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I.—Historical Setting.


2. The Mir'át i Sikandari by Sikandar bin Muhammad, A.D. 1611; translated in Sir E. Clive Bayley's History of Gujarát, A.D. 1886.*

3. The Mir'át i Aḥmádí by 'Alli Muhammad Khán, A.D. 1756-1761;
   (a) translated in James Bird's History of Gujarát, A.D. 1835,
   (b) also translated in Sir E. Clive Bayley's History of Gujarát, A.D. 1886.

4. The Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I., Part I., A.D. 1896, containing the History of Gujarát, Musalmán Period, by Colonel J. W. Watson. Throughout this article the following abbreviations will be employed:
   Br.-F. = Briggs's Firishta; Ba.-S = Bayley's Mir'át i Sikandari;
   Bi.-A. = Bird's Mir'át i Aḥmádí; Ba.-A = Bayley's Mir'át i Aḥmádí;

* A copy of the recently published complete translation of the Mir'át i Sikandari by Fazlullah Lutfullah Faridi reached me too late to be of service in the preparation of this article.

A flavour of romance attaches to the history that has come down to us of the founder of the Gujarāt Salṭanat. In the days of the eccentric Sultan of Dehlī, Muḥammad bin Ṭagḥlaq (A.H. 725-752; A.D. 1324-1351), his cousin Fīrūz, while on a hunting expedition in the Khedā district of Gujarāt, wandered from his attendants and lost his way. Weared with the chase, he turned his horse at eventide in the direction of the village of Thāsārā,* and on the stranger's arrival there the village headmen, two brothers of the Tānka family of Rājpūts, Sādhū and Sadhāran by name, cordially invited him to partake of their hospitality. Soon an ample board was spread, and Sādhū's sister, a maiden "peerless in beauty and loveliness," filling a goblet, presented it to the unknown guest. He received the vessel from her hand with a pleasure he was at no pains to conceal. After he had quaffed three cups, "the rosebud of his disposition unfolded," and now the talk grew confidential. The stranger ere long revealed himself to be the Sultan's cousin and his acknowledged heir. Sādhū straightway gave his sister, "more lovely than a hūrī of light," in nikāḥ marriage to the prince, and thereafter the two brothers, linking their fortunes with his, accompanied him to Dehlī, the capital of the kingdom. It was not long before both of them, in the phrase of Sikandar bin Muḥammad, "obtained the honour of Islām," and on this change of his faith Sadhāran received the title of Waji' al Mulk, "the Support of the State." With the proselyte's proverbial zeal, the brothers became disciples of a much revered Muslim saint,† and soon gained a high reputation for piety. Of Zafar Khān, the more famous son of Waji' al Mulk, it is related that this saint, in return for a timely kindness, promised him prophetically the whole country of Gujarāt, and later, giving him a handful of dates, said, "Zafar Khān, thy seed like unto these in number shall rule over Gujarāt." The historian adds, "Some say there were twelve, some thirteen dates, others say eleven: God knows which story is true."

* Some historians are of opinion that the scene of this incident lay not at Thāsārā in Gujarāt, but at Thānesar in the Sirhind division of the Panjāb.

† This saint was known as Quṭb al aqṭāb Ḥaḍrat Makhdūm i Jahānīyān, 'the pole-star of pole-stars, His Highness the Lord of Mortals.' As the quṭb al aqṭāb, he was held to have attained that supreme stage of sanctity wherein is reflected the heart of the Prophet himself.
The death of the Sultan Muhammad bin Taghlaq was in keeping with a life marked by projects magnificent in conception but abortive, at times ludicrously abortive, in achievement. In 1351 he set off from Gujarat in order to chastise Lower Sindh for harbouring insurgents. Though accompanied by an army "as numerous as a swarm of ants or locusts," he did not live to annihilate the refractory Sumra Rujputs of Thatta, but himself died on the banks of the Indus from fever induced by a surfeit of fish. The Sultan had left no son,* but Firuz, his cousin and legatee, on the third day ascended the throne, and for the next thirty-seven years swayed, and on the whole beneficently, the destinies, of the Empire. Zafar Khan and his brother Shams Khan, as nephews of the queen, were now advanced to high honours, and to them were entrusted the responsible duties pertaining to the office of Chief Butler, 'Onda i sharabdar. On the death of Firuz Shah in 1388, a grandson, Ghiyath al din Taghlaq Shah II, succeeding to the Sultanat, spent his brief reign of five months in an unbroken round of debauchery. Another grandson, Abu Bakr, next held the throne for some nine months, at the end of which time he was deposed by the late

---

* The following Genealogical Table shows the relationship of the Taghlaqid Sultans of Delhi:

```
 Taghlaq,
 (slave of Ghiyath al din Balban)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ghiyath al din Taghlaq I</th>
<th>Sipah Salar Rajab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammed II (Junah)</td>
<td>Firuz Shah III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bin Taghlaq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320-1324</td>
<td>1351-1388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fath</th>
<th>Zafar Nasir al din Muhammad III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1389-1392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ghiyathal din Nuurat Khan</th>
<th>Abu Bakr</th>
<th>Sikandar</th>
<th>Nasir al din Mahmud II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taghlaq II 1394-1399</td>
<td>1388-1389</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>1392-1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388 (5 mos.)</td>
<td>(9 mos.)</td>
<td>(45 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Firūz Shāh's son, Nāṣir al din Muḥammad Shāh III, who for the three years 1389-1392 managed to retain the sovereign power. It was during the reign of this Sultān, Muḥammad III., that Zafar Khān was appointed to the viceroalty of Gujarāt. Ugly rumours had reached the Court that the then viceroy, Mufarrāḥ Sultānī, more commonly known by his title of Farḥūt al Mulk Rāstit Khān, had been encouraging the Hindū religion, so as to gain the goodwill of the populace, and by their aid establish a kingdom of Gujarāt entirely independent of the paramount power at Dehli. Accordingly in 1391 the Sultān Muḥammad selected Zafar Khan, the son, it will be remembered, of Sadhāran the zealous apostate from Hindūism, for the viceroalty, in supersession of Mufarrāḥ Khān. The governor-designate had a royal send off. Firīhita records that he was given the title of Muẓaffar Khān and honoured with a dress of instamle. He was further presented with the white canopy and scarlet pavilion "such as are exclusively used by kings"—a fitting presage of Zafar's future assumption of regal power. Mufarrāḥ gave battle to Zafar at the village of Kāmbhū in the district of Anhīlwaḍa Pattan, but the unruly ruler (Nāẓim be-nīgām) was slain, and Zafar, to commemorate his victory, founded on the site of the battle the town of Jitpur. Thereafter the whole of Gujarāt acknowledged his authority, and under his strong administration the country prospered.

But very different ran the course of affairs at the seat of the Empire. On the death of Muḥammad III. in 1392, his son Si-kandar succeeded to the throne, but suddenly died after a reign of only five and forty days. In the resultant confusion, his brother Nāṣir al din Mahmūd II. was chosen king by one faction of the nobles, and a cousin Nuṣrat Khān by a rival faction. For many years thereafter the kingdom was sore distracted by internal strife. War between the claimants was still proceeding when Timūr Lang, the lame Timūr (Tamerlane), crossing the Indus, led the hordes of Tartary on that terrible invasion which for a time converted Hindūstān into shambles. It was in 1398 that he marched rapidly upon Dehli, on his way thither slaughtering in cold blood the hundred thousand captives in his camp; and early in 1399, after defeating Mahmūd at Firūzābād, he entered the capital. For five days the ill-fated city was given over to pillage, the conqueror feasting, while his brutal soldiery in the general and indiscriminate massacre of the inhabitants perpetrated indescribable atrocities.
The Sultān Maḥmūd II., however, had effected an escape, and eventually, after many wanderings in remote parts of his dominions, arrived a fugitive before the gates of Pattan. Zafar Khān at once went out to meet him, and escorted him to the palace with every mark of honour. The Sultan had hoped to secure Zafar Khān’s alliance and march immediately upon Dehli, where Nuṣrat Khān was still a source of danger. Zafar, however, did not think this enterprise advisable, so the Sultan, aggrieved, departed for Mālwā. Here, too, he was doomed to disappointment, but, having in the meantime heard that his wazīr Iqbāl Khān had expelled the rival ruler Nuṣrat, Maḥmūd returned to Dehli in 1402—“a very shadow of a king.” His authority extended to only a few districts beyond the city walls, and even that only because his wazīr amiably bestowed on him countenance and protection.

The utter anarchy that now reigned in Hindūstān naturally issued in the dismemberment of the Empire. Embracing twenty-three provinces, all held in full subjection by Muḥammad bin Taghlaq in the early part of his reign, it became from the very number of its satrapies essentially incoherent. After the catastrophe of Timūr’s invasion, several independent kingdoms were carved out of the dominions of Dehli, and the Empire was thus despoiled of its fairest provinces. How large a number became at this time independent under their several governors, all of whom styled themselves ‘kings,’ is shown in the following list, quoted in Thomas’ “Chronicles of the Paṭhān Kings of Dehli” from the Tārīkh i Mubārak Shāhī MS.

Zafar Khān ... ... Gujarat.
Khizr Khān... ... Multān, Daibalpūr, Sindh.
Māhmūd Khān ... Mahobah, Kālpī.
Khwājah i Jahān ... Kanauj, Oudh, Karrah, Dalamau, Sundalāh, Bahraich, Bahūr, Jaunpūr.
Dilāwar Khān ... Dhār (Mālwā).
Ghālib Khān ... Samānah.
Shams Khān ... Biāna.

Strange to relate, not Zafar Khān himself but his son was the first to assume an independent authority over Gujarat. This son, by name Tātār Khān, had, on his father’s departure as viceroy-designate of Gujarat, been detained in Dehli, not improbably as a pledge for the father’s fidelity. In the disorders that followed upon the death
of Sultan Muhammad III (A. D. 1392), Tahar Khan, as well as others of the more ambitious nobles, aspired to the imperial throne, and thus came into collision with the powerful wazir Iqbal Khan. Tahar was, however, worsted in this unequal struggle, and found safety only in flight to Gujarat, where on his arrival his father accorded him a gracious reception. But Tahar harboured in his heart an ardent desire for revenge on Iqbal Khan, and frequently sought to win his father over to his own ambitious designs. Zafar Khan, however, was not to be moved from the conviction that any attempt on Delhi would be fraught with disaster. From the various conflicting accounts it is difficult to ascertain what precisely was the subsequent course of events, but the version favoured by several writers is that Tahar, finding his father thus intractable, basely had him seized and placed in confinement in the village of Asawal, near the site of the future city of Ahmadabad. He next won over to himself the army and the chief Government officials. Thus secure, he at once assumed royal rank, and, setting up a throne, made himself king with a title variously given as Nasir al dunya wa al din, Muhammad Shah or Ghiyath al dunya wa al din Muhammad Shah. This coup d'état would seem to have been struck in the year 1403 (A. H. 806). The imprisoned Zafar Khan, however, through one of his confidants, and afterwards by a letter secretly conveyed, prevailed upon his brother, Shams Khan, whom Tahar had appointed wazir, to devise measures for his release. Accordingly one night, when Tahar with his army, in furtherance of his long-cherished design, was already on the march towards Delhi, Shams Khan administered poison to his nephew, who thus, little more than two months after his accession to the throne, "drank the draught of death, and went to the city of non-existence." Liberated from his prison, Zafar Khan, with the cordial concurrence of the nobles, now resumed the governorship. He did not, however, affect a royal style or dignity, but, on the contrary, he seems to have found the cares of office so burdensome that he desired to demit them to his brother and himself retire into private life. Shams Khan, however, refused the proffered honour, and Zafar Khan was then content to nominate as his successor his grandson, Ahmad Khan, son of the late Sultan Muhammad, a youth then but fourteen years of age. Some three uneventful years passed away before Zafar was finally constrained to accept the rôle of an independent sovereign. The circumstances
under which this change was effected, a change so fraught with
consequence for Gujarāt, are thus recorded in the Mir'at i
Sikandari.

