.

ʿAzīz-ul-lah, Maulānā, p. 798; was invited by Jām Bāyāzīd, p. 804.

ʿAzīz-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent by Maḥmūd Shāh to punish Malik Ḥısām-ud-dīn and ʿAlām Khān, p. 284.

Āzurī, Shāhī, p. 53.

B

Bābā Khālid, effected a peace between ʿIdī Zīnā and the Kashmīris, p. 722; took a message to Abdāl Khān, p. 752; was sent by Saiyid Mubārak Khān to the latter's enemies, p. 754; his determination about Yūsuf Khān, p. 760.

Bābā Mahdī, his determination about Yūsuf Khān, p. 760.

Bābar Bādadāh, Firūdūs Makānī Žahir-
ud-dīn Muḥammad, encamped in the neighbourhood of Delhi, p. 321; having slain Sultān Ibrāhīm Lūdī

possessed Delhi, p. 444; Raḍī-ul-
Mulk came to him, p. 610.

Bāghrā, Rāyḍāda, his flight, p. 766.

Badeh, Malik, son of Niẓām-ul-mulk, p. 269; after the death of his father he was given the title of Ikhtiyār-
ul-mulk by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 271.

Bādī Alangdār, Saiyid, he was ap-
pointed by Maḥmūd Shāh for guarding the road and for the bringing in of provisions, p. 273.

Bādī, went to conquer Dābul but attained martyrdom, p. 764.

Bādīʿ-uz-zamān, Mirzā, p. 781.

Badr ʿAlī, Malik, instigated Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān to revolt against Ahmad Shāh; made arrange-
ments to defend the fort of Mahrāsā; message of Sultān Aḥmad to him; his reply to Aḥmad Shāh, p. 192; his treachery with the amirs of Aḥmad Shāh; he was executed by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 193.

Badr Khān, came into the city and offered congratulations to the murderers of Changāz Khān, p. 409.

Bahādur, Sultān, Gujratī, Sultān of Mālwa, details of his reign in Mālwa, p. 615.

Bahādur Bhat, was asked by Ghazāl Khān to bring his son on the right path, p. 736.

Bahādur Gīlāni, account of his rebel-
lation; took forcible possession; oppression in the ports of Gujrat; plundered ships of Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī and imprisoned his men; after a great battle arrested Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān and sent them to Dābul, p. 117; wrote an improper reply to Maḥmūd Shāh Bahmani, p. 119; fight with the army of Sultān Maḥmūd near the fort of Mīrīch and its result, p. 120; sent Ḥawājah Naʿamat-ul-lah Tabrīzī in order to ask pardon of his offences,
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p. 121; revolted and was defeated by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 122; his men joined Sulṭān Mahmūd; fled from Kolāpūr; sent Khwājah Na'amat-ul-lah Tabrīz with a petition to Sulṭān Mahmūd, p. 123; petition was granted but he himself changed his resolution, p. 124; was killed by Zain Khān, p. 125.

Bahādur Khān, agent of Jām Nandā, p. 778.

Bahādur Khān, son of Khān Zamān; joined his father, p. 743; was slain, p. 744.

Bahādur Khān, Shāhzāda, his petition to Muẓaffar Shāh for the increase of his allowance; went to Aḥmadābād from there to the country of Māl, p. 320; visited the tomb of Khwājah Muṭin-ud-dīn Ḥasan Sanjārī and went towards Delhi, fought with the Maghūl soldiers, p. 321.

Bahādur Shāh, Sulṭān of Gujrat, at the invitation of 'Imād-ul-mulk invaded the Deccan, p. 135; arrived in the neighbourhood of Aḥmadnagar; encamped at Kālāchabūtra, p. 139; started for Gujrat, p. 330; a letter to Tāj Khān; his successful advance, p. 331; left Aḥmadābād with great pomp, p. 332; sat on the throne; raised the standard of empire; his generous bestowal pleased every one; advanced towards Chāmpānīr, p. 333; halted at the town of Salhvunj; army crossed over the river Mahīndrī; after crossing the river advanced towards Chāmpānīr, p. 334; ordered Naṣīr Khān to seize 'Imād-ul-mulk; sent Tāj Khān to attack 'Imād-ul-mulk and himself mounted to follow him; the house of 'Imād-ul-mulk was pillaged and his sons were taken prisoner; sentenced 'Imād-ul-mulk and Šafī-ud-dīn to death; appointed Shamshīr-ul-mulk to seize 'Add-ul-mulk and Niẓām-ul-mulk to attack Muḥāfīz Khān, p. 335; sentenced Bahā'-ul-mulk to death; all the murderers of Sulṭān Sikandar were put to death, p. 336; pleased all people by his generosity, p. 337; coronation in the capital of Gujrat; bestowed wealth and honours on the people; Qhāzī Khān was appointed to the government of Nadarbār and Sulṭānpūr; sent orders for Laṭīf Khān’s destruction, p. 338; arranged a festive assembly; a famine took place; endeavoured to ameliorate the condition of the ṭa'īyats; movements of disturbers; sent Ulugh Khān, p. 339, against Laṭīf Khān; Tāj Khān reported to the Sulṭān the hostile attitude of Ulugh Khān and Qaṣīr Khān; arrest of the conspirators; ordered release of the conspirators, p. 340; ordered the payment of Sulābdār’s allowances; news from Qhāzī Khān about the battle and arrest of Laṭīf Khān; sent Muḥīb-ul-mulk to bring Laṭīf Khān; appointment of beadsmen at his brothers’ tombs, p. 341; wanted to advance against the Rāja of Māl; Tāj Khān opposed it and soothed the Sulṭān; sent an army with Tāj Khān for the punishment of Rāy Singh, p. 342; Tāj Khān ravaged the country of Rāy Singh; sent Tāj Khān to arrange the affairs of Kanbāyet; dismissed the dāroghā of Kanbāyet; conquered the countries of Īdar and Bākhar; returned to Chāmpānīr; went to rebuild the fort of Bahrūj, p. 343; after finishing the work went to Kanbāyet; travelled to Dīp by road; invited the firangī to accept Islām; a letter from the governor of Āsr; p. 344; an order was issued in
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reply to the governor of Āsīr; advanced to conquer the Deccan; encamped for the collection of troops in the town of Barōda; Jām Fīrūz joined the Sultān, p. 345; fixed a stipend for Jām Fīrūz; promised to restore his dominion to Jām Fīrūz after recovering it from the Maghūls; powers from the various directions came and joined; representation from 'Imād-ul-mulk; decided to invade the Deccan; allowed Ja'far Khān to visit Aḥmadābād, p. 346; returned to Muḥammadābād and passed the rainy season there; marched towards Bākār and Idar; sent Shudāwand Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk from Khānpūr to Bākār; proceeded towards Kanbāyet; embarked in a ship for the Dip; showed kindness to Rūmās (Turk), p. 347; arranged residences for Rūmās and returned after recommending them to the favour of Malik Ayāz; on his arrival at Chāmpānīr 'Umr Khān, Qūṭb Khān, and amīrs of Sultān Ibrāhīm fled to Gujarāt and were exalted to high ranks; penetrated into Bākār by successive marches; arranged for the better government of Bākār, p. 348; acceded to the prayer of Ratan Sā; laid the foundation of a mosque; gave Karchi to Prithvi Rāj; divided the territory of Bākār between Prithvi Rāj and Jagā, p. 349; bestowed favours on Sikandar Khān and Bhūpat; a message from Sultān Maḥmūd, p. 350; reply to the message of Sultān Maḥmūd; marched towards Bānswāla; arrived at Sambhāla; waited for ten days for Sultān Maḥmūd, p. 351; on arrival at Dībālpūr came to know that Sultān Maḥmūd wanted to confer the title of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn on his eldest son and had no desire to meet Sultan Bahādur; started and encamped at Sūdpūr; arrived at Na'leha and made arrangements for the siege, p. 352; sent the Pārabīa contingent to Pahalwānīa; took up quarters in the palaces at Muḥammadpūr; captured the fort of Mandū, p. 353; ascended to the top of Lāl Māhāl and sent a man to wait on Sultan Maḥmūd; received Sultan Maḥmūd with respect and tried to please him; took up his residence, p. 354, at Mandū; gave permission to amīrs to go back to Gujarāt; went to see Burhānpūr and Āsīr; conferred on Niẓām-ul-mulk Dakhīn the title of Muḥammad Shāh and returned to Mandū; ordered the release of Musalmān women from the disgrace of Kufr and condign punishment for Sīlhadī; sent Muqbal Khān to Chāmpānīr to guard the fort; sent Ikhtiyār Khān with troops and treasure; made proclamation of his departure to Gujarāt, p. 355; went to Mandū to make preparations for the march towards Gujarāt; left Ikhtiyār Khān in charge of the government of Mandū; gave permission to Bhūpat to bring Sīlhadī; advanced towards Ujjain; went away to Dībālpūr, Banharīa and Sa'dulpūr for hunting, p. 356; started from Sa'dulpūr for Dhār; talked with the amīrs about seizing Sīlhadī; took up his residence in the fort of Dhār; sent 'Imād-ul-mulk to attack Bhūpat; started towards Ujjain; conferred the government of Ujjain, p. 357, on Dāryā Khān; bestowed Sārangpūr on Mallū Khān; gave permission to Hābib Khān to go back to Āshta; marched towards Bhīlsa and Rāisīn;
on arrival at Bhilsa came to know about the currency of heathenism there, p. 358; waited at Bhilsa for three days for the erection of mosques and houses for pious purposes; advanced to conquer Raisn; attacked Parabla Rajputs, p. 359; forbade continuance of the fight and postponed it to next day; marched from Raisn and commenced the construction of covered passages; representation from Silhadi for submission and acceptance of Islam, p. 360; acceding to the request of his brother, Silhadi asked leave of the Sultan for evacuating the fort; granted leave to Silhadi and waited; Silhadi was permitted to go to the fort; Silhadi advised the Rajputs of the fort, p. 361; fight between the son of Silhadi and the army of Gujrat; ordered imprisonment of Silhadi in the fort of Mandu; became violent on hearing the news of the Rana’s approach; sent Muhammad Khan and ‘Imad-ul-mulk Sultan for their chastisement, p. 362; Muhammad Khan and ‘Imad-ul-mulk submitted a report to the Sultan describing the advance of Rana with a large force; on the report of ‘Imad-ul-mulk hastened towards Kahrur; report of the spies of Rana about the arrival of the Sultan, p. 363; flight of Rana and Bhupat; pursued the enemy, p. 364; leaving the punishment and castigation of the Rana to the next year returned to Raisn and after arrival there made the siege closer than before; terms and conditions of Lakhman for evacuating his fort for the Sultan; granted Lakhman’s prayer and summoned Silhadi from the fort of Mandu; detailed a body of soldiers to guard the fort, p. 365; sent Malik Ali Shere with Silhadi to the fort; enthusiastic speech of Rana Durgawati made Silhadi ready for revolt, p. 366; fatal end of the rebels; granted the fort of Raisn and Chanderi and the territories of Bhilsa as a jagir to Sultan ‘Alam; appointed Muhammad Khan to capture the fort of the Karkur; started on an expedition to hunt elephants; made Kanur over to Ulugh Khan; took possession of Islamabad and Husangabod and the whole of the country of Malwa; granted these possessions as jagirs to the amirs of Gujrat, p. 367; arrived towards Karkur; occupied himself in Karkur in a festive assembly; sent ‘Imad-ul-mulk and Iqtiyvar Khan to capture the fort of Mandisor; forts of Mandisor and Karkur came into the Sultan’s possession; advanced from Mandu to Champaran, p. 368; advanced towards Dip on being informed of the power of firangis; advanced towards Chitor; siege of the fort of Chitor, sporadic fights of the Gujratis and their victories; submission of the Rana to the Sultan; cause of hostility with Humayan Badshah; conferred favours on Tatarkhan, p. 369; spent money for collection of troops, p. 370; letters from Humayan Badshah which were not satisfactorily responded to; Humayan Badshah advanced to crush the Sultan; advanced to seize the fort of Chitor, p. 371; took the fort of Chitor; met Humayun Badshah in the vicinity of Mandisor; opinion of the amirs of the Sultan, p. 372; preparations for war with the Mughals; reinforcement by ‘Alam
Kālpīwālī, p. 373; exhaustion of the Gujrattīs; fled towards Mandū; Humāyūn Bādshāh pursued him to the fort of Mandū, shut himself up in Mandū, p. 374; flight from Mandū to Chāmpānīr; sent the treasure and jewels which he had at Chāmpānīr to the port of Dīp and himself went to Kanbāyat; taking strong horses went on to the port of Dīp, p. 375; distribution of the treasures of the Sultan; deputed ‘Imād-ul-mulk for collecting the revenue, p. 376; rebellion over the whole of Gujrāt, p. 377; advanced into Gujrāt; relinquishment of Gujrāt by the amirs of Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 378; advanced towards Chāmpānīr to crush Tārdī Bēg Khān; halted at Chāmpānīr for arranging the affairs in that neighbourhood; advanced towards Sōrath and Junāgarh to enable the firangīs, who had been called for help, to return, p. 379; arrival of the firangīs at the port of Dīp; successful conspiracy of the firangīs caused the death of the Sultan, p. 380; port of Dīp in the possession of the firangīs; period of reign, p. 381.

Bahār Khān, the command of the fort of Ranthambhōr was transferred from him by Maḥmūd Khalījī, p. 520.

Bahā’-ud-dīn, was welcomed by Yusuf Khān, p. 759.

Bahā-ud-dīn, Malik, one of the adherents of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 239; he was made Iḵtīyār-ul-mulk by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 242.

Bahā’-ud-dīn ‘Imād-ul-mulk, Malik, he was sent to the thāna of Sonkhir by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 263; by taking an oath on Qurān he gave assurance to Rāy Rāyān not to disclose the secrets of his treachery to Maḥmūd Shāh and promised to assist him in carrying out his intention; had a talk with Malik Miṅīyān; wrote a letter to Malik Fārḥat-ul-mulk to meet him; sent a letter to Malik Qiyām-ul-Mulk forbidding him to march from Rakhālī; sent for Muḥāfīz Khān and gave him special directions, p. 265; advised Maḥmūd Shāh to go to Ahmādābād; addressed the amirs in regard to the reply to the question of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 268; inquired the cause of silence of Maḥmūd Shāh; reported the whole story of conspiracy to Maḥmūd Shāh who sent him to conquer Jālōr and Sājūr; encamped near the tomb of Shāhī Hājī Rajāb, p. 270; informed Maḥmūd Shāh what was done by Muẓāḥīd Khān; his death, p. 271.

Bahā’-ud-dīn Quraishī, Shāhījī, went as an ambassador to Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain, p. 805.

Bahā’-ud-dīn Zakariyā Multānī, Shāhījī, p. 788.

Bahā’ul-mulk, helped ‘Imād-ul-mulk in placing Naṣīr Khān on the throne, p. 328; joined Sultan Bahādur, p. 332; was hanged by the order of Sultan Bahādur, p. 336.

Bahā’-ul-mulk (son of Alī Khān), killed Ḍādī Shīlāḥdār and fled to Idar, p. 247.

Bahlūl, Maulānā, went as an ambassador to Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain, p. 805.

Bahlūl Lūdī, Malik, was sent by Sultan Muḥammad to fight against Maḥmūd Khalījī, p. 510.

Bahlūl Lūdī, Sultan, Bādshāh of Dehelī, asked help of Sultan Maḥmūd Khalījī, p. 460; asked favour of Sultan Ḥusain, defeated Sultan Ḥusain, sent Makkah-i-Jahān to Sultan Ḥusain, p. 461; requested Sultan Ḥusain to be pardoned;
defeated Sultan Husain on every occasion, took possession of Jaunpur and established his son there; his death, p. 462.

Bahram, Raja, raided Indarkot, p. 716.

Bahram Chak, son of Regi Chak, reached Srinagar, p. 709; went to Haitab Khan Niyazi, p. 713; his share in the division of Kashmir, p. 719; was seized by 'Idi Zinah, p. 721; defeated the Niyazis, p. 723; his imprisonment, p. 725; was granted favours by Chahz Khan, p. 732; joined the rebels, p. 733.

Bahram Khan, p. 16; Bahram Khan and Govind Raya rose in revolt; the Sultan started towards Deogarh; arrived in its neighbourhood; they became afraid and went to Daualatbad to Shaiakh Rukn-ud-din, the great Sufi of the time, p. 17; the Sultan on hearing of this arrived at Daualatbad and went to visit the Shaiakh, and agreed to pardon them; they went away to Gujrat, p. 18; was sent by Mahmud Shah to meet Raya Batai, p. 272.

Bahram Khan, son of Sultan Zain-ul-Abidin, welcomed Hajji Khan, p. 668; his treachery, p. 670; in the service of Haidar Shah; his jagir, p. 673; went towards Hindustan, p. 676; arrived in the district of Karra, p. 677; his defeat; his death, p. 678.

Bahram Khan, Khan Khanan, respected Nasrat Chak, p. 736.

Bahrain, entered the service of Sultan Bahadur, p. 346.

Baji Bhat, was slain, p. 683.

Balal, son of Imad-ul-mulk Tawalak, his murder, p. 799.

Bandagan Koka, was nominated to crush the rebel, p. 709; was left by Mirza Haidar at Srinagar, p. 710; fought with the Kishwaras army as the commander of Mirta Haidar's troop, p. 711; was slain, p. 712.

Baqi Beg, Khwaja, the fort of Sihwan was made over to him, p. 779.

Babak Shah, Sultan of Bangala, the amira seated him on the throne; passed his time in pleasure, died, p. 435 (and see notes 2-3, p. 435); period of reign, p. 436.

Babak Shah, Sultan of Bangala, after murdering his master took the title of badshah, p. 438 (and see n. 1, p. 348); his pomp and strength; was slain; period of reign, p. 439.

Babak Shah, son of Bahlul Lodi, the government of Jaunpur was given to him by his father; after the death of his father he advanced to conquer Delhi; being defeated by Sultan Sikandar he fled to Jaunpur, p. 462; went to conquer Multan, p. 793; possessed the fort of Khawwal, p. 795.

Barid, Malik, imprisoned Sultan Kalim-ul-lah in the city of Bidar, p. 4; was appointed as the koteel of Sultan Shihab-ud-din, p. 112; was informed about the intention of Dilawar Khan; kept the Sultan in imprisonment, p. 113; became all powerful in administration; kept Mahmud Shah as a puppet; met with the army of 'Imad-ul-mulk Kawili, p. 131; placed Ahmad Shah on the throne of Mahmud Shah and kept him in confinement, p. 132; placed 'Ali-ud-din in place of Ahmad Shah; dethroned 'Ali-ud-din, p. 133; placed Sultan Waliullah in place of Sultan 'Ali-ud-din; poisoned Waliullah on account of the latter's wife; after Waliullah gave the name of Sultan to Kalim-ul-lah, p. 134; had a fight with 'Imad-ul-mulk
Kāwili; made submission to Sultān Bahādur of Gujarāt, p. 135; his eunuch was demanded by 'Alī 'Ādil Khān; was attacked by Murtaḍa Niẓām-ul-mulk; asked 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh for help; presented the eunuch to 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh, p. 164.

Barkhūrdār, Malik, was sent by Ghaznūn Khān to seize Zafar Minjumla, p. 487; was given the title of Tāj Khān by Maḥmūd Khāljī, p. 497; sent a petition asking for aid to suppress the rebels; joined Ā'zam Humāyūn, p. 499; fought with Malik Ḥāji 'Alī; reassured Malik Iḥṣāq of his good luck, p. 504; was sent by Maḥmūd Khāljī with a message of peace to Sultān Qūṭbul-dīn, p. 525; fought against the army of Kōnbhā, p. 529; captured the fort of Būndi, p. 532; defeated Rāyūzāda of Kehrī, p. 540.

Barkhūrdār, Saiyid, was sent by Saiyid Mubārak Khān with a message to the latter's enemies, p. 754.

Basant Rāy, was entrusted with the administration by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 576; was slain by the amirs, p. 577.

Batāl, Rāy, fought with Malik Sadhā and killed him with his followers; plundered the army of Malik Sadhā; on the arrival of Maḥmūd Shāh he repented of his shameful deed and asked for pardon of his offences; his ambassadors were turned back by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 272; sent tribute to Maḥmūd Shāh which was refused; asked Sultān Qīyāṭ-ud-dīn Khāljī to help him, p. 273; fought with Qāwān-ul-mulk and his troops and made martyrs of them; p. 275; was captured and brought to Maḥmūd Shāh; was made over to Muḥāfiz Khān to recover his health; was urged by Maḥmūd Shāh to accept Islām; refused and was executed, p. 276.

Bāyazid, Jām, joined Sultān Ḥusain, p. 795; his love of learned men, p. 796; his engagement with Sultān Ḥusain, p. 799; seized 'Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak; his appointment as vāżīr; raised Maḥmūd to the throne of Mūltān, p. 800; disposition of Sultān Maḥmūd towards him; his order for the punishment of the turbulent men of Mūltān, p. 801; sent his son to Shōr; defeated the army of Sultān Maḥmūd; his petition to Sultān Sikandar, p. 802; peace with Sultān Maḥmūd, p. 803; granted favours to Mīr Jākar Zand; his invitation to Mālānā 'Aẓīz-ul-lah, p. 804.

Bāyazid Saiḥā, Malik, was sent with a message to Maḥmūd Khān, p. 494; his suggestion to the amirs to deal with Maḥmūd Khān, p. 495.

Bāz Bahādur, son of Shuja' Khān, Sultān of Mālwa, took possession of his father's property, p. 628; sent his mother to Daulat Khān; distribution among the heirs of Shuja' Khān, treacherously slew Daulat Khān; took possession of Mālwa; declared himself as the Sultān with the title of Bāz Bahādur Shāh; advanced towards Rāisin; defeated Malik Muṣṭafā; advanced towards Kadrūlā, p. 629; took possession of Kadrūlā; invaded Katinkah but was defeated; occupied himself in pleasure and enjoyment, p. 630; was defeated by the servants of Akbar; his character; period of reign; went to Gujarāt, p. 631; went to the Rānā of the fort of Kōnhbal- mīr; was enrolled in the band of Akbar's servants; his death, p. 632.

Bhāgmatī, she was loved by Muḥāmmadh Qūlī Qūṭbul-mulk, p. 171.
Bhagwān Dās, Rāja, was sent to invade Kashmir, p. 760; made peaceful settlement with the Kashmiris, p. 761.
Bhā’ī Khān, p. 153; his resolve; his proclamation; was put to death, p. 154.
Bhareu, p. 136 (and see also n. 2, p. 136).
Bhawānlās, son of Shevdās, brought his daughter as a tribute to Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 570.
Bherōdās, took a letter to Bihjat Khān, p. 589; reported all the talk of Bihjat Khān to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 590.
Bihkam Ādam Khān Afghān, p. 190; attended on Ahmad Shāh and was received with favour, p. 191; revolted against Ahmad Shāh, p. 194.
Bhīṃ, p. 481.
Bhīṃ, Rāy, fought with Latīf Khān, p. 341.
Bhīṃ, Rāy, Rāja of Beyt, when the citadel of Beyt was captured by Mahmūd Shāh he took the path of flight, p. 261; was seized and sent to Muhāfiz Khān for hanging and the announcement of his death, p. 262.
Bhūpat, waited on Sultan Bahādur and was favoured, p. 350; asked Sultan Baḥādur to go to Ujjain to bring Sillhadi, p. 356; his flight with Rānā of Chitōr, p. 364.
Bhūpat, son of Sillhadi, went to Burhānpūr with Sultan Bahādur, p. 615; went to Chitōr, p. 616; possessed the fort of Rāśīn and its neighbourhood, p. 617.
Bihār Māl, joined Niẓām-ul-mulk; was sent with Niẓām-ul-mulk by Muṣaffar Shāh to recover Idar, p. 300.

Bihistī, Mīr, a Saiyid; had Fattū in his house, p. 149.
Bihjat Khān, was entrusted with the government of Chandīrī, p. 568; his reply to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 583; sent his son to attend on Mahmūd Shāh, p. 584; was summoned by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 588; his reply to Mahmūd Shāh; submitted a petition to Sultan Sikandar Lūdī, p. 589; proclaimed Ṣāhib Khān as the Sultan, p. 592; sent an army to capture Sārangpūr, p. 593; prayed for the pardon of their offences to Mahmūd Shāh and was promised favours; his dishonesty with Ṣāhib Khān, p. 595; welcomed Mahmūd Shāh and was favoured by the latter, p. 596.
Bīr, Rāy, Rāja of Idar, was rewarded by Mahmūd Kahlījī, p. 522.
Bīr Bāl, Rāja, p. 628.
Birkānā Rāy, could not withstand Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari and paid tribute to him, p. 192.
Bōlī, a barber, was distinguished by Haidar Shāh, p. 673; caused the death of Hasan Kachhī, p. 674.
Burhān, the pésh-mandār of Sultan Mahmūd of Gujrat, description of the murder of Sultan Mahmūd committed by him, p. 389; murdered Aṣaf Khān and Khudawānd Khān, p. 390; murdered Afrāj Khān; his proclamation for the throne; was slain by Shērwan Khān, p. 391.
Burhān-ud-dīn, Qutb 'Alam Shaikh, p. 324.
Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk, son of Ahmad, succeeded his father; Shāh Tāhir came from 'Irāq to the Deccan, p. 137; adopted Īmānīa religion, p. 138; Sultan Bahādur Gujratī advanced to conquer the Deccan and encamped at Kālāchabūtra; Burhān did homage to him; Sultan Bahādur
respected Shāh Tāhir; Burhān had the public prayer read, and coins struck in his own name; ruled for forty-eight years, p. 139; married Āmla, a prostitute, and Ḥusain Nīrām-ul-mulk was born of her, p. 140.

Burhan Nizām-ul-mulk, son of Ḥusain Nīrām-ul-mulk, escaped from prison; was defeated by the amīra of Murtaḍa; went to Khlīfa-i-Ilāhī and was favourably received, p. 148; his entrance in the service of AKBAR and start towards Berār, p. 156; possessed the country of Berār; the duration of his imprisonment and escape; came to Gujrāt; was favoured by Khlīfa-i-Ilāhī and sent to Mālwa; Ā'zam Khān was sent to free the Deccan and make it over to Burhān; came back to the court of Khlīfa-i-Ilāhī; was appointed to attack the Āfgāns, p. 157; was summoned from Bangaš and sent to the Deccan; a fārmān of Khlīfa-i-Ilāhī to all concerned in support of Burhān; Nazr Bā and Rājā 'Alī Khān joined Burhān; Jamāl Khān marched from Bījāpur to defend Burhān; date of his accession, p. 158.

Burhān-ul-mulk, Silhādi was made over to him by the order of Sultān Bahādur, p. 382.

C

Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī, had an interview with Bahādur Shāh, p. 330; got out of the fort of Mandū and fled, p. 353; after the death of his father went to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 610; fled from Mahmūd Shāh, p. 612.
Chandar, son of Rājā Raṇjan, p. 634.
Chengiz Khān, his father attacked Burhān, p. 391; ports of Sūrath, Nāgōt and Chāmpānīr were in his possession, p. 398; arrived at Ahmādadābād and congratulated Sultān Muẓaffar, p. 399; sent a message to I’tmād Khān, p. 400; sent a petition to the court of Sultān Muẓaffar for the extension of his dominion, p. 401; possessed Nadarbār; marched towards the fort of Tāhir; posted his army to defend Mīrān Muhammad Shāh, p. 402; being unable to withstand Mīrān Muhammad Shāh fled to Bahārjī; advanced towards Ahmādadābād to punish I’tmād Khān, occupied Barōda; sent a message to I’tmād Khān that he should retire to his own jāghir, p. 403; advanced towards the battlefield of Ahmādadābād; without giving battle I’tmād Khān took the path of flight and became victorious, p. 404; made an amicable settlement with Shēr Khān; defeated Mīrān Muhammad Shāh, p. 405; allotted some parganas in the Sārākār of Bahārjī to the Mīrzās as jāghirs; without his permission the Mīrzās began to occupy other estates; sent an army to attack the Mīrzās; his army was defeated by the Mīrzās, p. 406; asked Ulugh Khān and Juhājār Khān to come to him; received Ightiyār-ul-mulk, Ulugh Khān, Juhājār Khān and other Habahis with respect, p. 407; ordered Ulugh Khān to go to the chaugān field, p. 408; was killed by Juhājār Khān, p. 409.

D

Dāhir, Rāy, his reply to Hajjāj, p. 763; his fight with Muḥammad Qāsim, p. 767; summary of the circumstances attending his death,
Dastūr-ul-mulk, was defeated by 'Ādil Khān; at the request of 'Ādil Khān his offences were pardoned by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 116.

Dāūd, the kingdom of Sulaimān Kararānī came under his power; was defeated by Khān Khānān; was slain by Khān Jahān, p. 446.

Dāūd, son of Jahāngīr Mākri, fought with the Saiyids and was killed, p. 684.

Dāūd, Malik-ul-umāra Malik, was appointed by Maḥmūd Khaljī to chastise the Gōnda, p. 540.

Dāūd Kadār, his imprisonment, p. 751.

Dāūd Khān, an amīr of the Deccan, challenged the Gujrātī amīrās and was taken prisoner, p. 219.

Dāūd Khān, governor of Biyāna, made his submission to Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 526.

Dāūd Khān, ruler of Asīr, sought protection of Nāṣīr Shāh, p. 570.

Dāūd Khān, youngest son of Ahmad Shāh Bahmani, Sultān Ahmad Shāh gave him the fort of Rājīrū (Rāischūr) with its surrounding country, p. 48; was sent to his gūba, p. 49.

Dāūd Shāh, cousin of Mujāhid Shāh, hostility with Mujāhid Shāh; slew Mujāhid Shāh; ascended the throne of Mujāhid Shāh, p. 21; hostility of the sister of Mujāhid Shāh against Dāūd Khān; he was wounded by his amīrās who were incited by the sister of Mujāhid Shāh; was carried to the palace; his enemy was defeated; his death; period of reign, p. 22 (also see n. 1, p. 22).

Dāūd Shāh, Sultān, Gujrātī, p. 235; amīrās placed Shāhzāda Dāūd Khān, uncle of Qūṭb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh on the throne; began to commit unworthy deeds; made the promise of conferring the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk on a farrāsh; annoyance of
the amīrz; direction to be separated from the work of government, p. 236; Malik 'Alā-ul-mulk took Shāhzāda Fatḥ Khān to the royal palace; amīrz placed Fatḥ Khān on the throne and gave him the title of Sultan Maḥmūd; period of reign, p. 237.

Daulat, his advice to Hūsain Khān, p. 748.

Daulat, nephew of Sultan Maḥmūd, helped Burhān in the murder of Sultan Maḥmūd, p. 390.

Daulat Chak, nephew of Kājī Chak, ignored the summons of Mirzā Haidar, p. 712; went to Haibat Khān Niyāzi, p. 713; his share in the division of Kashmir; gave his sīf to his son, p. 719; summoned Sankar Chak, p. 720; marriage of his daughter; went to Sāyyāpūr, p. 721; joined Ghazi Khān, p. 722; defeated the Niyāzis, p. 723; defeated 'Īd Zinā, p. 724; rise of his power, p. 725; hostility of Ghazi Khān, p. 726; sent 'Ībrahīm Chak and Haidar Chak to invade great Tibet, p. 727; was blinded by Ghazi Khān, p. 730.

Daulat Khān, p. 743; conflict with Bahādur Khān, p. 744; fled from Mubārak Khān, p. 755.

Daulat Khān Ajīyalā, adopted son of Shujā' Khān, p. 623; requested Islām Khān to pardon the offences of Shujā' Khān, p. 627; was slain by Miyan Bāyazid, p. 629.

Daulat Khān Lūḑi, received the farman of Sultan Sikander, p. 802; effected peace between Sultan Maḥmūd and Jām Bāyazid, p. 803.

Dāwar-ul-mulk, joined Sultan Bahādur, p. 332; was arrested, p. 340; Débah, sent troops to fight against Maḥmūd Khāliq, p. 512.

Deo Rāy, sent an army in the neighbourhood of Badhūl, p. 32; his fight with Fīrūz Shāh, p. 34; his submission to Fīrūz Shāh, p. 35; his revolt against Fīrūz Shāh, p. 38; sent gifts and presents to Sultan Ahmad Shāh and asked pardon of his offences, p. 45.

Dhūlānūn Beg, Mīr, his death, p. 781.

Dīl-ul-mulk, saw Sultan Bahādur in the city of Chāmpānīr, p. 334; was asked to convey an order to his father, p. 335; was imprisoned but was released by the order of Sultan Bahādur, p. 340.

Dilawar Khān, was sent by Maḥmūd Shāh to reinforce Aẓam Humayūn, p. 288; arrived at the town of Nadarbar, p. 289.

Dilawar Khān, Khān Aẓam Khān, the reins of the government of Sultan 'Alā-ud-din came under his grasp; p. 56; was nominated by Sultan 'Alā-ud-din to conquer the country of the Rāys of Kokan; sent Asad Khān, Fālād Khān and Safdar Khān to devastate the country of the Rāys, p. 66; forgave the Rāy of Sangesar; advanced to capture the fort of Rāhal; after much bloodshed the Rāy of Rāhal requested for pardon of his offences; at the instigation of envious people Sultan 'Ala-ud-din turned against him; retired into a corner of safety, p. 67.

Dilawar Khān Ghūrī Sultan of Mālwa, brought Mālwa under his possession, p. 467; after the downfall of Sultan Maḥmūd of Dehli declared himself as the independent ruler of Mālwa; died after enjoying success and pleasures of life; views of other historians in connection with his death, p. 468.

Dilawar Khān Ḥabshi, wounded Nizām-ul-mulk, p. 112; vakalat of 'Ībrahīm
'Adil Khán reverted to him; ran the government for nine years; was attacked by Ibráhím 'Adil Khán, p. 166; fled to Burhán Nizám-ul-mulk and instigated him to attack 'Adil Khán; was summoned by 'Adil Khán and blinded, p. 167.

Diláwar Khán, Jangjú, got into the fort, p. 562.

Diljú, p. 636; destroyed Kashmir; returned to Qandahár, p. 637.

Dūkha, was placed in charge of the public affairs, p. 748.

Dūngar Sén, besieged Narwar, p. 507; retreated to Gwállar, p. 508; despatched treatises on music to Sultán Zain-ul-Abédín, p. 659.

Dūngarast, he was captured and brought to Mahmúd Sháh; he was made over to Muḥáfiz Khán and was executed, p. 276.

Durgáwatí, Ráni, mother of Bhúpat, delivered an enthusiastic speech which made Silhádi ready for revolt; her sacrifice, pp. 365-366.

Durgáwatí, Ráni, wife of Rája Katinkah, defeated Báz Bahádur, p. 630.

F

Fádíl Bég, Kokaltásh, was left in the fort of Bhákkar, p. 779.


Faqil-ul-lah Ḥakím, Maulána, was appointed by Mahmúd Khaljí, 519.

Fakhr-ud-dín, Sultán of Bangála, after murdering Qadr Khán became the master of the throne; sent Mukhlis to the frontier district of Bangála, p. 419 (see notes 2-4, p. 419); had no faith in his followers; 'Alí Mubáarak attacked him and sentenced him to death; period of reign, p. 420.

Fakhr-ul-mulk, was sent to crush Muḥáfiz Khán, p. 594.

Fakhr-ul-mulk, Malik, dispersed the rebels, p. 115; was entrusted with the management of the army by Mahmúd Sháh, p. 116; was sent to take charge of the fort of Panála, p. 123; destroyed Bahádur, p. 125; was given the title of Khán Jahán by Mahmúd Sháh, p. 126.

Farhád-ul-mulk Turk, was seized by the traitorous amírs in the time of Muhammed Sháh Lashkari, p. 112.

Farhat-ul-mulk, reported Mahmúd Sháh about the messenger of Sháh Ismá'íl, p. 290.