"When the striking of coin and supreme authority were no longer
exercised by the House of Dehli, the nobles and officers represented
to Zafar Khān, at an auspicious time and favourable moment, that
the government of the country of Gujarāt could not be maintained
without the signs and manifestation of kingly authority. No one
was capable of wielding regal power but himself: he was, therefore,
indicated by public opinion as the person who ought, for the
maintenance of Muḥammadan religion and tradition, to unfold the
royal umbrella over his head, and to delight the eyes of those who
longed for that beautiful display. In compliance with this requis-
tion in the year H. 810 (A. D. 1407), three years and seven months
after the death of Sulṭān Muḥammad, the victorious Zafar Khān
raised the umbrella of royalty, and took to himself the title of Muẓaffar Shāh at Birpur" (Ba.-S. pp. 83, 84). The laqab, or sur-
name, adopted on his acceptance of the throne was Shams al dunyā
wa al din, 'the Sun of the World and of the Faith.'

The three years of Muẓaffar's reign witnessed no events of gen-
eral interest, being occupied mainly with a successful expedition
against Dhar (Mālwā), and another "against the infidels of Kambh-
Kot." To aid his former master, the Sultan Maḥmūd, he marched
an army towards Dehli, thus preventing the meditated attack on
that city by Sulṭān Ibrāhīm of Jaunpūr.

"As commonly reported and believed," Muẓaffar's death took place
under the following tragic circumstances. Some Kolis near Asīwal
having risen in rebellion, Aḥmad Khān was placed in command of an
army to quell the insurrection. After completing a single march
from Pattan, he convened an assembly of divines, learned in the law,
to whom he propounded the question, 'If one person kills the father
of another unjustly, ought the son of the murdered man to exact
retribution?' All replied in the affirmative, and gave in their answers
in writing. Armed with this authoritative decision, Aḥmad suddenly
returned with the troops to Pattan, there overpowered his grand-
father, and forthwith handed him a cup of poison to drink. The old
King in mild remonstrance exclaimed, 'Why so hasty my boy? A
little patience, and power would have come to you of itself, for all I
have is intended for you.' After words of advice to punish the evil counsellors who had plotted this nefarious scheme and to abstain from wine, "for such abstinence is proper for kings," the Sultan Mu'azzafar Shah raised to his lips, and drained, the bitter cup of death. Remorse for this unnatural crime is said to have so embittered Ahmad's after-life that, like our own King Henry I., he was never known to smile again.

It is true that some historians state that in the fourth year of his reign Sultan Mu'azzafar, falling ill, abdicated in favour of his grandson Ahmad, but that the disease did not terminate fatally till five months and sixteen days later. The circumstantial and detailed narrative of Sikandar can, however, hardly be a fabrication pure and simple, whereas a Muhammadan historian, writing of a Muhammadan king eminent for orthodoxy, would be sore tempted to suppress the record of a deed so infamous. The scrupulous observance of religious ritual that marked the after years of Ahmad's life finds perhaps its best explanation in the assumption that, profoundly penitent, he was seeking thus to expiate his terrible crime. In the Jam' Masjid of Ahmadaabad is still shown in the Royal Gallery—the Muluk Khana—a low dais with its marble surface worn away by Ahmad's feet, attesting his so frequent prayer-prostrations. Tradition also tells that his home-life was severely simple, his personal expenses being restricted to the sum received from the sale of caps made by his own hands. It is further significant that his after-death title is Khudayagan i Maghfur, 'The Great Lord forgiven,' thus betokening that "Allah the Pitiiful, moved by the prayer of forty believers, had spread his forgiveness over the crime of Ahmad's youth." (W.-B. G. p. 240.)

On his grandfather's death Ahmad succeeded to the throne with the title of Nasir al dunya wa al din Abu'l Fath Ahmad Shah. Though thus the third Sultan of the dynasty, his long and brilliant reign of thirty-three years (A. H. 813-846; A.D. 1410-1443), his introduction of an admirable system of civil and military administration, his successful expeditions against Junagadh, Champaran, Idar, and Malwa, his building of Ahmadaabad as his capital, all combined in the process of years to invest him with eponymous honours, so that from him the Saltanat is known to-day by the name of Ahmad Shahi. He may with justice be held the virtual founder of that dynasty "which was to maintain in Gujarat for nearly two hundred years
swar brilliant in its military enterprises and in the architecture with which it adorned its capital, but precarious, ever disputed at lavish cost in blood and treasure, and never effectually established throughout the province." *

Having now traced in some detail the rise of the Gujarat Sultanat, it will suffice for the purpose of this article to indicate little more than the succession of rulers till the close of the dynasty in 1573. Two events, however, in Ahmad's reign demand special notice by reason of their connexion with the coins of the period, to wit, the founding of the two cities named after the Sultan himself, Ahmadabad and Ahmadnagar (Iftar). According to the Mir'at i Ahmadi it was in the year H. 813 (A. D. 1411) that Ahmad Shāh, having received "the assent and leave of that Moon of the Faithful and Sun of the Righteous, Shaikh Ahmad Gajj Bakhsh," began to build and establish the Shāri i Mu'āqam 'the Great City,' Ahmadabad, in the immediate vicinity of A'wāl. The Sultan had always professed himself partial to the air and soil of that town, but tradition assigns two further reasons for the founding of the city on its present site. Aśwāl was the hold of the famous robber chief ain Asā Bhill, whose daughter's charms and beauty had won the heart of Ahmad Shāh. Then, too, at this spot, while the King was one day hunting, a hare had turned on the hunters and fiercely assailed them. To commemorate a courage so phenomenal, Ahmad desired a city should be built, and among the local peasantry the saying still is heard, "When a hare attacked a dog, the king founded the city." It is on record that the four boundaries of the city were lined out by four Ahmads who had never missed the afternoon prayer (ṣāhr). The first was that Pole-Star of Shaikhs and Holy Men, the Shaikh Ahmad Khattu Gajj Bakhsh; the second the king himself; the third another Shaikh Ahmad; and the fourth a Mullā Ahmad; these last two being high-born connexions of the Sultan. The city walls, some six miles in circumference, formed a semicircle facing the river Sābarmati and frowned down on it in imposing ramparts, fifty feet high. Sir Theodore Hope has thus graphically pictured the wonderful development of the work then begun. "In three years the city was sufficiently advanced for habitation, but the great buildings rose only by degrees, and for upwards of a century the work of population and adornment was carried on with unremitting energy, till archi-

itecture could proceed no further, having satisfied the aesthetic and social wants of above two millions of souls. For materials the finest edifices of Anbilwāda, Chandrāvatī, and other cities were ruthlessly plundered; but their delicate sculptures appear with few exceptions to have been scornfully thrown into walls and foundations, where they are now constantly found, while for their own works the conquerors resorted to the sand-stone quarries of Ajmadnagar and Dhrāngadra, or the marble hills of the Ajmir district. As to style it was the singular fortune of the Muḥammadans to find themselves among a people their equals in conception, their superiors in execution, and whose tastes had been refined by centuries of cultivation. While moulding them, they were moulded by them, and, though insisting on the bold features of their own minaret and pointed arch, they were fain to borrow the pillared hall, the delicate traceries and rich surface ornaments of their despised and prostrate foe. In Ahmad's own reign the chief buildings erected were, in addition to the triple gateway and the walls surrounding the city and the inner citadel (Bhadra), the Jāmē' Masjīd or Cathedral Mosque, the Sultan's private chapel, and the mosques of Haibat Khān, Saiyid 'Ālam, Malik 'Ālam, and Sidi Saiyid, the last with glorious windows of pierced stone. With so noble a city as his creation, it is not without reason that historians have delighted to link with Ahmad's name the proud title of Bānī Ahmadābād, 'Founder of Ahmadābād.'

The chief of Īdar long proved a troublesome neighbour to Ahmad Shāh, who on more than one occasion led an army against that State, only to find that its ruler had retired to the safe covert of its hills. To overawe the Rāv Pūnjā, and permanently check his movements, Ahmad constructed, eighteen miles south-west of Īdar, on the banks of the Hathmatī River, a fort, and to the city that sprang up round it he gave the name of Ahmadnagar. So beautiful is the natural scenery of that district—maiden-hair fern still grows in rich profusion beside the river's limpid waters—that no visitor to the spot to-day will feel surprised that Ahmad made choice of it for a residence, and thought for a time of transferring thither the headquarters of Government. The date of the founding of Ahmadnagar is given by Firıśta as H. 829, but by Sikandar as H. 830. Frequently have I come across coins from the Ahmadnagar mint

* Hope and Fergusson's Architecture of Ahmadābād, pp. 27, 28.
bearing as date of issue the later year (compare Plate I, Nos. 4, 5, 6); but it was a special pleasure to receive a few months ago from my friend Mr. Frâmîji Jâmspîji Thânâwîlâ of Bombay the present of a copper coin of Aḥmad's from this mint, dated quite clearly H. 829.

On his death in H. 846, Aḥmad was succeeded on the throne by his son Muḥammad Shâh (II), who, taking the title of Ghîyâth al-dunyâ wa al-din, 'Aid of the World and of the Faith,' reigned during the next nine years. Some of the coins struck by this king were, as we shall afterwards see, of an unusual type (Plate I, 8a, 8b), but the events of his reign do not merit special record. The mildness of his disposition, contrasting with his father's forceful character, gained him the appellation of Karîm, 'Merciful; ' while his lavish liberality procured him the epithet Zar Bakhsh, 'the Gold-giver.' Sikandar writes, 'He gave himself up to pleasure and ease, and had no care for the affairs of Government, or rather the capacity of his understanding did not attain unto the lofty heights of the concerns of State' (Ba.-S. p. 129). When Maḥmûd Khalji advanced with a large army to annex Gujarât to his own kingdom of Mâlwa, Sultan Muhammad with a craven timidity took to flight, whereupon the Gujarât officers, 'feeling for their character," compassed his destruction. According to one account, at their instance the Sultan's queen herself administered poison to him (Br.-F. IV. 36); whereas, according to another, it was his son and successor Jalâl Khân who "dropped the medicine of death into the cup of the Sultan's life" (Ba.-S. p. 134).

Jalâl Khân, on his accession to the throne, assumed the title and style of Qâb al-dunyâ wa al-din Aḥmad Shâh II, 'the Pole-star of the world and of the Faith.' Over this reign also, extending from H. 855 to 863, we need not linger. The Mâlwa Sultan was defeated near Kapâdwanj, and later on in the reign tribute was exacted from the Rânâ of Chitor. His personal valour gained this Ahmad the appellation of Ghâzi, or Champion of the Faith, but he was of a violent and capricious temper, and frequently abandoned himself to disgraceful debauches. When angry, or under the influence of liquor, he was absolutely reckless as to the shedding of blood. A terrible tragedy attended his sudden death. A rumour spread that his wife had poisoned him at the instance of her father, who hoped thus to clear a path for himself to the throne. The Sultan's mother,
giving credence to this story, handed the unsuspecting queen over to the vengeance of her eunuchs, who literally tore her in pieces, and the nobles of the court killed her father. Ere long, however, ample evidence was forthcoming to establish the absolute innocence of the murdered father and daughter.

The next occupant of the throne was Dā'ūd Shāh, uncle of the preceding king, and brother of his predecessor, Muḥammad II. He had hardly assumed the sovereign power when he ennobled one of the common sweepers of the household. This and "other acts of imbecility" led to his deposition after a reign of only seven days. He sought refuge in the friendly shelter of a monastery, and there spent the short remainder of his life.

His successor, Mahmūd Shāh, was by far the most celebrated of all the kings of this dynasty, and the prosperity of the kingdom culminated during his glorious reign of over half a century (A. H. 863-917, A. D. 1458-1511). As in the history of the Saltānat it is his figure that bulked largest, and round him most of glory gathers, so also in the numismatic record of the dynasty, it is his coins that are of all the most abundant and distinctly the most beautiful. In the Ahmadābād bazaar more silver and copper coins of his reign are met with to-day than those of all the other Gujarāt Sultāns together, and of the entire series his are almost the only Mahmūdis that can be justly termed effective expressions of the engraver's art. The Muḥammadan historians verge on rhapsody in their high eulogies of Mahmud and all his works. "He added glory and lustre to the Kingdom of Gujarāt, and was the best of all the Gujarāt Kings, including all who preceded and all who succeeded him, and whether for abounding justice and generosity, for success in religious war, and for the diffusion of the laws of Islām and of Musalām, for soundness of judgment, alike in boyhood, in manhood and in old age, for power, for valour, and victory—he was a pattern of excellence" (Ba.-S. p. 161). To this day the glory of his name lives enshrined in native tradition throughout the whole of India as a pious Musalām and model sovereign. He was eminently successful not in military operations alone, but also in civil administration, and sought to secure to his subjects the sweets of peace. The Mir'āt-i Ahmadī records that he "built several magnificent caravanserais and lodging-houses for travellers, and founded several colleges and mosques. . . . All the fruit-trees in the open country, as
well as those in the city, towns, and villages, were planted in the reign of this Sultan" (Bi.-A. p. 205). With all his many excellencies, however, Mahmud had at least one quality which must have rendered him as a companion disgusting—no milder adjective will do. He was a huge glutton. His daily allowance of food was one Gujarati man in weight, i.e., 41 lbs. On his retiring to rest, a confection of rice would be placed on either side of his bed, so that, awaking at whatever hour, he might stretch forth his hand and eat. His "little breakfast" consisted of a hundred and fifty plantains, with a cup of honey and another of butter. Uneasy in his consciousness of an appetite transgressing all decent bounds, he often used to say, "If God had not raised Mahmud to the throne of Gujrat, who would have satisfied his hunger?" Nor, according to the stories of early European travellers, was his diet limited to rice and plantains and honey and butter. "Every day he eats poison," so wrote Ludovico di Varthema* in 1510, and then he proceeds to record how this poison had so saturated Mahmud's system that his spittle was fatal to any upon whom His Majesty might choose to eject it. Duarte Barbosa, who visited Gujrat shortly after Mahmud's death, states that the Sultan was brought up from a child, and nourished, with poison. "This king began to eat it in such a small quantity that it could not do him any harm, and from that he went on increasing this kind of food in such manner that he could eat a great quantity of it; for which cause he became so poisonous that if a fly settled on his hand, it swelled and immediately fell dead."† From such travellers' tales as these Mahmud gained in Europe an unenviable notoriety as the Blue Beard of Indian History, and it is to him that Butler referred in the well-known lines from Hudibras,

"The Prince of Cambay's daily food
Is asp and basilisk and toad" (Part II., Canto I).

This "Prince of Cambay" was but thirteen years of age when called to the throne, and even thus early he showed his mettle in the fearless suppression of a conspiracy designed to effect the downfall of the chief minister 'Imad al mulk. Quiver on back and how in

---

*The Travels of Ludovico di Varthema, Hakluyt Society Reprint, page 159.
† A Description of the Coasts of East India and Malabar, by Duarte Barbosa, Hakluyt Society Reprint, page 57.
hand, the young king, attended by only three hundred horsemen, marched from his palace in the Bhadra to oppose the rebel force, assembled in far superior numbers. Having first secured the various approaches to the palace, he gave orders that his elephants, some five hundred in number, should charge all at once. Panic seized the enemy. Their soldiers cast away their arms, and slunk into hiding in the neighbouring houses, while the amirs fled precipitately from the city. A detailed account of the reign of Mahmūd, or of his successes in the Deccan and Kāthīawād and Sindh would here be out of place. We need for our present purpose only narrate his founding of the two mint-towns of Muṣṭafābād and Muḥammadābād.

In H. 871 (A. D. 1466) Mahmūd made an expedition against the Maṇḍalik Rājā, or petty king, of Girnār, a district in the south-west of Kāthīawād. On this occasion the Rā'o tendered his submission, whereupon Mahmūd withdrew his troops to Gujārat. The next year, however, information was received that the Rā'o Maṇḍalik had visited a "temple of idolatry," taking with him all the insignia of royalty. Mahmūd, accordingly, determined to humble the pride of this infidel ruler. His capital was forthwith invested, and its inhabitants were reduced to the utmost straits. In H. 874 the fort of Girnār, considered one of the strongest in all India, surrendered to this Gujārat Sultān, and the Rājā accepted the faith of Islām. Firishta adds that Mahmūd, "being desirous that the tenets of Islām should be propagated throughout the country of Girnār, caused a city to be built, which he called Muṣṭafābād, for the purpose of establishing an honorable residence for the venerable personages of the Muḥammadan religion deputed to disseminate its principles, Mahmūd Shāh also took up his residence in that city" (Br.-F. IV. 56).

Fifteen years elapsed before the founding of the second mint-town, Muḥammadābād, in H. 889 (A. D. 1484). During a season of scarcity one of Sultan Mahmūd's captains, raiding in Chāmpānīr territory, was attacked, defeated, and slain by Rāwal Jayasingh. Thereupon Mahmūd, refusing all arbitration except 'the sword and the dagger,' marched with a large army against Chāmpānīr by way of Baroda. The siege of the hill-fort was protracted for more than a year, but Mahmūd, in token of his fixed resolution not to leave till the fort should be taken, laid in his military lines the foundations of a beautiful mosque. At length finding resistance unavailing, the Rāwal consigned to the flames the women of his household and all
his valuables, and then sallied forth in a fierce charge. Wounded, he fell into the hands of the Sultan, but, unlike the Manjali Raja, he declined to embrace Islam, and bravely paid the forfeit of his life. On the fall of the fort, Mahmud changed the name of the city to Muhammadabad. This name is correctly given in the Mirat i Sikandari (Ba.-S. p. 211) and in the Moeiisir (Blochmann's translation of the Ain i Akbari, I. 507, note). Firishta, however, states, "During the time the king was detained by the sick and wounded at Chaumpanir, he laid the foundation of the city of Mahmudabad." (Br.-F. IV. 70); but in at least nine subsequent references to this same place Firishta himself calls it Muhammadabad-Chaumpanir.* Discussion on this point, however, is practically foreclosed by the evidence of the beautiful coin No. 34 on Plate III., the margin of which reads not Mahmudabad, but very clearly Muhammadabad 'urf Chaumpanir. Mahmud did found a city named after himself Muhammadabad, but this was situated not in the vicinity of Chaumpanir, but on the bank of the River Watrak, eighteen miles south-east of Ahmadabad. It is the city which in A. D. 1546 the Sultan Mahmud III., on removing from Ahmadabad, chose for his residence, and where he "laid out a magnificent palace, which he called the 'Deer Park,' the like of which was never seen upon the earth" (Ba.-S. p. 443). The original name Muhammadabad is now corrupted to Mehmudabad or Mehmadabad. This city does not seem to have ever possessed a mint, and should not be confused with the mint town Muhammadabad Chaumpanir. In the latter "many great buildings were raised and gardens laid out, and, by the skill of a native of Khurassan, well-fitted with fountains and waterfalls. Its fruits, especially its mangoes, were famous, and its sandal trees grew so freely that their timber was used in house-building. Mechanics and craftsmen thronged its streets, Chaumpanir sword-blades became noted for their sharpness, and Chaumpanir silks for their bright colours. Though he by no means deserted Ahmadabad, Mahmud III. continued to the close of his reign to consider Muhammadabad Chaumpanir his capital" (Bombay Gazetteer, III. 305). In 1535, however, this city was pillaged by the Emperor Humayun, and soon thereafter the court and capital were transferred back to Ahmadabad. The almost simultaneous loss of the Gujarat ascendancy over Malwa precipitated

* Br.-F. IV. 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 80, 82, 87, 128.
the city's decay. Its subsequent decline was indeed so rapid that only some eighty years later it was held to afford a classical illustration of the truth of the verse, 'All on earth fades, and God does as He wills.'