Farid 'Imád-ul-mulk, Malik, was directed to command the force in war by Aḥmad Sháh; was summoned by Aḥmad Sháh, p. 200; fought with Sultán Húshang and defeated him, p. 201; was given Kántha by Aḥmad Sháh in his fief, p. 205; enquired of Malik Júná about the welfare of Aḥmad Sháh; came for the destruction of Sultán Húshang, p. 207.

Fath Chak, raided Indarkót, p. 716; created disturbance, p. 733; joined Khán Zamán, p. 743.

Fath Jang Khán Shérwání, went to his jiážir, p. 587.

Fath Khán, his flight from Ghází Khán, p. 738; his fight with the Tibetans and death, p. 739.

Fath Khán, commander of Húsain Khán, defeated Sankar, p. 741.

Fath Khán, son of Aḥmad Khán, see Fath Sháh, Sultán of Kashmir.

Fath Khán, son of Sultán Muẓaffár, was sent by Aḥmad Sháh but joined his brothers, p. 192; helped to place Sikandár Khán on the throne, p. 323; was made over to custodians by the order of Sultán Húshang,
Index.

p. 482; was sent by Mużaffar Güjrātī to chastise Mādhī Rāy and Rānā Śāṅkā, p. 602.

Fath Ḫān, uncle-in-law of Bāz Bāhādur, his consultation with Miyaṇ Bāyazid, p. 626; was killed, p. 630.

Fath Ḫān, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 778.

Fath Ḫān, Shāhzādā, was married to the daughter of the Rāy of Mahāmīn by Ahmad Shāh, p. 219.

Fath Ḫān Balūch, p. 398; was attacked by the Fūlādis and defeated, p. 399.

Fath Ḫān Rāfī, put Mulla Yūṣuf and Mulla Firūz to death, p. 746.

Fath Shāh, Sultan of Bangāla, the amīrs placed him on the throne, p. 437 (and see n. 4, p. 437); he was slain by the ṣāḥib who were instigated by an eunuch who himself sat on the throne; period of reign; custom of Bangāla, p. 438.

Fath Shāh, Sultan of Kashmir, his efforts to regain his ancestral dominions, p. 686; his defeat in fight, advanced to conquer Kashmir, p. 687; his fight with Muḥammad Shāh; defeat; victory, p. 688; his order for Muḥammad Shāh; accession; arrival of Mir Shams, p. 689; disputes among the amīrs; release of Muḥammad Shāh; division of Kashmir; his ḍāʾir and Dīwān; an example of the judgement of Malik Aḥī, p. 690; struggle between Muḥammad Shāh and the latter’s victory; retired to Hindūstān; period of reign; accession of Muḥammad Shāh for the second time; his ḍāʾir; his successor; death of Malik Aḥī; victorious attack of Fath Ḫān, p. 691; period of Sultan Muḥammad’s reign; Kashmir under Fath Shāh for the second time; successful attack of Muḥammad Shāh; his death and period of reign; Sultan Muḥammad’s accession for the third time, p. 692; his ḍāʾir; an example of the wisdom of Kājī Chak; execution of the amīrs of Fath Shāh, p. 693; skirmishes between Muḥammad Shāh and Iskandār Ḫān; Muḥammad Shāh turned against Malik Kājī, p. 694; Malik Yārī defeated and seized Iskandār Ḫān; Iskandār’s eyes were blinded; Malik Kājī imprisoned Muḥammad Shāh and raised Ibrāhīm Ḫān to the throne, p. 695; period of the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, p. 696.

Fath-ul-lāh, Maulānā, p. 798.

Fath-ul-lāh Shīrāzī, Amīr, was brought by ‘Ali ‘Adīl Ḫān, p. 163.

Fattū, a prostitute, her account, p. 149; her power, p. 150.

Firūz, Jām, ruler of Sind, succeeded his father; made Daryā Ḫān his ḍāʾir; hostility with Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-din, p. 779; account of his reign, p. 780.

Firūz, Mulla, gave the order for the execution of Yūṣuf, p. 745; his execution, p. 746.

Firūz, Sultan, son of Sultan Ḥusain, Sultan of Multān, his accession; his ḍāʾir; his nature, p. 798; his envy towards Balāl; caused the murder of Balāl; his death by poison, p. 799.

Firūz Ḫān, was asked to come to the private chamber of Maḥmūd Shāh and was explained the purpose of the announcement of Haj; p. 267; was ordered by Maḥmūd Shāh to arrest Azdār Ḫān, p. 271.

Firūz Ḫān of Kashmir, was slain in the battle, p. 723.

Firūz Ḫān, ruler of Nāgōr, son of Shams Ḫān Dandānī, fought with Rānā Mākul, p. 194; brought some
lakhs of tankas as tribute which was returned by Ahmad Shâh, p. 221; news of his death, p. 229.

Firuz Khân, son of Sultan Muzafr, rose in revolt, amirs united with him in rebellion; went to Kanbâyat; used the opportunity of the unity of his brothers and advanced towards Bahroj; asked Sultan Hushang Ghûrî to help him, p. 189; was favoured by Ahmad Shâh, p. 190; revolted in 814 A.H.; took shelter in the hills of Idar; asked Raja of Idar to help him, p. 192; fled from Ankhor to the hills of Idar, fled to Nagor; attained martyrdom, p. 194; his revolt in the country of Bahroj and request to Sultan Hushang; joined Ahmad Shâh, p. 472.

Firuz Shâh, Sultan, success in the attempt at regaining his hereditary dominions, p. 25; accession to the throne, p. 27; account of justice in his reign; conquered Bijanagar, p. 28; advanced towards Shakar, p. 29; opposed by the Ray of Bijanagar; defeated the Ray of Bijanagar, p. 30; marched to conquer the country of the Marhatta, p. 35; conquered Kehla and devastated its surrounding countries; sanctioned the plan of a new city with the name of Firuzabad, p. 36; welcomed Amir Saiyid Muhammad Glâi darâz, p. 37; marched towards Arankal, p. 38; was wounded by the army of Deo Ray and was taken to Guibarga, p. 39; asked help of Sultan Ahmad of Gujrât, p. 40; tried to crush Khan Khânân; declared Ahmad Khan to be his heir; his death, p. 40; period of reign, p. 42.

Firuz Shâh, Sultan of Bangâla, the amirs placed him on the throne, p. 439 (and see n. 4, p. 439); his death; period of reign, p. 440.

Firuz Shâh Tughluq, Sultan, son of Rabab, advanced from Delhi towards Lakhnauti, p. 422; engaged in a battle with Sultan Shams-ud-din near Ekdâla; returned to Delhi, received tribute from Sultan Shams-ud-din, p. 423; treated the ambassador of Sultan Shams-ud-din with kindness and sent 'Arab and Turkî horses to Sultan Shams-ud-din with Malik Saiîf-ud-din, p. 424; advanced to conquer Bangâla in the time of Sultan Sikandar, p. 426.

Fulâd Khân, was appointed as the governor of Bijanagar by Firuz Shâh, p. 32; killed many soldiers of Deo Ray, p. 34; devastated the country of the Rayâs of Kokan; plundered the country of Râhal, p. 67.

G

Gadâl of Râwat tribe, Saiyid Muhammed got into his house, p. 686.

Gadâl, Malik, was sent to help the men of Nâgor by Sultan Qutb-ud-din, p. 230.

Gajadhur, fought against Mahmud Khalfi and was slain, p. 529.

Ganessa, paid a tribute to Ahmad Shâh, p. 220; did homage to Sultan Muhammed Shâh through the intervention of Malik Mir Sultanî, p. 224.

Gangdás, sent his request to Mahmud Khalfi, p. 521; paid tribute to Mahmûd Khâlîfî, p. 522.

Gangdás Raja of Châmpânîr, p. 257.

Ghadanfar, fled to Sultan Bahadur and incited him to advance on Ahmadâbâd, p. 377.

Ghâlib Khân, was ordered to destroy the palace of Nasir-ud-din, p. 557.

Ghâzi Khân, was appointed to the government of Nadarbar and Sultan-
pûr; was sent with an army to crush Laţîf Khân, p. 338; informed Sulṭân Bahadûr about the hostility of Laţîf Khân, p. 341.

Ghâzî Khân, son of Mubârak Khân of Asîr, his titles; his oppressions; asked pardon of his, p. 533, offences and was excused by Maḥmûd Khalîjî, p. 534; being defeated fled towards Elichepûr, p. 538; informed Maḥmûd Khalîjî about the rebellion of the Zamindârs of Kachwârah, p. 541.

Ghâzî Khân, son of Rûqî Chak, Sulṭân of Kashmîr, was brought before Mîrzâ Haïdar, p. 710; went to Haïbat Khân Nyâzî, p. 713; went to Mîrzâ Haïdar, p. 714; his share in the division of Kashmîr, p. 719; his relation with Kâjî Chak; summoned Sankar Chak, p. 720; his marriage; p. 721; his fight with the army of Tîd Zinâ, p. 722; hostilities with Daulat Chak, p. 726; rose to power; his advice to Naṣrat Chak; p. 729; seized and blinded Daulat Chak; raised Ḥâbib Shâh to the throne, p. 730; fight with Ḥâbib Chak, p. 731; attack on his enemies, p. 733; defeated Shâh Abu-ul-ma‘âlî; his order for the execution of the Mughals, p. 735; his tyranny; his order for his son, p. 736; after defeating his enemies raised the standard of his rule; accession, p. 737; pardoned his enemies; took up his residence at Lâr; sent his son for the conquest of Tibet, p. 738; fight with the Tibetans; period of rule, p. 739, raised his brother to the throne, p. 740; collected army to fight with Husain Khân, p. 741; his death, p. 744.

Ghâzî Saiyid Khân, his fight with Sulṭân Husain, p. 792.

Ghaznûn Khân, with the title of Sulṭân 'Alâ-ud-dîn, was sent by Sulṭân Maḥmûd Khalîjî against Sulṭân Muḥammad, p. 510; for further details see Qadam Khân, son of Sulṭân Maḥmûd Khalîjî.

Ghaznûn Khân, Shâhîzâda, son of Sulṭân Hûshang see Muḥammad Shâh, son of Hûshang Shâh Ghûrî, Sulṭân of Mâlwa.

Qhiyâs-ud-dîn, Sulṭân, succeeded his father, p. 24; he was imprisoned and blinded by Taghâlîjî; period of his reign, p. 25.

Qhiyâs-ud-dîn, Sulṭân of Bangâlâ, succeeded his father with the title of Sulṭân Qhiyâs-ud-dîn, p. 427; his life; period of reign, p. 428 (and see note 4, p. 427).

Qhiyath-ud-dîn, Sulṭân, Sulṭân of Mâlwa, p. 257; advanced to help Rây Batâî, p. 273; withdrew his steps and retired to Mandû, p. 274; was sent by Maḥmûd Khalîjî against Sulṭân Muḥammad, p. 510; entrusted with the command of the army of Sârangpûr, p. 523; ravaged the surrounding places of Sûrat, p. 525; ravaged the countries of Kilwârah and Dilwârah, p. 532; his accession; bestowal of Ranthambhôr upon Qadam Khân; his generosity, p. 543; granted rank and title to ‘Abd-ul-qâdîr; his statement to the amirs about his activities for the sake of his kingdom, p. 544; sent an order to Shôr Khân, p. 546, to chastise Sulṭân Bahût; description of his faith and simplicity; his strictness in religious rites and duties; an example of his love and respect for Qurân, p. 548; an incident in connection with his obedience to the laws of the Prophet, p. 549; his reply to the petition of the Rây of Châmpânîr according to the law
of religion, p. 551; period of reign, p. 553; representation of Shujā'at Kān and his order, p. 554; killed Malik Maḥmūd and Sāv Dās; sent men to seize the murderers of Mūnjā Baqāl, p. 555; sent a message to Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 556; ordered the destruction of the Nāṣir Shāh palace; message of Nāṣir Shāh, p. 557; sent a message to Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 559; his effort to arrange peace among his sons, p. 561; destruction of his palace; shifted to the palace of Sarsati, p. 563; recognised Nāṣir-ud-din as a Sultān, p. 564; news of his death, 566.

Gītā Deōrah, did homage to Sultān Qutb-ud-din and represented the forcible possession of Rānā Kūmbhā, p. 231; the fortress of Abū was made over to him by Sultān Qutb-ud-din, p. 233.

Gōp Singh, Rāja, his relations with Sultān Zain-ul-ʿabīdīn, p. 660. Govind Rāy see Bahārum Kān.

H

Hābib, gun maker, Sultān Zain-ul-ʿabīdīn wrote a book in concert with him, p. 657.

Hābib, Qādī, went to the house of Husain Kān, p. 742; was injured by a Rāfī, p. 745.

Hābib Chak, son of Daulet Chak, his jāgīr; his marriage, p. 719; his victory over the Tibetans, p. 727; refused to fulfil the demands of Haidar Chak, p. 728; his rebellion; fight with Ghāzī Kān, p. 731; his execution, p. 732.

Hābib Kān, governor of Ashta, p. 301; fled from Mandū and complained about the power and violence of Pūrabā Rājpūta to Muḥṣīf Shāh, p. 302; was permitted to go to Ashta by Sultān Bahādur, p. 358; was sent to crush Muḥṣīf Kān, p. 594.

Hābib Kān, his effort to defeat Yusuf Kān, p. 758.

Hābib Shāh, son of Ismāʿīl Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, accession; agreement among the enemies of Ghāzī Kān, p. 730; definition of the Rishā; advance of Shāh Abū-ul-ʿalā towards Kashmir, p. 734; defeat of Shāh Abū-ul-ʿalā; execution of the Mughals, p. 735; was concealed in a corner, p. 737.

Hābib-ul-lah, Shalīq, was allotted the management of Khāja parvanas, p. 554; killed Mūnjā Baqāl and fled to the harem of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 555; fled from the palace of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 556; waited on Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 557; despatched his ring to Nāṣir Shāh after the victory, p. 563; favoured by Nāṣir ud-din; Nāṣir Shāh conferred on him the title of Ālam Kān, p. 564; went to Shāh Kān, p. 565; was made over to the men of Shāh Kān, p. 566; was imprisoned by Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 569.

Hāshīḥ, Hāshīḥ, his escape from execution, p. 735.

Hāfiz, Malik, was given the title of Muḥṣīf Kān by Maḥmūd Shāh and was sent in attendance on ʿAnām Humāyūn, p. 285.

Haibat Kān, had an interview with Fīrūz Kān; united with Fīrūz Kān, p. 189; was sent by the amirs to the presence of Aḥmad Shāh, was favoured by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 190; summoned the Rāja of Idar for help, p. 192; joined Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 558; was nominated to crush Yakān Kān by Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 560.

Haibat Kān, son of Sultān Muḥṣīf, his revolt in the country of Bahrūj
and request to Sultan Hushang; joined the troops of Ahmad Shah, p. 472; was made over to custodians by Sultan Hushang, p. 482.

Haibat Khan, son of Jam Salah-ud-din, his death, p. 780.

Haibat Khan, son of Sultan Qutb-ud-din, p. 643.

Haibat Khan Niyazi, settlement with Islam Khan; made proposals for peace with Mirza Haidar, p. 713; his advance to conquer Kashmir; was slain, p. 723.

Haidar, son of Muhammed Khan, was appointed as the successor of Sultan Zain-ul-Abidin, p. 660.

Haidar, Mirza, Sultan of Kashmir, Humayun permitted him to conquer Kashmir, p. 707; possessed Srinagar, p. 708; his victory over Kajj Chak; suspicious about Rogi Chak; nominated his men to crush the rebels, p. 709; advanced to conquer Tibet; seized the fort of Kasa; welcomed the ambassador of Kashaqar at Lar, p. 710; his reply to Idi Zin; advanced from Lar to Kashwav; skirmishes with the Kashwav army, p. 711; advanced towards Tibet; appointed Mhusin as the governor of Tibet; granted the prayer of Adam Kakhar, p. 712; returned to Kashmir; proposals of Haibat Khan for peace, p. 713; Kashmiris separated from Haibat Khan; sent an ambassador to Islam Khan; sent back the ambassador of Islam Khan; appointed the governor of Baharmal; representation of the Mughals, p. 714; refused to listen to Ali Makri; conflagration in Indarkot; message of Qar Sadu; battle between the Mughals and the men of Baharmal; appointment of agent; news about the arrival of Mulla Abd-ulla, p. 715; came out of Indarkot; the Mughals joined him and resided at Shihab-ud-dinpur; his encampment; destruction of Indarkot, p. 716; took up his residence in Khanspur; the Kashmiris came to Adampur; made a will for his brother; started to attack his enemy; account of his death, p. 717; flight of the Mughals; the Kashmiris buried his corpse; peace between the Mughals and the Kashmiris; period of reign, p. 718.

Haidar Chak, went with Ali Khan, p. 755; helped Lohar, p. 757; fought but was defeated by Yusuf Khan; went to Raja Man Singh, p. 758.

Haidar Chak, son of Ghazi Khan, his message to Habib Chak, p. 728; his execution, p. 736.

Haidar Kaghari, Mirza, was sent to invade Kashmir, p. 701; fought with the Kashmiris, p. 703.

Haidar Khan, son of Muhammed Shah, his arrival in Nau Shahr for the conquest of Kashmir, p. 750; was deceived by Muhammad Khan Chak, p. 751.

Haidar Khan, son of Yusuf Khan, went to wait on Akbar, p. 758.

Haidar Shahr, Sultan, son of Sultan Zain-ul-Abidin as Hajji Khan revolted against his father, p. 663; his defeat, p. 664; was sent for by his father, p. 666; obeyed the arm of his father, p. 667; was made the successor of his father, p. 668; his illness, p. 669; was summoned by the amirs to occupy the seat of his father, p. 671; his accession, p. 672; his heir; allotment of fief; character and habits, p. 673; illness, p. 674; death; period of reign, p. 675.
Hâji, Malik, one of the adherents of Maḥmūd Shâh, p. 239; made an attack on the rebels, p. 241; was given the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk by Maḥmūd Shâh, p. 242; was sent to İdar by Maḥmūd Shâh; induced two servants of Bahâ-ul-mulk to confess to the murder of Ādam Silâhdâr; reported to Maḥmūd Shâh that he had brought the murderers of Ādam Silâhdâr, and Bahâ-ul-mulk had fled into İdar; caused the execution of the two servants of Bahâ-ul-mulk; was executed by the order of Maḥmūd Shâh, p. 248.

Hâji 'Ali, Malik, Tâj Kânh and Mašqâr Kânh fought with him, p. 504.

Hâji Kamâl, Malik-ul-umârâ, government of Chandérf was transferred from Naṣrat Kânh to him, p. 501; rebellion in his country, p. 503.

Hâji Kashârî, Khwâjah, was nominated to crush the rebel Bahârîm Chak, p. 709; went to the spot where Mîrzâ Hâidar was lying wounded, p. 718; one lakh donkey-loads of paddy allotted to him, p. 719; went to Islâm Kânh, p. 725.

Hâji Kânh did not take part in the battle between İtmâd Kânh and the Fûlâdîs; joined the Fûlâdîs who demanded his jâgîr from İtmâd Kânh, p. 400.

Hâji Kânh, son of Sulţân Zain-ul-ʿabîdîn, was Hâidar Shâh, Sulţân, son of Sulţân Zain-ul-ʿabîdîn, Sulţân of Kashmir.

Hâji Kânh Sulṭâni, was appointed to Dhâr, p. 621; informed Shujâʿ Kânh about the advance of Mâllû Kânh, p. 623.

Hajîjî, son of Yûsuf, sent Muḥammad Hârûn towards India, p. 761; his letter to Rây Dâhir, p. 763; sent Badîl to conquer Debul; sent Muḥammad Qâsim for the conquest of Sind, p. 764.

Hâkîm 'Ali, was welcomed by Yûsuf Kânh, p. 759.

Hâmid Bukhârî, Saiyîd, satisfied Shâr Kânh by answering his question, p. 413.

Hans, Râja of Bhimbar, fought with the army of Tîtâr Kânh, p. 685.

Harawi, Amîrzâdâh-i, was removed by Sulţân Maḥmûd from Qânanj, p. 450.

Harjû, went to bring Sankar Chak, p. 720.

Harkhûkâh, his son asked help from Muṣaffâr Shâh, p. 298.

Har Rây, prayed Aḥmad Shâh for the pardon of his offences, p. 211; was forgiven by Aḥmad Shâh and was taken into the circle of loyal adherents; was asked to pay tribute; this was delayed; was pursued; fled from the place, p. 212; presented his daughter in the shape of tribute to Muḥammad Shâh; Muḥammad Shâh gave him the fort of İdar at the request of his daughter, p. 224.

Harsînw Rây, was the Rây of Kehrla who made his submission to Firûz Shâh and accepted his sovereignty, p. 36.

Hasan, informed Sulţân Ghiyâth-ud-dîn about the raid of Bahhûl Lûdî, p. 546.

Hasan, son of Shâr Āshâmâk, was banished with his brother by Shâr Āshâmâk, p. 642; was imprisoned by Sulţân Qutb-ud-dîn, p. 643.

Hasan, Malik, was given the title of Şafdar-ul-mulk by Aḥmad Shâh and was left in Aḥmadnagar, p. 212.

Hasan, Malik, was sent by Qâhâznin Kânh to seize Zafar Minjumla, p. 487.

Hasan, Saiyîd, son of Saiyîd Nâṣîr, was sent for and entrusted with the reins of authority by Sulţân Hasan;
turned the mind of Sultan Hassan against the Kashmiris, p. 681; accepted the will of Sultan Hassan for his successor; placed Muhammad Khan on the throne of his father; was slain, p. 682.

Hassan, Sultan, son of Haji Khan Haider Shah, Sultan of Kashmir, his accession, p. 675; residence; entrusted the administration to Ahmad Aswad; revived the rules of Sultan Zain-ul-abidin; act of mischievous persons, p. 676; sent Malik Taj Bhat against Bahram Khan, p. 677; imprisonment of Bahram Khan and Zain Badr, p. 678; enmity between the amirs; disturbances created by the amirs, p. 680; imprisonment of Ahmad Aswad; made over the reins of authority to Saiyid Hassan; attacked by disease; made will for his heir and successor, p. 681; period of reign, p. 682.

Hassan 'Ali, his father; his appointment as moulvi; was conferred the title of Mirza Khan; his activities as the vali of Muradga Nizam Shah; declared Miran Husain to be the Sultan, p. 150.


Hassan Chak, went to Haibat Khan Niyazi, p. 713.

Hassan Dakin, Malik, was known as Malik-ut-tujjar; Shahrzada Zafar Khan was sent by Ahmad Shah to destroy him; his tyranny, p. 215; built a barricade along the shore of Mahiain; fought with the army of Gujrat; fled and got within the barricade; after the reinforcement of the army of Gujrat he prayed Sultan Ahmad Bahmani for help; was reinforced by the army of Sultan Ahmad Bahmani and advanced towards Thana; fought with Shahrzada Zafar Khan and was defeated, p. 216.

Hassan Gangu see 'Ala-ud-din Hassan Shakh.

Hassan Kachhi, favoured Haji Khan, p. 671; his execution, p. 674.

Hassan Khan, made strong terms of engagement with Amirzada Habibullah; gained the favour of the soldiers, p. 82; was deceived by Siraj Khan; receiving a safe conduct went to the besiegers, p. 83.

Hassan Khan, son of Haji Khan, joined his father, p. 672; Kamraj allotted as his jagir, p. 673; came to Kashmir but was not welcomed by his father, p. 675.

Hassan Khan, son of Kaji Chak, his marriage, p. 721.

Hassan Khan, son of Saiyid Mubarak Khan, was slain, p. 753.

Hassan Khan, son of Sultan Firuz Shah, p. 38.

Hassan Khan Shahrzada, youngest son of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din, was supported by Sai Khan, Mallu Khan and other amirs in taking the throne of Humayun Khan; at the time of sitting on the throne he saw Humayun Khan coming to the palace; became afraid, p. 75; came down from the throne, p. 76; was taken to the house of one of the conspirators, p. 239.

Hassan Malik, defeated the Niyazis, p. 723; joined Ghazi Khan, p. 726.

Hassan Matu, family of Mirza Haidar was placed in his house, p. 719.

Hasti Chak, helped Lohar, p. 757.

Hasti Khan, joined the enemy of Ghazi Khan, p. 731.

Hasti Tariq, seized Habib Chak, p. 731.

Hatim, Malik, attained martyrdom at the hands of Rana Sankka, p. 310.
Hayät Kháṭūn, wife of Sultan Hasān of Kashmir, gave birth to a son named Muḥammad, p. 680.

Hazbar Kháñ, p. 563.

Hāmkaran, was sent to crush Muḥafīṣ Kháñ, p. 594.

Himmát Kháñ, joined Naṣîr-ud-dīn, p. 559.

Hindāl, see Qutb-ud-dīn, Sultan, son of Sultan Shams-ud-dīn, Sultan of Kashmir.

Hindāl Mirzā, was sent by Humāyūn Bādešāh to crush Tātār Kháñ, p. 371.

Hindū Bēg Qulchīn, entered the fort of Mandū, p. 374; was sent with Mirzā 'Askārī, p. 376; was appointed to the government of Baroda by Humāyūn Bādešāh, p. 377; relinquished the country of Gujrat, p. 378.

Hīsām-ud-dīn, went to his brother Rukn-ud-dīn, p. 241.

Hīsām-ud-dīn, Malik, p. 203.

Hīsām-ud-dīn, Qādī, went to Chāmpānir from Aḥmadābād for negotiations; p. 232.

Hīsām-ud-dīn Maghūl, Malik placed Khānzsāda 'Alam Kháñ on the throne of Asir and Burḥānpūr, p. 283; joined the camp of Maḥmūd Shāh and was honoured by him, p. 284; was given the title of Shahryār and the moulāh of Dhanūra, and was permitted to go back by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 285; left Burḥānpūr and resided in Thālnir; joined Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahārī in rebellion; came towards Burḥānpūr with four thousand horsemen; came with pride to A'ẓam Humāyūn; was slain by Daryā Kháñ, p. 286.

Hīsām-ul-mulk Hāndīrī, was summoned by Maḥmūd Khálijī, p. 592.

Humāyūn Bādešāh, Jinnat Aṣhāni, sent letters to Sultan Bahādur to expel Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā from his dominions; advanced to crush Sultan Bahādur, p. 371; met with the army of Sultan Bahādur in the vicinity of Mandisūr, p. 372; pursued Sultan Bahādur to the fort of Mandū, p. 374; came to Bangāla in pursuit of Shīr Kháñ, p. 448. Sultan Bahādur came to him; account of the rule of deputies in Mālwa, p. 616; left Mālwa and went to Āgra; turned towards Bangāla, p. 617.

Humāyūn Shāh, Sultan (son of Sultan 'Alā-ud-dīn), ascended the throne and appointed a wise vizir, p. 76; entrusted the duties of the vizir to Khwājah Najm-ud-dīn Qārān Gīlānī; determined to march to Mālkonda; sent Kháñ Jahān in advance of himself, p. 77; fought; became victorious; returned to the capital; conferred the title of Khwājah Jahān on Malik Shāh, p. 78; sent Khwājah Jahān with Niẓām-ul-mulk Ghūrī to the country of Tilang and followed himself, p. 79; turned against Niẓām-ul-mulk; cast off the Khwājah from his favour; determined on the conquest of Tilang, p. 80; understood the policy of Hasan Kháñ; killed friends and strangers, p. 82; became a slave of lust; put members of his harem to death, p. 84; was slain; period of reign, p. 85.

Husain, Mir, was slain in the battle-field, p. 703.

Husain, Shāh, ruler of Sind, account of his reign, p. 783.

Husain, Sultan, son of Maḥmūd Shāh Sharqi, succeeded his brother; advanced towards the country of Orissa; conquered the country of Tīrūh; levied tribute, p. 459; returned to Jaunpūr after victory; put the fort of Bānāres into repair;
and agreement with Sulṭān Sīkandar; sent an ambassador to Sulṭān Muṣaffar Gujrātī; description of Qāḍī Muḥammad about the palaces of the Sulṭāns of Gujrāt; speech of Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak, p. 797; raised Firūz Khān on the throne, p. 798; his lamentations after the death of his son, again occupied himself with administration; sent for Jām Bāyazīd and instructed him to avenge the murder of his son, p. 799; appointment of Jām Bāyazīd as vāzīr; his death; period of reign, p. 800.

Husain Arghūn, Mirzā Shāh, a jamāl of Bābar; an ambassador of Sulṭān Mahmūd came to him, p. 805; besieged the fort of Multān, p. 806; began to destroy Multān, p. 808; made over Sulṭān Husain to the guards; treatment of Shujā’-ul-mulk; returned to Thatha, p. 810.

Husain Khān, brother of Ghazi Khān, Sulṭān of Kashmir, was made the commander of the army of his brother, p. 735; requested Ghazi Khān to pardon the offences of his enemies, p. 738; access to Muhammad, p. 740; divided the country of Kashmir; sent a large force against Sankar Chak; plans for murdering him, p. 741; sent a message to his enemies; imprisoned his enemies; sent a large army to attack Sankar Chak, p. 742; his disposition against Khān Zamān; attack of Khān Zamān, p. 743; execution of Khān Zamān, p. 744; founded a college, p. 745; ordered Mubāriz Khān to be imprisoned; consultation with the lawyers of Shara’īat, p. 745; reply to Yūsuf’s partisans; welcomed the ambassadors of Akbar; execution of the Mufīsīs; sent his daughter for the service of Akbar, p. 746; illness; his message
to 'Ali Khan, p. 747; handed over government to 'Ali Khan; died, p. 748.

Husain Mâkri, was sent with Qarrâ Bahâdur; sent his brother with a message to Mirzâ Haidâr, p. 714.

Husain Niẓâm-ul-mulk, (son of Burhân Niẓâm-ul-mulk), succeeded his father Burhân Niẓâm-ul-mulk, p. 140; attacked Râm Râj of Bijânaqar with 'Adîl Khan, Qutb-ul-mulk, and Malik Barîd; Râm Râj advanced to meet them with, p. 141, a large army, p. 142; Râm Râj was killed, p. 143; ruled for thirteen years; left two sons, p. 144.

Husain Niẓâm-ul-mulk, son of Murtaḍâ Niẓâm-ul-mulk, was released by Hasan; was made the successor of his father by Hasan Ali, p. 150; Mirzâ Khan in his government; spent his time in luxury; amirs of the Deccan envied of Mirzâ Khan decided to get rid of Mirzâ Khan; arrangement of a feast, p. 151; invitation to Mirzâ Khan and his refusal; Saiyid Murtaḍa Sharwâni complained that he was poisoned; report and suggestion of Mirzâ Khan to Husain Niẓâm-ul-mulk about Saiyid Murtaḍa Sharwâni; his imprisonment by Mirzâ Khan, p. 152; Mirzâ Khan imprisoned Ankas Khan; Mirzâ Khan sent Mir Tâhir to the fort and brought Ismâ'il out of prison; Jamâl Khan Gujrâtî and Yaqût declared war against Mirzâ Khan, p. 153; his massacre; announcement about Ismâ'il Niẓâm-ul-mulk for the succession of Husain; fight of Jamâl Khan and the other amirs with Mirzâ Khan; Mirzâ Khan's defeat and end; his period of rule, p. 154.

Husain Qûl Khan, p. 749.

Husain Sabaxwâri, Sultân, father of Hasan 'Ali, p. 150.

Husain Sharwâni, went with an army to reinforce Kâfi Chah, p. 708.

Hûshang, Sultân, son of Dîlawar Khan, Sultân of Mâlwa, invaded the country of Narsingh Rây; fought with Sultân Ahammad by the side of Narsingh Rây; was unsuccessful, p. 52; advanced to give battle to Muṣaffar Shâh; fled to the fort of Dhâr; saw Muṣaffar Shâh, p. 185; was imprisoned by Muṣaffar Shâh, p. 186; was released by Muṣaffar Shâh, p. 187; was requested by Fîrûz Khan for help, p. 189; advanced from Dhâr to help Fîrûz Khan, p. 190; returned to his country, p. 191; advanced towards Gujrât; returned to his country; retreat of Sultân Hûshang, p. 195; his arrival at the town of Mahrâsa; could not face the army of Sultân Ahammad Shâh and returned to his own country, p. 197; his repeated invasions of Gujrât; met the army of Ahammad Shâh, p. 199; was defeated and fled from the battlefield, p. 201; his offences were forgiven by Ahammad Shâh, p. 203; left Mâlwa, p. 204; returned from Jâjinaqar and entered the fort of Mandû, p. 205; went to Sârangpûr and agreed to pay tribute to Ahammad Shâh; his attack on the camp of Ahammad Shâh, p. 206; plundering of the camp of Ahammad Shâh by his army; army of Ahammad Shâh met with his army and wounded him, p. 207; was defeated by Ahammad Shâh and retired to Sârangpûr; fought with the army of Ahammad Shâh and was defeated, p. 208; succeeded his father and gave himself the title of Sultân Hûshang; the amirs and the great men of Mâlwa rendered homage to him; heard the news of the arrival of Sultân Muṣaffar Gujrâtî at
Ujjain, p. 468; fought with Sultan Muzaflar in the vicinity of Dhur but was defeated and arrested; army of Malwa carried Nasir Khan out of Dhur, p. 469; armies of Malwa left Dhur and resided in the fort of Mandu and made Musa Khan their chief; sent a petition to Sultan Muzaflar; Sultan Muzaflar granted permission to Shahzada Ahmad Shah to reinforce him; sent a man to the fort of Mandu to summon the amirs, p. 470; amirs could not join him; went to the town of Mahesar but could not conquer it; his cousins came out of the fort of Mandu and joined him, p. 471; entered the fort of Mandu; conferred the title of Malikush-sharq on Malik Mughith and appointed him as his vezir and representative; advanced to destroy the country of Gujurat but without fulfilling his aim returned to Dhur; while Sultan Ahmad Gujurati was attacking the Raja of Jhalawar he returned towards Gujurat, p. 472; could not withstand Ahmad Shah and returned to his own country; on the petitions of the Zamindars and the Rajas of Champa, Nadiot and Idar advanced to conquer Gujurat but was unsuccessful and had to return to his own country, p. 473; fought with Sultan Ahmad in the vicinity of Kalladah but fled and took shelter in the fort of Mandu; conferred the title of Mahmud Khan on Malik Mahmud and granted him a share in the government of his father; whenever he went on any expedition he left Malik Mughith as his deputy and took Mahmud Khan with him, p. 477; advanced towards Jajnagar, p. 475, as a merchant to buy some elephants, p. 476; attacked the Ray of Jajnagar and imprisoned him; the vezirs of Jajnagar sent 75 elephants to him; returned to his own country; released the Raja of Jajnagar, p. 477; made a night attack on the army of Sultan Ahmad, p. 478; fought with Sultan Ahmad and fled to the citadel of Sargongpur; when Sultan Ahmad turned his face towards his own country he pursued him and again gave battle, but being defeated took shelter in the fort of Sargongpur; went from Sargongpur to the fort of Mandu; conquered the fort of Kalpur; advanced to conquer Gawilgarh and took possession of its neighbouring territory; advanced to meet Sultan Mubarak Shah, p. 479; peace with Sultan Mubarak Shah; advanced to aid the Ray of Kehra; attacked Ahmad Shah Bahmani and fled towards Mandu; his wife fell into the hands of Sultan Ahmad who sent her to Mandu; marched to conquer Kalpi, p. 480; after fighting with Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi obtained possession of Kalpi, p. 481; summoned Uthman Khan Shahzada with his two brothers and gave orders for their confinement; destroyed the men of Jatba, p. 482; plundered the Raja of Bhim and went to the fort of Hushangabad; told an allegorical story of his death to the amirs; declared his son Ghaznin Khan as his successor, p. 483; gave directions to the amirs; gave counsel and advice to Mahmud Khan; some amirs represented to him in favour of Uthman Khan; his reply to the amirs, p. 484; he asked for his quiver and called for the amirs, p. 488; his death, p. 490; period of reign, p. 491.
Hūshang Shāh, adopted son of Shihāb-ud-dīn, was placed on the place of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn; was attacked and fled, p. 581.