The subjection of the "two forts" (in Gujarāti द व, be gadh) of Girmār and Chā mānir is held by some historians to supply the key to Maḥmūd's etymologically perplexing title of Begadā (बेराध). Another suggested derivation is that the term Bigarha (بیگارہ), meaning, so it is said, 'a bullock whose horns stretch out right and left like the arms of a person about to embrace,' was applied to Sultān Maḥmūd, inasmuch as the said Sultān "has mustachios under his nose so long that he ties them over his head as a woman would tie her tresses." ¹

Maḥmūd Shah died in 1511, just a hundred (so'ar) years after the founding of Aḥmaddāl. It had been a century of large growth and prosperity, thanks mainly to the strong administrations of Aḥmad and Maḥmūd, whose combined reigns covered not less than eighty-five years. But now began that period of national decline which was to issue in the final subjugation of the province by the imperial troops of Akbar (A. D. 1573). Maḥmūd Begadā's son, Khalil Khān, succeeded to the throne under the name of Mughaffar II. For piety and learning, liberality and bravery, he was held unequalled in his age, and on account of his many merciful acts he was entitled Mughaffar the Clement. Notwithstanding his many admirable traits, he was as a king fatally weak, and incapable of controlling his nobles. Their influence, thus unchecked, grew into a power which was eventually to subvert the dynasty. Lacking the sternness and energy that those rough times demanded, Mughaffar's clemency often interposed to save the guilty from merited punishment, and "such conduct was, on the whole, the cause of disturbances" (Bi-A. p. 229). Troubles in Mālū and wars with the İdar chief occupied much of the fifteen years of his reign (A. II. 917-932, A. D. 1511-1525), but these need not detain us. In connexion with this king's last illness, Sikandar relates several anecdotes illustrating a singularly unselfish and amiable disposition. A sore famine was afflicting the land, so Mughaffar lifted up his hands in prayer to God, and said, "O 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." For the Sultân was tender-hearted, and could not bear the sight of the poor and wretched. Moreover, since the prayers of a Sultân are entitled to acceptance, so the arrow of his prayers reached its mark, and the rain of mercy fell from the heavens. One day he was listening to the commentary of a reader of the Qôrân, and observed, "I read more of the Qôrân now, in the days of my sovereignty, than I did before I came to the throne. This morning I have heard half of the reader's commentary: I trust to hear the other half in heaven." He died on a Friday, the Muslim Sabbath. Hearing that morning the call to prayer, he said, 'I have not strength to go to the masjid myself,' but he sent one of his attendants. After a short time he performed his ablutions, and said the prayers: then he put up humble and earnest supplications for pardon. After that he stretched himself out on the couch, repeated the Confession of Faith three times, and rendered up his soul to heaven, leaving behind him a good and righteous name (Ba.-S., pp. 279-281).

Mugaffar's eldest son, Sikandar, ascended the throne on his father's death, but, slighting the older ministers of the crown, and showering honours on the companions of his youthful follies, he soon became extremely unpopular. The defeat of his troops by the Râţa of Chitor served to intensify the general odium against him. 'Imâd al mulk, a great favourite of the late king, being informed that Sikandar had designs upon his life, determined to be beforehand with him, and, forthwith entering into a conspiracy, caused the Sultân to be assassinated in his bedchamber.

After Sikandar's reign of less than seven weeks, his brother, Naşîr Khân, a child of six, was raised to the throne under the title of Mahmûd Shâh II., this being effected through the influence of 'Imâd al mulk. The complete ascendency now obtained by this minister excited the envy of the rest of the nobles, who sent secret messages to the late Sultân Mugaffar's second son, Bahâdur Khân, then at Jaunpûr, apprising him of the turn events had taken, and promising him, if he would assert his claim to the throne, their hearty assistance. This prince accepted the invitation to return, and, meeting with but little opposition on the way, advanced to Aḩmadâbâd. 'Imâd al mulk was at once seized, and ignominiously executed at
Châmpânîr, and a few months later by Bahâdur’s order his infant brother Mahmud II was poisoned.

The eleven years of Sultân Bahâdur’s reign (A. H. 932-943; A.D. 1526—1536) were years full of stirring incidents, for during them he entered into conflict not only with the rulers of Mâlwa, Jhâlûwâr, and the Deccan, but also with Humâyûn, who at Delhi was already carving out for his descendants the great Mughal Empire, and with the Portuguese, then so formidable as a naval power. Humâyûn, inflicting upon Bahâdur defeat after defeat, drove him from Mandûs to Mândû, thence to Muhammedâbâd-Châmpânîr, and thence to Cambay, all which towns were successively given up to plunder by the conquerors. Thus the Sultân Bahâdur, who had but recently compelled obedience from the Kings of the Deccan, Khândesh, and Birâr, who had overthrown the powerful rule of Mahmûd Khalji of Mâlwa, and had stormed the strong fortress of Chitor, found himself in the short space of six months a fugitive craving protection from the Portuguese at Diu. His overthrow had been complete and final had only the Emperor Humâyûn been able to follow up his victories and march against Soraû. Fortunately for the Sultân, however, Shîr Shâh, the governor of Bengal, revolted at this juncture, and it thus became imperative for the Emperor to return to his own capital. After his departure from Gujarât, Bahâdur took heart again, and with the aid of allies collected a large army. In the hard-contested battle of Kanij, five miles north-west of Mahmûdâbâd, the imperial troops that Humâyûn had left behind were defeated and ultimately expelled the country. Thus both Gujarât and Mâlwa were rid of the Mughals, who for some nine months had occupied these provinces, and the Sultân Bahâdur Shâh regained his kingdom. The Portuguese, in return for the help they had given Bahâdur, were now granted permission to build a factory at Diu. Instead of a factory, however, they erected a fort. Bahâdur, accordingly, proceeded in person to the island of Diu, and in the subsequent negotiations with the Portuguese Governor, Nuno da Cunha, there can be little doubt that both sides meditated treachery. In response to an invitation, the Sultân, accompanied only by a small guard, visited the Governor in his vessel, then lying at anchor in the harbour. On his arrival every mark of honour was accorded him. Round the Sultân’s head the captain waved as largesse “plates upon plates of gold and shield upon shield of jewels, and then
conducted him to a royal seat, using a great show of politeness to cover his designs. The Sultan, also, was weaving a plot, but Fate was not in accord with his plans" (Ba.-S., p. 397). At the moment of departure Bahadur was about to step into a barge to return to the shore when the boat drew off, and the King fell into the water. Faria e Souza's brief record of the final tragedy is as follows:— "Tristan de Payva de Santarem, coming up, reached out to the King an oar to bring him aboard his vessel, when a soldier struck him across the face with a halbert, and so others, till he was killed. He was a little while above water, and then sank, and neither his nor Emanuel de Souza his body could be found, though Nuno da Cunha caused them to be diligently looked after, to give them the due funeral honours".¹

His early death, for he was but thirty-one, under such tragic circumstances, won for Bahadur a sympathy he little merited. In disposition he was rash and impetuous, cruel and vindictive, and his inglorious administration of the country was due not so much to weakness or want of ability as to his sloth and sensuality.

On Bahadur's death, his sister's son, Miran Muhammad Farrakhi of Khundesh, was, in compliance with the express wish of the late king, invited to accept the throne of Gujarat. He, however, on learning of his uncle's murder, was overwhelmed with grief. Abandoning his wonted pleasures, he spent his days in fasting and his nights in prayer. Now and again with many a sigh he would exclaim, 'I consume! I consume!' and but six weeks after his accession he departed this life.

The next occupant of the throne of Gujarat was a child of eleven, the Sultan Mahmud III, who also was a nephew of the late Sultan Bahadur, a son of his brother Latif. The eighteen years of his reign (A. H. 943-961; A. D. 1536-1553) were altogether uneventful, being marked only by the petty intrigues of ministers, each seeking his own selfish ends. For some five years the king, being still a minor, was under the strict surveillance of a noble, named Daryâ Khân, who was de facto ruler of the province. When Mahmud, impatient of further restraint, threw off his yoke, Daryâ

¹ Quoted in Br. F. IV., p. 138, from Faria e Souza's History of the Portuguese in Asia.
Khān brought forward a boy, whom he declared to be a scion of the royal house, and, seating him on the throne under the title of Sūltān Muḥaffar III, caused coins to be struck and the public prayers to be read in his name. This rebellion, however, was but short-lived, the popular suffrage being in favour of Māḥmūd. It will be remembered that it was this monarch who beautified with the wonderful ‘Deer Park’ the city of Māḥmūdābūd (Meḥmadābūd), and who here took up his abode. Here, too, he met his death at the hand of ‘a certain villainous evil-doer,’ who bore ‘the ill-omened name of Burhān.’ Having invited some holy men for the reading of the Qūr‘ān, the Sūltān had entertained them as his guests, and distributed amongst them money and clothes, after which, wearied with this service, he retired to his chamber for rest. Thirsty, he called for some sharbat, whereupon Burhān, his cup-bearer, brought him a poisoned narcotic. After taking the draught, Māḥmūd suddenly became unwell, but in the second watch of the night dozed off to sleep. Then that villain, ‘accursed in this world and in the next,’ fearing lest the poison had failed to take effect, drew a Dārīnī dagger, and stabbed the Sūltān to death.

In the hope of securing for himself the throne of Gujarāt, Burhān had hatched a deep-laid plot. The late Sūltān had recruited a force of twelve hundred men, known as the Bāgh-mār, ‘Tiger-slayers.’ Burhān now sent for their leaders, with whom he had been at pains to ingratiate himself, and, concealing them in an ante-chamber, told them it was the Sūltān’s order that they should kill whoever might enter. He then summoned the chief minister and other nobles, on the pretext that the Sūltān desired to consult them on State business of urgency. Some thirteen of the highest functionaries responded to the summons, and on their arrival were all assassinated as they passed one by one into the room. Then, rifling the Sūltān’s jewel-chamber, Burhān distributed lapfuls of precious gems to his vile companions, and, binding on his own neck a richly bejewelled collar, ‘seated himself, like a dog, on the royal chair.’ When at dawn rumour of the foul murders spread through the city, some of the surviving nobles on their way to the palace met a procession heralding Burhān as the new Sūltān. As it was passing, Burhān himself, noticing that Shīrwān Khān had, as a mark of courtesy, alighted from his horse, cried out, ‘Let Shīrwān Khān come near; he is on my side, and desires to pay his obeisance.’
Hearing these words, Shirwān fired with rage, did draw near, and with his sword dealing the villain a mighty blow across the loins cut him in twain. Of the ‘tiger-slayers’ accompanying him, some fled, but “some were sent after that evil one to Hell” (Ba.-S., p. 452).

Incredible as it seems, the Hindūs in their passionate hatred of Maḥmūd regarded his murderer Burhān in the light of a saviour of the people, and are said to have made after Burhān’s death a stone image of him, to which they paid divine honours. This hatred on the part of the Hindūs was not without a cause, for the Sultan had visited them with bitter persecutions. Many of the Rājpūts and Kolis he had caused to be branded, and had compelled them to wear, as a token of subjection, a red rag on the right sleeve. They were forbidden to ride within the walls of the city of Aḥmadābād, and the celebration of the Holi and Diwāli was proscribed.

In the confusion consequent upon the massacre of Maḥmūd and so many of his nobles, the court and people turned, as though instinctively, towards one of the amirs, by name Éttimād Khān, who for the next twenty years fulfilled the rôle of “King-maker.” Originally a Hindū servant of the Sultan Maḥmūd, he had embraced Islām, and his master ultimately reposed in him such absolute confidence as to place the haram under his charge. On his now being questioned whether any of the Sultan’s wives were expecting a child, he replied in the negative, but he added that a boy, a blood-relation of the murdered Sultan, was living at Aḥmadābād. The messenger sent thither found the child bringing home some grain for his pet pigeons. Picking up the boy, he drove off at full speed towards Maḥmūdābād, and to the expostulating nurse sententiously replied, ‘I am going to take him to a place where all the world will to-morrow crowd round his house, and where he will not find one friend.’

Enthroned in the year H. 961 (A. D. 1553) with the title of Ghīyāth āl ḍunyā wa al din Aḥmad Shāh (III), he was nominal ruler of Gujarāt till H. 968. Firāshtā, indeed, gives H. 969 as the last year of Ahmad’s reign (Br.-F. IV. 155), but the coin No. 71 on Plate VI proves that already in H. 968 Muẓaffar (III) was king.

Early in Ahmad’s reign a party headed by Ikhtiyār al mulk espoused the cause of another aspirant to the throne, “a person
named Shāhū, the Sultan's paternal uncle" (Bi.-A., p. 275); but at a battle fought near Mahmūdābād this Shāhū and his supporters were defeated. Mutual strife and discord prevailed amongst the nobles and served to hasten on the disintegration of the kingdom. Ė'timād Khān on some slight pretext fled to Mubārak Shāh of Khāndesh, who, championing his cause, gladly led an army against Gujarāt. The invader was, however, content to return on the cession to him of Sultānpūr and Nandarbār, which districts thus became permanently alienated from the Sultanat. On a later occasion one of the nobles, in order to gain possession of the city of Sūrat, called in the assistance of the Portuguese, to whom, in recognition of the services then rendered, Daman and Sanjān were granted. Thus two more provinces were lost to the kingdom.

After remaining for five years in tutelage, Aḥmad sought to take the reins of power into his own hands, but Ė'timād was too powerful a minister to be superseded, and Aḥmad, who had meanwhile left for Mahmūdābād to consult with one of his principal courtiers, was brought back to the capital. Outwardly he was reconciled to Ė'timād, but his animosity against the masterful wazir could not be long concealed. Once in his impatience he cut down a plantain tree, and then exclaimed, 'Would God it had been Ė'timād Khān!.' Shortly thereafter the king's dead body was found, lying exposed on the sands of the Sābarmati River, close by the houses of the Bhadra. One account has it that he met his death in a love-intrigue at night, but the more probable story is that of the Mīrāt-i Aḥmadi, which records in detail how the Sultan was assassinated at the instigation of his designing minister.

At this crisis it was to him that the nobles again looked to nominate a successor to the throne, and Ė'timād, again equal to the occasion, produced a child named Nathū (or, according to Fīrishta, Habū or Ḥabū, Br.-F. IV. 155), who, he now swore, was a son of Sultan Mahmūd. The mother, when pregnant, had, so he asserted, been handed over to him for the purpose of procuring an abortion, but, the child being five months old, he had not carried out the order. The nobles accepting, if not believing, this new version of the story, raised the boy of twelve to the throne under the title of Shams al-dunyā wa al din Muẓaffar Shāh (III).
The Tarikh i Soraţh mentions that during this reign—it was probably in the year H. 978 (A. D. 1570)—Satrasul bin Vibhâji, the Jâm of Navânagar in the west of Kâthiâwâd, received permission from the Gujarât Sultân to issue coined money. It was, however, stipulated that Muţaffâr's name should appear on these new coins, and that they should be called Mahtmûdis after Muţaffâr's father, the late Sultân Mahtmûd. "The permission was obtained in the following way. On a certain occasion the Jâm presented a rupee to the Sultân with a "Kori (the newly-struck silver coin) as nazrânah, and said, 'In the same way as the dignity of râjâs is augmented by giving their daughters to His Majesty the Sultân, so I wed my Kuţârâ (Guja- arâtî, ña ñî a maiden) to this rupee, in the hope that her honour will increase.' The Sultân, pleased with the conceit, issued the permission for coining this money, and ordered it to be called Kuţârâ in the Hindû language. And by the mispronunciation of the vulgar it is now called Kori."

The latter name, as being in homely vernaenlar, has at the present day quite superseded the Persian name of Mahtmûd. The Koris issued by the Navânagar State are known as Jâmshâis, those of the Jûnâgâd State as Diwânshâis, and those of the Porbandar State as Rânâshâis. All three kinds have continued to be minted till within the last few years.

During his minority Muţaffâr was but a puppet-king, the kingdom being definitely partitioned out amongst some half dozen of his nobles. Incessant feuds resulted. At this juncture another disturbing element appeared upon the scene. Certain Mirzâs, five in number, sons of Sultân Husain of Khurâsân, having escaped from the fort in which by the order of the Emperor Akbar they had been confined, sought an asylum with the powerful amir Changiz Khan of Broach. On the complicated intrigues that ensued it is unnecessary here to dwell. Suffice it to say, confusion now became worse confounded, and every man's hand was raised against his neighbour. Party

1 Burgess' translation of the Tarikh i Soraţh, pp. 246, 247.
2 100 Jâmshâî Koris equal 28-4-4 Imperial rupees;
100 Diwânshâî Koris equal 27-2-2 Imperial rupees,
and 100 Rânâshâî Koris equal 31-7-11 Imperial rupees (Kâthiâwâd Gazet-
teer, pp. 201, 202).
fought against party, and new parties were ever forming. In the midst of all this anarchy Ėtimād Khān resolved once again to be ‘King-maker.’ Accordingly through one of his agents he sent a message to the Emperor Akbar, representing the state of affairs, and entreatings him to invade Gujarāt and annex it to his dominions. Akbar, glad of any pretext for driving the Mirzās from their place of refuge, readily responded to Ėtimād Khān’s proposal. If ‘Divide et impera’ be the secret of imperial extension, Akbar’s work was practically accomplished for him even before the July of 1572 (A. H. 980) when with his army he set out for Ahmadābād. The Kingdom of Gujarāt was already broken up into many incoherent fragments, and Akbar had but to step in and assume supreme control. On the invading army’s arrival at Disā, intelligence was received that the road to Ahmadābād was clear, the siege of that city by Shir Khān Fūlādī, one of the chief insurgents, having been abandoned. Officers sent ahead to secure the person of Sultan Muṣaffar found him hiding in a field of grain, and brought him to their camp a prisoner. Thereupon the Gujarātī nobles one after another tendered their submission to the Emperor, and orders were forthwith issued that coins should be struck and the Khutba read in the name of Akbar Pādshāh. Not six months had elapsed since his departure from Ajmir, nor had he in the meantime risked the issue of a single battle, yet now the fair province of Gujarāt — the Garden of India — lay at his feet, acknowledging him as Lord Paramount. True, the country had not yet been definitely conquered, much less finally pacified. Akbar, who had early returned to Agra, was in the following year to make his wonderful march from Fathpūr back to Ahmadābād — six hundred miles in nine days — and within the following eleven days was to inflict a crushing defeat on the enemy, relieve the beleaguered garrison, settle the future government of the province, and leave again for Agra. Still later on, severe fighting was to take place in different parts of the country, at Nāndod and Idar and Sirohi and Nandarbār, also in the Soraḥt district at Navānagar and Mangrol and Kodinār; but at no time did the imperial troops suffer more than temporary checks. From the annexation of the province in 1573 right on till 1758, the year of the final capture of Ahmadābād by the Marāthīs, Gujarāt remained under the government of officers appointed by the Mughal Emperors of Dehli. The days of the Gujarāt Saltanat had ended.
One episode, the last bright flicker of the dying flame, remains to be recorded. The Emperor Akbar, having in H. 980 taken Mugaffar Shâh with him to Agra, granted him in jagîr the sarkârs of Sârangpûr and Ujjain in Mâlwâ, districts producing a handsome revenue. On Mun‘im Khân Khânân’s departure for Bengal, he was accompanied by Mugaffar, who soon thereafter received his daughter in marriage. Ere long, however, Mugaffar, falling under suspicion, was imprisoned by his father-in-law, but eventually in H. 991 he managed to escape and fled direct to Gujarât. While in retirement with his mother’s relatives at the village of Khîrî in the Sardhûr district of Sorath, he received an invitation from certain disaffected officers of the but recently recalled viceroy, Shihâb al din, urging that he should strike for the throne. Shihâb al din himself repudiated these conspirators, and ultimately with his remaining troops joined the army of ‘Etimâd Khân, the new viceroy. Meanwhile, however, Mugaffar marched at the head of some four thousand horse on ‘Almudâbâd. A friendly faction in that city gave him access, and, as part of the city wall was broken down, he effected an immediate entrance. The united imperial forces now advanced against him, but Mugaffar, engaging them without delay, inflicted a total defeat and captured all their baggage. Thus once again, after an interval of eleven years, Mugaffar seated himself on the throne of Gujarât, and in token of his new-found sovereignty issued from the ‘Almudâbâd mint coins struck in his own name. But this resumption of regal power was not of long duration. When the news of Mugaffar’s successes reached the Emperor at the end of H. 991 (A. D. 1583), he at once conferred the government of Gujarât on Mirzâ Abd al Ra‘îm Khân, who some six years before had held the viceroyalty of that province. Hearing of the advance of this new viceroy, Mugaffar, who had gone to Broach to take over its surrendered fort, at once returned to ‘Almudâbâd, and encamped his army close to the suburb of ‘Othmânpûr, on the right bank of the Sâharmatî. Mirzâ Khân halted his troops near Sarkhej, awaiting hourly expected reinforcements from Mâlwâ. Obviously it was to Sultân Mugaffar’s advantage not to allow of delay, and accordingly advancing he engaged Mirzâ Khân’s army in a pitched battle on the 26th of January, 1584. At first fortune seemed to favour Mugaffar, but later in the day the imperial elephants threw the enemy’s ranks into confusion, and the Sultân, giving up all as lost, fled to Mâhmûdâbâd and thence to Cambay. In honour of this decisive victory, Mirzâ
Khān, now ennobled with the title of Khān Khānān, built on the battle-site near Sarkhej a palace and in a garden summer-houses. A few traces of these buildings are still to be seen at the village known to-day as Fath Wādī, or Victory Garden.