I
Ibrāhīm, was slain, p. 327.
Ibrāhīm, son of Jahāngīr Mākri, persuaded Muḥammad Shāh to invade Kashmir; his rank in the court of Muḥammad Shāh, p. 691; was imprisoned by Malik Kājī, p. 693.
Ibrāhīm, Jām, joined Sultān Husain, p. 795; bestowal of Uch by Sultān Husain on him, p. 796.
Ibrāhīm, Saiyid, was seized by Idi Zinā, p. 721; fled from custody and joined Daulat Chak, p. 722.
Ibrāhīm `Adil Kān, son of Ismā`l Kān, succeeded his father; request of Mallū Kān to Asa`d Kān, p. 161; Mallū Kān’s reign; repentance of Asa`d Kān; he imprisoned and punished Mallū Kān and Ulugh Kān; fight with Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk; period of reign, p. 162.
Ibrāhīm `Adil Kān, son of Tāhmāsp; when and how he ascended the throne, p. 165; Kishvar Kān slew Kāmil Kān; the end of Kishvar Kān and Muṣṭafa Kān; abolished the established form of religion; establishment of a new religion; Dīlāwar Kān as a vakil in the administration, p. 166; attacked Dīlāwar Kān; instigation of Dīlāwar Kān to Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk to attack `Adil Kān; summoned Dīlāwar Kān; and blinded him; period of reign, p. 167.
Ibrāhīm Husain Mīrza, reinforced Chengiz Kān, p. 403; went with his brother towards Baroda and Bahrōj, p. 413.

Ibrāhīm Kān, son of Chiṣṭi Kān; his faith in Shāh `Arif, p. 749; his execution, p. 750.
Ibrāhīm Kān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, see Ibrāhīm Shāh, Sultān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir.
Ibrāhīm Kān, Saiyid, p. 697; as the commander of the army of Ibrāhīm Shāh, p. 698.
Ibrāhīm Niẓām, Saiyid, instigated Faṭḥ Kān to join his brothers; entitled Rukn Kān; made arrangement to defend the fort of Mahrās; p. 192; his treachery in conjunction with the amirs of Ahmād Shāh; his execution, p. 193.
Ibrāhīm Qutb-ul-mulk, became the ruler of Golkonda; his character and habits; period of reign, pp. 169-170.
Ibrāhīm Shāh Sultān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, was placed on the throne of his father by Malik Kājī, p. 695; accession; his vāzir; rise of Abdāl Mākri and his advance towards Kashmir, p. 696; message of Abdāl Mākri to Malik Kājī, p. 697; victorious fight of Abdāl Mākri; period of reign, p. 698.
Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, brother of Nāzuk Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, accession, p. 725; hostility between Chiṣṭi Kān and Daulat Chak, p. 726; settlement between Chiṣṭi Kān and Daulat Chak; destruction of Tibet, p. 727; earthquake in Kashmir, p. 728.
Ibrāhīm Sharqī, Sultān, advanced from Jaunpūr to capture Delhi but returned to his country on hearing of the advance of Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 186; was reinforced by the arrival of Shāhzadā Bahādur Kān, p. 321; had an interview with Bahādur
Index.

Shāh, p. 330; succeeded Mubārak Shāh; condition of Jaumpūr, p. 449; literary works which were written in his name; personal qualifications; advanced to destroy Sultān Māhmūd and Māllā Iqābāl Kāhān, p. 450; laid siege to Kanauj; conquered Kanauj and made it over to Iktiṣyār Kāhān; captured Sanbal and entrusted, p. 451, it to Tātār Kāhān; seized the town of Baran and made it over to Malik Marjān; returned towards Jaumpūr; fight and peace with Kālid Kāhān; advanced to conquer Kālpī, p. 452; returned towards Jaumpūr hearing of the advance of Mubārak Shāh; died; period of reign, p. 453.

Idd Zīnā; his anger on the murder of Ujj Bahāmah, p. 710; fought with the Khishtwārī army as the commander of Mīrzā Hāider’s troop, p. 711; fight with the Mughals, p. 715; his house at Srīnagar was burnt, p. 716; his daughter was married to Habīb Chak; rise of his power, p. 719; settlement with Ghāzī Kāhān, p. 720; released the Mughals, p. 721; fight with Ghāzī Kāhān, p. 722; his victory over the Niyāzīs, p. 723; was defeated by Daulat Chak; his death, p. 724.

Iftikār-ul-mulk, Malik, was granted Muḥammadpur by Ahmad Shāh as his sīf, p. 205; was sent with an army by Ahmad Shāh; his victorious fight, p. 208; was sent with Shāhāzāda Muḥammad Khān by Ahmad Shāh, p. 213; seized a large elephant as booty on the destruction of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn, p. 214; was sent by Zafar Kān to surround Thānā, p. 215.

Iktiṣyār Kāhān, was sent by Māhmūd Shāh to meet Rāy Bātāi, p. 272; joined Sultān Bahādur in the town of Dhār, p. 355; the charge of the government of Mandal was placed in his hands, p. 356; was left to carry on the siege of the fort of Rāśīn, p. 363; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to capture the fort of Mandisār, p. 368; was enlisted among the courtiers of Humāyūn, p. 375; Kanauj was made over to him by Sultān Ibrāhīm, p. 461; was entrusted with the government of Mandal by Sultān Bahādur, p. 616.

Iktiṣyār Kāhān Gūrīsī, became powerful but was put to death, p. 385.

Iktiṣyār-ul-mulk, was sent to reassure the citizens of Dhār, p. 298; attacked Saiyid Mubārak, p. 395; advised I’timād Kāhān to leave Ahmadābād, p. 404; arrived at Ahmadābād, p. 407; proposed to conquer Bahrūj, p. 410; was enlisted in the band of the loyal servants, p. 414.

Iktiṣyār-ul-mulk, Malik, was made ‘Imād-ul-mulk by Māhmūd Shāh and was appointed as nā’ib g环卫; all the soldiers of Malik Hājit were made over to him by Māhmūd Shāh, p. 248.

Ilyās, Hājit, Sultān of Bangāla, slew Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn; his possessions; gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn; had public prayers read in his name; marched to Jānagar, p. 421; his administration, p. 422; fled to the fort of Ekdāla; fought with Sultān Firūz and fled; sent tribute to Firūz Shāh and prayed for pardon; sent Malik Tāj-ud-dīn to Delhi with tribute, p. 423; died; period of reign, p. 424 (and see note 4 of p. 424).

‘Ilm-ud-dīn, Saiyid, p. 327, became a martyr, p. 328.
'Imād, Maulānā, brought a gift to Maḥmūd Khālji, p. 539; joined Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 558.

'Imād-ud-dīn Ghūrī, Malik; joined the army of Muḥammad Khān on the bank of the river Krishna; was put to death by Muḥammad Khān, p. 59.

'Imād-ud-dīn Khurāsānī, Maulānā, fought against Sāhib Khān, p. 586.

'Imād-ul-mulk, was appointed by Sultān Muḥammad to subdue Ḥasan; Ḥasan defeated and slew him, pp. 9-10.

'Imād-ul-mulk, son of 'Imād-ul-mulk, with his help Malik Barid dethroned Ahmad Shāh, p. 133; was sent by Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī to fight with Sultān Hūshang; seized all those who had joined Hūshang and brought them to Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī, p. 191; was appointed by Muẓaffar Shāh to crush Rānā Sāṅkā; taking Qawām-ul-mulk went to Parāntēj, p. 311; was deputed by Sultān Bahādur for revenue collection; fought with Mīrzā 'Askārī and was defeated, p. 376; enmity arose between him and Daryā Khān; went as a suppliant to Mīrān Mubārak Shāh; being defeated by the army of Gujrāt fled from Burhānpūr, p. 386; attacked I'tmād Khān, p. 396; news of his encampment reached Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 592; sent a message to Bihjat Khān, p. 593; entered the fort of the Rājputās and opened the gate to his soldiers, p. 603.

'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwīlī, Malik, submitted himself to Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt and instigated him to invade the Deccan, p. 4; Sultān Muḥammad Lashkārī granted him Kāwīl as jāfīr, p. 94; took up the duties of vāsīr of Maḥmūd Shāh; consulted Malka-i-Jahān in administration; was attacked by Dīlāwār Khān, p. 112; went to Kāwīl, p. 113; invited Maḥmūd Shāh to come to Kāwīl; advanced to crush Malik Barid; met the army of Malik Barid, p. 131; returned to Kāwīl, p. 132; reinforced Maḥmūm Shāh of Asr and Burhānpūr; fought with the amirs of the Deccan; fled to Asr and Burhānpūr; regained possession of his dominions with the help of Bahādur Shāh Gujrātī, p. 135; his hospitable transaction with Ismāʿīl 'Ādīl Khān, p. 161; sent a representation to Sultān Bahādur, p. 346.

'Imād-ul-mulk Samarqandī, Malik, was sent with an army to meet Sultān Hūshang by Aḥmad Shāh; arrested some of the disturbers, p. 195.

'Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī, helped to place Sikandar Khān on the throne, p. 323; determined to dethrone Sultān Sikandar, p. 326; his entrance into the palace of Sultān Sikandar, p. 327; placed Nāṣir Khān on the throne of Sultān Sikandar, p. 328; despatched letters to various powers for help, p. 329; collected troops to meet Bahādur Shāh, p. 331; paid wages for one year to the soldiers, p. 332; sent men towards Barīdā, p. 334; took shelter in the house of Shāh Jū Śādiqī; was seized and ordered to be hanged, p. 335; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to attack Bhūpāt, p. 357; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to chastise Bhūpāt and Rānā, p. 362; fought with Pūran Mal and made him run away, and imprisoned some of the Pūrabāsīs; submitted a report to Sultān Bahādur, p. 363; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to capture the fort of Mandisār, p. 368.
IQbāl Khān, was sent to fight against Mubārak Khān by Mahmūd Khaljī, p. 527; was appointed to get rid of Shēr Khān, p. 567; pursued Khwājah Suhail and Mahābat Khān, p. 568; went to defend Asūr and Burhānpūr, p. 570; sent a message to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 577; was summoned by Mahmūd Shāh; his flight from his house, p. 579; sent the corpse of Shihāb-ud-dīn to Shāhīdābād, p. 580; his petition to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 581; joined Mahmūd Shāh, p. 582; was slain by the order of Mahmūd Shāh, p. 587.

Iṣā Khān Sūr, was left in the town of Ujjain by Iṣlām Khān, p. 627.

Iṣa Sālār, Malik, rose in revolt, p. 194.

Iṣa Tarkhān, Mirzā, ruler of Sind, defeated the Jām’s army, p. 778; account of his rule in Sind, p. 784.

Iṣfandiyār, p. 4.

Iṣbāq, Malik, son of Qutb-ul-mulk, sent a petition to Mahmūd Khaljī, who conferred the title of Daulat Khān, wealth and honour on him, p. 504.

Iṣbāq, Qādī Ṭir, was sent to reinforce Malik Shāhīd; fought with Alī Khān, p. 280 (and see also note 1 on p. 280).

Iṣḥāq Mulla, went as an ambassador to ‘Alī Shāh, p. 750.

Iṣkandar, Jām, son of Jām Fath Khān, ruler of Sind; account of his rule, p. 777.

Iṣkandar Kakhar, reinforced Muhammad Shāh, p. 692.

Iṣkandar Khān, was made successor to the throne by Muhammad Shāh, p. 691; skirmishes with Muhammad Shāh, p. 694.

Iṣlām Khān, the possessions of Shēr Khān devolved on him, p. 623; placed the reins of Mālwa in the hands of Shujā’ Khān; his anger with Shujā’ Khān, p. 624; a message from Shujā’ Khān, p. 625; went to enquire about Shujā’ Khān, p. 626; rewarded Shujā’ Khān; detached soldiers to pursue Shujā’ Khān; took possession of Mālwa, p. 627; pardoned the offences of Shujā’ Khān and bestowed Sārangpūr and Rāhsān on the latter; his death, p. 628.

Iṣlām Khān of Kashmir, made an amicable settlement with Haibat Khān Niyyāzī, p. 713; an ambassador came from Mīrzā Ḥaidar, p. 714; was slain by Muhammad Khān Chak, p. 751.

Iṣmā’īl, p. 162, was blinded by his brother ‘Alī Ḥānī Khān, p. 163.

Iṣmā’īl, son of Mīr Bhīshiti; relations with Fattū; his rank in service; imprisoned Ṣalābat Khān; showed a written letter to Ṣalābat Khān, p. 149; his rise to power; his cruelty, p. 150.

Iṣmā’īl, Shāh, the Badshāh of Irān, sent Yādgār Bēg Qazībhāsh to Mahmūd Shāh with presents, p. 290.

Iṣmā’īl ‘Adil Khān, succeeded his father; his character; his achievements; received a title, p. 160; description of his soldiers; sent ships to Hurmuz and summoned men from ‘Irāq and Khūrāsān; transaction with ‘Imād-ul-mulk Kāwilī; his wars with Niẓām-ul-mulk and their results; period of reign, p. 161.

Iṣmā’īl Afghān, p. 9.

Iṣmā’īl Fath, was placed on the throne by Hasan Gāngū with the title of Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 8 (and see note 3 on pp. 8-9); crept into the fort of Dahrāgarh, p. 9.

Iṣmā’īl Ḥāyat, went to bring Sankar Chak, p. 720.

Iṣmā’īl Khān Kālpī, p. 507.
Ismāʿīl Niẓām-ul-mulk, Jamāl Khān as an all in all in his government; his attitude towards the white skinned people; Jamāl Khān invaded the Āḍīl Shāhī country and became victorious, p. 155; arrival of Burhān in the Deccan, p. 156; Burhān took the possession of Berār; opposition of Jamāl Khān; Burhān possessed Aḥmadnagar; period of reign, p. 157.

Ismāʿīl Šāhī, Shāh, sent an ambas- sadar to Gujrāt, p. 586.

Ismāʿīl Shāh, brother of ʿAbrāhīm Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, accession, p. 729.

Iʿtīmād Khān, refused to believe the message of Burhān summoning him, p. 390; was appointed by Sultān Mahmūd as the attendant of his harem, p. 393; placed Raḍī-ul-mulk on the throne of Sultān Mahmūd; kept the affairs of Kingdom in his own hands and kept Raḍī-ul-mulk confined in his house; fought and defeated Sultān Ahmad, p. 395; confined Sultān Aḥmad in his house; put Sultān Aḥmad to death, p. 396; declared on oath that Nasū was the real heir of the throne of Sultān Aḥmad, p. 397; remained as wuzūr in the reign of Sultān Muẓaffar, p. 398; kept Sultān Muẓaffar Naṣū in a state of imprisonment; attacked the Fūlādīs, p. 399; refused the demands of the Fūlādīs; was defeated by the Fūlādīs; met Muṣū Khān and Shēr Khān but was defeated; gave up the possession of the jāgūr of Ḫāji Khān and took up his quarters at Aḥmadābād; received a message from Chengiz Khān, p. 400; sent a reply to the message of Chengiz Khān, p. 401; sent a reply to Chengiz Khān inducing him to conquer Nadarbār, p. 402; commenced to equip his army; after receiving the message of Chengiz Khān left the city and encamped in the vicinity of Batūn; on the arrival of Chengiz Khān took Muẓaffar Shāh to the battlefield but being frightened fled towards Dūngarpūr, p. 404; arrived at Aḥmadābād bringing Muẓaffar Shāh with him; wrote a letter to Shēr Khān for the evacuation of Bahdar, p. 410; did not accept the agreement which was settled among the admir, p. 411; deceived Juhūjār Khān; sent a letter to Shēr Khān stating that Nasū was not the son of the Sultān, p. 412; summoned the Miržās from Bahroj; sent a petition to Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī requesting him to conquer Gujrāt, p. 413.

Jādā, was appointed by Shāhī Shujāʿ-ul-mulk; plundered the house of a poor man, p. 807.

Jafʿar Khān, was sent by his father to Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt with a request; took permission to visit the city of Aḥmadābād, p. 346.

Jagā, moved about in the hills; went for protection to Ratan Sēn, p. 348; was sent for by Sultān Bahādur, p. 349.

Jahān Khān, his letter to Aḥmad Shāh informing him of the intention of Sultān Husayn, p. 197.

Jahāngīr Badrah, as the wuzūr of Fath Shāh; joined Muḥammad Shāh, p. 692.

Jahāngīr Mākri, fled from Kashmir, p. 681; came to strengthen the Kashmiri, p. 684; persuaded Muḥammad Shāh to come out of Kashmir, p. 686; fought with the army of Fath Khān and defeated it; advanced for the second time to meet Fath Khān, p. 687; his message
to the Rāja of Rājaurī; summoned the Saiyids; fight with Fath Khān, p. 688; his seclusion, p. 689; as the commander of the army of Fath Shāh; was killed, p. 692.

Jahāngir Mākri, agent of Mirzā Ḥaidar, was awarded the sie of Ḥusain Mākri, p. 115.

Jahāngir Qulī Bēg, ruled Bangāla on behalf of Humāyūn Būdshāh; was slain by Shēr Khān, p. 445.

Jālīdah, Shaiḵ, p. 301; fled from Mandū and complained about the power and violence of Pūrabīa Rājpūta to Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 302; received a letter to Sultān Māḥmūd Shāqri, p. 456; sent a letter to Sultān Māḥmūd Khāļī, p. 457; by his exertions peace was effected between Māḥmūd Khāļī and Māḥmūd Shāqri, p. 519.

Jai Singh, account of his rebellion against Māḥmūd Shāh, p. 257.

Jai Singh Rāy, proprietor of the fort of Birākar, p. 99.

Jākār Zand, Mir, arrival in Multān, p. 803; was respected by Jām Bāyaẕīd, p. 804.

Jalāl Būḵhārī, Saiyid, p. 327.

Jalāl Khān Būḵhārī, shut himself in the fort of Mālkonda, p. 78; was released from the prison of Humāyūn Shāh; was put to death by a kottedī, p. 82; incited Māḥmūd Khāļī to seize the fort of Māḥūr, p. 526.

Jalāl Kōkhar, Malik, was displaced by Aḡam Humāyūn, p. 184.

Jalāl-ud-dīn, Saiyid, asked for the help of Māḥmūd Khāļī against the oppression of Ghāzi Khān, p. 533.

Jalāl-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla, became a Musalmān; assumed the name of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn; died; period of reign, p. 432 (and see note 3, p. 432).

Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishī, Shaiḵ, was respected by Jām Bāyaẕīd, p. 796; a wonderful story which was narrated by him, p. 804.

Jāmāl, Shaiḵ, father of Shaiḵ ‘Abd-ul-ḥai, p. 621.

Jāmāl Khān Gujratī, his fight; his rank in service, p. 153; sentenced Mīrzā Khān to death, p. 154; placed Ismā’il Nizām-ul-mulk on the throne; kept Ismā’il as a puppet and himself rose in power; invaded the ‘Adil Shāhī country, p. 155; attacked Burhān-ul-mulk and was killed, p. 157; defeated ‘Adil Khān; fought with Rāja ‘Ali Khān; his death, p. 158.

Jalāl-ud-dīn, Malik, was given the title of Muhasil Khān by Sultān Māḥmūd Gujratī, p. 255; was appointed as Shaiḵna and kotwal and posted to Ahmadābād; satisfactory discharge of his duties improved his honour, wealth and rank, p. 256; was promoted to the rank of vazīr, p. 257; was ordered to execute Bhim Rāy, p. 262; was directed by ‘Imād-ul-mulk to attend on Prince Aḥmad Khān and to guard the city on the day of ‘Id, p. 265; was transferred to the post of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, p. 271; his charge when the fort of Chāmpānīr was besieged by Sultān Māḥmūd, p. 273; reported to Sultān Māḥmūd about the cure of Rāy Bātāl; charge of the erection of Jalān Pardāwī castle was given to him, p. 276; was sent to receive and welcome Sāhib Khān by Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 293; fled and sought the protection of Rāy Singh, p. 336; joined Laṭīf Khān, p. 337.

Jalāl-ud-dīn Astrābādī, Khwājah; went with presents to Māḥmūd Khāļī, pp. 540-41.
Jâm Irûz, left Thatha and joined Sulţân Bahâdur, p. 345.
Jâmî, p. 581.
Jamî Hâfîz, Mullâ, received favours from Sulţân Zain-ul-Abîdîn, p. 657.
Jamshîd Khân, p. 153; his decision; his proclamation; was put to death, p. 154.
Jamshîd Qutb-ul-mulk, succeeded his father; period of reign, p. 168.
Jân Bâbâ, was defeated by his brother, p. 785.
Jân Bég, Mirzâ, ruler of Sind, account of his reign, p. 786.
Jâriah, mother of Nanû, p. 397.
Jârijû, a pigeon fancier, p. 386.
Jârûz; helped Saiyîd ‘Îbrâhîm and Saiyîd Ya’qûb in their release, p. 722.
Jasrat Khokhar, p. 651; became powerful in the Punjab and brought it into his possession, p. 652.
Jâwâsh Khân, was sent to crush Shihâb-ud-dîn, p. 575; despatched a report to Mahmûd Shâh and was summoned back, p. 576; was given a title and sent to crush Mukhtâs Khân and Iqbal Khân, p. 580; was summoned by Mahmûd Shâh, p. 582.
Jay Sinha, Râyzâda, his flight, p. 765; his flight with Muhammad Qâsim, p. 769.
Jesus, p. 547.
Jhâjû Muḥammad, his title, p. 238; for further account see Kabîr Sulţânî, Malik.
Jhuhîr Khân, attacked Saiyîd Muḥîrak, p. 395; advised I’tmâd Khân to leave Ahmadâbâd, p. 404; took Sulţân Muṣâaffâr to Dûngarpur and made him over to I’tmâd Khân, p. 406; explained his position, p. 407; started for the chauqân field with Chengî Khân, p. 408; killed Chengî Khân, p. 409; went to I’tmâd Khân, p. 412.
Jhujûr Khân, defeated Malik Mahmûd, p. 593.
Jû, Shâh Shaikh, the descendant of Qutb ‘Alâm Shaikh Burhân-ud-dîn, p. 324; was slain in the house of Qadr Khân, p. 336.
Jivan Dâs Khattrî, was appointed to the post of vazîr by Sulţân Ahmad Shâh, p. 182.
Jûnî, Malik, came out of the camp with Ahmad Shâh; was sent by Ahmad Shâh to make an enquiry; informed Ahmad Shâh about Sulţân Hûshang and his army, p. 207.
Jûnân, Jâm, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 773.

K
Kabîr Sulţânî, Malik, his title; prepared to create disturbances; resolved to remove Malik Shâbân ‘îun ‘îmâd-ul-mulk from his office, p. 238; went to his house, p. 239; his amazement, p. 240; fled from the darbâr; went among the grassias was slain by them, p. 241.
Kâjî Chak, Malik, as the vazîr of Muḥammad Shâh; his power of judgment; imprisoned ‘Îbrâhîm Mâkri, p. 693; fought against Iskandar Khân; went to Râjauri, p. 694, as the vazîr of Muḥammad Shâh; imprisoned Muḥammad Shâh and raised ‘Îbrâhîm Khân to the throne, p. 695; as the vazîr of ‘Îbrâhîm Shâh, p. 696; went to the village of Sullâh to meet Abdâl Mâkri; a message from Abdâl Mâkri, p. 697; his defeat and flight, p. 698; his defeat by Abdâl Mâkri, p. 700; owing to the treachery of Abdâl
Mākri went to Hindūstān, p. 701; his defeat and flight, p. 702; fought with the Kāshghāris, p. 703; his residence, p. 705; disputes with Abdāl Mākri, p. 706; defeat by Mīrzā Ḥaidar; brought reinforcements from Shēr Khān Afghān, p. 708; fight with Mīrzā Ḥaidar; advanced to crush Mīrzā Ḥaidar, p. 709; his flight; death, p. 710.:

Kālm-ul-lah, (son of Māhmūd Shāh), was placed in place of Wālī-ul-lah Sultan by Malik Barīd; his imprisonment in Bīdar, p. 134; ‘Imād-ul-mulk Kāwīl went to the aid of Muhammad Khān; fought with Nizām-ul-mulk, Malik Barīd, Khudāwānd Khān and the amīrs of the Deccan; fled to Asīr and Burhānpūr; with the help of Sultan Bahādur of Gujrat ‘Imād-ul-mulk regained his possessions and read the Khutba in the name of Sultan Bahādur in the parganas of his territories, and invited him to invade the Deccan; Nizām-ul-mulk, Malik Barīd, and other amīrs could not withstand the Sultan Bahādur of Gujrat and read the Khutba in his name in Ahmadnagar and all the provinces of the Deccan were divided among the four amīrs, p. 135.

Kālī, Malik, one of the adherents of Māhmūd Shāh, p. 239; was sent by Māhmūd Shāh to seize the murderer of Ādām Sīlāhdār; was executed by the order of Māhmūd Shāh, p. 248; was defeated by Mūzaffar Ibrāhīm, p. 518.

Kānsha, Rāja, Rāja of Jhālāwār, p. 212; hearing of the marches of Ahmad Shāh left his country; brought a force from Sultan Ahmad Bahu; plundered parts of Nadarhār, p. 213; joined Sultan ‘Alā-ud-dīn, p. 214.

Kamāl, Mir, was slain in the battlefield, p. 703.

Kamāl Khān with Šafīdar Khān went to punish Bahādur Gīlānī; they fought and were wounded; fell into Bahādur’s hands; and were sent to Dābul, p. 117 (and see note 1, p. 160).

Kamāl Kōkah, a tradition about his name, p. 718.


Kamāl-ud-dīn, Saiyīd, was slain by Ghāzī Khān, p. 533.


Kāmil Khān, Ibrāhīm ‘Ādīl Khān was placed on the throne by his help, p. 165; was slain by Kishwar Khān, p. 166.

Kāmrān, Mīrzā, sent an army to conquer Kashmir, p. 700.

Kaniyā, Rāni, wife of Māhmūd Shāh, p. 600.

Kank Dās, Rāy, fought with Sultan Muhammad; asked Sultan Māhmūd Khālij for aid, p. 225.

Kāns, Rāja, how he acquired power; his son became a Musalman and sat on the throne, p. 430; period of his power, p. 431 (and see note 3, p. 430).

Kapūr Chand; brought a message from Sultan Bahūl Lūdī to Māhmūd Khālij, p. 542.

Karn, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 776.

Karshāshab, father of Tāhir Āl, p. 633.

Khādar Khān, p. 124.

Khālīst Ḥasan ‘Arab, Malik-ut-tujjār, was appointed to conquer Mahāhīm by Ahmad Shāh, p. 49; possessed Mahāhīm; fought with Šafīr Khān but was defeated, p. 50; opposed Naṣīr Khān as far as Asīr and raided part of that territory, p. 58; advanced to capture the fort
Index.

of Sangēsar; seized the fort of Rāja Sarka and made him prisoner, p. 61; forgave Sarka; made Sarka the leader of his army; Sarka led him to a place where the whole army was murdered, p. 62; p. 65 n.

Khalifa-i-Dālī, His Majesty, sent Psharau Kān to give an account of the administration of Murtāda Nizām Shāh, p. 147; Murtāda Nizām Shāh in his service; showed favours to Burhān; gave shelter to the amirs of Berār, p. 148; issued ṭadvānā to the amirs and Zaminār in favour of Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk, p. 158; was requested by I’timād Kān to invade Gujrat; sent Kān Kalān to conquer Sirōhī; marched towards Gujrat, p. 413.

Khalīf Kān, Shāhzāda, was given the country of Sūrat, forts of Jūnāgarh and Karnāl by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 277.

Khānām, widow of Mirzā Ḥaidar, her advice to the Mughals, p. 718.

Khānamjī, sister of Mirzā Ḥaidar, went to Kāshghar, p. 723.

Kān Jahan, marched towards Māl-konda; was attacked and defeated by Sikandar Kān, p. 77; watched the city, p. 115; was sent by Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmani to fight with Shāhzāda Muḥammad, p. 213; went to reinforce Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 216; ruled Bangāla after Kān Kānān and slew Dāūd, p. 446.

Kān Jahan Shīrāzī, took possession of Nauśāri, p. 377.

Kān Jahan, Sulṭān; through his intervention Har Rāy asked Aḥmad Shāh to be pardoned, p. 211.

Kān Kānān, his decision; his proclamation, p. 154; defeated Dāūd and conquered Bangāla, p. 446.

Kān Kānān Aḥmad Kān, see Aḥmad Shāh Bahmani, Sulṭān.

Kān Zamān; defeated Sankar Chak, p. 742; attacked Ḥusain Kān, p. 743; his execution, p. 744.

Khāwās Kān; did not admit Shihāb-ud-dīn, 574.

Khādīr, Mālūna, his title, p. 238; was imprisoned, and sent to Dīp, p. 242; and see Kabīr Sulṭān, Malik.

Khādīr, Malik, took tribute from the Rājas of Bākar, Idar, and Sirōhī, p. 257; consultation by Malik Mughīth; was celebrated as Mīyān Ḍaghī; joined Sulṭān Hūshang, p. 471.

Khādīr Kān, slew Mālū Kān, p. 451; ruled in Delhi; fight and peace with Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, p. 452.

Khudāwānd Kān, Māhūr was conferred on him by Sulṭān Lashkārī, p. 94; fought with Ḥmād-ul-mulk Kāvīl, p. 135; his designation in the time of Murtāda Nizām Shāh; an event, p. 147; his performance, p. 148; was sent to Shaitān Muḥammad Qāsim Budhu by Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 187; was appointed as the vīzīr of the kingdom by Maḥmūd Shāh and was left in attendance on Shāhzāda Aḥmad Kān at Aḥmadābād; private talk with Rāy Rāyān to unite with Ḥmād-ul-mulk and to place Shāhzāda Aḥmad Kān on the throne, p. 264; sent for Rāy Rāyān and explained his views about Ḥmād-ul-mulk; kept his intention in secret, p. 266; was fined by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 270; was ordered to be arrested, p. 271; was left by Muẓaffar Shāh to guard the camp, p. 300; gave advice to Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 319; was ordered to summon Bahādur Kān, p. 322; helped to place Sikandar Kān on the throne, p. 323; sought to be ahead of the others, p. 329; rendered homage to Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 335.
was sent to Bākar by Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 347; waited upon Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 348; was left to accompany the camp, p. 357; was murdered by Būrān, p. 390.

Khurāsān Khān, deserted Sulṭān Bahādur and joined the army of Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 372.

Khurram Khān, welcomed Bahādur Shāh, p. 331.

Khurshid, Rānī, p. 545, took the side of Shujā’-at Khān in the latter’s fraternal dispute, p. 552; made over the treasures of Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn to Nāṣir Shāhīl agents, p. 553; her report against Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 554; took the affairs of the kingdom in her hands; narrated the death of Mūnjab Baqāl to Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, p. 555; representation to Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, p. 556; her order to the pay-master; sent an army in pursuit of Shai kh Ĥābī and Khwājah Suhail, p. 557; sent a report about the power of Nāṣir-ud-dīn to Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud- din, p. 559; her advice to Shujā’at Khān, p. 561; dismissed ‘All Khān and appointed Malik Piyārā, p. 562; she was seized by the amirs of Nāṣir Shāh, p. 563; was made over to custodians, p. 564.

Kush-Qadām, Malik, was given the title of ‘Imād-ul-mulk by Sulṭān Muḥaffar Shāh, p. 293.

Khwājah Bābū, was imprisoned but was released by the order of Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 340.

Khwājah Jahān, went to protect Asfīr and Būrānpūr, p. 570.

Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk, seizing the bridle of the horse of Niẓām Shāh went to Bīdar, pp. 244, 535.

Kishan Rāy, p. 20; surrendered his fort to Muḥāfīd Shāh, p. 21.

Kishwar Khān, p. 165; slew Kāmil Khān; became the wakil of Ibrāhīm ‘Adl Khān; was put to death, p. 166.

Kōbī Zummārdār, Malik, was sent by Rāja of Idar to Muḥaffar Shāh, p. 297.

Kōnbhā, his defeat by Muḥmūd Khalījī, p. 514; attacked Maḥmūd Khalījī but was defeated by the latter, p. 515; agreed to pay tribute to Maḥmūd Khalījī, p. 520; sent tribute to Maḥmūd Khalījī, p. 527; sent a message to Maḥmūd Khalījī for the pardon of his offences, p. 528; sent troops to confront the army of Maḥmūd Khalījī, p. 529.

Kōpā Dēvt, wife of Rāja Adwan, her message to Shāh Mīr; attacked Shāh Mīr; conversion to Islām; her imprisonment, p. 633.

Kōpwarī, sister of Yūsuf Chak, was married to Ghāzi Khān, p. 721.

L

Lādan Khalījī, Malik, his hostile attitude towards Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Maḥṣūl; had an interview with Aṣaf Khān and welcomed him; was given the title of Khān Jahān by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 284; the village of Banās was given to him by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 288.

Lājin, Malik, was sent by Sulṭān Tughlaq to summon the amirs of hundreds of Daulatābād; was slain by the amirs of hundreds, p. 2.

Lakhman Sēn, strengthened the citadel of Rāsīn and was ready for battle, p. 359; his advice to Sīhhādī, p. 361; sent two thousand Pārabias to fight with the army of Gujrāt, p. 362; agreed to evacuate the fort of Rāsīn if Sulṭān Bahādur would excuse the offences of Sīhhādī and summon him from the fort of Mandū; a request to Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 365.
Lalitādat Devharah, Rāja, the temple which was built by him, p. 648.
Lang, Shāhzāda, joined Mirzā Haidar, p. 716; his release, p. 722.
Langar Khān, p. 805; joined Mirzā Shāh Husain, p. 806; gained possession of Multān; was summoned by Mirzā Kamrān, and was granted the territory of Bābal by the latter, p. 810.
Latīf, entered the service of Bahādur Shāh, p. 331.
Latīf, Ustād, accompanied Yusuf Khān, p. 761.
Latīf Khān, was sent by Ahmad Shāh to punish Malik Shāh Malik; defeated Malik Shāh Malik, p. 195.
Latīf Khān Bāriwāl, Malik, Sultān Sikandar conferred on him the title of Sharzah Khān; advanced to put down Shāhzāda Latīf Khān but was slain, p. 325.
Latīf Khān, Shāhzāda, his intention to seize the throne of Sikandar Khān, p. 325; went as a suppliant to Fatḥ Khān, p. 331; remained concealed at Chāmpānhr, p. 336; his arrival at Awās, p. 338; fought and died, p. 341.
Latīf Zakariyā, placed Shāhzāda Masʿūd Khān on the throne of Mālwa, p. 494.
Loār, was sent to conquer Loharkāt by Sultān Qutb-ud-din and was slain, p. 642.
Lōdhā, governor of Kandūyah, p. 586; attacked Sāhib Khān, p. 587; was nominated to punish Sikandar Khān, p. 591; was murdered, p. 592.
Lōhar Chak, was sent with an army to Rājauri; was seized by Muhammad Khān Chak, p. 750; imprisoned 'Ali Khān; intention of the Kashmiris about him, p. 755; Kashmir came under his power, p. 756; his defeat and imprisonment; was blinded, p. 757.
Lōhar Mākri, his share in Kashmir, p. 699.
Lūlī Laund, Malik, made proposals of peace, p. 742; his imprisonment, p. 745; fled to 'Alī Khān, p. 748.