For eight more years Mūgāffar bravely strove to maintain the unequal contest, wandering from place to place and seeking the aid of friendly nobles. His cause was espoused for a time by the chiefs of Rājpīpla, Morvī, and Jūnāgadh. In H. 1000 (A. D. 1591) he had taken refuge with the pirate chieftain Sewā Wādhel of Bet, who gallantly gave his life in the defence of his guest Mūgāffar. The royal fugitive forthwith crossed over into Cutch, and accordingly the Gujarāt viceroy, Mirzā 'Azīz Kokaṭaš, struck across country towards Morvī. Here the Jādejā Bhārmal I, the then Rā'o, on coming to pay his respects to the viceroy, was base enough to barter the person of his suppliant sovereign for the district of Morvī, proffered him as a bribe. In fulfilment of his atrocious stipulation, the Rā'o led a small detachment of the imperial troops to the spot where Mūgāffar lay in concealment, and the ex-king thus fell into the enemy's hands. That whole night he was marched under strict guard towards the viceroy's camp, but at daybreak, on reaching Dhrol, a town some twenty-five miles east of Jāmnagar, he alighted from his horse, and, withdrawing behind a tree, cut his throat with a razor. Thus miserably perished the unfortunate Mūgāffar, last but not least of the Sultāns of Gujarāt.

II.—Chronological List of the Kings of the Gujarāt Sultānat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muḥammad I.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>A. H. 806 A. D. 1403</td>
<td>2 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mūgāffar I.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>A. H. 743 A. H. 810—813</td>
<td>3 years 8 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1342 A. D.1407—1410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 "To mark his sense of the infamy of the Jādejā and the honour of the pirate Wādhel, the Emperor erected two jālīyās at the gates of Dehli, issuing an edict that whoever passed that of the Wādhel should crown it with chaplets of flowers, while on that of the Jādejā the passer should bestow a blow with his slipper." Tod's "Western India," p. 438.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Reign.</th>
<th>Length of Reign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ahmad I.</td>
<td>A. H. 793</td>
<td>A. H. 813—846</td>
<td>32 years 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1390</td>
<td>A. D. 1410—1442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Muhammad II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. H. 846—855</td>
<td>8 years 9 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1442—1451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Qutb al din Ahmad II.</td>
<td>cir. A. H. 835</td>
<td>A. H. 855—883</td>
<td>8 years 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1451—1488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Da'ud</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. H. 863</td>
<td>7 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mahmud I.</td>
<td>A. H. 849</td>
<td>A. H. 863—917</td>
<td>54 years 1 month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1445</td>
<td>A. D. 1465—1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Musaffar II.</td>
<td>A. H. 880</td>
<td>A. H. 917—932</td>
<td>14 years 9 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1475</td>
<td>A. D. 1511—1525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sikandar</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. H. 932</td>
<td>1 month 16 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mahmud II.</td>
<td>cir. A. H. 926</td>
<td>A. H. 932</td>
<td>4 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bahadur</td>
<td>A. H. 912</td>
<td>A. H. 932—942</td>
<td>11 years 3 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1506</td>
<td>A. D. 1526—1536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Muhammad III.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. H. 943</td>
<td>1 month 12 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mahmud III.</td>
<td>A. H. 932</td>
<td>A. H. 943—961</td>
<td>18 years 3 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1525</td>
<td>A. D. 1536—1553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ahmad III.</td>
<td>cir. A. H. 949</td>
<td>A. H. 961—968</td>
<td>7 years 5 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1553—1560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Musaffar III.</td>
<td>cir. A. H. 955</td>
<td>A. H. 968—980</td>
<td>12 years 2 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1560—1573 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. H. 991—992</td>
<td>5 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. 1583—1584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes on the Chronological List of the Kings of the Gujrat Saltanat.

1. The dates entered in the "List" have been determined after weighing the available evidence, but absolute correctness is difficult of attainment, as the authorities themselves are frequently at variance. The following are the chief discrepancies:

(a) According to the Tariikh-i Alfi, Musaffar I. died not in H. 813 but in H. 814. It states that in the former year Musaffar
THE COINS OF THE GUJARAT SALṬANAT.

abdicated his throne in favour of his grandson Āḥmad I., but that his death did not take place till five months and sixteen days after his abdication. During this interval the Khutba was read and coins were struck in Ahmad’s name (Ba.-S. page 87 note).

(b) According to Firishta, Āḥmad I. was born not in H. 793 but in H. 794 (Br.-F. IV. 3).

(c) According to the Mir‘āt i Sikandarī, Āḥmad I. died not in H. 846 but in H. 845. Copper coins of this Sultān are, however, in my possession bearing the date H. 846, which year tallies with the statement in the Ṭabaqāt i Akbarī that Āḥmad’s successor, Muḥammad I., ascended the throne on “3rd Rabi’ al akhir, 846.”

(d) According to the Mir‘āt i Āḥmadi, Dā’ud reigned not for seven days only but for one month and seven days (Bi.-A. p. 202).

(e) According to Firishta, Muḥaffar II. was born not in H. 880 but in H. 875.

(f) According to the Mir‘āt i Āḥmadi, Sikandar reigned for two months and sixteen days (Bi.-A. p. 232), and according to Firishta for three months and seventeen days (Br.-F. IV. 100).

(g) According to Firishta and the Ṭabaqāt i Akbarī, Maḥmūd III. ascended the throne not in H. 943 but in H. 944. The correct date is probably the end of H. 943.

(h) According to Firishta, Āḥmad III. died not in H. 968 but in H. 969. Silver coins, however, of Muḥaffar III., the successor of Āḥmad III., are known, dated H. 968 (see Plate VI., No. 71), agreeing thus with the Mir‘āt i Āḥmadi which assigns to that year both the death of Āḥmad III. and the accession of Muḥaffar III. (Bi.-A. pp. 283, 287).

2. Of the fifteen Sultāns, the coins of nine are illustrated on the accompanying plates. Nos. 1-6 are of Āḥmad I.’s reign, Nos. 7-10a of Muḥammad II.’s, Nos. 11-14 of Āḥmad II.’s, Nos. 15-43 of Maḥmūd I.’s, Nos. 44-50 of Muḥaffar II.’s, Nos. 51-57 of Bahādur’s, Nos. 58-66 of Maḥmūd III.’s, Nos. 67-70a of Āḥmad III.’s, Nos. 71-78 of Muḥaffar III.’s first reign, and Nos. 79 and 80 of his second reign.
I have never come across a single coin of any of the remaining six kings. Of these six Mużaaffar I. reigned for three years and eight months, but the aggregate length of the reigns of the other five (Muḥammad I., Dā'ud, Sīkandar, Mahmūd II., and Muḥammad III.) was less than one year. The histories are silent as to any coins having been struck by Dā'ud or Sīkandar, or Mahmūd II.; but distinct evidence is to hand that Muḥammad I., Muğaṭṭar I., and Muḥammad III. did, all three, issue coins in their own names.

(a) Of Tāṭār Khān, Firīšṣṭa records: "He dignified his uncle Shams Khān with the title of Nuṣrat Khān, and causing himself to be proclaimed king, coined money under the name of Muḥammad Shāh Gujarāṭī" (Br.-F. IV. 9).

(b) The Mīrāṭī Ahmādī states: "Zafar Khān, having assumed the title of Muğaṭṭar Shāh, struck coins in his own name, and appointed his grandson Ahmād Shāh to succeed him as his heir" (Bi.-A. pp. 183, 184).

(c) The following is Firīšṭa's reference to a currency issued in the name of Muḥammad III.: "The Gujarāt officers, convening a meeting, resolved on inviting Mīrān Muḥammad Khān of Khāndesh, nephew of Bahādur Shāh, who was then in Mīlūwā, to ascend the throne; and, without any further hesitation, coins were struck and public prayers read in his name" (Br.-F. IV. 142).

3. It is worthy of special note that the Mīrāṭī Ahmādī has an express statement to the effect that during a rebellion in the reign of Mahmūd III., coins were issued in the name of a Sultān Muğaṭṭar. The passage reads as follows:—"One day had elapsed before Daryā Khān became acquainted with the Sultān's flight, and he was now at a loss how to proceed. As he was in possession of the treasure, he elevated to the throne a grandson of Sultān Ahmād II., and, having entitled him Sultān Muğaṭṭar (III.), caused the currency to be struck, and the oration at the mosque to be pronounced in his name" (Bi.-A. pp. 258, 259).

No specimen of these coins is now known.

4. Was there a Pretender "Muḥammad" Sultān who caused coins to be struck in his own name in H. 963 (A. D. 1555—1556)?

(a) Mr. E. E. Oliver in his article on "the Coins of the Muḥammadan Kings of Gujarāt" in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1889), assigns, though doubtfully, No. 28 of his collection to this "Muḥammad Shāh, (?)
THE COINS OF THE GUJARĀT SALTANAT.

Pretender." If, however, that coin be, as seems almost certain, identical with the billon coins Nos. 15a and 15b given on the accompanying Plate II., its legends read as follow:—

**Obverse:** Nāṣir al dunyā wa al dīn Abu’l Fath Mahmūd Shāh;

**Reverse:** Akh Ḥaq Shāh bin Muḥammad Shāh al Saltān ʿawr
Mahmūd Shāh, Helper of the World and of the Faith, Brother of Qub Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, the Sultan, 863.

This coin was thus struck by Mahmūd I (Begadā) in the first year of his reign, H. 863 (A. D. 1458-1459), and has no connexion whatsoever with a Pretender, later by exactly a century (H. 963).

(6) In the British Museum Catalogue, three copper coins, Nos. 437, 438 and 439, are doubtfully assigned to a "Muḥammad Shāh, Pretender (?)".

1. Of these, No. 439 is a square coin, the only square coin of the Gujarāt series in the British Museum Collection. Thomas, on page 353 of his "Chronicles of the Pathān Kings," refers to "square coins, A. H. 856?" struck by Muḥammad II. But that Saltān died in H. 855, thus in the year preceding the issue of this coin. I have myself never seen a square coin of the Gujarāt Saltanat.

2. The reverse of all the three coins is very unlike that of any of the Gujarāt coins of the Saltanat period. Save these three, I know of none with a double parallel line as diameter, none with "several ornaments," and none with the Hijri year entered quite in the upper portion of the reverse field. The "type" is foreign to Gujarāt.

For these reasons I am of opinion that Nos. 437, 438 and 439 of the British Museum Catalogue are not coins of the Gujarāt Saltanat at all. Further, none of the extant histories makes reference to a Pretender Muḥammad Shāh asserting claim to the throne of Gujarāt in H. 963; and, apart from the above three doubtful coins, there is, so far as I can learn, no evidence whatsoever in proof of the existence of the hypothetical Pretender. It is true that in the early part of the reign of Aḥmad III—thus about H. 963—the "person named Shāhu" did head a rebellion: but no evidence is to hand that he assumed the name of Saltān Muḥammad, or that in this name he caused coins to be struck. Thus to identify him with the Pretender Muḥammad is certainly unsafe.
### III. Genealogical Table of the Kings of the Gujarat Sultanate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Johar Khan | 900-943 | Ghiyath Khan | Arzu Khan 
| 2. Muhammad I | 943-986 | Johar Khan | Khadijeh of Khaidh |  
| 3. Ahmad I | 986-1020 | Muhammad I | daughter of Hasa Khan Farukh |  
| 4. Muhammad | 1020-1060 | Ahmad I |  
| 5. Qutb al-din Ahmad | 1060-1100 | Muhammad |  
| 6. Daud | 1100-1125 | Qutb al-din Ahmad |  
| 7. Mahmod I | 1125-1177 | Daud |  
| 8. Muzaffar | 1177-1193 | Mahmod I |  
| 9. Sikandar | 1193-1236 | Muzaffar |  
| 10. Mahmod II | 1236-1270 | Sikandar |  
| 11. Bahadur | 1270-1314 | Mahmod II |  
| 12. Muhammad III | 1314-1358 | Bahadur |  
| 13. Ahmad III | 1358-1395 | Muhammad III |  
| 14. Ahmad IV | 1395-1435 | Ahmad III |  
| 15. Muzaffar | 1435-1465 | Ahmad IV |  

*Note: The table is not fully transcribed due to the complexity and layout of the text.*
Notes on the Genealogical Table of the Kings of the Gujarāt Sāltānāt.

1. Grave doubt attaches to the pedigree as given in this "Table" of Ahmād III. and Muẓaffar III.
   (a) According to the Mir'āt i Ahmādī, Ahmād III. was "son of " Laṭīf Khān, who was grandson of Shukār Khān, the son "of Sultān Ahmād I." (Bi.-A. p. 273).

   The Mir'āt i Sikandarī calls this Ahmād (III) merely "a relative of the Sultān Maḥmūd III." (Ba.-S. p. 454); and Colonel Watson in his History styles him vaguely "a descendant of the stock of Ahmād Shāh" (W.-B. G. p. 259).

   (b) The following are the terms of the reference in the Mir'āti Ahmādī to the parentage of Muẓaffar III:— "According to the faith of most historians, Ėtimād Khān, who "had all the power of government in his hands, seeing "that there were none of the late Sultān's relations fit "for government, produced a young boy named Nathū; "and, having in open assembly taken an oath that such "was the son of Sultān Maḥmūd III., he explained that "his mother, when pregnant, had been delivered over to "him for the purpose of procuring an abortion; but that "this child had been brought forth, as, five months of her "pregnancy having passed, no abortion could take place. "He said, moreover, that he had brought him up in "secret, and that there was no heir to the Government "excepting him. Every one, assenting to this, and "supporting his claim to the throne, entitled him "Muẓaffar Shāh." (Bi.-A. pp. 287-288).

   Abu'l Fazl states that the child Nathū "did not belong to "the line of kings," but that the Amirs "had to believe "Ētimād's story (Bloehmann's Ain i Akbarī I. 385, 386).

   Firīshṭā gives the birth-name of this Muẓaffar (III) as "Hubbo, a familiar contraction of Hūbeeb," meaning "affectionate" (Br.-F. IV. 155).
2. On many of the coins struck in their several reigns, Maḥmūd (I) is called bin Muḥammad, Muẓaffar (II) bin Maḥmūd, Bahādur bin Muẓaffar, Maḥmūd (III) bin Latīf, Ahmad (III) bin Maḥmūd, and Muẓaffar (III) bin Maḥmūd. On the other hand it would seem that, with the sole exception of a silver piece of H. 828, on none of the coins issued by Ahmad (I), or Muḥammad (II), or Quṭb al-dīn Ahmad (II) was the name of the father of the reigning Sultān indicated.

3. (a) Of coins bearing inscriptions of a genealogical character, far and away the most remarkable and interesting in my collection is the silver piece presented to me last year (1901) by my kind friend, H. Nelson Wright, Esq., I.C.S., of Allahābād. It is pictured on Plate IV., No. 51. Struck in H. 933 by the Sultān Bahādur, its obverse and reverse, read consecutively, trace his pedigree back to Muẓaffar (I), the founder of the dynasty. Bahādur Shāh is thus termed “bin Muẓaffar Shāh bin Maḥmūd Shāh bin Muḥammad Shāh bin Ahmad Shāh bin Muḥammad Shāh, bin Muẓaffar Shāh.”

(b) On the silver coin of H. 828 represented on page 352 of Thomas’s “Chronicles,” Ahmad (I)’s much shorter pedigree back to Muẓaffar (I) is thus given:—Ahmad Shāh bin Muḥammad Shāh bin Muẓaffar Shāh.

(c) On the billon coin of Maḥmūd (I), struck in H. 863 (Plate II, Nos. 15a, 15b), his relationship to the two preceding Sultāns is indicated as follows:—

Akḥ Quṭb Shāh bin Muḥammad Shāh,
Brother of Quṭb Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh.

IV. Literature on the Coinage of the Gujarāt Sultānat.

But little has hitherto been published on the coins of the Gujarāt Sultānat. The chief modern contributions to the literature on this subject are the following five:—

1. “The Chronicles of the Pathān kings of Delhī” by Edward Thomas (1871), in which pages 350-353 are devoted to “the Muhammadan kings of Gujarāt.” A chronological list of the Sultāns is given, in which, strange to say, the name of Muhammad I. (Ṭūṭūr Khān) does not appear. In all forty-eight coins are briefly specified. Two of
these are illustrated by beautifully clear woodcuts, namely, a silver coin of Ahmad Shāh, dated H. 828, and a gold coin of Mahmūd bin Latif of H. 960. One could wish that pictures had also been given of the "square coins, A. H. 856?" and especially of the "Mahmūd II. Silver," inasmuch as, in the absence of further evidence, the specification of these coins is open to grave doubt.

2. The chapters on the Coins of Gujarāt, pages lvii-lxii and 131-143, in the "Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum," Vol. II., Muḥammadan States, by Stanley Lane-Poole (1885). The introductory portion is helpful for the information given regarding the legends on the Gujarāt coins. Especially noteworthy is Dr. Rieu's decipherment of the distich on the obverse and reverse of the large copper coins struck during the reign of Muḥammad II. See Plate I., Nos. 8a, 8b. Forty-one coins are catalogued, ten of them being also photographed. The two undated coins, numbered 435 and 436, are incorrectly assigned to the Ahmad Shāh who reigned from H. 961 till H. 968. Their legends are clearly identical with those of coin No. 11 in this article, and the coins themselves were thus doubtless struck during the reign of the earlier Ahmad (Qub al din'), A. H. 855-863. The three coins, Nos. 437, 438, 439, which Lane-Poole assigns with some hesitation to "Muḥammad Shāh Pretender (?)" are probably foreign to Gujarāt.

3. An admirable article entitled "Coins of the Muḥammadan kings of Gujarāt," contributed by E. E. Oliver to the "Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal," Vol.lviii., Part I., No. 1—1889. The four pages of historical introduction are followed by "a genealogical tree of the "Gujarat Kings, and a table showing the contemporary "rulers in Mālwā, Jaunpūr, Khāndesh, the Deccan, and "Dehli, taken from Lane-Poole's very handy graphic "scheme of the Muḥammadan dynasties of India." Three plates supply rather roughly executed woodcuts of thirty-four coins, each of which is fully described, though not
without occasional misleotions. The coins numbered 6 and 7 are not of the Aḥmadābād but of the Muḥammad-
ābād waṛf Cūmpānīr Mint. Nos. 11, 12, and 13 are Bahmanī coins, and Nos. 16 and 17 are almost certainly not of Gujārāt. No. 27, which is of precisely the same type as No. 13 of Plate I. of the present article, is a coin of Qutb al din Aḥmad Shāh, not of the later Aḥmad (III.). No. 28, whose true date is H. 863, not H. 963, was struck not by "Muḥammad Shāh (?) Pretender," but by Maḥmūd Shāh I. Cf. Nos. 15a and 15b on Plate II. of this article. Nos. 29 and 30, being Jāmshīd Korīs of Navānagar, are incorrectly assigned to Muṣaffar, the last Sultān of Gujārāt.

4. The "Catalogue of the Coins of the Indian Museum," Part I., by Chas. J. Rodgers (1894). This portion of the Calcutta Museum Catalogue contains on pages 130—134 a chronological list of the kings of Gujārāt, and a description of twenty-two coins, three of which are represented by photo-etching. Here again two of Qutb al din Aḥmad Shāh's coins are assigned to the later Aḥmad Shāh. The three undated coins, 7214—7216, I am inclined to attribute to Maḥmūd bin Laṭīf rather than to Maḥmud II., and No. 8684 to Muṣaffar III. rather than to "Muḥammad Shāh (Interloper)."

5. "The Catalogue of the Coins collected by Chas. J. Rodgers and purchased by the Government of the Punjāb," Part II. (1894). Of this catalogue pages 132—134 contain a description of sixteen copper coins of the Gujārāt Sultānāt. No. 15, the same as No. 437 of the British Museum Catalogue, assigned to Muḥammad Shāh Pretender, should probably be relegated to some non-Gujārāti series, perhaps to that of Māīwā.

V. Cabinets of the Coins of the Gujārāt Sultānāt.

In writing the present article, I have depended not only upon my own cabinet of coins, but upon the aggregate resulting from combining all the collections of which catalogues have been published. Of
the different cabinets thus laid under contribution, the following table indicates the contents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Billon</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta Museum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāhor Museum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultant Aggregate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resultant collection contains no coin of the following years:— H. 860, 866, 871, 875, 876, 877, 878, 953, and 975: thus in all between H. 828 (seemingly the first year when dated coins were issued in Gujarāt) and H. 980, nine years are unrepresented by any coin in any of the metals.

The sixteen gold coins in the above Cabinets are as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muzaffar II</th>
<th>Māḥmūd III</th>
<th>Muzaffar III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>H. 920, 929, 946, 947, 949, 950, 956, 960</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>923, 946, 947, 950, 960</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta Museum</td>
<td>947, 960</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultant Aggregate</td>
<td>H. 920, 929, 946, 947, 949, 950, 956, 960</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twelve billon coins are five of the reign of Quṭb al din Aḥmad II (85x, 861, 862, and two undated) and seven of the reign of Māḥmūd I. (863, 863, 864, 865, 867, 869, and 870).

In the aggregate collection the first dated coin in gold is of the year H. 920, in silver of H. 828 (followed, longo intervallo, by one of H.884), in billon of H. 85x, and in copper of H. 829.