M
Mādarī, Rāy, was sent by Sultān Sikandar to Tibet; his rebellion; death, p. 645.
Mādhō Singh, received Yusuf Khān, p. 761.
Maghīth, Malik, father of Maḥmūd Khān, p. 221.
Mahābat Khān, the governor of Chandīr; was killed on the battlefield, pp. 88, 533.
Mahābat Khān, joined Shīr Khān, p. 565; instigated Shīr Khān to battle, p. 566; taking the wounded Shīr Khān with him fled from the battlefield, 568.
Mahādēv, p. 648.
Mahīt Kōkah, accompanied Yusuf Khān, p. 761.
Maḥmūd, Malik, was defeated by Jhūjār Khān, p. 593.
Maḥmūd, Malik, son of Malik Mughīth, see Maḥmūd Khālji, Sultān, Sultān of Mālwa.
Maḥmūd, Sultān, the ruler of Bhakkar, ruler of Sind, account of his reigne, p. 786.
Maḥmūd, Sultān, son of Ibrāhīm Shārqī, succeeded his father; sent an ambassador with presents to Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, p. 453; asked permission to punish Naṣīr Khān Jahān for his cruelty and disobedience; reply of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, p. 454; advanced towards Kalpī, p. 455; started for Kalpī to meet Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji; sent troops to raid the country of Barhār;
joined the detachment which was sent to Barhār; sent a letter to the Shaikh-ul-Islām, Shaikh Jāïsaldeh, p. 456; his emissary was sent to Sultān Mahmūd Khāliji by Shaikh Jāïsaldeh with a note of advice; acceptance of the proposals, p. 457; returned to Jaumpūr; treatment of his people; conquest of Chunār advanced into the country of Orissa; period of reign, p. 458.

Mahmūd, Sultān, son of Sultān Firūz, Sultān of Multān, his accession, p. 800; his associates; his disposition towards Jām Bāyazid, p. 801; was wounded by ‘Ālam Khān; nominated amirs to punish Jām Bāyazid, p. 802; peace with Jām Bāyazid, p. 803; a wonderful story which was narrated by Shaikh Jālāl-ud-dīn Quraishī, p. 804; farmān of Bābar Bādshāh to Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain Arghūn; collected his troops and sent an ambassador to the latter; his death, p. 805.

Mahmūd Barkī, Malik, was sent by Aḥmad Shāh to punish Naṣīr; captured Nādōt, p. 199.

Mahmūd Garjistānī Khwājah, sold ‘Ādil Khān to Mahmūd Shāh Bahānī, p. 159.

Mahmūd Gilānī, Khwājah, Malik-ut-tujjār, defeated the Mandū army, p. 535.

Mahmūd Khāliji, Sultān, Sultān of Mālwa, on the invitation of Sikandar Khān Bukhārī came to conquer Berār, p. 70; besieged Māhūr; after the arrival of ‘Alā-ud-dīn Shāh, Khāliji retired towards Mandū; p. 71; at the instigation of Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī invaded, p. 87, the Deccan; fought but was defeated by Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 88; appeared before Nizām Shah’s army and after defeat; pursued, p. 89, it as far as Bidār; on the arrival of Mahmūd Gujrātī started for Mandū, p. 90; advanced to conquer, p. 91, the Deccan; arrived on the frontier of Daulatābād; heard that Mahmūd Gujrātī was approaching; marched towards Māl-konda, p. 92; wanted to help Rāy Kank Dās, p. 225, but did not advance to support him, p. 226; started to conquer Gujrāt; ordered destruction of Barānāma; invaded Gujrāt, p. 227; met Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn in Kaparānj; wrote a copلط to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 228; was defeated by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn and went back to Mālwa, p. 229; attacked Nizām Shāh, p. 243; travelled by way of Gōndwāna towards Mālwa, p. 244; invaded the Deccan; plundered the neighbourhood of Daulatābād; retired to his own country; a letter from Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī; reply to Mahmūd Gujrātī, p. 251; came from Mandū to Dhār and prayed for help from Muṣaffār Shāh, p. 305; marched with Aṣaf Khān against Bhīm Karan Fūrbā; fought, was wounded and taken prisoner, p. 307; sent Sharzah Khān to plunder the towns in the territory of Chitūr; sent Dārūz Khān with a message to Sultān Bahādur, p. 350; conferred the title of Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-dīn on his son and neglected to see Sultān Bahādur, p. 352; came out to give battle, p. 353; was treated with respect by Sultān Bahādur but owing to his harsh attitude was arrested, p. 354; wrote a letter in reply to Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, p. 454; despached a note in favour of Naṣīr Khān to Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, p. 455; advanced towards Chandāri and Kālpī; struggle between the army of Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, p. 456;
proposing some conditions made peace with Sultan Mahmud Sharqi, p. 457; was granted favours and title by Sultan Hushang, p. 474; Ghaznīn Khān was placed in his charge by Sultan Hushang; his guarantee for faithfulness to Ghaznīn Khān; his interview with other sardārs, p. 485; his reply to Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl, p. 486; informed Ghaznīn Khān about the intention of Zafar Minjumla, p. 487; attended on Sultan Hushang during his last illness; sent a reply to Ghaznīn Khān, p. 488; became watchful for the death of Hushang; his orders, p. 489; declared Ghaznīn Khān as the heir of Sultan Hushang; after rendering homage confirmed the accession of Ghaznīn Khān, p. 490; result of his skill in administration, p. 491; his reply to the suspicions of Sultan Muhammed, p. 493; caused the murder of Sultan Muhammed; sent a reply to Malik Bāyazid Shalghā, p. 494; kept his men ready; fought with the amirs and defeated them, p. 495; sent a message to Khan Jahān, p. 496; accession on the throne of Mālwa; description of his reforms and benevolence, p. 497; contributions to education; attempt of Hushang Shāhī amirs to injure him; wounded some of the conspirators, p. 498; punished the conspirators; excused Shāhzhāda Ḍuḥmān Khān as well as the others who took part in the conspiracy on the request of Aẓam Humāyūn; sent Aẓam Humāyūn Khan Jahān to suppress the rebels of Islāmābād, p. 499; sent out detachments to fight with Sultan Aḥmad, p. 501; his generosity towards the poor; summoned some amirs who were hostile to Sultan Aḥmad, p. 502;
detachments for ravaging Chitōr; summoned ʿAṭam Humayūn Khān Jahān to capture the possessions of the Rājpūts; his grief on the death of ʿAṭam Humayūn; appointed Tāj Khān in the place of ʿAṭam Humayūn, p. 514; opposed the attack of Kōnbāhā and defeated him; returned to Shādiābād; a message from Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī regarding the religious disobedience of Naṣīr, p. 515; gave permission to Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī to chastise Naṣīr; request of Naṣīr; sent ʿAli Khān to Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī and, p. 516, the latter's reply; advanced to protect Naṣīr, p. 517; after fighting with the army of Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī returned to Fathābād; sent Muḥāfīz Ibrāhīm to suppress Mubārak Khān, p. 518; peace with Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī; establishment of a hospital; advanced to capture the fort of Mandalgarh, p. 519; agreed to a peace with the Rājpūts and returned to his own dominions; conferred favours on Saiyid Muḥammad Khān; captured the town of Alampūr, p. 520; took tribute from the Rāja of Kōtah and returned to Shādiābād; request of Gangās; advanced to help Gangās, p. 521; besieged the town of Sultanpur; granted rank and title to Malik ʿAlā-ud-dīn; his grief on the death of Sultan Muhammad, p. 522; ravaged the town of Barōda; fight with Sultan Qutb-ud-dīn and its result, p. 523; appointed Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-dīn to raid the town of Sūrat; made peace with Sultan Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 525; punished the Rājpūts of Mahōl; changed hostility between Yūsuf Khān Hindāunt and the governor of Biyānā into friendship; left the government of the fort of Rantambhōr and Hārauti in the charge of Qadām Khān; besieged Māhūr but fled, p. 526; turned Mubārak Khān out of Baklāna; sent Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-dīn to put down Mubārak Khān; advanced towards Chitōr, p. 527; appointed Manusūr-ul-mulk to destroy Mandisār; took tribute from Kōnbāhā and turned towards Shādiābād; his advance towards Mandisār; his sudden advance towards Ajmūr, p. 528; gave up the idea of conquering the fort of Mandalgarh and returned to Shādiābād, p. 529; captured the fort of Mandalgarh, p. 530; sent Shāhzāda Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-dīn to raid Kiwārāh and Dilwārāh; nominated Shāhzāda Qadām Khān and Tāj Khān to capture the fort of Bāndī; appointed Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-dīn and Qadām Khān to raid the countries of Kiwārāh and Dilwārāh; encamped in the vicinity of Kōnbhalmīr, p. 532; took tribute from the Rāja of Dāngarpūr; returned to Shādiābād; marched towards Asīr, p. 533; forgave ʿĀdil Khān's offences; march against Nīpān Shāh, p. 534; after defeat by Nīpān Shāh retreated to his own territory, p. 535; sent Maqbool Khān with an army to suppress the disturbances in the fort of Kehri; advanced towards Daulatābād, p. 536; having raided some villages of Mālkōnda returned to Shādiābād; sent Maqbool Khān to plunder Elichpūr, p. 537; treaty with the ruler of the Deccan, p. 538; received Shalihīr Nūr-ud-dīn with respect; welcomed the arrival of Maulānā ʿImād-ud-dīn, p. 539; sent Tāj Khān and Ahmad Khān to put down Maqbool Khān; started towards Mahmūdābād; appointed Malik Dāūd to chastise the tribe.
Muhammad Shāh, Sultan, Gujratī, son of Muhammad Shāh; sent a letter to Muhammad Shah Bahmani giving an account of the treachery of Bahādur Gīlānī, p. 118; his flight from Amir Taimūr, p. 181; date of accession to the throne of Gujrat, p. 237; attitude towards his people; plot to cause disturbance, p. 238; ordered that the creators of disturbance be arrested; end of the conspirators; suppression of disturbances, pp. 239–242; marched in the direction of Kaparbanj; regulated the administration of the thānas and of the paragas; started from Aḥmadābād; encamped on the bank of the river Khārī; letter from Nizām Shāh for assistance; advanced to help Nizām Shāh against Sultan Muhammad Khalījī, pp. 90, 92 and 243; directed attention towards the Deccan; advanced into the country of Asir and Burhanpur; encamped in the neighbourhood of Tāhlīr; army of Sultan Muhammad Khalījī suffered hardships, p. 244; returned to Ahmadābād; Jāgīr of the soldiers of Gujrat; the march towards the Deccan made Muhammad Khalījī fly after ravaging the neighbourhood of Daulatābād; turned back to Ahmadābād accepting the presents of Nizām Shāh; warning to Sultan Muhammad Khalījī, p. 245; report about the infection of the Zaminārs of Bawar and of the fort of Dūn; punished and defeated the rebellious chiefs, p. 246; returned with success to Ahmadābād; Bahā'-ul-mulk killed Ādam Sīlāḥdār, p. 248; execution of 'Imād-ul-mulk and 'Aḍḍ-ul-mulk; Malik Ikhšiyār-ul-mulk was made 'Imād-ul-mulk; marched to conquer the fort of Karnāl, p. 248; on the way to
Jūnāgarh ravaged the country of Sōrath; arrived near the hill of Karnāl, p. 249; defeated the Rājpūts; ravaged the surrounding country; besieged the fort of Karnāl; Rāy Mandalik asked for pardon; went back to Aḥmadābād; appointed soldiers to punish Rāy Mandalik, p. 250; Rāy Mandalik was defeated by the soldiers of the Sultān and paid a tribute, p. 251; rejected the counsel of the amirs in connection of the conquest of Mālwa on receiving the news of the death of Sultān Mahmūd Khalji; sent armies to plunder Sōrath; was wounded by an elephant, p. 252; advanced to conquer the fort of Jūnāgarh and the hill of Karnāl; distribution of five kroṣa of gold among the soldiers; sent troops in every direction to plunder the country; determination for the upliftment of Islam in Jūnāgarh, p. 253; fight with Rājpūts for the fort of Jūnāgarh; surrendered the fort of Jūnāgarh; besieged the hill of Karnāl, p. 254; Rāy Mandalik became humble and surrendered the hill of Karnāl to the Sultān; Rāy Mandalik was CONVERTED to Islam and received the title of Khalīlah; foundation of the city of Muṣṭafā-ābād, p. 255; gave up the idea of conquering Chāmpānīr marched against the country of Kach, p. 257; accepted the excuses of the people of Kach; marched towards Sind, p. 258; possession of Sind, p. 259; marched towards Jagat to release the Musalmāns from the oppressions of the Kāfīra; arrived at Jagat, p. 260; ravaged the temple of Jagat; started for the island of Beyt; captured the citadel of Beyt; Rāy Bhīm fled; entered the city of Beyt; released all the Musalmāns from prison; left Malik Tūghān as the thānādār of Beyt; returned to Muṣṭafā-ābād, p. 261; Rāy Bhīm was arrested and brought to the Sultān; sentenced Rāy Bhīm to death; started towards the fort of Chāmpānīr, p. 262; sailed to punish the Malābāris; arrived at the port of Kanbāyat; attacked Chāmpānīr; returned to Aḥmadābād; despatched his amirs to the thānās of various countries, p. 263; appointment of vazīr and engagement with the administration; conspiracy of Khudāwān Khalīlah with Rāy Rāyān, p. 264; effort of Rāy Rāyān to include 'Imād-ul-mulk in the conspiracy; confidential activities of 'Imād-ul-mulk against the conspiracy, p. 265; failure of the conspiracy; a rumour in Muṣṭafā-ābād, p. 266; investigation about the rumour; made a plan to deceive his opponents and his activities according to the plan, pp. 267–269; 'Imād-ul-mulk disclosed the story of the conspiracy; punishment of Khudāwān Khalīlah; went to Nahrwāla; sent 'Imād-ul-mulk to conquer Jālōr and Sājīr; Mujāhid Khalīlah murdered Qaisār Khalīlah, p. 270; punishment of the murderer of Qaisār Khalīlah; favours for the family of 'Imād-ul-mulk after the latter's death; famine in Gujrāt, p. 271; Rāy Bataī defeated and killed Malik Sadhā; marched towards Chāmpānīr; Rāja of Chāmpānīr submitted for the pardon of his offences which was not granted; encamped in the village of Karnāl, p. 272; conflicting attitude of the Rājpūts; siege of the fort of Chāmpānīr; petition of apology from Rāy Bataī to the Sultān; Rāy Bataī asked Sultān
Chiyāth-ud-dīn for help, p. 273; after consulting the learned men Sulṭān Chiyāth-ud-dīn gave up the idea of helping Rāy Bataī; measures and activities for the conquest of the fort of Chāmpānīr; conquest of the fort of Chāmpānīr, pp. 274–276; gave the name of Muḥammadābād to Chāmpānīr; execution of Rāy Bataī and Dūngarsī; order for the construction of citadel, palaces, and gardens in Chāmpānīr, p. 276; jāgīr for Khaṭlī Khaṇ Shāhzāda, p. 277; a farrān to the Rāja of Ābū in regard to the merchants who were looted by them; news about the disobedience of Bahādur Gīlānī, p. 278; sent Malik Qawām-ul-mulk to punish Bahādur Gīlānī; Sulṭān Maḥmūd Bahmanī marched from Bīdar, defeated, and slew Bahādur Gīlānī; marched towards Mahraṣa; flight of Alf Khaṇ; sent Shāfī-ī-Tahān to reassure Alf Khaṇ, p. 279; sent Qāḍī Pir Ishaq to reinforce Malik Shaikhba; Alf Khaṇ fought with Qāḍī Pir Ishaq; on the request Alf Khaṇ was excused; owing to the murder of nāb-i- arq Alf Khaṇ was imprisoned and he died, p. 280; on arrival of the Sulṭān 'Adil Khaṇ Fārūqī paid tribute and was pardoned, p. 281; postponed his march towards Mālwa; after hearing the victory of his slave Ayāz over the Fīravnst returned from Dūn to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr, p. 282; agreed to bestow the dominions of Asīr and Būrhanpūr on 'Ādil Khaṇ, son of Ḥasan Khaṇ; marched towards Asīr and Būrhanpūr; heard of the activities of Ḥiṣām-ud-dīn Maḥgūl, p. 283; advanced to Thānlīr; sent ʻĀṣaf Khaṇ, and Malik 'Azīz-ul-mulk to punish Malik Ḥiṣām-ud-dīn and 'Ālam Khaṇ; bestowed the govern-

ment of Asīr and Būrhanpūr on 'Ādil Khaṇ, p. 284; marched towards Sulṭānīpūr Nadarbār, p. 285; after hearing of the homicidal accounts of his subordinates he ordered destruction of those who did not observe the rights of salt; a petition from Ḥaṭam Humāyūn detailing the hostile account of Shīr Khaṇ and Saif Khaṇ and his siege of the fort of Asīr, p. 287; grant of money to Ḥaṭam Humāyūn; assurance of royal aid in case of necessity to Ḥaṭam Humāyūn; request of Niẓām-ul-mulk Bāhīrī for 'Alam Khāznāda, p. 288; reply to Niẓām-ul-mulk; Sulṭān Sīkandar Lūdī of Delhi sent presents to the Sulṭān; travelled towards Nahrwālā, p. 289; paid a visit to the tombs of sufis; summoned Shāhzāda Muẓaffar Khaṇ; became ill, p. 290; died; period of reign; titles after death, p. 291; came as a suppliant to Naṣīr Shāh, p. 444; bestowed the title of Sulṭān-ush-sharq on Malik Sarwar and conferred on him the government of Jāmpūr, p. 447; joined Sulṭān Ibrāhim but was not honoured by the latter; went to Kanauj; removed the thānadar of Kanauj; possessed Kanauj, p. 450; opposed Mallū Khaṇ bravely; came and sat on the throne of Delhi; marched to engage Sulṭān Ibrāhim Sharqī, p. 451; made over the government of Sanbal to Asad Khaṇ Lūdī and returned to Delhi, p. 452.

Maḥmūd Shāh, Sulṭān of Gujrat, p. 383, son of Latīf Khaṇ, son of Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh sent Maḥmūd Khaṇ to Gujrat; was placed on the throne of Gujrat with the title, p. 384, of Maḥmūd Shāh;
Daryā Khān took the Sultan to Chāmpānī, p. 385; ‘Imād-ul-mulk advanced against the Sultan; advanced towards the country of Sūrath to crush ‘Imād-ul-mulk; advanced towards Burhānpūr in pursuit of ‘Imād-ul-mulk; Mirān Mubārak was defeated; Daryā Khān’s administration and his actions as the bādshāh, p. 386; came out of the fort of Ahmadābād and went to ‘Alam Khān Lūdi; ‘Alam Khān Lūdi helped the Sultan; march of Daryā Khān towards Dūlqa; fight between ‘Alam Khān and Daryā Khān and the defeat of the latter, p. 387; departure of messengers to bring Sultan Mahmūd; arrived at Ahmadābād and flight of Daryā Khān to Shāh Khān Afgān, p. 388; set himself to manage the government; favourable treatment for his men; how Burhān murdered the Sultan and others, p. 389; proclamation that Burhān was the heir to the throne; murder of Burhān; period of reign, p. 391; character of the Sultan, p. 392; his constructive works and peculiar tastes; abolished the improper customs of Gujrat, p. 393.

Mahmūd Shāh, Sultan, son of Nasīr Shāh, Sultan of Mālwa, was summoned by his father, p. 571; was made the heir with the title of Sultan Mahmūd Shāh, p. 572; was pained at heart after the speech of Nasīr-ud-dīn Shāh, p. 573; his accession on the throne, p. 574; sent Jāwāsh Khān to crush Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn; ascended the throne of Khāliṭi Sultāns, p. 575, a report from Jāwāsh Khān; entrusted the management of the affairs of the Kingdom to Basant Rāy, p. 576; pride and death of Basant Rāy; message by Sadr Khān and Afdal Khān about the removal of Naqd-ul-mulk, p. 577; false report of Muhāfīs Khān against Iqbal Khān and Mukhtāṣ Khān which incited him to issue an order for their execution, p. 578; Mukhtāṣ Khān and Iqbal Khān escaped the deceitful attempt of Muhāfīs Khān, p. 579; sat on the throne and sent Afdal Khān and Jāwāsh Khān to put down Mukhtāṣ Khān and Iqbal Khān; death of Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 580; title of Hūshang Shāh for the adopted son of Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn; sent Niẓām Khān to reinforce Dastūr Khān; flight of Hūshang in the hills of Baḥār Bāhā Ḥāji; petitions from Iqbal Khān and Mukhtāṣ Khān about the wickedness of Muhāfīs Khān, p. 581; statements of his servants about the evil aims of Muhāfīs Khān; on the order of punishment Muhāfīs Khān revolted against him and attempted to seize him; fled to the town of Ujjain; Muhāfīs Khān placed Shāhzāda Šāhīb Khān on the throne, p. 582; contracts of Šāhīb Khān with Sadr and Afdal Khān; rise of Šāhīb Khān; his victory over Šāhīb Khān, p. 583; advanced towards Shādīlābād, p. 584; fought with and defeated Šāhīb Khān; sent a message to Šāhīb Khān for settlement, p. 585; refusal by Šāhīb Khān of his peace offer; defeat and flight of Šāhīb Khān; promise of Sultan Muẓaffar to Šāhīb Khān, p. 586; evil aims and actions of Médina Rāy which promoted rebellion; ordered the execution of Afdal Khān and Iqbal Khān; rebellion of Sikandar Khān, p. 587; entrusted the office of the madīnāt to Médina Rāy; wrote to Mansūr Khān to put down Sikandar Khān; Mansūr Khān and Sanjar
accepted the request of Médini Rây; disobedience of Sâlbâhân, p. 598; had a consultation for the execution of Médini Rây and Sâlbâhân; combat with the Râjpûts, p. 599; suppression of the tumult; his conclusion from the message of Médini Rây; being fed up with the Râjpûts fled to Sultân Muẓaffar Gujrâti, p. 600; the efforts of Sultân Muẓaffar brought him again to Mâlwa putting the enemies to death, p. 602; retreat of Rânâ Sâṅkâ, p. 604; invited Sultân Muẓaffar to come to the fort of Shâdîâbâd; departure of Sultân Muẓaffar; summoned his amirs, sardars and soldiers; advanced to attack Hâmkaran in the fort of Kâkrûn, p. 605; his defeat in the fight with Rânâ Sâṅkâ and the latter’s kindness to him, p. 606; retirement of the Gujrâtî troops from Mâlwa; the whole of his territory was occupied by his enemies, p. 608; a portion of Mâlwa under the possession of Rânâ Sâṅkâ; ended the violence of Silhâdî; returned to Mandû; submission of Silhâdî, p. 609; showed respect to Chând Khân; efforts of Raṣîl-ul-mulk to transfer the rule of Gujrât from Sultân Bahâdûr to Chând Khân; Ratan Sîn advanced into Mâlwa; summoned Mu’în Khân and Silhâdî to his aid; conferred a title and honour on Mu’în Khân, p. 610; gave some parganas to Silhâdî; sent Daryâ Khân to wait on Sultân Bahâdûr with a message; reply of Sultân Bahâdûr; marched from Ujjain towards Satwâs; his servants joined Sultân Bahâdûr, p. 611; invasion of Sultân Bahâdûr and the latter’s victory, p. 612; was kept in imprisonment with all his sons; attack of Rây Singh on the camp of
Åsaf Khān and Iqbal Khān; attained martyrdom, p. 614; period of reign, p. 615.

Mahmūd Turk, Malik, p. 203.

Mahram Beg, was sent to conquer Kashmīr by Mirzā Kāmrān, p. 700.

Mahta, Malik, joined Nāsir-ud-dīn, p. 558; was nominated by Nāsir-ud-dīn to crush Yakān Khān, p. 560; was sent to bring Miyān Manjha, p. 564.

Majd-ud-dīn, Khwājah, p. 124.

Majhī Khokhar, Malik, surrendered the fort of Khānawal, p. 793.

Makhdūma-i-Jahān, directed all her energies in furnishing the bed of equity and justice; administration of Nizām Shāh was entrusted to her hands, p. 86; refused to send Shāhzzāda Fath Khān for the throne of Dāud Shāh, p. 237; design of Mahmūd Shāh for the possession of her territory, p. 259.

Makna Mughal, fought with the Kishowārā army as the commander of Mirzā Haidar’s troops, p. 711.

Makta, Mīr, joined Mirzā Haidar, p. 716.

Mal, Rāy, Rāja of Idar, retired to the hills of Bijānagar; had a fight with Nizām-ul-mulk, p. 300; advanced to Idar, p. 301; the news of his raid reached Muṣaffar Shāh; his territory was destroyed by Muṣaffar Shāh, p. 306.

Malhū, Malik, defeated the army of Shujā’at Khān, p. 559.

Malik Shāh Turk, Khwājah Jahān, was given the title of Khwājah Jahān and sent to Tilang by Humāyūn Shāh; besieged the fort of Deor Konda; did not appreciate the opinion of Nizām-ul-mulk; was defeated by the Rāy of Orissa; joined Humāyūn Shāh and gave a false reason for his defeat, p. 79;

was made over to a jailor by Humāyūn Shāh, p. 80; was made over to the army of Nizām Shāh, p. 88; seized the bridle of the horse of Nizām Shāh and turned towards Bīdar, p. 89; was sent with a large army to fight with Sultan Mahmūd Khālji, p. 90; pursued Mahmūd Khālji; returned via Gondwārā; ordered the Rājas of Gondwārā to be put to death, p. 91.

Malik-ul-Mashāikh, Qādī, his son fought with Alf Khān, p. 280.

Malik-ush-sharq, p. 486; was summoned by Mahmūd Khālji, p. 502.

Malik-ut-tujjār, the son of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk, and the governor of Junīr; went with his father to Gujrat, p. 75 (and see note on p. 75).

Malik-ut-tujjār, Khwājah Jahān Khwājah Mahmūd Gīlānī, plundered the Khālji camp, p. 88; was sent by Muhammad Shāh Lashkari to conquer the territory of the Rāy of Sangsār and Kokan; was reinforced by As’ad Khān and Kishwar Khān in Kolāpūr; fought with the enemy in the vicinity of Kaikana, p. 97; seized the fort of Rangta; captured the fort of Māchal; message of submission by the Rāy of Sonkar, p. 98; conquered the island of Goa; came to the capital where he was granted the title of Ā’īm Humāyūn Khwājah Jahān, p. 99; informed Muhammad Shāh Lashkari about the disobedience of Bīrkāna Ray, p. 101; the territory of Bīrkāna Ray was entrusted to him by Muhammad Shāh, p. 102; conspiracy which resulted in his murder, p. 107; his literary qualification and work, p. 108.

Malitha, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 774.
Malkah-i-Jahān, mother of Nizām Shāh, being apprised of the treachery of Khwājah Jahān entrusted the defence of the fort of Bīdar to Mallū Khān and took Nizām Shāh with her to Fīrūzābād, p. 89 (and see note 1, p. 89), p. 535.

Malka-i-Jahān, mother of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn Māḥmūd, p. 112.

Malkh-i-Jahān, wife of Sultān Hūsain Shārgāl, instigated Sultān Hūsain for the conquest of Dīlī, p. 460; was seized by the men of Sultān Bahlūl who sent her to Sultān Hūsain; induced Sultān Hūsain to fight with Sultān Bahlūl, p. 461.

Mallū Iqbal Khān, advanced towards Jaunpūr, p. 448; on the way arrived at Kanaŭj; again advanced towards Kanaŭj; took Sultān Māḥmūd with him, p. 449; ran away from his own camp, and joined Sultān Ibrāhīm, p. 450; went to Jaunpūr and Dīlī, leaving Kanaŭj to Sultān Māḥmūd; again came to besiege Kanaŭj; returned unsuccessful to Dīlī; was slain by Khādīr Khān, p. 451.

Mallū Khān, see Mallū Khan, Qādir Shāh, Sultān of Mālwa.

Mallū Khān, brother of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādīl Khān, request to Asād Khān, p. 161; was made Sultān by Asād Khān; was arrested by Ibrāhīm ‘Ādīl Khān and blinded, p. 162.

Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, see Mallū Khān, Qādir Shāh, Sultān of Mālwa.

Mallū Khān, Qādir Shāh, Sultān of Mālwa, was appointed as the defendant of the fort of Bīdar by Mulkh-i-Jahān, pp. 89, 535; was given Sārangpūr by Sultān Bahādur, pp. 358, 616; gave protection to ‘Imād-ul-mulk, p. 386; was appointed by Nāṣir-ud-dīn to defeat Shīr Khān, p. 567; gave himself the title of Qādir Shāh; took the town of Bhusā in the vicinity of the Narbāda river into his possession; Bhūpat Rāy and Pūran Māl took possession of the fort of Rāsān; development of his power; a farmān from Shīr Khān of Bengāl, p. 617; reply to Shīr Khān; representation of Saif Khān Dehlavī; his reply to Saif Khān, p. 618; period of his occupation of Mālwa; advice of Saif Khān; his submission to Shīr Khān; in favour with Shīr Khān, p. 619; brought his family to Ujjain; his flight from Shīr Khān; period of reign, p. 620.

Mallū Qādir Khān, governor of Mālwa; fled towards Mandū, p. 374.

Mān Rāy, the Rāy of Orissa left him in the fort of Rājmāndīr; surrendered the fort to Sultān Lashkarī, p. 104.

Mandālīk, Rāy, asked pardon for his offences from Māḥmūd Shāh; the news of his pride reached Māḥmūd Shāh, who sent a strong army against him, p. 250; presented valuable ornaments and large tribute to the amirs of Māḥmūd Shāh, p. 251; his humble representation to, and the reply from Māḥmūd Shāh, p. 253; fled and retired into the fort of Jūnāgah; fight with the army of Māḥmūd Shāh; proposal of peace which was accepted; surrendered the fort of Jūnāgah and took shelter in the hills of Kānāl, p. 254; joined the service of Māḥmūd Shāh and surrendered the hills of Kānāl; his wish to become a Musalmān; was granted the title of Khān Jahān by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 255.

Mānh Khān, was sent with a message to Nāṣir-ud-dīn by Ghīyāḥ-ud-dīn, p. 556.

Mānik Dēṅ, Rāja of Jammū; was reinforced by Ādām Khān, p. 674.
Mán Singh, Rája, Yúsuf Kháñ had an interview with him, p. 756.

Mańşúr Kháñ, informed Súltán Aẖmad of the advance of Muhmúd Kháñji, p. 504; reply of Módiñ Ráy; joined Bihját Kháñ, p. 588; proclaimed Sáhib Kháñ as the Súltán, p. 592; his agent plundered the army of Muhmúd Sháh, p. 593.

Mańşúr-ul-mulk, was appointed to destroy Mándísór by Muhmúd Kháñji, p. 528.

Mańdbúl Kháñ, was sent by Muhmúd Kháñji towards the fort of Kehri, p. 536; his victory over Gházi Kháñ, p. 537; news of his revolt reached Muhmúd Kháñji, p. 540.

Mańján, Malík, was sent with presents to Súltán Bahádur of Gujrát by Náṣíb Sháh, p. 444; joined Súltán Ibráhim, p. 451.

Másśúd Kháñ, fled from Málwa and came to Aẖmad Sháh for protection, p. 222.

Másñhád, Sáiyid Mírzá-i, p. 114.

Máshir-ul-mulk; took a message from Ghíyásh-ud-dín to Náṣír-ud-dín, p. 556; was sent to arrange for peace, p. 561.

Máshir-ul-mulk, Malík, placed Sháh-záda Másśúd Kháñ on the throne of Málwa, p. 494; was given the title of Nińam-ul-mulk and the post of vazírat by Muhmúd Kháñji, p. 497; went in pursuit of the conspirators, p. 498; was sent to reconnoitre the roads, p. 505; his hostility, p. 525; was sent by Muhmúd Kháñji to the Deccan for confirmation of peace, p. 538.

Másśúd, was killed by Sháh, p. 660.

Másśúd, son of Malík Kájí, attacked Iskándár Kháñ and was slain, p. 694.

Másśúd Kháñ, Sháh-záda, was placed on the throne of Málwa by the efforts of Amíra and Sárdára, p. 494; took sanctuary with Sháikh Jálílah, p. 495; was sent by Súltán Aẖmad Gujrátí to conquer Málwa, p. 501; Súltán Aẖmad promised to recover Málwa for him next year, p. 506.

Máśúd Náyák, Khwájah, defeated Sánkar, p. 741; slew Bahádur Kháñ; seized Kháñ Zamán; bestowal of the title of Husain Kháñ on him, p. 744; his imprisonment, p. 745.

Mawádáb Kháñ, fort of Shádábád under his control, p. 583.

Módiñ Ráy, hearing of the advance of Múzaffár Sháh proceeded to Dhán; went to Ráná Sánká to beg for help; sent a letter to Ráy Pithórá giving an account of his preparations, p. 303; brought Ráná Sánká to aid Bním Káran Púrabí, p. 307; was sent to Sílahdú with a message by Ráná Sánká, p. 315; joined Muhmúd Sháh, p. 583; wounded Sáhib Kháñ, p. 585; his false representation to Muhmúd Sháh against the Amíra, p. 587; was made vazír; his reply to Mańşúr Kháñ; was sent to put down Síkandár Kháñ, p. 588; his wicked instigation of Muhmúd Sháh and its results, p. 596; his advice to the Rájpút in connection with rebellion, p. 597; his submission to Muhmúd Sháh, p. 598; was wounded by a servant of Muhmúd Sháh, p. 599; suppressed the tumult of the Rájpút; sent a petition to Muhmúd Sháh and was reappointed to his post, p. 600; went to Chítór to bring Ráná Sánká, p. 602; request to Ráná Sánká, p. 606.

Mírák Harávi, Khwájah, minister of Múrtáḍa Nińam Sháh, p. 145; was given the title of Chengí Kháñ; conquered Berár and annexed it to the territories of Múrtáḍa Nińam
Shâh; his death, p. 146 (and see note 2, p. 146).
Mrâk Mrzâ, Khân, killed Ujj Bahrâm, p. 710; joined Mrzâ Haidar, p. 716; his release, p. 722.
Mrân, Saiyid, placed the imperial crown on the head of Nanû, p. 397; possessed Dûlqa and Dandûka, p. 398.
Mrân Husain, see Husain Nișân-ul-mulk, (son of Murtada Nișân-ul-mulk).
Mrân Khân, bestowal of Sultân Sîkandar on him, p. 649.
Mrzâ Khân, nephew of Kishwar Khân, in the administration of Husain Nişân-ul-mulk; envoy of the amirs of the Deccan, p. 151; invitation to a feast; had an interview with Husain Nişân-ul-mulk and requested him to keep the sick Saiyid in the fort; imprisoned Husain Nişân-ul-mulk, p. 152; imprisoned Ankas Khân; released Ismâ'il; his flight, p. 153; his decision; proclamation; tried for peace; flight; was sentenced to death by Jamâl Khân, p. 154.
Mrzâ Khân, Jalâlpur was placed under his charge by Mahmûd Khalji, p. 541.
Miyân, Malik, was asked by 'Imâd-ul-mulk to have an interview with him, p. 265.
Miyân Bâyazîd, son of Shujâ' Khân, was entrusted with the government of Hândiyah and Râisân by Shujâ' Khân, p. 628.
Miyân Jiw, was nominated to crush Yakân Khân by Nâsir-ud-dîn, p. 560.
Miyân Manjâla, was appointed as the heir of Nâsir-ud-dîn with the title of Sultân Shihâb-ud-dîn; his residence, p. 564; his rebellion, p. 570; fought but was defeated and fled; his father's instructions, p. 571; attempted to enter Naqratâbâd, p. 574; retired despondent towards Kandâsah, p. 575; his death, p. 580.
Mu'âzam Khân, waited on Sultân Bahâdur, p. 333.
Mubârak, Jam, ruler of Sind, account of his rule, p. 777.
Mubârak Bukhâri, Mirân Saiyid, helped I'tâmûd Khân in placing Raqi-ul-mulk on the throne; was attacked by I'tâmûd Khân and slain, p. 395.
Mubârak Ghâzi, Malik; went to wait on Mahmûd Khân, p. 485; told 'Umdat-ul-mulk to inform Ghazvin Khân about the idea of Mahmûd Khân, p. 487.
Mubârak Khân, joined Nâsir-ud-dîn, p. 559; was sent to conquer the fort of Mandû, p. 563; was sent to reassure Shâh Khân, p. 565; was made over to the men of Shâh Khân, p. 566; attacked and killed Sultân Muhammed, p. 778.
Mubârak Khân, ruler of Asir, invaded the country of Baklâna but was defeated by Mahmûd Khalji, p. 527.
Mubârak Khân, son of Junaid Khân, was seized by Sultân Mahmûd Sharqi, p. 517; complained of his tyranny to Mahmûd Khalji, p. 518.
Mubârak Khân, Saiyid, took a message to Abdâl Khân, p. 752; his report to Yusuf Khân; his revolt, p. 753; after the defeat of Yusuf Khân sat on the throne; fight with Yusuf Khân; his letter to Yusuf Khân, p. 754; went to the Khângâh of Bâbâ Khalil, p. 755.
Mubârak Khân Sarwânî, released Shujâ', Khân, p. 622.
Mubârak Shâh, Mirân, helped 'Imâd-ul-mulk; fought with the Gujrât army but was defeated; rendered homage to Sultân Mahmûd, p. 386.
Mubârak Shâh, Sultân, son of Khâjûr Khân, intended to conquer Jaunpûr, p. 453; marched to aid the Ray of
Gwáliar, p. 479; agreement of peace with Sultán Húshang, p. 480.
Mubárrak Sháh Sharqi, succeeded Sul-tán-ush-Sharq, p. 448; collected an army to oppose Mallú Iqbal Káhán; both retired without an engagement to their countries; on hearing of the advance of Mallú Iqbal Káhán he again began to collect an army; his death; period of reign, p. 449.
Mubáriz Káhán 'Adalí, conferred the country of Málwa on Shujá' Káhán, p. 628.
Mubáriz-ul-mulk, Malik, was appointed to the government of Idar by Muqaffar Sháh; heard about the bravery of Ráh Sánká from a bard; gave the name of Ráh Sánká to a dog and kept it tied up at the gate of Idar, p. 307; sent an account to Muqaffar Sháh about the violence of Ráh Sánká; was condemned by the vazírs of Muqaffar Sháh, p. 308; instead of fighting with Ráh Sánká, he, according to the advice of the sarídárs came to Ahmadnagar; advice of a bard to him; his reply to the bard; his fight with Ráh Sánká in which he was wounded, p. 309; retired to Ahmadábab, p. 310; came with an army to Ahmadnagar to bury the martyrs; was attacked by the kóls and the grásáids but was victorious, p. 311; advanced to fight with Ráh Sánká, p. 316.
Mufarráh Pídar Hábehl, was sentenced to death, p. 564.
Mughíth, Malik, Káhán Jahan, decided to support Sultán Húshang; the request of Músa Káhán, p. 471; was given a title and rank by Sultán Húshang, p. 472; requested Sultán Húshang to pardon Sháhzáda 'Uthmán Káhán; kept Fatáh Káhán, 'Uthmán Káhán and Halbat Káhán in confinement under the orders of Sultán Húshang, p. 482; rendered homage to Ghazín Káhán; was given the title of Masnad-i-'Alí Káhán Jahan by Ghazín Káhán, p. 491; was nominated by Sultán Muhammad Sháh to punish the Rájpúts of Hárúti, p. 492; his reply to Mahmúd Káhán in connection with the accession to the throne of Málwa, p. 496; was given the title of Á'mám Humáyún and honour by his son Mahmúd Káháli, p. 497; requested Mahmúd Káháli to pardon the conspirators; was sent to suppress the rebels by Mahmúd Káháli, p. 499; sent wise men with advice to Ahmad Káhán; advanced to overthrow Malik Anchá, p. 500; asked the Saiyíds to describe the behaviour of Naṣrat Káhán; transferred the government of Chandéri from Naṣrat Káhán; entered the fort of Mandú, p. 501.
Mughíth Káháli, Malik, p. 238.
Mubádíz Káhán, was put to death by Ráh Khurshíd and Shujá'at Káhán, p. 562.
Mubádíz Káhán, Káhájáh Sardí, did not allow Shiháb-ud-dín to enter the gates of Naṣratábab, p. 574; his report to Mahmúd Sháh against the amírs, p. 578; instigated Mahmúd Sháh to seize Mukhtáṣ Káhán and Iqbal Káhán, p. 579; was given a rank and title, p. 580; his victorious revolt; placed Sháhzáda Sáhib Káhán on the throne of Mahmúd Sháh, p. 582; his flight from Shahráli, p. 584; his defeat and flight, p. 586; his fatal defeat, p. 594.
Mubádíz Káhán Jadíd, was sentenced to death, p. 564.
Muhammad, son of Sultán Hasan, his education was entrusted to Malik Yári Bhat, p. 680.
Muḥammad, Malik, son of Ahmad Šīlāḡ, was summoned by Maḥmūd Ḫaljī, p. 502.

Muḥammad, Qādī, went as an ambas-
sador to Sulṭān Muẓaffar Gujrātī; his
description of the palaces of the
Sulṭāns of Gujrāt, p. 797.

Muḥammad, Saiyid, was honoured by
Sulṭān Sikandar, p. 647.

Muḥammad, Saiyid, Qoṭb-i-‘Alam,
Sulṭān Qoṭb-ud-dīn went to see
him, p. 234; said to Sulṭān Qoṭb-ud-
dīn that the dynasty of Muẓaffar
Shāh would be maintained by his
younger brother, p. 235.

Muḥammad, Saiyid, son of Saiyid
Ḥasan, guarded Muḥammad Shāh,
p. 683; his fortifications, p. 686;
joined Fatḥ Ǧān, p. 689.

Muḥammad, Sulṭān, was left in the
fort of Sāw by Shāh Bēg; was killed
by Muḥārak Ǧān, p. 778.

Muḥammad Atka, Mīr, celebrated
Ǧān Kalān; was sent by Khaḍīfa-i-
Ǧāhilī to conquer Sīrōhī, p. 413.

Muḥammad Bāḵẖā, Malik, was given
the title of Ghażī Ḫān by Maḥmūd Shāh and was sent in attendance on Aẓam Ḥumayūn,
p. 285; left Burhānpūr and took his
residence in Thālnīr; fled, p. 286;
was slain, p. 287.

Muḥammad Bāqī, Mīrzā, ruler of
Sīnīd, account of his reign, p. 785.

Muḥammad Bhat, incited Yūsuf to
rebel against Ḥusain Ḫān, p. 747;
his imprisonment, p. 750; brought
Lōhār to the presence of Yūsuf
Ḵān, p. 757.

Muḥammad Chak, son of Kājī Chak;
his death, p. 710.

Muḥammad Farkhān, Shaiḵ, brought
a message from Sulṭān Bahīlū Lūdī to Maḥmūd Ḫaljī, p. 542.

Muḥammad Ghūḏ-darāz, Amīr Saiyyad,
a great Sūfī of the time, and the
disciple of Shaikh Naṣīr-ud-dīnMuḥammad Dāḏū, came from Delhi; Sulṭān Fīrūz Shāh wel-
comed him; his holiness the Saiyyad
settled down at Gulbarga, p. 37;
the Saiyyad informed Fīrūz Shāh
that Ǧān Ḥānīn Shāhīzāda Ahmad
Ǧān was destined to succeed him
instead of his son Ḥasan Ǧān,
p. 38.

Muḥammad Ḥaidar, his flight, p. 734.

Muḥammad Hārūn, advanced towards
Mekrān, p. 761; sent the letter of
Ḥajjaj to Rāy Dāhīr, p. 763.

Muḥammad Ǧān, was directed to
obey Shāhī Ǧān, p. 650; was made
a councillor by Sulṭān Zain-ul-
ʿābidin, p. 652; was appointed as
the successor of Sulṭān Zain-ul-
ʿābidin, p. 660; was made the com-
mander of a detachment, p. 696;
his representation to Mīrāḏ Kāmrān,
p. 700; his imprisonment, p. 757; was
seized and punished, p. 758.

Muḥammad Ǧān, son of Shīr Ǧān
Fūlādī, came into the city of Aḥ-
madābād and offered congratulations
to the murderers of Chengiz Ǧān,
p. 409; governed Bangāla for a time;
his son gave himself the title of
Sulṭān Bahādūr and ruled there,
p. 445.

Muḥammad Ǧān, son of Sulṭān Aḥmad
Dakīnī, was made over to Shāhīzāda
ʿAlā-ud-dīn by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 48
(and see note 2 on p. 48); was sent
by Sulṭān ʿAla-ud-dīn to conquer Bījānagar, p. 58 (and see
note 1 on p. 58); put the innocent
Malik ʿImād-ul-mulk to death; was
defeated by ʿAla-ud-dīn; fled in
disgrace, p. 59; received farmān of
ʿAla-ud-dīn; went to Rājūr and
retired there, p. 60.

Muḥammad Ǧān, son of ʿAḍīl Ǧān,
the ruler of Aṣīr and Burhānpūr, was
reinforced by 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwili, p. 135.
Muḥammad Khān, Saiyid, rendered tribute to Maḥmūd Khalji, p. 520.
Muḥammad Khān, Shāhzāda, was appointed by Ahmad Shāh to inquire about the act of plundering of Kānhā; defeated the Dakini troops, p. 213; advanced towards Daulatbād to give battle; fought with Sultan 'Alā-ud-dīn and defeated him; returned from Daulatbād and halted in the town of Nadarbār from where he informed his father and received his directions, p. 214; received a special favour from Ahmad Shāh; sent a representation to Ahmad Shāh, p. 217.
Muḥammad Khān, Shāhzāda, son of Sultan Ahmad Gujrātī; his advancement towards Sārangpūr, p. 503; left Sārangpūr for Ujjain, p. 504.
Muḥammad Khān Asīrī, waited upon Sultan Bahādur at Sambla, p. 351; was posted to the west of the battery of Shāhpūr, p. 353; was sent by Sultan Bahādur for the chastisement of Bhūpat and Rānā, p. 362; arrived in the vicinity of Kahrār and informed Sultan Bahādur about the enemy in that place, p. 363; was appointed to capture the fort of Kākrūn by Sultan Bahādur, p. 367.
Muḥammad Khān Chak, seized Lōhar Chak; went to Haidar Khān, p. 750; slew Islām Khān, p. 751; was slain, p. 753.
Muḥammad Khān Mākri, went with a message of Saiyid Mubārak Khān to Yūsuf Khān, p. 754; joined the enemies of Mubārak Khān, p. 755.
Muḥammad Khān Mākri, son of Abūl Mākri, his marriage, p. 721; was granted a fief by Husain Khān; his plans against Husain Khān, p. 741; his imprisonment, p. 742; was blinded, p. 744.
Muḥammad Khān Qandahārī, Shāh; was sent to conquer Mālwa by Akbar, p. 631.
Muḥammad Lārī Khwāja, author of Sirāj-ut-Tawārīkh, p. 4.
Muḥammad Mākri, fought with Kīshwārī army as the commander of Mīrzā Hāidar’s troop, p. 711; was slain with his son, p. 712.
Muḥammad Naṣr, Rājaurī was made over to him by Mīrzā Hāidar, p. 712; his imprisonment, p. 715; his release, p. 722.
Muḥammad Qāsim, 'Imād-ud-dīn, was sent to conquer Sind, p. 764; his victories, p. 765; defeated Bahāhrā; p. 766; his fight with Rāy Dāhir, p. 767; conquest of Rāwar, p. 770; account of his death, p. 771.
Muḥammad Qāsim Būdūh, Shāikh, was requested by Muẓaffar Shāh to pray for the victory of Islām, p. 187.
Muḥammad Qull Qūṭb-ul-mulk; his succession to the throne; fell in love with a prostitute; laid the foundation of Bhāṣ nagar; his period of reign, p. 171.
Muḥammad Rūmī, p. 718.
Muḥammad Ṣadūr, was killed by Hāidar Chak, p. 736.
Muḥammad Šāliḥ 'Āqil, went as an ambassador to Yūsuf Khān, p. 758.
Muḥammad Sāmarqandī, Maulānā, p. 259; narrated his story to Maḥmūd Shāh of having been looted; was treated kindly, sent to Ahmadābad, and helped financially by Maḥmūd Shāh; was assured and consoled by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 260; was sent for by the order of Maḥmūd Shāh from Ahmadābad, p. 262.
Muḥammad Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, ascended the throne of Dakin;
gave himself the title of Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari, enlisted a thousand Turki slaves among his servants; granted, p. 93, Kāwil to 'Imād-ul-mulk, Junīr to Niẓām-ul-mulk, and Māhūr to Khudāwānd Khān as Jāḡrā, p. 94; appointed Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk to conquer the fort of Kehria, p. 95; sent Malik-ut-tujjār to conquer the territory of the Rāy of Sonkar and Kakan, p. 97; Rāy of Sonkar surrendered the fort of Kaikānī to Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 98; conferred the title of Aʿẓam Humāyūn Khwājah Jahan on Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 99; sent 'Ādil Khān to capture the fort of Būrāk; conferred that territory on 'Ādil Khān as Jāḡrā, p. 100; Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahan reported about the rebellion of BirkāNA Rāy; besieged the fort of Birkāna, p. 101; the Rāy offered allegiance, excused the Rāy; entrusted the country of the Rāy to Khwājah Jahan and returned to the capital; the Rāy of Orissa, p. 102, plundered and devastated part of the Deccan and retired to his country; sent Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk to punish the Rāy of Orissa; instead of going, p. 103, towards Orissa Niẓām-ul-mulk went towards Zīrbād; marched and arrived near Rājmundri; left Khwājah Jahan in attendance on the Shāhzāda went to Rājmundri; arrived on the bank of the river; nominated Daryā Khān to pursue the Rāy of Orissa; encamped around the fort of Rājmundri; Rāy Mān asked for protection and surrendered the fort; confirmed Rāy Mān in the possession of the fort and its neighbourhood; returned to the capital, p. 104; started for Tīlang; besieged the fort of Kandār; thānādār of Kandār became loyal and surrendered the fort; advanced to the ports of Narsingh Rāy; took tribute from the Rāy and retired to his capital; ordered erection of a fort for thānādārs; vazir reported about Khānjī, p. 105; arrived at Khānjī; the soldiers ravaged Khānjī; returned to the capital; heard a rumor against Khwājah Jahan, p. 106; the enemies of Khwājah Jahan proved the rumor by a forged letter; without asking explanation the Khwājah was put to death, p. 107; fell ill and died; period of reign, p. 109.

Muḥammad Shāh, son of Hūshang Shāh Ghūrī, Sultān of Māwā, helped Naṣīr in besieging the fort of Tālūr, p. 198; on the arrival of Ahmad Shāh's army retired to his country, p. 199; killed the elephant of Ahmad Shāh's army, p. 200; treatment of his brother, p. 481; was declared as the heir of Sultān Hūshang, p. 483; sent a message to Mahmūd Khān, p. 484; having heard about the intention of the amīr, sent another message to Mahmūd Khān, p. 485; fled to Kākūn; sent a message to Mahmūd Khān; wrote a letter to Malik Mughīth, p. 488; enshrouded the corpse of Sultān Hūshang by the order of Mahmūd Khān and was proclaimed as the successor of Sultān Hūshang; confirmation of his accession, p. 490; succeeded his father by the exertions of Malik Mughīth and Mahmūd Khān and received the title of Muḥammād Shāh; conferred the title of Masnad-i-Āl Khān Jahan on, p. 491, Malik Mughīth and kept him in the rank of vazir; shed much unrighteous blood which caused the downfall of his empire; the Rājpūts revolted against him; nominated Khān Jahan to punish the
Râjpûts, p. 492; had a conversation with Mahmûd Khân about the conspiracy of which he had heard, p. 493; he was killed by being poisoned, p. 494.

Muhammad Shâh, Ghiyâs-ud-dunyâ-wad-din, Gujrâtî, succeeded his father; description of the day of coronation; known as Zar-bakhsh; had a son born to him, p. 223; advanced to Êdar to devastate it; Rây Har offered his daughter in the shape of tribute; gave the fort of Êdar to Har Rây; advanced towards Bâkur; Ganâsâ, the Râja of Dûngarpûr, did homage to the Sulûân; returned to Ahmadâbâd, p. 224; advanced to conquer the fort of Châmpanûr; Rây Kank Dâs fought with the Sulûân but fled and re-entered the fort, p. 225; retired towards Ahmadâbâd; stopped in Kothrâh; collected re-inforcements; death; period of reign; title after death, p. 226.

Muhammad Shâh, Mirân, ruler of Asir and Burhânpûr, p. 381; according to the wish of Sulûân Bahâdur, Mirân Muhammad Shâh was selected as the Sulûân, p. 382; the Khânâ was read and the Sîkka was struck in his name in his absence; died of natural death, p. 383.

Muhammad Shâh, Mirân, son of Mirân Mubârak Shâh, advanced to defeat Chengiz Khân, p. 402; pursued Chengiz Khân as far as Nadâbâr, p. 403; advanced to conquer the kingdom of Gujrât but was defeated by Chengiz Khân, p. 405.

Muhammad Shâh, Sulûân, son of 'Alâ-ud-din Hasan Shâh, succeeded his father; assumed the title of Sulûân Muhammad Shâh, p. 11; advanced towards Bilâmpatân; seized and annexed many villages and towns, p. 13; the Rây of Bilâmpatân shut the gates of the fort; conquest of the fort of Bilâmpatân; returned to Gulbarga, p. 14; news of the rapid advance of and seizure of the Rây of Bijnâ Nagar, p. 15; advanced to punish the Rây of Bijnâ Nagar; the Rây fled and took shelter in a fort; besieged the fort; fought with the Rây; and he returned after success to Gulbarga; the rebellion of Bhrâm Khân and Govind Rây, p. 16, brought him to Deogarh; Bhrâm Khân and Govind Rây went to Shaikh Rukn-ud-din, p. 17; visited Rukn-ud-din at Daulatâbâd; excused Bhrâm Khân and Govind Rây on the recommendation of Rukn-ud-din; Bhrâm Khân and Govind Rây went away to Gujrât; made arrangements at Deogarh; returned to Gulbarga; pleased his subjects; account of death, p. 18; period of reign, p. 19; and see note 2, p. 18.

Muhammad Shâh, Sulûân, (grandson of Bahman Shâh), succeeded Dâd Khân, p. 22; the thânâdar, p. 23, of the fort of Sâghir rebelled against him; marched against the thânâdar and defeated him; his death; period of reign, p. 24.

Muhammad Shâh, Sulûân, son of Sulûân Hasan Shâh, Sulûân of Kashmîr, attained to sovereignty; disputes between the Saiyids and the Kashmiris, p. 682; banished Saiyid 'Ali Khân and other Saiyids from Kashmir; efforts of Fath Khân to regain his ancestral dominions, p. 686; fight with Fath Khân and the latter's defeat; invasions of Fath Khân, p. 687; was imprisoned by Fath Khân; period of reign; treatment of Fath Khân, p. 689; was released and escaped,
Index.

p. 690; defeated Fatḥ Shāh and ascended the throne of Kashmir for the second time; his vazīr; his successor; not being able to oppose Fatḥ Shāh, took to flight, p. 691; period of his reign for the second time; attacked Fatḥ Shāh and defeated him; his accession for the third time, p. 692; order for the executions of the amīrs of Fatḥ Shāh; order for the corpse of Fatḥ Shāh, p. 693; skirmishes with Iskandar Kẖān; turned against Malik Kājī, p. 694; entrusted the post of vazīrat to Malik Kājī; blinded Iskandar Kẖān; his imprisonment, p. 695; period of his reign for the third time, p. 696; his accession to the throne of Kashmir for the fourth time, p. 699; agreement of peace with Kāshgharīs, p. 704; his death; period of reign, p. 705.

Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari, see Muḥammad Shāh (son of Humāyūn Shāh).

Muḥammad Tughlaq Shāh, Sulṭān, various kinds of disturbances in his kingdom and their causes, p. 1; rebellion of amīr Sadhā; advanced towards Gujrat in order to suppress the rebellion; sent Malik Lājin to summon the amīrs of hundreds of Daulatābād; amīrs of hundreds slew Malik Lājin and seized all the property of Dārāgarh, p. 2; could not suppress ‘Ālā-ud-din; died 796 A.H. in the neighbourhood of Thatha, pp. 3, 177; hearing the news of the sovereignty of Ismā’il Fatḥ marched from Bahūrj to put him down; fought with the rebels and defeated them; halted at Dārāgarh; nominated ‘Imād-ud-mulk for overthrowing Hasan; left some amīrs for protecting the fort of Dārāgarh; marched towards Guj-
p. 229; was unable to defeat Rānā Kūmhā; asked help from Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khājī, p. 230.

Mujāhid Khān, son of Khudāwand Khān, in concert with Shāhib Khān he murdered Qaṣar Khān, p. 270; fled with his family, p. 271.

Mujāhid Shāh, son of Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, succeeded his father; attitude towards his subjects; marched towards Bījānagar, p. 19; age of his accession, p. 19, n. 1; plundered portion of Bījānagar; Kishān Rāy, p. 20, became sub- mission and surrendered the forts of Bījānagar; on the way to his kingdom plundered the rebels who were stationed on a hill; the cause of the hostility of Dāūd Khān and its result; period of reign, p. 21; difference of opinion about his reign and the real cause of enmity of Dāūd Khān, p. 21, n. 1.

Mujāhid-ul-mulk Gujrāthī, was left in the service of Aʿzām Humāyūn by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 285.

Mukhlīs, was sent to the frontier district of Bangālā by Sulṭān Fakhr-ud-dīn, p. 419.

Mukhlīs-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent by Aḥmad Shāh to punish Naṣr; captured Nādīt, p. 199; was granted Dīpālpūr Banharī by Aḥmad Shāh as jāgīr p. 205; was ordered by Aḥmad Shāh to attend on Zafar Khān with ships collected from all ports; came and waited on Zafar Khān with ships from various ports in the neighbourhood of Mahām, p. 215.

Mukhtār Khān, sent a message to Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 577; his flight from his residence, p. 579; sent the corpse of Shīhāb-ud-dīn to Shādsībād, p. 580; sent a petition to Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 581; joined Maḥ- mūd Shāh, p. 582; was sent with a large army to Chandīrī, p. 590; fled towards Chandīrī, p. 592.

Mūkūl, Rāna, the Rāja of Dilwārā, fought with Firūz Khān, p. 194; was destroyed by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 220.

Mūnṣā Baqāl, complained to Rānī Khurshid, p. 554; was slain, p. 555.

Muqbal Khān, was sent to Chāmpānīr to punish Sīhādī, p. 355.

Muqbil Khān, his flight from Mandesōr, p. 565.

Muqīm, Mīrāz, his arrival at Kashmir; insulted and tortured the Muftī who had decided the execution of Yūsuf, p. 746; his execution, p. 747.

Murtāda, Mīr, his designation; his actions, pp. 147, 148.

Murtāda Niẓām-ul-mulk; succeeded his father; Khwājah Mīrāk Harvī (of Herāt) who was his minister, p. 145, was known as Changī Khān; conquest of Changī Khān for Murtāda Niẓām-ul-mulk; death of Chengī Khān; relationship with Muṣāḥib Khān, his vakīl; actions of Muṣāḥib Khān towards the subjects and the amīrs, p. 146; death of Muṣāḥib Khān led Murtāda Niẓām Shāh to a state of madness; separated himself from the administration and retired in Bāgh-i- Bihisht; Khaḍīfa-i-Ilāhī sent Pashrā Khān to the Deccan, p. 147; interview of Asad Khān Rūmī with Pashrā Khān; Murtāda Niẓām Shāh offered his faithful services to Khāḍīfa-i-Ilāhī; rebellion of Burhān; defeat of Burhān; Burhān received imperial favours from Khāḍīfa- i-Ilāhī; Murtāda Niẓām Shāh again secluded himself in the garden in the year 996; Sālābāt Khān became the minister of Murtāda; enmity of Jāgārdār amīrs of Berār against Sālābāt Khān and its result, p. 148;
Murtada Niżām-ul-mulk became enan-
moured of a prostitute by the
name of Fattū; Ismāʿīl became the
vakīl of Niżām Shāh and put
Ṣalābat Khān in prison, p. 149;
Ismāʿīl and Fattū assumed full
power; Mirzā Khān his nāyīb made
himself the vakīl of Murtada; re-
leased his son Mirzā Husain, p. 150;
death of Murtada and the period of
his reign, p. 151.

Murtada Shārwarānī, Saiyid, a friend of
Mirzā Khān; his action in a feast;
settlement with Mirzā Khān, p. 152;
his duties in the fort, p. 153; his
decision; his proclamation; was put
to death, p. 154.

Mūsā, Maulānā, p. 202; his request to
Aḥmad Shāh not to fight with
Sultaṅ Ḥūshang, p. 203.

Mūsā, Ḥādi, brought Lōhar in the
presence of Yūsuf Khān, p. 757.

Mūsā Khān, was made leader by the
people of Mālwa, p. 187; was made
the chief of the Mālwa army, p. 470;
his disappointment and message
to Malik Mughalī, p. 471; evacuated
the fort of Dāhār, p. 472.

Mūsā Khān Fūlādā, joined Sultaṅ
Aḥmad, p. 395; the district of Pattan
as far as Kārī came into his posses-
sion, p. 398; defeated Iʿtmād
Khān, p. 400.

Mūsā Zīnā, Ḫādī Zīnā was buried in his
mausoleum, p. 725.

Muṣḥib Khān, his reajity; his relations
with Murtada Niżām Shāh; his rank;
his attitude towards the common
people and the amīrs, p. 146; his
attacks on the amīrs of Berār; his
death, p. 147.

Muṣṭafā, Malik, son of Shujaʿ Khān,
estoوال of the title of Shujaʿ Khān
on him, p. 628; was defeated by Bāz
Bahādūr, p. 629.

Muṣṭafā Khān, was put to death, p. 166
(and see ii. 1, p. 171).

Muṣṭafā Rūmī, p. 347; he, with his
men, was receiued with favour by
Sultaṅ Bahādūr, p. 348.

Muwāṣiṣ Khān, joined Nāṣir-ud-dīn,
p. 562; was sent to conquer the fort
of Mandū, p. 563.

Muẓaffar, Sultaṅ of Gujrāt, was raised
to the throne, p. 297; distribution of
jāğırs among the amīrs of Gujrāt,
p. 398; attitude of Iʿtmād Khān
towards the Sultaṅ and his activi-
ties in administration; mutiny
of the amīrs, p. 399; went and took
up his abode in his own palace,
p. 410; went to Ulugh Khān at
Ghiyāspūr; a letter from Iʿtmād
Khān to Shēr Khān about the Sultaṅ,
p. 412; Saiyid Ḥāmid rendered
homage to the Sultaṅ, p. 413; period
of reign, p. 414.

Muẓaffar Ibrāhīm, Malik, Malik-ush-
sharq, Chandīrī was allotted to him
in fief by Mahmūd Khaḷījī, p. 507;
defeated Malik Kālū; seized the
inhabitants of Rāṭah; advanced
towards Barhār, p. 518.

Muẓaffar Khān, his attack on the army
of Sultaṅ Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 524.

Muẓaffar Khān, Shāhzāda, came from
the town of Barīdā and obtained
seven lakhs of tankas towards the
expenses of ʿAzam Humāyūn from
his father, p. 288; was summoned by
Mahmūd Shāh, p. 290.

Muẓaffar Shāh, Sultaṅ, Gujrāt, suc-
ceeded his father; sent the body of
his father to the tomb of Shaikh
Aḥmad Khāṭṭū; distributed wealth
among the deserving; conferred
honours and titles upon the amīrs,
p. 292; appointed Malik Rashīd-ul-
mulk to the post of vaẓīr; sent the
amīrs and vaẓīr to welcome Yaḏgār
Bīg Qażībāsh; favours shown to
Qazlbâashes; changed the name of Muḥammadābâd into Daulatābâd; sent Muḥāfiz Kháん to receive Šâhib Kháñ, p. 293; entertained Šâhib Kháñ at Barōda; ordered Qaisâr Kháñ to submit an account of the ruler of Mâlwa; expressed his wish to Šâhib Kháñ to recover anyhow the kingdom of Mâlwa from Sultân Maḥmûd Khájlî and make it over to him, p. 294; intended to punish the Râjpûts who were creating disturbances; went to Ahmadâbâd p. 295; advanced to Kôdrhârah and collected his troops there; hearing of the defeat of ‘A’in-ul-mulk advanced towards İdar; sent an army to plunder Mahrâsa; devastated İdar, p. 296; granted the request of the Râja of İdar; returned to Kôdrhârah; bestowed the presents of the Râja of İdar on ‘A’in-ul-mulk; sent Shâhzâda Sikandar Kháñ to Muḥammadâbâd as an acting governor; ordered Qaisâr Kháñ to possess Dahûd as far as the village of Dêvîla, p. 297; advanced towards Dhârâgarh; gave assurance of safety to Harkhûkhâ; did not allow his amîrs to attack the kingdom of Sultân Maḥmûd when the latter had gone to put down the amîrs of Chandîrî, p. 298; proceeded to Dhâr; visited the tombs of Shâlkâs; the destruction of Pûrahâbas by Niẓâm-ul-mulk greatly annoyed him; marched towards Gujrât, p. 299; appointed Niẓâm-ul-mulk to recover the country of İdar and make it over to Bihâr Mâl; proceeded towards Ahmadnagar; went to Pâtân leaving the title-holders to guard the camp; sent Bihâr Mâl with Niẓâm-ul-mulk; ordered Niẓâm-ul-mulk not to prolong the war after recovering İdar, p. 300; celebration of the marriages of Shâhzâdas; advanced to visit İdar; after hearing of the murder of Zahr-ul-mulk by Rây Mâl sent famân to Malik Naqrat-ul-mulk to invade and devastate the country as far as Bîjânâgar, p. 301; representation from dârâghâ of Dâhûd about the arrival of Sultân Maḥmûd Khájlî; sent precious gifts to and welcomed Sultân Maḥmûd as a bâdshâh, p. 302; advanced into Mâlwa; fought with the Râjpûts near Mandû; besieged Mandû; a message from Rây Pîthôrâ to the Sultân, p. 303; agreed to the request of Rây Pîthôrâ; victorious fight with the Râjpûts of Mandû; general massacre in the fort of Mandû, p. 304; bestowed the fort of Mandû on Sultân Maḥmûd; advanced to meet Rânân Sânkâ; accepted the invitation of Sultân Maḥmûd and went to Mandû with the Shâhzâdas, p. 305; visited the palaces and buildings of Mâlwa; went back to Dhâr; leaving Âsaf Kháñ Gujrâtî started for Gujrât; advanced towards İdar to punish Rây Mâl and other disturbers; destroyed the territory of Rây Mâl; came back to Muḥammadâbâd Châmpânîr, p. 306; went to İdar for enjoyment; entrusted the government of İdar to Malik Mubâriz-ul-mulk, p. 307; went to Châmpânîr leaving Qiwârm-ul-mulk at Ahmadâbâd for the control of grâssias, p. 308; after hearing of the ferocious activities of Rânân Sânkâ appointed ‘Imâd-ul-mulk and Qaisâr Kháñ to crush him, p. 311; instructions to ‘Imâd-ul-mulk and Qaisâr Kháñ in connection with their march towards Chitôr; wanted to march to Chitôr but postponed it at the advice of Malik Ayâz Sultânî; arrived at Ahmadnagar, p. 312; sent Malik
Ayáz and Qawâm-ul-mulk to chastise Rānā Sánkā; sent Tāj Ḿān and Nizām-ul-mulk Sulṭān to reinforce the Gujrāt army, p. 313; detailed accounts of the chastisement of Rānā Sánkā, pp. 313-316; advice of Malik Ayáz to Rānā Sánkā; came to Aḥmadābād to advance towards Chitār, p. 317; forgave the offences of Rānā Sánkā; present of Rānā Sánkā to the Sulṭān; spent some days in Jhālāwār and went to Aḥmadābād; bidding farewell to the son of Rānā Sánkā went to Kapar-bhanj; grieved at the death of Malik Ayáz and conferred a Jāḏir on his eldest son; rode out from Chāmpānīr to chastise some rebels, p. 318; halted between the towns of Mahrāsa and Harsēl; rebuilt the fort of Mahrāsa and returned towards Aḥmadābād; excessive sadness on the death of a member of his harem; went to Chāmpānīr to refresh himself; request of Ḵānān Ḿān to the Sulṭān and, p. 319, its fulfilment; went through Chāmpānīr to Idar; delay in fulfilling the expectations of Shāhīzāda Bahādur Ḿān, p. 320; going round his dependencies Shāhīzāda Bahādur Ḿān went towards Delhi; arrival of Bābar Bādshāh to conquer India; fight of Bahādur Ḿān with the Maghūls, p. 321; hearing of the arrival of Bābar Bādshāh and departure of Shāhīzāda Bahādur Ḿān became sorrowful; ordered Ḥudāwānd Ḿān to summon Shāhīzāda Bahādur Ḿān; famine in Gujrāt; fell ill, p. 322; hearing of the division of the army enquired about the arrival of Shāhīzāda Bahādur Ḿān; called Sikandar Ḿān to his presence and gave him some advice; died; period of reign, p. 323.

Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshī, Sulṭān of Bangālā, how he ascended the throne, p. 441 (and see n. 1, p. 441); his nature; how he was murdered; period of reign, p. 442.

N

Najm-ud-dīn Qārān Gīlānī, Khwājah, was entrusted with the duties of vāṣīr by Humāyūn Shāh; was given the title of Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 77.

Na’mat-ul-lah, Khwājah, was given the title of Saif Ḿān by Mahmūd Ḵāljī, p. 529.

Na’mat-ul-lah, Saiyid, Shāh Ḥabib-ul-lah’s great ancestor, p. 84.

Na’amat-ul-lah Tabrīzī, Khwājah, was sent by Bahādur to ask pardon of the latter’s offences from Mahmūd Shāh, p. 121; wrote to Bahādur about the acceptance of his prayer by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 122; was sent by Bahādur with a petition to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 123; made a representation to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 124.

Naqīd-ul-mulk, his flight, p. 577; was expelled by the amīrā, p. 578.

Narsingh Rāy, one of the associates of Ahmad Shāh, p. 61; informed Ahmad Shāh about the invasion of Sulṭān Hūshang; summoned Hūshang to his aid when Ahmad Shāh had besieged the fort of Kehrla; agreed to pay Hūshang his daily expenses, p. 52; paid tribute to Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari, p. 105.

Naṣīb Shāh, Sulṭān of Bangālā, succeeded his father; bestowed jāḏir on the amīrā of Afḡān and on Sulṭān Mahmūd; prayed for the hand of the daughter of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm for himself; sent beautiful presents to Sulṭān Bahādur of Gujrāt, p. 444;

Naṣīr, son of ʿAdil Khān, see ʿAdil Khān, ruler of Asf and Burhānpūr.

Naṣīr, Saiyid, at the call of Sultān Ḥasan he was coming to help but died on the way near the valley of Pīr Punjāl, p. 681.

Naṣīr the slave, ruler of Bangladesh, after the death of Sultān Ṭāhmad sat on the throne; was put to death; period of reign, p. 434 (and see note 5, p. 434).

Naṣīr Khān, (ruler of Asf), accepted the proposal of Ṭāhmad Shāh for the marriage of Shāhzhāda ʿAlāʾ-ud-dīn with his own daughter, p. 45; raiding a part of the territory of the Dakhāl Kingdom, p. 57; was opposed by Malik-ut-tujjār and went back to Asf; his death, p. 58; his possession of parts of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, p. 196; took possession of the fort of Tālnār; invaded the country of Sultānpūr, p. 198; prepared to defend himself in the fort of Tālnār; requested Ahmad Shāh to excuse his offences; was given the title of Naṣīr Khān by Ahmad Shāh, p. 199; gave shelter to Kānūn in his kingdom, p. 213; joined Sultān ʿAlāʾ-ud-dīn; fled to the hills of Kuldān, p. 214.

Naṣīr Khān, brother of Sultān Muṣaffar Gujratī, was left in the fort of Dhār by Sultān Muṣaffar Gujratī; his treatment of the raʾiṣats and the attack of Mālwa army, p. 469; different views about his name, p. 469, n. 4.

Naṣīr Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, attacked Natū Khān, p. 621; fought against Shujāʾ Khān but was defeated and fled, p. 622.

Naṣīr Khān, Sultān of Gujrat, Bahāʾ-ud-dīn mulk placed Naṣīr Khān on the throne and gave him the title of Sultān Maḥmūd; amīrs of Gujrat offered congratulations; ʿImād-ul-mulk comforted the amīrs, p. 328; arrival of Bahādur Shāh in Gujrat and the defence of ʿImād-ul-mulk, pp. 329-332; period of reign, p. 333.

Naṣīr Khān Jahān, son of Ḥādir Khān, on account of his cruel and high-handed actions, p. 453, requested Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī to save his dominion from the attack of Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, p. 455; waited on Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī at Chandīrī, p. 456.

Naṣīr Kiyānī, went to conquer Tibet, p. 738.

Naṣīr Rāja, Malik, see Adil Khān, ruler of Asf and Burhānpūr.

Naṣīr Shāh, son of ʿAbd-ul-qādir, news of his oppression reached Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 511; submitted a representation to Maḥmūd Khaljī and was pardoned by the latter, p. 512; a message regarding his unorthodox views reached Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 515; was expelled by Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī from Kālīpī; his request to Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 516; rendered homage to Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 517; Rāṭah and Mahābah were given to him by Maḥmūd Sharqī, p. 519.

Naṣīr Shāh, Sultān of Bangladesh, the amīrs placed one of the descendants of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Bhongara on the throne and gave him the title of Naṣīr Shāh, p. 434; died; period of reign, p. 435 (and see note 1, p. 435).

Naṣīr-ud-dīn, this title was conferred on Ismāʾīl Fāṭḥ by ʿAlāʾ-ud-dīn Ḥasan Bahmani, p. 8.

Naṣīr-ud-dīn, Sultān, Sultān of Mālwa, took the kingdom from Sultān
Ghiyāth-ud-dīn; on the advance of Maḥmūd Shāh he submitted to him, p. 281; was given the title of Nāṣir Shāh by Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn and appointed as the heir of the latter, p. 544; dispute with Shujā'at Khān, p. 552; his birth, p. 553; gained favour with his father; hostility of Shujā'at Khān; supported his father; took all the affairs of the state in his own hands; an evil deed of Rānī Khūrshid and its result, p. 554; withdrew his hands from the duties of the ezafrāt; Rānī Khūrshid and Shujā'at Khān took over the management of the affairs of the government of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn; an order of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn to seize the murderers of Mūnjā Bagāl, p. 555; a message of his father; attended his father; left his father and went towards Dhār, p. 556; sent a petition to his father; order of Rānī Khūrshid for his destruction; amazement of the army, p. 557; encamped in the town of Thahmah; amāra of the Ghiyāth Shāhī states joined him; moved to the town of Rājāwiyah; raised the royal umbrella over his head, p. 558; sent Malik Malhū to chastise the troops of Shujā'at Khān; was reinforced by the amāra; hearing of his strong position Ghiyāth-ud-dīn sent ambassadors to him; his reply to Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, p. 559; his victories over the troops of Shādiābād, p. 560; failure of Shujā'at Khān and Rānī Khūrshid in their evil attempt; fight between Shujā'at Khān and the effort of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn for peace, p. 561; his disputes with Shujā'at Khān and their result, p. 562; sat on the throne of the empire; made over Shujā'at Khān and Rānī Khūrshid to custodians; appointed his heir; his general announcement as the Sultān and punishment of the enemies; was allowed to do homage to his father; was recognized as Sultān by his father, p. 564; concentration of the enemies under Shēr Khān; hostility of Shēr Khān, p. 565; aggrieved on the death of his father, p. 566; suppressed the disturbance caused by Shēr Khān; instigation of Shāhjāzādas prompted Shēr Khān to rebellion which caused the latter's death, p. 567; imprisoned Shāh Hābh-ul-lah; occupied himself with pleasure and drinking; an example of his immorality; erection of a palace in Bāgh Fīrūz, p. 569; built a lofty and noble palace in Agar; having chastised the rebels returned to his capital; accepted tribute from the Zamīndārs of Chitūr; sent Iqbāl Khān Khwājah Jahān to Asīr and Burhānpūr; rebellion of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 570; unfavourable reply of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn to his father, p. 571; removed Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn and made A'ẓam Humāyūn his heir; various diseases attacked him; his counsels and precepts to the amāra and Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 572; his death and period of reign, p. 573.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn 'Aḍl-ul-qaḍīr, Sultān, see Nāṣir-ud-dīn, Sultān, Maḥmūd of Mālwa.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn 'Aḍl-ud-daula, was directed to command the force by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 200.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn 'Arab, Saiyid, was sent by Aḥmad Shāh to Karbala to open out a stream; was insulted by Shēr Malik, p. 43.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn Dābir, Malik, his treachery with Maḥmūd Khālji, p. 498; was pardoned by Maḥmūd Khālji;
was given the title of Nasrat Khan and a sieve by Mahmud Khalji; his rebellion against Mahmud Khalji, p. 499; was relieved of the government of Chandrari, p. 501.

Nasr-ud-din Muhammad Daud, Shaikh, p. 37.

Nasrat Chak, opinion of Ghazi Khan, p. 729; his imprisonment, p. 731; his release; went to Khan Khannan Bahrn Khan, p. 736.

Nasrat Khan, his plans against Husain Khan, p. 741; his imprisonment, p. 742; was blinded, p. 744.

Nasrat Khan, brother of Muazzafar Shah, was placed in charge of the government of Malwa by Muazzafar Shah, p. 186; his harsh treatment of the ru'iya; rebellion against him; was rescued by Khwaja Zalzal and was sent to Gujrat, p. 187.

Nasrat Khan, son of Iqbal Khan, went to bring Shihab-ud-din, p. 580.

Nasrat-ul-mulk, Malik, was left in the service of A'zam Humayin by Mahmud Shah, p. 285; was sent to Idar; was ordered by Muazzafar Shah to devastate as far as Bijanagar, p. 301; advanced to give battle to Ray Mal, p. 306; was brought to Ahmadabad by Muazzafar Shah, p. 307; was slain, p. 327.

Nasr-ul-lah Dabir, Khwaja, representation of other amirs through his intervention to Sultan Husbang, p. 484.

Nasr-ul-lah Parniyani, Khwaja, in concert with other amirs brought Shahrzada Mas'ud Khan and placed him on the throne of Malwa, p. 494.

Natu Khan, was appointed to the Sarkar of Hardiyah, p. 621.

Nauruz Aswad, son of Ahmad Aswad, was made the chamberlain of Sultan Hasan, p. 676.

Nauruz Chak, his house was burnt, p. 716.

Naushirwan, the just, p. 82.

Nazi, the poet, friend, and companion of Amurzada Habib-ul-lah, p. 85.

Nazi, Shah, his statement about the death of Mirza Haidar, p. 717.

Nazi he Uzbek, was ordered to support Burhan; joined Burhan, p. 158.

Nauzuk Chak, his escape from Ghazi Khan, p. 730; his rebellion, p. 731; his execution, p. 732.

Najaz Shahr, Sultan of Kashmir, the Kashmiris brought the family of Mirza Haidar to Srinagar and divided the country of Kashmir among themselves; his accession, p. 719; an amicable settlement between Ghazi Khan and Sankar Chak; groups which exercised power in Kashmir, p. 720; power of the Chaks; the Maksis went to Bankan, p. 721; release of the Mughals; skirmishes between the Chaks and the Mughals, p. 722; victory of the Kashmiris over the Niyazi tribe, p. 723; hostilities among the Kashmiris, p. 724; period of rule for the second time, p. 725.

Nauzuk Shahr, son of Fatih Shahr, Sultan of Kashmir, was given the title of Sultan by Abdal Maksir, p. 697; accession; capital; his errir; division of the country, p. 698; allotment of divisions; summoned Muhammad Shah; accession of Muhammad Shah for the fourth time; was appointed successor of Muhammad Shah; period of reign, p. 699; Malik Abdal defeated Malik Kajji; Mirza Kamaran sent detachments for the conquest of Kashmir, p. 700; destruction of the Kashmiris by the Mughals; retreat of the Mughals; Malik Kajji retired to Hindustan;
Sultān Saiyid Khān of Kāshghār conquered Kashmir and destroyed the Kashmirīs, p. 701; fight between the Kāshghāris and the Kashmirīs, resulted, after a great loss, in peace, p. 703; agreement with the Kāshghāris; famine in Kashmir, p. 704; illness of Muḥammad Shāh and his death, p. 705.

Nāzuk Shāh, son of Sultān Shams-ud-din; succeeded his father but was defeated by Mīrzā Haidar, p. 707.

Nākrūz, father of Karsháshab, p. 633.

Niẓām Khān, reinforced Dastūr Khān and attacked Hūshang, p. 581.

Niẓām Mufarrāh, bore the title of Ashtī Khān; was the governor of Gujrat under Sultān Maḥmūmad; his cruelty, p. 173; received a letter from Zafar Khān, p. 175; reply to Zafar Khān; his advance to fight with Zafar Khān; his murder, p. 176.

Niẓām Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, succeeded his father; administration was entrusted to the hands of Maḥdūmah-i-Jahān, p. 86; marched out with his amāra for the campaign; the army of Niẓām Shāh fell upon the vanguard of the Rāya of Orissa; defeated them and made them return to their capital; p. 87; advanced to meet the army of Mandū; placed ten thousand horsemen in charge of Khwājah Maḥmūd Gilanjī; made over the army of the centre, to Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk, p. 88; defeated the army of Sultān Maḥmūd; came with Malkah-i-Jahān to Firūzābād, p. 89; wrote a letter to Sultān Maḥmūd of Gujrat; sent Khwājah Jahān with a large army to fight against Sultān Maḥmūd Khālijī, p. 90; advanced to fight with Maḥmūd Khālijī; asked help from Sultān Maḥmūd of Gujrat; offered him thanks for his help and died; period of his reign, pp. 92, 243, 244, and 245.

Niẓām Shāh, nephew of Ghaznīn Khān; was blinded by Ghaznīn Khān, p. 492.

Niẓām-ud-din, Jām, son of Salāḥ-ud-din, ruler of Sind; account of his government, p. 775.

Niẓām-ud-din, Jām, i.e. Jām Nandā, ruler of Sind, accession on the throne of Sind; account of his reign, p. 778.

Niẓām-ud-din, Shaikb, went to Chāmpānīr from the side of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālijī for drawing up the treaty, p. 232.

Niẓām-ud-din Aḥmad, the author, the statement which he had heard from the friends of Shujā' Khān, p. 626; his statement about the tree of Kashmir, p. 717; his statement about the rulers of Sind, p. 771; his statement about the Sultān of Maktān, p. 800; his final statement, p. 811.

Niẓām-ud-din Dehlavi, Shaikb, issued a general invitation for dinner during the reign of Sultān Tughlaq Shāh; Ḥasan Gāngū presented himself before him; told Ḥasan: Gāngū symbolically that he will become a Sultān, p. 8.

Niẓām-ul-mulk, Malik of Gujrat, p. 192; was sent to Badr 'Alā in order to assure the latter's safety by Aḥmad Shāh; was seized by Badr 'Alā; was released by the people of Aḥmad Shāh, p. 193; was sent to punish Malik Shāh, p. 195; Aḥmad Shāh made him the regent of his kingdom during his absence and ordered him to punish the Rāja of Mandal, p. 199; was sent to hunt in the neighbourhood of Dilāwarā; was defeated by the Pārabā Rājāpūta, p. 299; was appointed to recover the country of Idar; made over Idar to Bihār Mal;
fought with Rā'īl Mal, p. 300; his illness; was summoned to the presence of Muzaffar Shāh; left Zahīr-ul-mulk at Idar and hastened towards Muḥammadābād, p. 301; was appointed to attack Muḥāṣṣīl Khān by Sultan Bahādur, p. 335.

Niẓām-ul-mulk, Malik, was appointed vazīr by Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 110; made an agreement with the Turkī amīrs; his fruitful flattery of Qiyām-ul-mulk, p. 111; after the death of Qiyām-ul-mulk took up the duties of vazīr; was wounded by Dilwar Khān, p. 112; informed Malik Barīd about the hostile intention of Dilwar Khān and started for Junīr, p. 113.

Niẓām-ul-mulk, Malik, father of Malik Badeh, was sent to the thāna at Kīz by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 263; requested Mahmūd Shāh to confer the thāna which, belonged to him, on his son and to take him with him for the performance of the Haj; was advised by 'Imād-ul-mulk to go alone for pilgrimage on behalf of all; was greatly liked by Mahmūd Shāh; was sent to the amīrs to demand a reply to the Sultan's question, p. 269.

Niẓām-ul-mulk, father of Malik-ut-tujiyār, governor of Junīr, pp. 74, 75.

Niẓām-ul-mulk, son of Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk, informed Malik Barīd about the ambition of Sultan 'Alā-ud-dīn, p. 133.

Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahārī, a slave of Brahman; was called Bahārī; his son Ahmad had the ambition to rule; vazīr of Sultan Kalim-ul-lah made Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahārī a prisoner and put him to death, p. 136.

Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahārī, ruler of Aḥmadnagar, his death, p. 391.

Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahārī, ruler of Kāwīl, helped Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Maghūl in placing Khānzāda 'Alām Khān on the throne of Asīr and Burhānpūr, p. 283; leaving horsemen with 'Alām Khān and Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn went to Kāwīl, p. 284; stationed near the border of Asīr with 'Alām Khān with his army, p. 287; presented a petition to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 288.

Niẓām-ul-mulk Dakīn, joined Sultan Bahādur and was given the title of Muḥammad Shāh by him, p. 355.

Niẓām-ul-mulk Ghūrī; Humāyūn Shāh sent him to the country of Tīlang; went away from the foot of the fort of Tīlang, p. 79; fled and joined Sultan Mahmūd Khalījī, p. 80; instigated Mahmūd Khalījī to invade the Deccan, pp. 87, 533.

Niẓām-ul-mulk Sultanī, was sent by Muzaffar Shāh to join Malik Ayāz, p. 313; was sent with an army to Na'lcha, p. 590.

Niẓām-ul-mulk Turk, Malik, father of 'Ādil Khān and Daryā Khān, appointed to take charge of the left wing of the army of Niẓām Shāh, pp. 58, 535; was given Junīr by Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari as jāfīr, p. 94; was appointed to conquer the fort of Čehrāl, pp. 95, 536; attacked the Mandū army; on a petition of mercy excused the Mandū army, p. 95; was made martyr by a Mandū soldier, p. 96.

Niẓām-ul-Mulkīya; list of Sultanān, p. 7.

Nūh bīn Yūṣuf-ul-mulk, was given the title of Shams-ul-mulk by Sultan Bahādur, p. 333.

Nūr, Malik, son of Malik Aḥmad, Husain was entrusted to him by Sultan Ḥasan, p. 680.

Nūr Bahlāsh, Saiyid Muḥammad, sent a gift to Mahmūd Khalījī, p. 539.

Nūr Ḥaṭīb 'Alām, Saiyid, p. 443.
Nūr-ud-dīn, Shaikh, was respected by Maḥmūd Khaļījī, p. 539.

P

Pandey Brij, was the vazīr of Rāja Bhōj; after accepting Islām he was known as Shaikh 'Abd-ul-lah Jangāl, p. 299.
Pāṇḍus, p. 633.
Para Rām, Rāja Bākār, entered the service of Sultān Bahādur, p. 348.
Pararsām, Rāja of Jammū, took part in the murder of Saiyid Ḥasan, p. 682; was sent back with gifts, p. 686.
Pāyinda Khān Afghān, was permitted to go back to Jaumpūr, p. 330.
Piyārā, Malik, appointed by Rānī Khurshid and was given the title of 'Ali Khān, p. 562; joined Shīr Khān, p. 565.
Piārā Ismā'īl, his title, p. 238; his execution, p. 242; and see Kabīr Sultānī, Malik.
Pr Khān, fought against Maqbul Khān, p. 537.
Prī Muhammad Khān, was sent to conquer Mālwa by Akbar, p. 631.
Prī Muhammad Khān, Mirzā, possessed Multān; seized Sārang Khān, p. 180.
Pishru Khān, had an interview with Murtadā Nizām Shāh; conveyed the order of Khalifa-i-Ilāhī to Murtadā Nizām Shāh; went back with the tribute presented by Murtadā Nizām Shāh, p. 148.
Pithōrā Rāy, was appointed by Mēdīnī Rāy to guard the fort of Mandū; sent a message to Muẓaffar Shāh, pp. 303, 590, 602.
Prithi Rāj, was given half of the territory of Bākār by Sultān Bahādur, p. 349.
Pūṇjā, an army was sent by Ahmad Shāh to attack him, p. 209; his attack; his submission to Ahmad Shāh which was not accepted, p. 210; his death, p. 211.
Pūran Mal, son of Sīhādī, possessed the fort of Rāīstān and its neighbourhood, p. 617.

Q

Qadam Khān, with the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaļījī, was given the command of the amīra of Chandīrī, p. 523; was entrusted with the government of the forts of Hārautī and Rantambhōr, p. 526; captured the fort of Būndī, p. 532; favours conferred on him by Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, p. 543.
Qādan, Qādi, surrendered the fort of Bhakkār to Shāh Bēg, p. 778.
Qādī Khān, fought against Maqbul Khān, p. 537.
Qādir Khān, ruler of Kālpī, p. 481.
Qadr Khān, his fight with Malik Muẓaffar Ahmad Ayāz, p. 214.
Qaiṣer Khān, was summoned by Maḥmūd Shāh; was sent with 'Imād-ul-mulk by Maḥmūd Shāh for the conquest of Jālōr and Sājōr; was murdered by Mujāhid Khān, p. 270.
Qaiṣar Khān, inquest bearer of Sultān Hūshang, informed Ahmad Gujrātī of the plan of Maḥmūd Khaļījī, p. 503.
Qaiṣar Khān, Shānādār of Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī, was sent by Muẓaffar Shāh to Dāhūlī, 294; was ordered by Muẓaffar Shāh to take possession of the country as far as Dēvla, p. 297; Muẓaffar Shāh sent presents through him to Sultān Maḥmūd, p. 302; was appointed to crush Rāna Sānkā by Muẓaffar Shāh; taking Qawām-ul-mulk, went to Parāntēj, p. 311; was appointed to punish the rebels by Sultān Sīkander, p. 336; sent a message to Latīf Khān to leave Chāmpānīr, 336; sent a number of
retainers with Shujā'-ul-mulk, p. 339; was imprisoned by the order of Sūltān Bahādur, p. 340; welcomed Sūltān Mahmūd and treated him with great respect, p. 601.

Qarrā Bahādur Mīrzā, was appointed the governor of Baharmal, created disturbance against the Mughals, p. 714; sent a message to Mīrzā Ḥaidar; was imprisoned by the Kashmiris, p. 715; his release, p. 722; his fight with Ghażi Kān, p. 737.

Qāsim, Khwājah, was slain, p. 716.
Qāsim, Malik, was summoned by Mahmūd Kahlī, p. 502.
Qāsim, Mīrzā, son of Khwāja Haft, accompanied Yūsuf Kān, p. 761.
Qāsim, Mullā, little Tibet was given to him by Mīrzā Ḥaidar, p. 712.
Qāsim, Shāh, teacher of Mr Shams, p. 689.
Qāsim, Saiyid, was left behind to collect tribute in Karnāl, p. 196; was sent with Shāhzāda Muhammad Kān by Ahmad Shāh, p. 213.
Qāsim Ḥusain Sūltān, was appointed to the government of Bahrōj by Humāyūn Bādshah; could not stand the attacks of Gūrātīs; went to Tārdji Beg Kān, p. 377.
Qassāb, the name of an elephant, under whose feet Shīr Malik was thrown by the order of Aḥmad Shāh, p. 43.
Qawām Kān, see Yūsuf Qawām, Malik.
Qawām Kān Lankāh, joined Mīrzā Shāh Husain, p. 806.
Qawām-ul-mulk, son of Qawām-ul-mulk, was sent to encourage the citizens of Dhrār by Muẓaffar Shāh; inflamed the desire of Muẓaffar Shāh to visit Dhrā, p. 298; fought with great exertion and slew many Rājpūts, p. 303; was left in Aḥmad-dābād to control the grāssias, p. 308.

Qawām-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent to the town of Kondhrā by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 263; crushed the Rājpūts, p. 275; was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to punish Bahādur Gīlānī, p. 279; was sent by Muẓaffar Shāh to attack Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 304; went to Parāntēj, p. 311; was sent to join Malik Ayāz, p. 313; penetrated into the hills of Bāṅswāla and caused great destruction, p. 314; opposed Malik Ayāz in making peace with Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 316; enslaved the firangīs, p. 344; was sent by Muẓaffar Gūrātī to welcome Mahmūd Shāh, p. 601; was sent by Muẓaffar Gūrātī to punish Mūdīnī Rāy and Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 602.

Qiwām-ul-mulk, was appointed to attack Bahādur Gīlānī by Sūltān Shīhāb-ud-dīn, p. 117.
Qiyā Kān, was sent to conquer Mālwa by Akbar, p. 631.
Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk, Malik, was appointed wazīr by Sūltān Shīhāb-ud-dīn, p. 110; agreed to the proposal of Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk, p. 111; was killed by the Turki amīrs, p. 112.
Qulī Kān, Shāh, was appointed to invade Kashmir, p. 760.
Qulī Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī, Sūltān, of the Quyun tribe and a wazīr of the Bāhmanīs, p. 167; he sold himself to Sūltān Mahmūd; he took possession of Gōlkonda; period of his reign, p. 168.
Qutb, officer-in-charge of the island of Mahām, p. 214; informed Sūltān Ahmad about the tyranny and oppression of Malik Ḥasan, p. 215.
Qutb 'Ālam Shāikh Farid-ud-dīn Mās'ūd Shakarganj; was sent to wait on Mahmūd Kahlī by Ghāzī Kān, p. 533-34.
Qutb Kān, joined Sūltān Bahādur, p. 348; was sent by Sūltān Muḥammad
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to fight against Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 510.
Qutb-ud-dīn, Sulṭān, son of Sulṭān Shams-ud-dīn, Sulṭān of Kaḥmir, accession; character; sent Loār for the conquest of the fort of Loharkōt, p. 642; execution of Rāy Rāwal and imprisonment of Ḥasan; period of reign, p. 643.
Qutb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh, Sulṭān, Gujrāt, succeeded his father; received the title of Sulṭān Qutb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh; currency of the rite of Niḥār; bestowed jāgers upon the amīrs, p. 226; Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khaljī advanced into the country of Gujrāt; consultation with a baqāl; advice of the baqāl; amīrs took him along to carry on the war with Sulṭān Maḥmūd; gained victory, p. 227; met Sulṭān Maḥmūd in Kaparbanj; Malik ‘Alā’-ud-dīn Suhrāb joined him, p. 228; communication with Sulṭān Maḥmūd by a couplet; returned to Ahmadābād with triumph, p. 229; Shams Khān went to Ahmadābād; conferred favours on Shams Khān and married his daughter in the nikāh form, sent reinforcements to Nāgōr; devastation of the men of Nāgōr by Rānā Kūmbhā, p. 230; advanced against the fort of Kūmbhālmīr; Gītā Dēōrah did homage; appointed Malik Sha’bān Sulṭānī in-charge of the fort of Ābū; sent a messenger to summon Imād-ul-mulk; advanced to capture the fort of Sirōhī; defeated the Raja of Sirōhī; invaded the country of Rānā Kūmbhā, p. 231; Kūmbhā offered tribute; returned to Ahmadābād; peace and settlement with Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 232; marched to invade Kūmbhālmīr; took the fortress of Ābū; delivered it to Gītā Dēōrah; from Ābū advanced towards Kūmbhālmīr; Rānā Kūmbhā retired to the fort of Chitōr; Rānā being defeated begged for pardon; returned to Ahmadābād, p. 233; resolved to punish the Zamīṇ-dārs; marched to Sirōhī; destroyed various towns; sent armies to ravage the dominions of Rānā Kūmbhā; giving up the siege of the fort of Kūmbhālmīr advanced towards the fortress of Chitōr to help Sulṭān Maḥmūd; plundering the surrounded country went to Ahmadābād; forgave Rānā Kūmbhā at his request; his illness; interview with Saiyid Muḥammad, p. 234; prophecy of Saiyid Muḥammad; date of death; title after death; period of reign; special characteristics; amīrs put Shams Khān to death, p. 235.
Qutb-ud-dīn Lankāh, Sulṭān of Mulfān, sent a message to Shaikh Yūsuf, gave his daughter in marriage to Yūsuf, p. 789; defeated Shaikh Yūsuf and ascended on the throne of Mulfān; sent Shaikh Yūsuf to Delhi, p. 790; raised the standard of sovereignty; period of rule, p. 791.
Qutb-ud-dīn Muḥammad Khān Ghaznavī; Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk came to him; was one of the amīrs of Khalīfa-i-Īlāhī, p. 157.
Qutb-ud-dīn Shaibānī, Malik, his treachery towards Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 498; was punished by Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 499.
Qutb-ul-Mulkīya, list of the Sulṭāns, see p. 7.
Qutlagh Khān, brother of ‘Alam-ul-mulk, p. 8.

R

Rābe’a, Bibi, wife of Ḥaidar Khān, her fight and death, p. 723.
Radž-ul-ulmulk, see Ahmad, Sultan of Gujrat.

Radž-ul-ulmulk, amirs of Sultan Muhammad; his efforts to transfer the rule of Gujrat from Sultan Bahadur to Chând Khán, p. 610.

Rafi-ul-ulmulk, was given the title of 'Imad-ul-ulmulk by Sultan Bahadur and was made 'Arid-i-Mumalik, p. 335.

Raja of Abu, looted a caravan of merchants; received a farmân from Mahmud Shâh; gave back what he had looted to the merchants and sent a tribute to Muhmud Shâh, p. 278.

Raja of Badhul, p. 194; his petition to Sultan Hushang, p. 195.

Raja of Chàmpínir, sent a representation to Sultan Hushang, p. 197; did homage to Ahmad Shâh, p. 199; his submission to Ahmad Shâh, p. 201.

Raja of Gwàliar, his nephew entered the service of Sultan Bahadur, p. 346.

Raja of Idar, his rebellion; sent his vakîla, p. 177, to Zafar Khán, p. 178; agreed to pay tribute to Zafar Khán, p. 180; evacuated the fort, p. 181; his rebellion; fought against 'Ain-ul-ulmulk; became victorious; evacuated the fort of Mahrása; fled to the hills of Bijânaqar, p. 296; asked Muzaffar Shâh to pardon him; sent a message to Muzaffar Shâh; was excused by Muzaffar Shâh, p. 297.

Raja of Kálna, sent tribute to 'Adil Khán, p. 289.

Raja of Karnal, gave shelter to Shâh Malik; his fight with Ahmad Shâh; his defeat; fled to the hills of Karnal; asked pardon for his offences, p. 196.

Raja of Mâhûr, joined Mirân Muhammamad Shâh, p. 402.

Raja of Mâl, did not favour Latif Khán, p. 337.

Raja of Mandal, p. 194; instigated Sultan Hushang to conquer Gujrat, p. 193; brought Sultan Hushang to Gujrat, p. 197; his rebellion, p. 199.

Raja of Mandalgahr, his fight with Zafar Khán; his defeat; promise for the payment of a tribute, p. 179.

Raja of Nâdût, p. 194; his petition to Sultan Hushang, p. 195; brought Sultan Hushang into Gujrat, p. 197; asked pardon of his offences, p. 199.

Raja of Sirohi, fought with Sultan Quib-ud-dîn and was defeated, p. 231; fled to the hills, p. 234.

Raja of Sûrath, his negligence in the payment of a tribute, p. 197.

Raja Rustam, Nižâm-ul-ulmulk, was sent to Jâlna by the Dakini uzîsa; his treatment of the Saîvyads, p. 65; became afflicted with leprosy, p. 66.

Râm, governor of Kâkrûn, on the advance of Muhammamad Khán he evacuated Kâkrûn and fled, p. 368.

Râm Chand Nâïk, Rây, was sent by Sultan Quib-ud-dîn to reinforce Nâgor, p. 230.

Râm Rây of Bijânaqar, was attacked by Husain Nižâm-ul-ulmulk; advanced to meet Husain Nižâm-ul-ulmulk, p. 141; was killed, p. 143.

Râm Shâh, Raja of Gwàliar, helped Mubârak Khán Sarwânî, p. 622.

Rânâ Kûmbhâ, his determination to recover Nâgor from Mujâhid Khân; marched against Nâgor; sent a message to Shams Khán to carry out his promise; on the denial of Shams Khán advanced towards Nâgor; fought and destroyed the men of Nâgor, p. 230; his fight with Sultan Quib-ud-dîn, p. 231; after defeat paid tribute to Sultan Quib-ud-dîn, p. 232; left Kûmbhâmîr and retired to the fort of Chitôt; fought and was crushed by Sultan Quib-ud-dîn;
made submission to Sultan Qutb-ud-din; attempted to destroy Nagor; hearing of the preparations of Sultan Qutb-ud-din withdrew his steps, p. 233; was besieged by Sultan Qutb-ud-din in the fort of Kumbhalmir; prayed Sultan Qutb-ud-din for the pardon of his offences, p. 234. Rana Sankar, p. 299; helped Ray Mal; took possession of the country of Idar from Bihir Mal and made it over to Ray Mal, p. 300; news of his arrival in the neighbourhood of Ujjain to aid and reinforce Medinib Raya, p. 304; treated Sultan Mahmud with kindness and sent him to Mandi; turned towards Idar, p. 307; ravaged Idar to the boundary of Sirini; came to Baktar and then to Dungarpur, p. 308; advanced against Idar; advanced against Ahmadnagar; a battle with Mubariz-ul-mulk, p. 309; ravaged Ahmadnagar; advanced to Balsalnagar and ravaged it, p. 310; went to help the thanadar of Mandisor, p. 314; sent a message to Malik Ayaz; sent a message to Silhad; p. 315; sent emissaries to Malik Ayaz, p. 316; a message from Malik Ayaz, p. 317; sent his son with a tribute to Muzaifar Shab; his offences were excused by Muzaifar Shab, p. 318; paid tribute to Shahzada Bahadur when he arrived at Chitorgarh, p. 321; his son rendered homage to Taj Khan, p. 343; hearing of the defeat of Ray Pithora went back with Medinib Raya and Silhad to his own country, p. 604; advanced towards Karkrum; defeated Mahmud Shab, p. 606; his kind treatment of Mahmud Shab, p. 607; seized a part of the kingdom of Mahmud Shab, p. 608. Rafjan, Raja, son of Raja Sirdar, his vazir; his successor, p. 634.

Ranmal, Raja of Idar, was summoned by Firuz Khan to help him, p. 192; fled to the hills of Idar; his treachery towards Firuz Khan, p. 194; brought Sultan Hushang into Gujrat, p. 197; asked pardon for his offences and did homage to Ahmed Shab, p. 199. Ran Mal, Raja of Tibet, reinforced Habib Khan, p. 758. Rashid-ul-mulk, Malik, was given the title of Kudawand Khan by Muzaifar Shab, p. 293. Ratan Sen, son of Rana Sankar, prayed Sultan Bahadur for the pardon of Jagas offences, p. 349; devastated the villages of Siril and Balavat; confronted Sultan Mahmud at Ujjain, p. 350; waited on Sultan Bahadur at the pass of Kerehi; obtained leave to go to Chitorgarh, p. 351; advanced into Malwa, p. 610; made complaints about Mahmud Shab to Sultan Bahadur, p. 611. Rawal, Ray, his execution, p. 643. Ray of Bijanagar, seized the fort of Badhul and made martyrs of Munsamans, p. 15; hearing of the advance of Sultan Muhammad fled and took shelter in a fort, p. 16; posted himself on the other side of the river Krishna to confront Firuz Shab, p. 30; was killed by Qazi Siraj, p. 31; plundered certain parganas of Alaud-din, p. 67; feeling himself unable to withstand Alaud-din asked pardon for his offences and gained safety, p. 69. Ray of Gwalior, paid tribute to Sultan Husain, p. 460. Ray of Mahaim, marriage of his daughter, p. 219. Ray of Mahur; rose in rebellion; was defeated by Sultan Ahmad Shab; became a loyal adherent of Ahmad Shab, p. 47.
Rây of Orissa, defeated Khwâja Jahân and Nîrân-ul-mulk Ghûrî, p. 79; came to ravage Bîdar, p. 86; plundered and devastated a portion of the Deccan, p. 102; took the fort of Bakîr, p. 105; made his submission to Sultân Húsain, p. 460.

Rây of Râhâl, submitted, after fighting and killing the brother and son of Dîlawar Khân; sent his daughter with a large tribute to Dîlawar Khân, p. 67.

Rây of Sangîsar, sent a large tribute with his daughter to Dîlawar Khân and promised loyalty, p. 67.

Rây of Sonkar (Sangîsar), p. 97.

Rây Bâbû, Râja of Baklânâ, his son paid tribute to Sultân Jhiyâth-ud-dîn, p. 527.

Rây Singh, Râja of Mâl, p. 341; sacked the town of Dahûd, p. 342; suffered great loss from the invasion of Tâj Khân, p. 343.

Râyân, Rây, son of Mâdînî Rây, his reply to Khudâwând Khân in connection with the conspiracy against Maḥmûd Shâh; swore before 'Imâd-ul-mulk on the Qurân and achieved his agreement to the conspiracy, p. 265; communicated the message of the support of 'Imâd-ul-mulk to Khudâwând Khân, p. 265; determination of the Râjûs to place him on the throne, p. 597.

Râymal Chitôrî, his relation with Bhañânidâs, p. 570.

Râyzâda of Kehrâ, was defeated by Tâj Khân and Ahmad Khân, p. 540.

Râgî Chak, sent a petition to Hamâyûn, p. 707; joined Mîrzâ ʿHaidar; took charge of the affairs of Srinagar, p. 708; his flight by the side of Mîrzâ ʿHaidar; suspicions of Mîrzâ ʿHaidar about him; joined Kâjî Chak, p. 709; his flight; his fight and death, p. 710.

Rukn Khân, see Ibrâhîm Nîrân, Saiyid.

Rukn-ud-dîn, his flight with his brother Hîsâm-ud-dîn to Mâlwa, p. 241.

Rukn-ud-dîn, Shaikh, through his intercession the rebels Bahrâm Khân and Govind Rây were pardoned by Sultân Muḥammad Shâh, p. 17.

Rûmî Khân, fired the bastions of the fort of Râsîn, p. 360; his direction of the war, p. 372; joined with Khân Jahân Shîrâzî and marched towards Bahryj, p. 377.

Râmpati, wife of Bâz Bahâdur, p. 631.

Rustam Khân, brother-in-law of Chengiz Khân, p. 398; his flight with the corpse of Chengiz Khân, p. 409.

Rustam Khân, governor of Sârangpûr, paid tribute to Nasîr-ud-dîn, p. 559.

S

Saʿdât Khân, united with Firdûs Khân, p. 189.

Saʿdat Sultânî, Malik, defended the fort of Tambûl; fell upon the Dakînî army and slew many of them; attacked and defeated the Dakînî army, p. 218; was favoured by Ahmad Shâh, p. 219.

Saʿd Khân Lûdî, news of his encampment reached Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 592; sent a message to Bihjat Khân, p. 593.

Ṣabr ʿAli, Râja of Râjûs was made over to him by Mîrzâ ʿHaidar, p. 712; joined Mîrzâ ʿHaidar; burnt down the edifices of Sultân Zain-ul-ʿâbidîn, p. 716; his release, p. 722; was slain, p. 723.

Saʿd Bakît, Malik, was made Burhân-ul-mulk by Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 242.

Sâdât Khân, joined Sultân Aḥmad, p. 395; was sent to occupy Bahdar by Shîr Khân, p. 410; joined Shîr Khân, p. 412.

Sadî, Malik, attacked certain villages in Châmpânîr; fought with the Râja
of Champaunir and attained martyrdom, p. 272.

Sadhur, the thana dar of the fort of Shakar (Saghir) helped Fizuz Khan in his attempt, p. 27.

Sadiq Khan, was sent to conquer Malwa by Akbar, p. 631.

Sadiq Muhammad Khan, was sent with Burhan to attack the Afghans, p. 157.

Sadru Jahân, came to Champaunir to draft the treaty on behalf of Sultan Mahmud Khalji, p. 232.

Sadru Jahân, Makhdoom Azam, p. 125 (and see n. 1, p. 125).


Sadru Khan, took a message to Mahmud Shah, p. 577; joined Sahib Khan, p. 583; fled towards Chandrari, p. 592; decided to pay tribute to Mahmud Shah, p. 594.

Sadru Khan, governor of Râls, advised Sultan Bahadur not to raise the siege of Chitor, p. 371; encouraged Sultan Bahadur, p. 372; was taken in the service of Humayun Badshah, p. 375.

Sadru-ud-din, Qâdî, went as an ambassador to 'Ali Shâh, p. 750.

Sa’d-ud-lah Lahori, Maulânâ, his description of the siege of the fort of Multân, p. 807; description about himself after the victory of Husein Mirza, p. 808.

Sa’dfar Khan, devastated the country of the Râys of Kakan; plundered the country of Râhal, p. 67; was sent by Mahmud Shah to help A’zam Humayûn, p. 288; was wounded in the battle between Rânâ Sânkâ and Mubâriz-ul-mulk, p. 309; retired to Ahmadabad, p. 310; was sent by Muaffar Shah to chastise the Râjpûts of Lakhiakut; after ravaging Lakhiakot rejoined Malik Ayas, p. 313; heard about the plan of Udaya Singh; fought and defeated Udaya Singh, p. 314.

Sa’dfar Khan, Malik, was sent by Ahmad Shah to guard the camp; faced the enemies and defeated them, p. 208.

Sa’dfar-ul-mulk, p. 9.

Sahib Khan, cousin of Mujahid Khan, assisted Mujahid Khan in the murder of Qaisar Khan p. 270; ran away with his family, p. 271.

Sahib Khan, Shahrzada, (son of Sultan Nasir-ud-din); was placed on the throne of Mahmud Shah by Muhâfiz Khan with the title of Sultan Mahmud, p. 582; summoned Sadru Khan and Afjai Khan; his rise, p. 583; his flight from Shahrâ, p. 584; received a wound in the battlefield; a message from Mahmud Shah, p. 585; his defeat and flight; interview with Yâdgâr Mughul; went to the village of Lôrgon, p. 586; was attacked by Lôdhâ and sought shelter with the ruler of Kawil, p. 587; sent an army to conquer Sârangpûr, p. 593; his grief on the death of Muhâfiz Khan, p. 594; agreed to the proposal of submission to Mahmud Shah and received favours from the latter, p. 595; after hearing of the treacherous plan of Bihjat Khan betook himself to Sultan Sikandar’s army, pp. 595-96.

Sahrâ, Rây, see Quqt-ud-din Lankhât, Sultan of Multân.

Sahum, his literary work and qualifications, p. 658.

Sa’id, Malik, was brought by ‘Ain-ul-mulk to the presence of Mahmud Shâh Dakinî; was given the title of Bahadur Malik by Mahmud Shâh, p. 126.

Sa’id-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent to Badr Alâ by Sultan Ahmad Shâh; was seized by Badr Alâ, p. 193; investigated the news of the welfare
of Shâhzâda Ahmad Khân and reported to Mahmûd Shâh, p. 267.
Saif, fought with the Saiyids, p. 684; obtained release and fought against Muhammad Shâh, p. 688; Faṭh Shâh’s regard for him; his rank, p. 689; his execution, p. 693.
Saif Khân, with the help of other amîrs placed Shâhzâda Hasan Khân on the throne, p. 75; was executed by the order of Humâyûn Khân, p. 76.
Saif Khân Dèhlavî, his representation to Qâdir Shâh, p. 618; his advice to Qâdir Shâh, p. 619.
Saif Khvâjah, was sent to Badr ‘Alâ by Sulţân Ahmad Shâh, p. 193.
Saif-ud-dîn, was ordered by Sulţân Bahâdur to be hanged, p. 335.
Saif-ud-dîn, Malik, Superintendent of the elephants, was sent with presents to Sulţân Shams-ud-dîn by Fîrûz Shâh, p. 424.
Saif-ud-dîn, Malik, was given the command of the fort of Ranthambôr by Mahmûd Khâlîj, p. 520.
Saiyid Khân, was sent by Sulţân Muḥammad to fight against Mahmûd Khâlîj, p. 510.
Saiyid Khân, Sulţân of Kâshghar, sent an army to invade Kashmir, p. 701.
Saiyid Khân of the Niyâzî tribe, advanced to conquer Kashmir but was slain, p. 723.
Saiyid Mirzâ, his flight to Dâbil, p. 715.
Saiyid Sulţân, was slain by Ghaζî Khân, p. 533.
Sajawal Khân, see Shujâ’ Khân, Sulţân of Mâlwa.
Shâlabat Khân, original; his rank in the service of Murtaza Niζâm Shâh; envy of the amîr; fight; victory, p. 148; imprisonment; entrance into the fortress, p. 149; reply to the

men in charge of the fort, p. 150 (and see note 4, p. 149).
Şalâh-ud-dîn, Jâm, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 775.
Şalâh-ud-dîn, Jâm, relative of Jâm Fîrûz, hostility with Jâm Fîrûz, p. 779; received reinforcements from Sulţân Muζaffar Gujrâtî; his death, p. 780.
Sâlâr Hamza, Maζhîr-ul-mulk, was sent to Jâlân by the Dakîn vazîr; his treatment of the Saiyysa, p. 66; became afflicted with leprosy, p. 66.
Sâlbân, refused to accept the terms of Mahmûd Shâh, p. 598; was killed by the servant of Mahmûd Shâh, p. 599.
Sâlim, Sulţân, ‘Ali Shâh sent the daughter of his nephew to him, p. 750.
Sâmât Rây, Râja of Dandwâna, was killed by the soldiers of Sulţân Hûshang, pp. 206, 479.
Sanbal Khân, was sent to help Jâm Fîrûz, p. 780.
Sân Dîvi, mother of Yusuf Khân, p. 683.
Sanjar, Jâm, ruler of Sind, account of his rule, p. 778.
Sanjâr Khân, joined Bihjat Khân, p. 588.
Sankar, was given a part of Kashmir and was made the revenue officer by Fath Shâh, p. 690; as the revenue minister of Fath Shâh, p. 692; his imprisonment; death, p. 693.
Sankar Chak, son of Kâζî Chak, envy (which he bore) to Ghaζî Khân; refused the summons of Daulat Chak and Ghaζî Khân, p. 720; created disturbances, p. 733; his revolt, p. 741.
Saranâlîp, Malik, plunder of the gifts sent by him to Haζjîj, p. 762.
Sarang, p. 697, fought against Nâζuk Shâh and was slain, p. 698.
Sārang Khań, was seized by Mirzā Fīr Muḥammad Khań, p. 180.
Sarka, Rāja, his fort was captured by the Malik-ut-tujjār; was imprisoned, p. 61; was pardoned and made the pioneer of his army; deceived Malik-ut-tujjār; and led them to the mouth of death, p. 62.
Sēv Dās Baqāl, was killed by Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, p. 555.
Sarwar, Malik, entered the service of Bahādur Shāh, p. 331; was given the title of Khwājah Jahān by Muḥammad Shāh; was granted the title of Sultān-ussh-asharq by Maḥmūd Sultān and later appointed to the government of Jaumpūr by him, p. 447.
Sha'bān 'Imād-ul-mulk, Malik, the conspirators resolved to remove him from his office, p. 238; inference of Maḥmūd Shāh from his behaviour; his imprisonment; order of Maḥmūd Shāh to bring him; the denial of guards to leave him without the permission of 'Aḍd-ul-mulk, p. 239; was appointed by Maḥmūd Shāh to drive away flies, p. 240; made an attack on the conspirators, p. 241; separated himself from the office of the vazārat, p. 242.
Sha'bān Sultānī, Malik, was entitled 'Imād-ul-mulk; was appointed in charge of the fort of Ābū by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn; commenced a battle; was summoned by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 231.
Shādī Khań, Pūrabīya, was sent by Rāy Pithorā to put down 'Imād-ul-mulk, p. 604.
Shāhāb-ud-dīn, was the son of Malik Sha'bān 'Imād-ul-mulk, p. 238.
Shahbāz Khań Afghan, advanced to conquer Kashmir, p. 723.
Shāh Bēg Arghūn, ruler of Sind, conquered the fort of Sēwāl; possessed the fort of Bhakkār, p. 778; seized the fort of Sihwān, p. 779; possession of Thatha, p. 780; gained the rule of Sind, p. 781; his literary ability and bravery, p. 782.
Shāh Malik, Malik, rose in revolt, p. 194; his flight from the battlefield; a sudden attack on the camp of Shāhzāda Latīf Khań, p. 195.
Shāh Mir, see Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmir.
Shāh Mirzā, joined Chengīz Khań, p. 403.
Shāh Ruḵb, Mirzā, was appointed to invade Kashmir, p. 760.
Shahdād, Mir, arrived in Multān, p. 803.
Shāhī Bēg Arghūn, helped Jām Fīrūz, p. 780.
Shāhī Bēg Uzbek, his fight with Amir Dhuʿalnūn Bēg, p. 781.
Shāhī Khań, was made locum tenens of 'Ali Shāh, p. 650; retired to Siālkot, p. 651; joined Jasrāt; defeated 'Ali Shāh; entered Kashmir as Sultān, p. 652.
Shai Khāl Malik, was sent by Ghazīn Khań to seize Zafar Minjumla, p. 487.
Shai Khāh, Malik, was reinforced by Qāḍī Fīr Lēḥāq, p. 280.
Shai Khān, Qāḍī, came from the Deccan to Maḥmūd Khalji for peace, p. 538.
Shams, Mir, his arrival in Kashmir, p. 689.
Shams Chak, helped Lōhar; his imprisonment, p. 757; fled from prison and joined Ḥaidar Chak, p. 758; his offences were pardoned by Yūsuf, Khān, p. 759.
Shams Dūbar, his advice to Khān Zamān, p. 743.
Shams Dūtī, his determination about Yūsuf Khān, p. 760.
Shams Khān, son of Fīrūz Khān, for fear of Mujāhid Khān fled to Rānā.
Kumbhā, p. 229; agreed to fulfil the conditions of Rānā Kumbhā; took possession of the fort of Nāgūr; consulted with the amīr in connection with the fulfilment of the demands of Rānā Kumbhā; refused to fulfil his promise; went to Ahmadābād to seek for help; was favoured by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 230; was put to death by the amīr of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 235.

Shams Khān Dandānī, ruler of Nāgūr, was appointed to the office of razīr by Tūṣūr Khān, p. 183; was favoured by Aḥmad Humayūn, p. 184.

Shams Mughal, Khwājah, was sent as an ambassador to Islām Khān, p. 714.

Shams Zinā, his imprisonment, p. 725; joined Ghāzī Khān, p. 726.

Shams-hūr-ul-mulk, was appointed to seize 'Aqqul-ul-mulk by Sultān Bahādur, p. 335.

Shams-ud-dīn, Khwājah, was left in Multān, p. 810.

Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān, ascended the throne of Dākin, p. 25; Shāhzādas Fīrūz Khān and Ahmad Khān attempted to regain their hereditary dominion; their success, p. 26; period of reign, p. 27.

Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla, p. 429; succeeded his father; how he passed his life; period of reign, p. 430 (and see note 3, p. 429).

Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmir, his ancestry, p. 633; acquired power; message of Kōpā Dēvī; became the ruler of Kashmir, p. 635; accession; suppression of tyranny; rebuilt the kingdom of Kashmir, p. 636; meted out punishment to the Lūm tribe; left all affairs to Jamshid and 'Ali Shēr; period of reign, p. 637.

Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān, son of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, Sultān of Kash-
turned to give battle to Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 566; his flight; a letter from Shaikhzādas of Chandīrī and his advance, p. 567; his struggle and death, p. 568.

Shēr Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, united Firūz Khān, p. 189.

Shēr Khān Afghān, received Daryā Khān with favour, p. 388; sent a farman to Qādir Shāh, p. 617; his successful advance towards Mālwā; submission of Qādir Shāh, p. 619; gave the Sarkār of Lakhnautī to Qādir Shāh; his direction to Shuja'at Khān, p. 620; hemistich composed by him on the flight of Qādir Shāh; gave the towns of Ujjain and Sārangpur to Shuja'at Khān and also the government of Mālwā, p. 621.

Shēr Khān Fūlādī, the district of Pāttnā as far as Kāri came into his possession, p. 398; arrived at Ahmādābād and offered his congratulations to Sultān Muẓaffar, p. 399; defeated Iṭmād Khān, p. 400; sent a letter to Chengiz Khān, p. 401; 'Usmānpūr, Khānpūr and Kālpūr came into his possession, p. 405; sent Sādāt Khān who possessed Bahdār; vacated Bahdār at the arrival of Sultān Muẓaffar, p. 410; agreed with the views of Iṭmād Khān for suppressing the Mirzās, p. 411; went to Saiyid Hāmid Būkhārī to enquire about the truth of the fact about which Iṭmād Khān had written to him; on the arrival of Khālīfa-i-Nāhī became exhausted and fled, p. 413.

Shērwān Khān, killed Būrīhān, p. 391.

Shewdās, father of Bhāwānīdās, p. 570.

Shīhāb-ud-dīn, Sultān, brother of Sultān Husain, his rebellion and imprisonment, p. 793.

Shīhāb-ud-dīn, Sultān, son of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, Sultān of Mālwā, see Miyān Majhīla.

Shīhāb-ud-dīn, Sultān, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmir, accession; character and qualifications, p. 640; marched as far as Āshtnagar and slew his enemies; submission of the Rāja of Nagarkōt; residence, p. 641; his heir; banished his sons; founded two cities; period of reign, p. 642.

Shīhāb-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh Lashkārī, succeeded his father, p. 109; appointed Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk and Malik, p. 110, Niẓām-ul-mulk as his vazīr, p. 111; Dilāwar Khān Ḥabshī took permission for killing the vazīrs, p. 112; owing to the dispersion of all the amirs irregularities and weakness crept in his affairs; Malik Barīd kept him in imprisonment; became weak and the men of the city attacked him, p. 113; a body of ungrateful persons attacked him; 'Azīz Khān Turk, Ḥasan 'Alī Khān and Saiyid Mirzā-i-Mashhādī fought against the rebels and saved him, p. 114; ordered Jahāngīr Khān to guard the gate and Khān Jahān to guard the city and bāzār; troops dispersed the rebels and destroyed them; 'Adīl Khān sent a representation about the rebellion in his territory, p. 115; ordered the amirs to march to the help of 'Adīl Khān to put down the rebels and himself also started; arrived in the vicinity of Rājmundrī; fought and defeated the rebels; seized Dastūr-ul-mulk but seized his offences and confirmed his rank; returned to Gulbargā; marched towards the fort of Sunkar; besieged the fort and captured it; leaving one of his
trusted men there, returned to Bīdar; defined the ranks of great and noble men, p. 116; hearing of the rebellion and oppression of Bahādur Gilānī he sent a farmān to Bahādur in which he asked him to stop his oppression and to send back everything to the court of Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī and to release Kamāl Khān and Saftdar Khān; Bahādur sent him an improper reply, p. 119; advanced to punish Bahādur; arrived in front of the fort which was in the possession of Bahādur; seeing the grandeur of his army Bahādur fled; arranged the affairs of the place; arrived at Bōrkal; Bahādur took to flight from Bōrkal; the Rāyās or Zamindārs enlisted themselves as the loyal adherents of Maḥmūd Shāh; the commander of the army of Bahādur posted himself in the fort of Mirīch; his amīrs taking him advanced to capture Mirīch; fought with the men of Bahādur, p. 120; commandant of the fort of Mirīch prayed for peace; making peace with the men of Bahādur occupied the fort of Mirīch; turned towards the forts of Kalhar and Dābul; birth of his son at Mālwa; gave the name Ahmad Shāh to his son; Bahādur asked pardon of his offences, p. 121; Bahādur was excused and was asked to render homage and to pay tribute; Bahādur did not pay any attention to the order; advanced towards the fort of Jākhrī; flight in the town of Kalhar; advanced towards Kālāpūr, p. 122; received the news of the preparations of Bahādur for war at Salāla; arrived in the vicinity of Kālāpūr; most of the troops of Bahādur separated from him; Bahādur took to the path of his flight; sent Malik Faḵr-ul-mulk and 'Ain-ul-mulk to take charge of the fort of Panāla; spent the rainy season in Kōlpūr; Bahādur demanded, p. 123, assurance of his safety and promised to remain loyal in his service; agreed to the request of Bahādur; sent learned men to assure Bahādur but his resolution changed again, p. 124; sent Malik Faḵr-ul-mulk to crush Bahādur; Faḵr-ul-mulk met with the army of Bahādur, fought bravely and became victorious, p. 125; conferred favours and the title of Khwājah Jahnān on Malik Faḵr-ul-mulk; entered the fort of Panāla; sent Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk to occupy the island of Goa and to take possession of everything belonging to Bahādur; properties of Bahādur were entrusted to 'Ain-ul-mulk; returned towards the capital; halted in the town of Bījāpūr, p. 126; showed favours to the ambassadors of Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī; granted double the normal remuneration to the ambassadors; sent presents to Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī; sent for all the adherents of Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī and granted favours to them; ordered for making over twenty ships to the servants of Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī which were taken by Bahādur, p. 127; returned from camp and took up his residence, p. 129, in Bīdar; sardārs went to their places; became powerless, p. 130; Malik Barid rose to power; made him into a puppet; informed 'Imād-ul-mulk who asked him to come to Kāwīl; fled to Kāwīl; was welcomed by 'Imād-ul-mulk; arrived in the city of Bīdar with the soldiers of 'Imād-ul-mulk to crush Malik Barid, p. 131; joined the army of Malik Barid; complaint about the slave
of 'Imād-ul-mulk; 'Imād-ul-mulk returned to Kāwil; his miserable life; death; period of reign, p. 132; purchased 'Ādil Khān from Khwājah Maḥmūd Garjistānī, p. 159; marched from Bīdar to destroy Bahādur Gīlānī, p. 279.

Shirāz-ul-mulk, his petition to Maḥmūd Khaļījī, p. 536.

Shīr Malik, insulted Saiyyad Nāṣir-ud-dīn; Ahmad Shāh sentenced him to death; p. 43 (and see n. 1, p. 55).

Shīṭāb Khān, guardian of the seraglio, p. 84.

Shujā’ Khān, Sultān of Mālwa, was entrusted with the government of Mālwa by Shēr Khān; appointment of Ḥājī Khān Sultānī and Natū Khān, p. 621; fought a victorious battle with Nāṣir Khān, p. 622; a letter from Ḥājī Khān Sultānī; advanced to reinforce Ḥājī Khān; defeated Mālū Khān; brought the whole of Mālwa into his possession; attitude of Islām Khān towards him, p. 623; misdeeds of 'Uthmān Khān and the punishment which he suffered; became aggrieved at Islām Khān’s actions, p. 624; was attacked and wounded by 'Uthmān Khān; sent a message to Islām Khān, p. 625; sent Fath Khān to collect tribute and bid farewell to Islām Khān, p. 626; departed from Islām Khān and arrived at Sārangpur; his declaration in connection with fighting against Islām Khān; went away in the direction of Bānswālāh; Islām Khān took possession of Mālwa, without causing any damage; came and rendered homage to Islām Khān; was given presents by Islām Khān; gave jāgra to Daulat Khān Ajīyāla and Malik Muṣṭafā and Miyān Bāyazīd; his death; period of reign, p. 628.

Shujā’at Khān, had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; dispute with Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn and his flight, p. 552; he, with all his sons, was beheaded, p. 553; hostility with his brother, p. 554; took the affairs of the kingdom in his hands, p. 555; sent an army in pursuit of Shaikh Ḥabīb and Khwājah Shuhail, p. 557; sent a report to Ghiyāth-ud-dīn about the power of Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 559; his fight with Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 561; his fight with Nāṣir Shāh and its result, p. 562; was seized by the amir of Nāṣir Shāh, p. 563; was made over to custodians, p. 564; was ordered by Shēr Khān to watch on Qādir Shāh, p. 619.

Shujā’ul-mulk, joined Latīf Khān, p. 339.

Shujā’-ul-mulk Bukhārī, Shaikhb, took the administration of Sultān Husain in his hand, p. 806.

Sikandar, Sultān of Gujrat, succeeded his father; buried the body of his father in the town of Sarkhēj, p. 323; arrived in the town of Bātūb and visited the tombs of the holy men; ill-treatment of the servants of Muṣṭafār Shāh, p. 324; soldiers and raṭyāt became annoyed on the unjustified bestowal of favours; people tried to bring Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān; knowing the avaricious intention of Shāhzāda Latīf Khān appointed Sharzah Khān to put him down; Malik Latīf Khān in pursuit of Latīf Khān met with the Rāja of Chitūr and was slain in a battle, p. 325; appointed Qaisar Khān for the punishment of the Rājpūts of Chitūr; determination of 'Imād-ul-mulk to dethrone him; attempt of 'Imād-ul-mulk to murder the Sultān; did not believe reports against 'Imād-ul-mulk; news of the
advance of Bahādur Shāh caused him great mental worry; saw in a dream, p. 326, a number of Shaikhs and Muṣṭafār Shāh; entrance of Ṭmād-ul-mulk into the palace; Ṭmād-ul-mulk met Naṣrāt-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm; Naṣrāt-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm were slain, p. 327; one of the companions of Ṭmād-ul-mulk made a martyr of the Sultān; period of reign, p. 328.

Sikandar, Sultān, son of Bahlūl; a petition from Jām Bāyazīd; his farnās to Daulat Khān Lūdī, p. 302.

Sikandar, Sultān, son of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmir, accession, p. 644; sent Rāy Mādārī to Tibet; defeat of rebels; relation of friendship with Amīr Timūr, p. 645; Islāmī religion in Kashmir; showed honour to Saiyid Muḥammad, p. 647; made arrangements for breaking images and pulling down the temples, p. 648; bestowal of title and kingdom; period of reign, p. 649.

Sikandar Khān, incited Mahmūd Khālji to seize the fort of Māhūr, p. 526; exhibited Shāḥ Khān’s body on the gallows, p. 568.

Sikandar Khān, governor of Satwās, went to his Jāfar; his rebellion, p. 587; sought pardon of his offences, p. 589; rose in revolt for the second time, p. 591; returned victorious to Satwās, p. 592; brought Satwās with its neighbourhood into his possession, p. 608; was made over to jailors by Shāh Khān, p. 620.

Sikandar Khān, son of Sultān Saiyid Khān, was sent to invade Kashmir, p. 701; fought with the Kashmirīs, p. 703.

Sikandar Khān Bukhārī, p. 69; invited Sultān Mahmūd Khālji to invade Berār, p. 70; joined Mahmūd Khālji; besieged Māhūr; after the arrival of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn took the path of flight; met ‘Alā-ud-dīn on the way and asked pardon of his offences, p. 71; raised a rebellion; went to Mālkonda; defeated Khān Jāhān, p. 77; was defeated by Hūnāyūn Shāh, p. 78; had to run away to Bīdar taking Niẓām Shāh with him, p. 243.

Sikandar Khān Satwālī, waited on Sultān Bahādur and was received with favour, p. 350.

Sikandar Khān, Shāhzāda, was sent by Muṣṭafār Shāh to act as the governor of Muḥammadabād, p. 297; heard the precious advice of Muṣṭafār Shāh, p. 323.

Sikandar Lūdī, Sultān, son of Bahlūl Lūdī, sent gifts to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 289; sat on the throne of Delhi after the death of Bahlūl Lūdī; defeated Bārbak Shāh, p. 462; pursued Bārbak Shāh; possessed Jāmpūr; defeated Sultān Ḥusain and seized his territory, p. 463.

Sikandar Shāh, Sultān of Bangālā, succeeded his father by the exertion of the amīrī with the title of Sikandar Shāh, p. 424; proclaimed the gospel of justice, p. 425; occupied himself with the duties of the Salṭanat; sent a tribute to Sultān Firūz Shāh; being aware of the advance of Firūz Shāh fortified himself in the fort of Ekdāla but in the end paid tribute and asked pardon of Firūz Shāh; passed his life in pleasure, p. 426; period of reign, p. 427 (and see note 2 of p. 426).

Sikandar Shāh, Sultān of Bangālā, p. 436; the amīrī placed him on the throne: his work as the Sultān (n. 3, p. 436); period of reign, p. 437.
Sikār, son of Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 643.
Silhādī, went to Chitōr to bring Rānā Sāṅkā to the aid of Rāy Pihōrā, p. 602; occupied the boundry of Sārangpūr as far as Bhilsā and Rāśīn, p. 608; end of his power and submission to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 609; was summoned by Mahmūd Shāh to his aid, p. 610; Mahmūd Shāh granted some parganas to him; made complaints about Mahmūd Shāh to Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 611; his death, p. 616. Also see Silhādī Pūrābīa.
Silhādī Pūrābīa, came with Sulṭān Mahmūd to Mandiśūr; message of Rānā Sāṅkā to him, p. 315; being aware of the intention of Sulṭān Mahmūd sought protection of Rātan Sēn; went to Chitōr, p. 359; waited on Sulṭān Bahādur at the pass of Karchī, p. 351; left Bhūpat at Ujjain and waited on Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 356; news of his arrest, p. 357; sent a message to Sulṭān Bahādur expressing the wish to accept Islām, p. 360; advised Sulṭān Bahādur to postpone the matter of conquering the fort of Rāśīn which was accepted; went to the fort and inflamed the feeling of Rājpūts against Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 361; hearing of the death of his son fainted and was arrested, p. 362; fought with the Dakīnī army, p. 367.
Simā Imād-ul-mulk Sulṭānī, p. 324.
Sirāj, made Srīnagar over to ‘Alī Shēr, p. 639.
Sirāj, Qādī, killed Rāy of Biyānagar, p. 30.
Sirāj Khān, received the title of Mu‘azzam Khān; treated Ḥasan Khān and Ḥabīb-ul-lah with courtesy; took them into the citadel and attacked them; put Amīrāsī Ḥabīb-ul-lah with his friends to death, p. 83; was afflicted with leprosy, p. 84.
Sirāj-ul-mulk, his son opposed Nizām-ul-mulk Turk but fled after a fight, p. 536.
Sirdēv, Rāja, p. 632; his descendants, p. 634, sent tribute to Diljū, p. 637.
Sirkaja, Rāy, paid tribute to Mahmūd Khālji, p. 536.
Siyāh Bhat, his oppression; death, p. 650.
Srī Bhat, his request to Sulṭān Zain-ul-ābidīn, p. 653.
Ṣūfī Khān, son of ‘Alā-ul-mulk, was summoned by Mahmūd Khālji, p. 502.
Suhail, Khwājah, was allotted the management of Khāleqa parganas, p. 554; killed Mūnjā Baqāl and fled, p. 555; fled from the palace of Nāsir-ul-dīn, p. 556; waited on Nāsir-ul-dīn, p. 557; was nominated to crush Yakān Khān, p. 560; was sent by Nāsir Shāh to conquer the fort of Mandū, p. 563; favoured by Nāsir-ul-dīn, p. 564; took the wounded Shēr Khān and fled, p. 565.
Suhrāb Dūdāi, Malik, joined Sulṭān Ḥusain; grant to Malik Suhrāb by Sulṭān Ḥusain, p. 795.
Suhrāb Sulṭānī, Malik, was sent by Zafar Khān to surround the country of Thāna, p. 215.
Sūkhlā, took a message to Ḥabīb Chak; was punished by Ḥabīb Chak, p. 728.
Sulaimān, Malik, son of Malik Shēr-ul-mulk Ghūrī, was declared to be the ruler of Chandīrī by the amīrās; fight with Mahmūd Khālji, p. 506; death, p. 507.
Sulaimān Karārānī, his supremacy over Bangāla and Behār, p. 445, and Orissa; assumed the title of Hafrat A’dā; after his death his son succeeded him, p. 446.
Sultāni, Malik Mir, was appointed by Aḥmad Shāh to collect Ḵwāją, p. 221; through his intervention Gaṇeśa did homage to Sultān Muḥammad Shāh; had the title of Ḵān Jahān, p. 224. Sultāns of Bangāla, list of, p. 418 (and see note 4 on p. 415).

Sultāns of Gujrāt, list of, pp. 172-73.
Sultāns of Mālwa, list of, p. 465.
Sultāns of Multān, list of, pp. 787-88.
Sultān Muḥammad, his qualifications; was respected by Zain-ul-ʿabidin, p. 568.

Sultān-ul-Šalāṭin, Sultān of Bangāla, succeeded his father; his qualities; death; period of reign, p. 429 (and see note 2 on p. 429).

Sultān-ʿus Sharq, Sharq Sultān, rise to sovereignty; extension of power, p. 447; death; period of reign, p. 448.
Sūrā, was sent by Rāy Bāṭārī to Sultān Ghiyāṭh-ud-dīn Ḵaljī to ask for help, p. 273.
Sūrājmal, was sentenced to death, p. 562.
Syām Dās, Rāy, Rāja of Dūngarpūr; paid tribute to Mahmund Ḵaljī, p. 533.

T
Taghālji, imprisoned and blinded Sultān Ghiyāṭh-ud-dīn; placed Sultān Shams-ud-dīn on the throne of Ghiyāṭh-ud-dīn, p. 25.

Taghī, revolted in the neighbourhood of Nahrwālā Pattan; took possession of that place; besieged the fort of Bahrūj, p. 9; Sultān Muḥammad contemplated his subjugation, p. 10.

Ṭāhir, Mir, was sent to the fort by Mirzā Ḵān, p. 153.
Ṭāhir, Mīrza, went as an ambassador to Yusuf Ḵān, p. 758.
Ṭāhir, Saiyyid, p. 84.
Ṭāhir, Shāh, came from Sultāniya to the, p. 137, Deccan; became a courtier of Burhān Shāh; adopted Imāmī religion, p. 138 (and see n. 4, p. 137); was respected by Sultān Bahādur of Gujrat, p. 139.

Ṭāhir Āl, father of Shāh Mir, p. 633.
Ṯahmāp, p. 162; was blinded by his brother ʿAlī ʿĀdīl Ḵān, p. 163.

Ṯahmāsp, Shāh, p. 148.
Tāmir Gūrgān, Amir; his arrival in the neighbourhood of Delhi, p. 180; his oppression, p. 181.

Ṭūmūr, Amir, his friendship with Sultān Sikandar, p. 645.
Ṭāj Bhat, Malik, was sent to attack Bahārān Ḵān, p. 677.

Ṭāj Jamāl, Malik, was sent by Bahādur Shāh with a farāmān, p. 331.

Ṭāj Ḵān, was sent by Sultān Mahmūd Ḵaljī with a message of peace to Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 322; was sent to meet Rāy Bāṭārī by Mahmund Shāh, p. 272; was sent by Muẓaffar Shāh to join Malik Ayāz, p. 313; advanced with a well-equipped army, p. 329, to join Bahādur Shāh, p. 331; saw Bahādur Shāh, p. 332; was left on the bank of the river Bātrak by Bahādur Shāh, p. 334; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to attack Ḟīmād-ul-mulk, p. 335; informed Sultān Bahādur about the hostility of Ulugh Ḵān and Qaṣṣar Ḵān, p. 340; undertook the task of chastising Rāy Singh, p. 342; devastated the country of Māl, p. 343; was sent by Muẓaffar Gujratī to welcome Mahmund Shāh, p. 601; climbed the hill on which the fort of the enemy was built, p. 603.

Ṭāj-ud-dīn, Malik, Aḥmad Shāh conferred on him the title of Muʿīn-ul-mulk and directed him to remain at Tālimir, p. 219; was sent to Delhi by Sultān Shams-ud-dīn with a tribute, p. 423.
Tamāghi, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 774.
Tamīm Anṣārī, p. 772.
Tādīr Bāgh Kān, was entrusted with the charge of guarding the treasure by Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 376; was appointed governor of Chāmpānīr, p. 377; relinquished the country of Gujrat, p. 378; went to Āgra, p. 379.
Tātār Khān, Sultān of Gujrat, vazīr of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, p. 175; came from Delhi to Gujrat owing to the violence of Mālū Khān; his request to his father; plundered the country of the Rāja of Idrā, p. 180; requested his father to help him in defeating Mālū Khān; reply of his father, p. 182; accession to the throne; assumption of the title of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh; bestowal of wealth and honour; conferred the office of the vazīr on Shams Khān Dandān; words of his mono-gram; march from Āsāwal to conquer Delhi, p. 183; ravaged the villages and towns of Nādōt; halted in the town of Saniūr; period of his reign; title of Muḥammad Shāh after his death; after grieving for the death of Muḥammad Shāh Āʿṭarn Humāyūn made Malik Jalāl Kūkhar over to Shams Khān Dandān and again sat on the throne; rumor of the latter having poisoned Muḥammad Shāh, p. 184.
Tātār Khān of Mālwa, was ordered to bring Našir-ud-din to Ghiyāth-ud-din; advanced towards Bārah, p. 557.
Tātār Khān, governor of the Punjāb, sent his army to aid the Saiyids, p. 685.
Tātār Khān, son of Sārang Khān, joined Sultān Ibrāhīm, p. 451.
Tātār Khān, son of Sultān ʿAlā-ud-din, was favoured by Sultān Bahādur, p. 369; seized Bāna; fought with Mīrzā Hindāl’s army and was slain, p. 371.
Tātār Khān Lūlī, reinforced Bārbak Shāh, p. 793.
Tawalak, ʿImād-ul-mulk, his address to Sultān Hūsain, p. 797; his rank in the time of Sultān Fīrūz, p. 798; caused the murder of Sultān Fīrūz, p. 799; his imprisonment, p. 800.
Tufāl Khān, was defeated by the minister of Murtuza Nīğān Shāh, p. 146; helped Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, p. 402.
Tughān, Malik, was made Farḥat-ul-mulk by Makhmūd Shāh, p. 242; was appointed as the tānmādār of Beyt by Makhmūd Shāh and left there, p. 261; was sent to the thāna at fort Beyt and Jagat by Makhmūd Shāh, p. 263; arrived at the house of ʿImād-ul-mulk, p. 265.
Tughaqāq, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 777.
Tughaqāq Khān, informed Makhmūd Shāh about the preparations of the men of Karnāl, p. 249.
Tughaqāq Shāh Fūlādī, Malik, brought the amīrs back from the way, p. 316.

U

Udai Singh, received Shāhzaḍa Bahādur with good wishes, p. 321; joined the service of Bahādur Shāh, p. 330.
Udaya Singh, Rāja of Māl, was defeated by Malik Asja-ul-mulk and Šafīdar Khān, p. 314.
ʿUḍī Mālā, was respected and favoured by Sultān Zain-ul-ʿābīdīn, p. 657.
Ugar Šēn Pūrabīa, was wounded in the battle between Udaiya Singh and Šafīdar Khān; went to Rānā Sānkā
and related the story of the fight, p. 314.

Uthb Bahram, son of Mas'ud Chak, his proposals for peace with Khan Mirza; was killed by the latter, p. 710.

Ulugh Khan, did not abandon his hostile attitude, p. 339; was sent by Bahadur Shah against Latif Khan; was imprisoned by the order of Sultan Bahadur, p. 340; was posted to Bhilpur by Sultan Bahadur, p. 353.

Ulugh Khan, advised I'tmaad Khan to leave Ahmadabad, p. 404; took Sultan Muzafer to Dungarpur and made him over to I'tmaad Khan, p. 406; became annoyed with I'tmaad Khan; came to Chengiz Khan; disapproved any idea of superiority among the servants of Sultan Mahmud; heard of the intentions of Chengiz Khan in connection with his death, p. 407; went to the palace of Chengiz Khan, p. 408; invited I'tmaad Khan to Ahmadabad, p. 409; proposed to possess Bahruj, p. 410; resolved to put down I'tmaad Khan, p. 411; hostility with Juhjdar Khan; went to Shier Khan and informed him of the arrival of Sultan Muzafer, p. 412; enlisted his name in the band of the loyal servants, p. 413.

Ulugh Khan, brother of Mullah Khan, was blinded by Ibrahimm 'Adil Khan, p. 562.

Ulugh Khan Habash, attacked Burhan, p. 391; attacked Saiyid Mubarak, p. 395.

'Umar Khan, joined Sultan Bahadur and was highly honoured, p. 348.

'Umar Khan, Shahzada, son of Sultan Husang, took to the path of flight, p. 495; was made the leader of rebels, p. 503; his attempt for conquering Sarangpur proved fatal, p. 505.

'Uthman Khan, the punishment for his improper actions; complained to Islam Khan against Shuja Khan, p. 624; attacked and wounded Shuja Khan; was put to death, p. 625.

'Uthman Khan, Shahzada, his treatment of his younger brother, p. 481; was pardoned by Sultan Husang; was summoned and made over to custodians by the order of Sultan Husang, p. 482.

'Uthman Jalal, Malik, sent sardars to wait on Mahmud Khan, p. 485; his representation to Mahmud Khan in favour of Shahzada 'Uthman Khan, p. 486.

W

Wajih-ul-mulk, father of Zafar Khan, p. 173.

Wali-ul-lah, was imprisoned in the cage of sovereignty by Malik Barid; being led by an evil passion Malik Barid poisoned him; period of his reign, p. 134.

Y

Yadgar Beg Qazibash, came as an ambassador from Iran with presents to the court of Mahmud Shah, p. 290; could not see Mahmud Shah alive, p. 291; his arrival in the neighbourhood of Muhammadabad; was welcomed by Muzafer Shah, p. 293; his house was looted, p. 295.

Yadgar Mughul Surkh Kula, interview with Shah Khan; death of his retainers, p. 586.

Yadgar Nasir Mirza, was sent with Mirza 'Askari, p. 376; was appointed to the government of Pattan Gujrat by Humayun Badeshah, p. 377; relinquished Gujrat, p. 378; was left in Gujrat by Humayun Badeshah, p. 616.
Yahyā Khān, the Kotwāl of Humayūn Shāh, seized him and put him to death, p. 82.

Yakān Khān, was allotted the management of the Khālsa parγanas, p. 554; was sent to seize the murderers of Mūnjā Baqāl, p. 555; sent a message to Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 556; his fight against Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 560; was sentenced to death, p. 564.


Ya‘qūb, son of Yūsuf Chak, went to the court of Akbar; his letter to Yūsuf, p. 759.

Ya‘qūb, son of Yūsuf Khān, was sent to Kashmir, p. 756; was made the commander of an army, p. 759.

Ya‘qūb Chak, his sīf was confiscated, p. 757.

Ya‘qūb Kashmiri, Shāikh, went to wait on Akbar, p. 758.

Ya‘qūb Mīr, took the heads of Niyāzīs to Islām Khān, p. 723.

Ya‘qūb, Saiyid, was seized by ‘Idi Zinā, p. 721; fled from custody and joined Daulat Chak, p. 722.

Yāqūt, bore the title of Khudawand Khān; his fight; his rank of service, p. 153.

Yārī, Malik, brother of Malik Kājī, seized Iskandar Khān and sent him to Muḥammad Shāh, p. 695; fought against Nāzuk Shāh and was slain, p. 698.

Yārī Bhat, Malik, was sent in the direction of Delhi by Malik Ahmad, p. 679; defeated Tātār Khān; devastated Sīlolkō; enmity with Malik Ahmad, p. 680; his imprisonment, p. 681; was sent to ravage the place of shelter of Fath Khān, p. 687.

Yāsin Afghān, went as an ambassador to Mirzā Haidar, p. 714.

Yehayyī Zinā, marriage of his daughter, p. 721.

Yūsuf bin ‘Abbās, Mustanjad Būllāh, brought a mandate from Egypt conferring imperial rule upon Maḥmūd Khālji, p. 537.

Yūsuf, son of ‘Ali Khān, went to his father, p. 747; executed Ibrāhīm Khān, p. 750; was punished, p. 758.

Yūsuf, Malik, was given the title of Saif Khān by Maḥmūd Shāh and was sent in attendance on A‘zam Humayūn, p. 285; entered the service of Bahādur Shāh, p. 331.

Yūsuf, Mullā, gave the order for the execution of Yūsuf, p. 746; Yūsuf executed, p. 746.

Yūsuf, Shāikh, joined Sultān Ahmad; was conferred the title of A‘zam Humayūn, p. 395.

Yūsuf, Shāikh, Sultān of Multān, his election as the ruler of Multān; his administration; message of Rāy Sahrah; took the daughter of Rāy Sahrah in marriage, p. 789; message from Rāy Sahrah; deceitful victory of Rāy Sahrah over him; period of reign, p. 790.

Yūsuf ‘Adil Khān, founder of the dynasty; what he was; took possession of Shōlāpūr, p. 159; also Bijāpūr; period of his reign, p. 160.

Yūsuf Andāz, wounded Qāḍī Ḥabīb, p. 745.

Yūsuf Chak, his share in the division of Kashmir, p. 719; joined Daulat Chak with an army, p. 721; defeated the Niyāzīs, p. 723; fell from his horse, p. 726.

Yūsuf Kashmiri, joined Yūsuf Khān, p. 756; his sīf was taken from him, p. 757.

Yūsuf Khān, was sent to fight against Mubārak Khān by Maḥmūd Khālji, p. 527.
Yüsuf Khan, son of ‘Ali Shâh, Sultan of Kashmir, message to Abdul Khan, p. 752; attacked Abdul Khan; buried ‘Ali Shâh and succeeded the latter; advanced against the rebels, p. 753; came to Hirahpur and Saiyid Mubarak Khan sat on the seat of authority; an attempt on Kashmir; went to the village of Barsal; message from Saiyid Mubarak Khan, p. 754; intention of the Kashmiris to raise Lohar Chak on the throne, p. 755; went to Saiyid Yüsuf Khan Lahori; sent Ya’qub to Kashmir; the government of Kashmir was confirmed on Lohar; started to conquer Kashmir; took possession of Rajauri, p. 756; entered the fort of Suyapa; fought with Lohar Chak; marched to Srinagar; rebels were cast into prison; divided the country of Kashmir; blinded Lohar; imprisonment on suspicion, p. 757; welcomed the ambassadors of Akbar; visit to Lâr, p. 758; sent an army to attack Haider Chak; returned victorious towards Srinagar; defeat of Haider Chak, p. 759; determination of his enemies about his son; advance of the army of Akbar towards Kashmir, p. 760; took up his station in the village of Nagar; made his submission to Akbar, p. 761.

Yüsuf Khan, son of Bahram Khan, was slain, p. 683.

Yüsuf Khan, Saiyid, Yüsuf Khan had an interview with him, p. 756.

Yüsuf Khan Hindawi, waited on Sultan Mahmud, p. 509; his dispute was changed into friendship with Daud Khan by Mahmud Khalji, p. 526.

Yüsuf Khan Lahori, Saiyid, Yüsuf Khan had an interview with him, p. 756.

Yüsuf Qawâm, Malik, took part in the conspiracy against Mahmud Khalji; was given the title of Qawâm Khan and the sie of Bhilasa by Mahmud Khalji, p. 499; fled from the camp of A’zam Humayun, p. 500, from Bhilasa, p. 501.

Yüsuf Shâh, Sultan of Bangala, the amirs placed him on the throne; died; period of reign, p. 436 (and see note 2, p. 436).

Yüsuf Turk, Malik, joined the associates of Amirzada Muhibb-ud-din Habib-ul-lah; passed through the gates of the citadel, p. 81; cut off the head of the chief guard; released Amirzada Habib-ul-lah, the sons of the Sultan, and Jalal Khan Bukhari, p. 82.

Yüsuf Zaf, p. 628.

Z

Zabardast Khan, son of Hazbar Khan, with his help the Malpur gatekeeper was slain, p. 563.

Zafar Khan, (Gujralt), p. 184; sat on the throne in the town of Bhipur; assumed the title of Sultan Muazzafar Shâh; how he was described in the Khutba; distributed wealth and conferred honours; successive marches to the country of Malwa; fought with Sultan Hushang in the neighbourhood of Dhar and defeated him, p. 185; put Sultan Hushang with his adherents into prison; installed Naqrat Khan in the government of Malwa; Sultan Ibraham Sharqi came with the idea of seizing Delhi but owing to the opposition of Muazzafar Shâh gave it up, and went back to Jaumpur; came back to Gujrat; took Sultan Hushang with him in captivity; rebellion of râ’iyats and soldiers of Malwa, p. 186, against Naqrat Shâh;
Khwājahdār rescued Naṣrat Shāh from Dhār and sent him to Gujarāt; people of Málwa made Mīsā Khān their leader; released Sulṭān Hūshang from imprisonment; sent Shāhzhāda Ahmad Khān to take possession of Málwa and to deliver it to Sulṭān Hūshang; Shāhzhāda Ahmad Khān took possession of Málwa and delivered it to Sulṭān Hūshang; gathered a force to punish the Rājpūts of Kuhnakōt; sent Khudawand Khān to attend on Shaikb Muḥammad Qāsim Budhū, p. 187; date of his illness at Naharwāla Pattan; placed Shāhzhāda Ahmad Khān on his throne with the title of Nāṣir-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh; ordered that the Ḵuṭba should be read in the prince’s name; date of his death; period of his reign; place of his tomb; title after his death, p. 188.

Zafar Khān, Shāhzhāda, received the farmān of Sulṭān Ahmad of Gujarāt at Sulṭānpūr Nadarbār; defeated Shāhzhāda ‘Alā-ud-dīn and the Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 50; was sent by Ahmad Shāh to destroy Malik-ut-tujjār; sent Iftikhar-ul-mulk and Malik Suhrab Sulṭāni to surround Thāna; began to conquer the district of Thāna; fought with the governor of Thāna and made him leave Thāna; left a body of troops at Thāna; advanced on Mahām, p. 215; defeated Malik-ut-tujjār and the Dakînī army, p. 216; despatched wealthy offerings to Ahmad Shāh; took possession of the district of Mahām and divided it among the amīrs, p. 217.

Zafar Minjuṃla, went to release ‘Uṯmān Khān, p. 487.

Zahir-ul-mulk, fought with Rāy Mal and was slain, p. 301.
Zahir-ul-mulk, vezīr of Maḥmūd Khājī, was slain by the army of Niẓām Shāh, p. 353.
Zain, Qāḍī, criticised the decision of the Muḥfīṭ, p. 746.
Zain Badr, pursued Ādam Khān, p. 672; his death, p. 679.
Zain Khān, cut off Bahādur Golānī’s head, and sent it to Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 125; was granted the horses and weapons of Bahādur Golānī, p. 126.
Zain-ul-ʿābidīn, Sulṭān, son of Sulṭān Sikandar, Sulṭān of Kashmir, accession; extension of empire; qualifications, p. 652; measures to stop robbery; order for the benefit of public; granted the prayer of Sri Bhat, p. 653; social, religious and administrative reforms, p. 654; attitude towards his subjects, religious freedom; wealth and expenditure, p. 655; treatment of the learned men of Islām and Yogyā; example of his intelligence, p. 656; orders for the criminals; his abstinence; patronage of the men of skill and art; his literary work, p. 657; educational ability; gifts from various sovereigns, p. 659; his heir; his sons, p. 660; grant to the sons of Sri Bhat, p. 661; his recovery by the science of Yogyā, p. 662; defeated Hāji Khān, p. 663; famine in Kasmīr, p. 665; attack of Ādam Khān; sent for Hāji Khān, p. 666; destruction of Ādam Khān, p. 667; his heir, p. 668; arrival of Ādam Khān; illness; rejected the suggestion of the amīrs; hostility among his sons; his last days, p. 670; period of reign, p. 672.
Zirak, servants of Fath Khān, released the imprisoned amīrs, p. 687.
II. GEOGRAPHICAL.

A
Abū, pp. 231, 233, 278.
Adanpūr, p. 717.
Āgar, pp. 570, 589.
Āgra, pp. 378, 379, 610, 616, 617, 618, 746.
Alār, p. 532.
Ahlān, p. 738.
'Ajām, p. 108.
Ajmir, pp. 525, 528, 530.
Alhanpūr, pp. 520, 546, 547.
Ancha, p. 160.
Ankar, p. 160.
Ankhūr, p. 192.
'Arab, pp. 108, 238, 659, 767, 768, 769.
Arankal, p. 38.
Asāwal, pp. 177, 183.
Āshmagar, p. 641.
Āshtā, pp. 358, 506, 564, 616, 628.
Ashtanagar, p. 302.
Āśtnagar, p. 641.
Asc, pp. 57, 58, 135, 157, 158, 196, 197, 213, 214, 244, 281, 283, 284, 289, 344, 355, 367, 388, 386, 527, 533, 534, 570, 576, 580, 586, 602.
Atak, p. 761.
Aūdān, p. 687.
Āwās, p. 538.

B
Bābal, p. 810.
Baghārā, p. 766.
Badaḵšāhān, p. 811.
Bāḍhal, p. 734.
Badhūl, pp. 14, 15, 32, 194.
Badnagar, p. 310.
Bādūkhā, 735.
Baghdād, p. 762.
Baglāna, p. 217.
Bāhār Bābā Ḥājī, pp. 581, 584, 589, 590.
Baharmal, pp. 714, 715.
Bahbā, pp. 408, 409, 410.
Bahanābād, p. 769.
Bahrāīch, p. 447.
Bahrāngala, p. 687.
Brahmangalah, pp. 709, 710, 715, 716.
Bāhrārah, pp. 648, 738.
Bahrōj, pp. 9, 184, 189, 190, 343, 377, 396, 398, 400, 402, 403, 406, 409, 410, 413, 472.
Bakankālū, pp. 557, 558.
Bākār, pp. 257, 308, 343, 347, 348, 349.
Bakīr, p. 105.
Baklāna, p. 527.
Bākūr, p. 224.
Bālāpūr, p. 534.
Bālīvat, p. 359.
Bālkūr, p. 163.
Bālūchistān, p. 795.
Bān, pp. 713, 723.
Banās, pp. 285, 529.
Bānbū, p. 195.
Bāngāla, pp. 414, 415, 419, 420, 421, 423, 426, 430, 617, 618, 627.
Bāngālah, pp. 438, 445, 446, 463.
Bāngil, pp. 694, 697.
Bānharīa, p. 356.
Bānīhāl, p. 723.
Bāṅkal, pp. 721, 744.
Bāṅswālā, pp. 313, 314, 349, 351.
Bāṅswālah, pp. 623, 627.
Bārah, pp. 275, 557, 727.
Bārāmūla, pp. 647, 667, 690, 713, 714, 716, 734, 749, 750, 760.
Baran, p. 452.
Bārāsīr, p. 521.
Bardah, p. 811.
Barhār, pp. 456, 518.
Barnāma, p. 227.
Barsāl, p. 754.
Bāsūr, p. 163.
Bātrak, p. 334.
Batūh, pp. 234, 324, 337, 404.
Bāukalā, p. 163.
Bawar, p. 246.
Bedānagar, p. 141.
Behār, pp. 424, 445, 448.
Behishtpūr, pp. 572, 574, 583.
Behrah, pp. 792, 793.
Benāres, pp. 460, 520.
Bengal, pp. 617, 798, 811.
Bera, pp. 70, 146, 148, 157, 526, 534, 538.
Bēsālnagar, p. 310.
Beyt, pp. 261, 263.
Bhānagar, p. 171.
Bhakkār, pp. 778, 779, 784, 786, 795, 805.
Bhāndir, pp. 517, 567.
Bhilpūr, p. 353.
Bhilwārah, p. 629.
Bhīm, pp. 481, 482, 512.
Bhimbar, pp. 645, 664, 685, 707, 760.
Biāna, p. 371.
Biānah, p. 452.
Bidār, pp. 9, 45, 52, 87, 89, 90, 92, 109, 117, 130, 132, 134, 164, 244, 279, 345, 534, 535.
Bihat, pp. 667, 728, 757.
Bihut, p. 683.
Bijāgarh, p. 580.

Bilampatān, p. 13.
Bīr, pp. 83, 713.
Birākār, p. 99.
Birkāna, pp. 101, 102.
Bīrpūr, pp. 185, 404.
Bīyāna, pp. 479, 520, 526, 542, 547.
Bombay, p. 50.
Bōrkāl, p. 120.
Brahman-ābād, pp. 765, 769.
Būndl, p. 532.

C

Ceylon, p. 762.
Chakdhar, p. 702.
Chapkūr, p. 722.
Chanāb, p. 801.
Chaul, p. 282.
Chināb, p. 723.
Chunār, p. 458.
Index.

D
Dâbal, p. 97.
Dâbil, p. 715.
Dabôhî, pp. 237, 347.
Dâbul, pp. 117, 118, 121, 159, 279.
Dahûd, pp. 274, 294, 297, 342, 591, 601, 615.
Dâhûr, pp. 187, 225.
Dâiyarah, p. 737.
Dâkin, pp. 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 22, 52, 81, 219.
Dal, p. 730.
Dâmpûr, p. 728.
Danduka, p. 398.
Dandûqa, pp. 331, 387.
Dandwâna, pp. 179, 206.
Danîl, p. 712.
Dâr, p. 711.
Dârâpûr, p. 649.
Darbadû, p. 718.
Datarbâr, p. 709.
Daulatâbâd, pp. 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 18, 92, 213, 214, 216, 245, 293, 536, 537.
Dâbul, pp. 762, 764, 765, 768.
Dêhî, p. 336.
Delhi, pp. 127, 594, 680.
Deogarh, p. 17.
Deorkonda, pp. 47, 77.
Dêvâsar, p. 719.

Dhâil, p. 755.
Dhâmôdî, p. 203.
Dhamônl, p. 595.
Dhankôt, pp. 793, 795.
Dhanûra, p. 285.
Dhâragarh, pp. 2, 8, 9, 298.
Dhôl, p. 313.
Dhôlpûr, p. 480.
Dîb, p. 215.
Dibâlpûr, pp. 352, 356, 467, 566, 593, 588.
Dibalpûr Banhariya, p. 694.
Dilâwara, p. 299.
Dilâwarah, pp. 352, 590.
Dilwâra, pp. 179, 220.
Dilwarah, p. 532.
Dipalpûr Banharîa, p. 205.
Dôhut, p. 711.
Dülâpûr, p. 678.
Dülûqa, pp. 387, 398, 404.
Dûmrah, p. 731.
Dûn, pp. 246, 282.
Dundâh, p. 479.

E
Egypt, pp. 537, 659.
Ekâla, pp. 423, 426, 443, 446.
Elichpûr, pp. 157, 534, 537, 538.
Eriîj, pp. 456, 457, 517, 518, 567.

F
Fathâbâd, pp. 518, 542.
Fatâpûr, p. 756.
Firûzâbâd, pp. 36, 89, 90, 244, 535.
G
Ganšā, pp. 229, 224.
Garjistān, p. 159.
Ghāṭi Bawālt, p. 522.
Ghaznī, p. 641.
Ghiyāspūr, p. 412.
Ghōghā, p. 268.
Gilān, pp. 159, 659.
Gilwāra, p. 306.
Gītā Dōrāh, pp. 231, 233.
Gōlkonda, pp. 106, 168, 169.
Gōndwāna, pp. 244, 366, 500, 588, 592, 622.
Gōndwāra, pp. 90, 92, 537.
Gosawar, p. 687.
Gōswā, p. 706.
Gulbarga, pp. 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 18, 27, 37, 38, 45, 46, 47, 50, 55, 97, 116, 159, 213, 217.
Haırān Bāzār, p. 748.
Hālūl, pp. 328, 341.
Hāndiyah, pp. 621, 622, 628, 629.
Hānspūr, p. 660.
Hārautī, pp. 526, 528, 530.
Harpūr, p. 220.
Harsāl, p. 319.
Hārūtī, p. 492.
Hāsanābād, p. 10.
Haswās, p. 681.
Hatiyāpūl, p. 624.
Hāptamati, p. 209.
Hind, pp. 392, 763.
Hindaun, p. 509.
Hindūbāb, p. 566.
Hindū Kūh, p. 811.
Hindūkush, p. 641.
Hirāhpūr, pp. 688, 691, 716, 746, 754.
Hirārū, p. 716.
Hīrāpūr, pp. 664, 687.
Hormuz, p. 260.
Hurmuz, p. 161.
Hūshangābād, pp. 483, 499, 500, 501, 526.
I
Indarkōt, pp. 714, 715, 716, 718, 719.
India, pp. 381, 392, 468, 660, 675, 677, 761, 787, 788.
Indus, 668.
'Īraq, pp. 108, 137, 161, 647, 689.
Islāmābād, pp. 367, 499.
Itāvah, pp. 447, 448, 449.
J
Jagat, pp. 259, 260, 261, 263.
Jāñagar, pp. 205, 208, 421, 423, 475, 476, 477, 479.
Jāk, p. 730.
Jakdar, p. 648.
Jāktr, p. 122.
Jalālpūr, p. 541.
Jālandar, p. 686.
Jālna, pp. 62, 65, 72, 216.
Jālōr, p. 270.
Jalwāra, p. 179.
Jamalnagarī, pp. 698, 750.
Jamjāh, p. 731.
Jamuna, pp. 452, 461, 517.
Jār, p. 178.
Jāruḍ, p. 722.
Jāthba, pp. 481, 482, 483.
Jaukās, p. 751.
Jāwar, p. 609.
Jhālāwār, pp. 318, 386, 472.
Jhālu, pp. 711, 728.
Jhāro, p. 724.
Jhavāil, p. 756.
Jhelum, pp. 667, 683, 728, 757.
Jīnūr, p. 203.
Jīnūr, pp. 75, 94, 95, 97, 113, 137.
Jūthānāb, p. 400.

K
Kachwārah, pp. 541, 542, 569.
Kābul, p. 723.
Kadrūlā, pp. 629, 630.
Kahrār, pp. 362, 363, 700.
Kahtwārah, p. 750.
Kahumāhmū, pp. 732, 733.
Kaitaka, pp. 97, 98.
Kaitūr, p. 631.
Kākrēj, p. 399.
Kākrī, pp. 407, 408.
Kākpur, p. 755.
Kālāchābūtra, p. 139.

Kalahmāt, p. 732.
Kaland, p. 214.
Kālāpur, p. 122.
Kalhar, pp. 121, 122.
Kāllādāh, pp. 199, 474.
Kālinjar, p. 623.
Kāliyādāh, p. 569.
Kalna, p. 289.
Kālāpur, pp. 404, 405.
Kambāyat, p. 215.
Kampīlah, p. 447.
Kanbal, p. 504.
Kanbāyat, pp. 175, 177, 189, 263, 268, 343, 344, 346, 347, 351, 356.
Kanbāyet, 369, 375, 411.
Kandār, p. 105.
Kandāsah, p. 575.
Kandūyah, pp. 558, 587, 588, 591.
Kanjī, pp. 105, 106.
Kānkriā, p. 318.
Kankūla, p. 66.
Kānthā, pp. 205, 406.
Kānthū, p. 176.
Kānūr, p. 367.
Kaparbanj, pp. 228, 243, 252, 318, 523.
Karbalā, p. 43.
Karchi, pp. 349, 351.
Karī, pp. 398, 400, 479.
Kāritha, p. 203.
Karīthi, p. 811.
Karmal, p. 708.
Karnārī, p. 272.
Karsawār, p. 887.
Kāshgārah, pp. 701, 703, 704, 710, 716, 723, 728.
Index.


Katinkah, p. 630.

Kävri, p. 404.

Kâwâh, p. 709.


Kehrla, pp. 36, 52, 95, 477, 480, 536, 538, 540.

Khâlidgarh, pp. 716, 724, 731.

Khâljîpûr, p. 317.

Khâljipûr, p. 528.

Khânâvâl, pp. 792, 793, 795.

Khânîpûr, pp. 334, 347, 405, 410, 523, 716, 717.

Khârî, p. 243.

Khârî nadi, pp. 393, 404.

Khârkûn, p. 580.

Khâwâh, p. 727.

Khâwar, p. 720.

Khâwaryârah, p. 702.

Khîrîr, p. 619.

Khîd, p. 735.

Khîlâhuyah, p. 691.


Khîshâb, p. 792.

Khîwâra, pp. 212, 220.

Khîwârah, 532.

Kíshtwâr, pp. 637, 639, 711, 738, 750.

Kishun, p. 557.

Kîz, p. 263.

Kodhrâ, p. 263.

Kôdhrâh, pp. 296, 297.

Kokan, p. 97.

Köl, pp. 447, 448.

Kolâpûr, pp. 97, 98, 123.

Kônîbhalîmîr, pp. 512, 532, 632.

Kôsûr, p. 710.

Kothårî, p. 720.

Kothrah, p. 226.

Kôt Karûr, pp. 793, 795.

Kôtli Bîrâb, p. 629.

Krishna, pp. 16, 19, 21, 30, 59.

Kuhnakôt, p. 187.

Kumâyûn, p. 811.

Kûmbhalmîr, pp. 231, 233, 234.

L

Lakhmînagar, p. 642.

Lâhûre, pp. 381, 627, 707, 749, 803, 810, 811.

Lakhnauti, pp. 420, 421, 422, 426, 448, 620.

Lâkîâkôt, p. 313.

Lâlipûr, 737.

Lâr, pp. 701, 710, 711, 737, 738.


Lôrôgûn, p. 586.

Lûlpûr, p. 694.

Lûnkôt, p. 723.

M

Mâchal, pp. 98.

Madanjâh, p. 732.

Madwâr, p. 713.


Mahâsar, p. 471.

Mâhim, pp. 50, 118.

Mahîndpûr, p. 205.


Mahîrs, p. 205.

Mahmûdâbâd, pp. 331, 376, 393, 395, 403, 404, 411, 527, 538, 540.

Mahôbah, p. 519.

Mahollî, p. 526.

Mahrâsa, pp. 192, 193, 197, 279, 296, 313, 318, 319, 331, 332, 348, 473, 474.

Mâhûr, pp. 48, 71, 94, 345, 526, 527.

Mâî, pp. 337, 343.
Malkapur, p. 162.
Malkonda, pp. 77, 78, 92, 537.
Malpur, p. 563.
Mamun, p. 731.
Ma'murabadd, pp. 404, 407.
Mandal, p. 197.
Mandalgari, pp. 178, 519, 520, 529, 530.
Mandsur, p. 234.
Manik, p. 292.
Mansarwar, p. 660.
Muran, pp. 655, 745.
Murbawah, p. 703.
Mard Duhn, p. 729.
Marmah, p. 711.
Marwar, pp. 303, 525.
Marvarah, p. 728.
Masahhad, p. 72.
Maujpur, p. 398.
Maukedah Khair, p. 740.
Mawar, p. 720.
Mawara'-un-nahr, p. 647.
Mawas, p. 221.
Mecca, pp. 267, 659.
Mehran, p. 785.
Mehitar Sulaiman, p. 749.
Mekran, pp. 761, 795.
Mewar, pp. 220, 232, 357, 525, 530.
Mewat, pp. 454, 509.
Mirich, pp. 119, 120, 121, 123.
Miwat, p. 321.
Mukkai, pp. 59, 69.
Muhammadpur, pp. 203, 353, 612.
Multan, pp. 180, 467, 778, 783, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 793, 795, 797, 798, 801, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 810, 811.
Munka, p. 337.
Munka Baham, p. 325.
Muvwaara, p. 399.

N

Nadel, pp. 184, 197, 199, 201, 217, 340, 396.
Nagam, pp. 673, 687.
Nagar, p. 761.
Nagarkot, p. 641.
Nagor, pp. 175, 184, 194, 197, 220, 221, 229, 230, 233, 413, 530.
Nagot, p. 398.
Nahrwala, pp. 175, 197, 270, 289, 345.
Nahrwala Patlan, pp. 9, 188, 332.
Nakam, p. 694.
Index.

Naldirak, p. 59.
Narbada, pp. 197, 283, 396, 533, 579, 617.
Narwar, pp. 507, 508.
Nāsratābādī, pp. 160, 536, 574, 584.
Naurāzkot, p. 737.
Nausārī, p. 377.
Naushahr, pp. 673, 676, 682, 698, 741, 750.
Naushahrah, p. 713.
Nāvīl, p. 671.
Nīlāb, p. 668.
Nītwār, p. 106.
Nīr, p. 730.
Nīrūn, pp. 765, 766.

O
Orissa, pp. 87, 105, 446, 458, 459, 460, 811.

P
Pahalwānī, p. 353.
Pakī, pp. 712, 723.
Pāl, p. 396.
Pallašālā, p. 663.
Panāla, pp. 123, 125, 126.
Pāndūra, p. 426.
Pândūah, p. 443.
Pānīpat, p. 694.
Pānna, p. 509.
Pārāntēj, p. 311.
Pātīlād, p. 411.
Pattān, pp. 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 181, 182, 184, 188, 190, 215, 290, 296, 300, 306, 377, 398, 399, 413, 470.
Pattana, p. 735.
Persia, p. 163.
Peshāvar, p. 641.
Pir Punjāl, p. 681.
Punch, pp. 667, 672, 715.
Punj, p. 708.

Q
Qabq, p. 726.
Qāḍīpūr, p. 579.
Qandahār, pp. 634, 637, 641, 778, 779, 780, 781.
Qanouj, p. 182.
Qūb-ud-dīnpūr, pp. 666, 670, 671.

R
Rādhanpūr, pp. 398, 399.
Raichūr, p. 48.
Rājījūr, pp. 48, 60, 61.
Rājāwiyah, pp. 558, 559.
Rajkonda, p. 47.
Rakhāl, p. 265.
Ran, p. 257.
Rangta, p. 98.
Rantambhūr, pp. 526, 527, 621.
Ranthambhūr, pp. 520, 543, 559, 571, 583.
Ranthambhūr, p. 370.
Rāprī, p. 448.
Rasūlabādī, p. 337.
Rātah, pp. 457, 518, 519.
Rāthūr, p. 221.
Rāvī, p. 803.
Rāwar, p. 770.

S
Sābarmati, pp. 191, 242, 296, 398, 405.
Sa’dulpūr, pp. 356, 357, 588.
Sāghir, p. 24.
Sahvunj, p. 334.
Sājanpūr, p. 592.
Sājūr, p. 270.
Sālah, p. 746.
Salāla, p. 123.
Samarqand, pp. 260, 498, 647, 652.
Sambla, p. 351.
Samnāk, p. 724.
Sanbal, pp. 451, 611.
Sangesar, p. 61.
Saniūr, p. 184.
Index.

Sarābah, pp. 579, 580.
Sarkēj, p. 292.
Sarkāhēj, pp. 242, 265, 323, 337, 412.
Sarsati, palace at, p. 563.
Satwās, pp. 587, 589, 591, 592, 608, 610, 611, 622.
Sāwal, p. 402.
Sōwī, pp. 778, 779, 789, 803.
Shahahābād, p. 588.
Shāhāhpūr, p. 668.
Shāhpūr, pp. 353, 454.
Shahrāli, pp. 584, 594.
Shakar, pp. 27, 29.
Shārkōt, p. 733.
Shihābpūr, p. 642.
Shihāb-ud-dīn pūr, p. 716.
Shikārpūr, p. 590.
Shīrāz, pp. 498, 764.
Shōlāpūr, p. 159.
Shōr, pp. 792, 793, 794, 796, 802, 803, 804, 805.
Shīkākōt, pp. 651, 680, 713, 745, 756.
Sīhwān, pp. 766, 779, 780, 784.
Sikandarpūr, pp. 672, 676.
Sīlī, p. 283.
Sīplā, p. 350.
Sīprī, pp. 571, 572.
Sīrōhāl, pp. 231, 234, 257, 413.
Sīrōnū, p. 593.
Sīrsiah, pp. 584, 585.
Sīsāmas, p. 767.
Sītpūr, p. 705.
Siwālik, p. 647.
Siwistān, pp. 766, 767.
Sōmmāth, pp. 178, 181.
Sōnārgaon, p. 429.
Sonkhēra, p. 204.
Sonkhir, p. 263.
Sūdpūr, p. 352.
Sūltānābād, p. 204.
Sundarsā, p. 559.
Sūnkār, pp. 116, 375.
Sūrā, p. 525.
Sūtlej, p. 641.
Sūyāpūr, pp. 667, 677, 716, 721, 733, 747, 757.
Syria, p. 764.

T

Tahrād, pp. 398, 399.
Tālnūr, pp. 198, 199, 219, 244, 402, 403.
Tambūl, pp. 54, 196, 197, 218, 219.
Tāptī, pp. 281, 525.
Tar, p. 178.
Tārāpūr, pp. 206, 478, 501.
Tarwāra, pp. 398, 399.
Thānā, pp. 558.
Thālnūr, pp. 284, 286.
Thāna, pp. 215, 216.
Thatha, pp. 3, 10, 345, 756, 780, 784, 795, 805, 810.
Tilang, pp. 46, 60, 79, 80, 105, 111.
Tiptī, p. 217.
Index.

Tirhúta, pp. 448, 459.
Tughlaqábâd, p. 509.

U
Uch, pp. 796, 798.
Ucha, p. 789.
Uehh, p. 639.
Ujjain, pp. 205, 206, 304, 359, 356, 357, 468, 474, 478, 482, 504, 505, 559, 566, 569, 582, 583, 588, 589, 620, 621, 627, 628, 629.
Usmânpûr, p. 405.

V
Visâlnâgar, pp. 210, 211.
Vitastâ, p. 667.

W
Wahl, p. 719.
Walipûr, pp. 638, 677.
Wantaj, pp. 190, 192.
Warangal, p. 79.

Y
Yohiîyâpur, p. 639.

Z
Zainâgir, pp. 678, 705.
Zaingar, p. 732.
Zaingârî, pp. 736, 744.
Zainpûr, pp. 741, 744, 748.
Zîrbâd, p. 104.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Per unit of 96 or 100 pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demy octavo</td>
<td>Oriental text only</td>
<td>Rs. 0-12-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text and translation, English notes, etc., mixed; or translation only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal octavo</td>
<td>Oriental text only</td>
<td>Rs. 1-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text and translation, English notes, etc., mixed; or translation only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarto</td>
<td>Oriental text only</td>
<td>Rs. 1-4-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text and translation, English notes, etc., mixed; or translation only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some exceptions to this scale, which in each case will be indicated in the price-lists. For the calculation of prices, each part of a unit in excess of the 96 or 100 pages counts again as a full unit.

Single issues may be bought separately, but three years after the completion of a work no complete sets are broken for the sale of loose component parts.

Each issue bears, besides its issue number, a fascicle number indicating its place in the work and volume to which it belongs.

With the issue of this Notice all previous prices and price-lists are cancelled.

CALCUTTA,
1st January, 1940.

The publications or information about them are obtainable from the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, No. 1, Park Street, Calcutta, or from the Society’s Agents:

- MESSRS. LUZAC & CO., 48, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.
- M. PAUL GRUTHNER, 13, Rue Jacob, Paris, VI°.
- BUCHHANDELUNG OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, 14, Querstrasse, Leipzig.
- MESSRS. THACKER, SPINK & CO., Ltd., 3, Esplanade, East, Calcutta.
- MESSRS. THE MOORE COTTERELL SUBSCRIPTION AGENCIES, New York, U.S.A.

Residents of Europe should order from the Agents.

When ordering direct from the Society the following rules should be observed:

Orders should be addressed to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal and not to any Official by name or title.

All Cheques, Money Orders, etc., should be made payable to the "Treasurer, Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal".

Orders for books should be accompanied by a full name and address, legibly written, and should be sent on a separate sheet of paper containing no other communication.

In India, books are supplied by V.-P.P.
CALCUTTA:—Published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1, Park Street, and Printed by F. Knight, Baptist Mission Press, 41a, Lower Circular Road.