VI. Mint-towns.

Of the coins struck in Gujarāt during the reign of Aḥmad I., a large number have in the obverse margins an inscription recording Aḥmadnagar (Īdar) as their place of mintage. Subsequent to Ahmad's death, comparatively few coins bear any mint-name, and of those in which it is present nearly all are of the reign of Mahmūd I. There are only four cities in Gujarāt, of which we can confidently affirm that during the period of the Saṭṭanat mints were established in them, and were for at least a few years in active operation. These four are the two cities founded by Aḥmad—Aḥmadābād and Aḥmadnagar—and the two founded by Mahmūd—Muṣṭafābād and Muḥammadābād (Chāmpānīr). It is doubtful whether a fifth mint was opened at Khānpūr, a small town on the River Mahi. We proceed to treat of each of these five:


   Epithets: a. شهر مظعم Shahr muʿazzam, the great city.
   b. دار الضررب Dār al Ḍarb, the seat of the mint.

   So far as I am aware, no silver coin of the Gujarāt Saṭṭanat struck during the period of its independence bears Aḥmadābād as the name of its mint-town. Nos. 4, 6, and 7 in Oliver's article are, indeed, assigned by him to that city, but the representations of those coins given in his Plate I. show that certainly two of the three, and in all probability the third also, issued not from the Aḥmadābād mint, but from that at Muḥammadābād.

   The only copper coins that seem to bear the mint-name Shahr muʿazzam Aḥmadābād are a few struck by Muṣṭafār III. in the years H. 977, 978. One of these is shown as No. 75 of Plate VI. of the present article. After comparing six, all of the same type, in my collection I incline to accept their marginal legend as reading شهر مظعم احمد اباد.

   Just possibly also the name Aḥmadābād may occupy the upper margin of the obverse of the copper coin struck in H. 970 and shown on Plate VI., No. 73.

   The second epithet of Aḥmadābād, Dār al Ḍarb, is present on several of the coins that Akbar caused to be struck at the Aḥmadābād
mint after his conquest of Gujarāt in H. 980.* Muḥāfaẓ III., during
the few months of his second reign in H. 991, evidently followed
the example thus set by the Mughal Emperor, so that the few surviving
coins of H. 991, whether in silver or in copper, bearing the Sultān
Muḥāfaẓ's name, all specify their place of mintage under its full
designation of دار الإضراب احمد باد. See Plate VI., Nos. 79 and 80.

It is extremely improbable that during the entire period of the
Gujarāt Sultānat, the activity of the mint at its capital city should
have been confined to the years 970, 977, 978, and 991—so improba-
ble, indeed, is this supposition that one may safely hazard the con-
jecture that the Gujarāt coins bearing no mint name (and these are
the large majority) were all struck at the Aḥmadūbād mint. This
being known as the first mint in Gujarāt, first both in time and in
importance, it was not deemed necessary to record the name of the
city on the coins that issued from it. On the other hand, the compara-
atively very few coins struck at any minor mint in Gujarāt would
naturally bear, if only for purposes of differentiation, the distinctive
name of the mint-town.


Epithet (doubtful): شهر مهانور Shahr Mahānūr, the city of
great light.

What precisely was the honorific epithet assigned to the city of
Aḥmadnagar is difficult of determination from its coins. They
clearly bear on their obverse margins the words احمدنجر شهر مهانور, followed
by a term which on some of the specimens to hand resembles شهر مهانور. But the combination is certainly a strange one to be
adopted as the title for a mint-town. I confess I am not satisfied
as to the correctness of this reading, more especially as on several
of the coins it seems doubtful whether the letters as there given
admit of being read as Mahānūr. Compare Plate I., Nos. 4, 5, and 6.

From the founding of Aḥmadnagar in H. 829 right on till Aḥmad
Shāh’s death in H. 846, each year witnessed an abundant issue of
copper coins from the Aḥmadnagar mint. Indeed it would seem
that every dated copper coin of Aḥmad I. was struck at that mint,
whereas not a single copper coin, dated or otherwise, appears

* On other coins of Akbar, Aḥmadūbād is styled دار الإضراب السلطنت, the Seat of
the Caliphate, or دار الإضراب، the Seat of the Empire, and on a rupee of
Rafi’ al Darajāt Ziyād al-balād the Beauty of Towns.
to have issued from it subsequent to Ahmad’s death. Thus the period of activity of the mint at Ahmadnagar coincides with the last seventeen years of the reign of Ahmad I.


Epithet: شهرا عظم Shahr a’gam, the very great city.

My collection contains only one silver coin certainly bearing the mint-name Muṣṭafābād—an excellent specimen, dated H. 884. Unfortunately it came into my possession too late to admit of its being photographed for Plate II. of this article. It is a small coin, 1/6 inch in diameter, and weighing only 63 grains. Its obverse closely resembles that of No. 25, and its reverse (save for the date) is identical with that of No. 22.

The pretty little silver piece of the year H. 894, No. 29 on Plate III., I assign, but with some hesitancy, to Muṣṭafābād. Two of the margins contain the words شهرا عظم, but whether the remaining two give the reading مصطفى باد is not equally clear.

No. 36 on Plate III. is also a somewhat puzzling silver coin, but this too I assign provisionally to the Muṣṭafābād mint. Its date, given on the reverse, is H. 905.

The copper coins that issued from this mint during the last quarter of the ninth century (Hijri) must have been fairly numerous, every year (except 831) from 879 till 892 being represented in my cabinet. The latest of the series is dated seemingly H. 906. Five of these are shown on Plate II., Nos. 21-25, though No. 22 is open to question, the upper margin (obverse) not being decipherable with absolute certainty. The variety of designs in these Muṣṭafābād coins of Maḥmūd I. is noteworthy. In No. 21 the mint with its epithet Shahr a’gam occupies the margin circumscribing a circular area: in Nos. 22 (?) and 25 the mint-name is still relegated to the margin, but now we have the four margins that bound a square area: while lastly in Nos. 23 and 24, which exhibit no margin at all, the place of mintage is recorded in full as an integral part of the obverse legend. The two coins of H. 971, numbered 447 and 448, in the British Museum Catalogue, Muḥammadan States, doubtfully assigned to Muṣṭarābād, are, it seems, of the same type as that shown on Plate VI. as No. 78.


Epithet: شهرا مكرم Shahr mukarram, the illustrious city.
This name, it will be remembered, was given to the city of Chāmpānir on its capitulation to Māhmūd I. in 1484 at the close of a protracted siege. Chāmpānir—Chāmpa's city—is supposed to have derived its name from Chāmpa, the Hindū founder of the town, which dates as far back as the eighth century of the Christian era. And it is by this name of Chāmpānir alone that the city, now a desolate ruin, “except for a few Bhil and Nāikda squatters,” is known today. The coins struck at its mint record the name generally in its doubled form Muḥammadābād ‘urī Chāmpānir, but occasionally, it would seem, the “alias Chāmpānir” was dropped and the new name Muḥammadābād alone retained. Compare Plate III., Nos. 34 and 39, and contrast with No. 33. Whether the full, or the shortened, designation was on the die from which the imperfect coins Nos. 31 and 41 were struck is difficult to say, but, from the general resemblance between these and No. 34, it seems probable that the lost margins did contain the words "urī Chāmpānir.

The city's remarkable prosperity was reflected on its coins, for these are quite the most florid and the most elaborately designed of all in the series of the Gujarāt Sāltanat. In silver the issue must have been considerable—my cabinet contains some thirteen specimens—but I have never found a single copper coin bearing the name of this mint. If the exquisite workmanship of the silver coins is suggestive of the phenomenal prosperity that early attended the new Muḥammadābād, so also its short-lived glory is betokened in the fact that the activity of the mint was restricted but a few years, all comprised within the reign of Māhmūd I. The earliest of its coins in my collection is dated H. 895, the latest H. 904, and we shall probably not be far wrong in assuming that the whole period during which the mint was working does not cover more than five and twenty years, say H. 890—915.

In one year subsequent to this period coins were again struck at the Chāmpānir mint, but these can scarcely be classed among the coins of the Gujarāt Sāltanat. In H. 942 the Mughal Emperor Humāyūn swooped down upon the province, and gained possession of this important frontier-city. In commemoration of his victory, he forthwith caused coins to be struck both in silver and in copper. The silver ones bear Humāyūn's name, which is wanting on the copper: also on the silver the mint-town is given as simply Chāmpānir (with the first vowel short), while in the copper is added the
epithet Shahr mukarram. On neither the silver nor the copper, however, do we find the name Muḥammadābād, which even thus early would seem to have passed into desuetude. A unique copper coin in the Lāhor Museum is of especial interest as briefly recording the conquest of Champānīr. Its obverse reads قلخ جنتابناب بنا خسرو and the reverse simply غروب شهو تکم.

In another coin of the same year, H. 942, Champānīr is styled شهر اکرم, the City of the Age. See British Museum Catalogue of coins of the Mughal Emperors of India, No. 1232.

5. Regarding the existence of mints at Aḥmadābād, Aḥmadnagar, Muṣṭafābād and Muḥammadābād-Champānīr, no manner of doubt can be entertained, but whether there was at any time a fifth mint at Khānpūr, خانپور, is a debatable question. On the Coin No. 44, Plate IV., the upper part of the obverse inscription clearly reads Al Sultan Muṣṭafār Shāh: but what of the lower part? The date is certainly 921, and on two other coins of the same type now in my possession is also certainly 922. The decipherment of the words immediately above the date has proved very baffling to me: but quite the best of various suggested readings is the one submitted by my friend, Mr. Nelson Wright, I. C. S. He reads the words as ضربت خانپور, Darbat Khānpūr, “Struck at Khānpūr”, and unquestionably the coins of H. 922, even better than the H. 921 coin shown on Plate IV., bear out this reading. Accepting it, we should on the evidence of these three coins add Khānpūr to the list of the mint-towns in Gujarāt, and should assign as the minimum period of the mint’s activity the years H. 921 and 922. Khānpūr, or, to give it its full name, Khānpūr Wānkānīr, is a town on the left bank of the River Mahi, and about midway between Baroda to the south and Dākor to the north. Here it was that in H. 855 Maḥmūd (I.) Khalji, Sultān of Mūlwa, encamped his army of invasion after plundering the city of Baroda. Subsequently, however, he marched northwards to Kapaḍwānj, where Qutb-al-din, the newly-chosen Sultān of Gujarāt, inflicted on him a severe defeat. Khānpūr again figures, though not prominently, in the intrigues that attended the accession of Bahādur Shāh in H. 932: and, late in the same reign, the Sultān, while at this place, appointed two of his most trusted officers to lead a strong army against the country of Bāgar, East of Ḩad. I have failed, however, to discover a single reference to this Khānpūr in the histories of the reign of Muṣṭafār II.
(A.H. 917-932), and am unable to suggest any reason for his having caused coins to be struck in his name at that mint.

Lane-Poole has assigned, though doubtfully, a Gujarātī copper coin of H. 971 to the mint-town Shādiābād. This reading must, I feel sure, be abandoned. Shādiābād is not in Gujarāt at all: but the name does occur on several of the coins of the neighbouring kingdom of Mālwa. Firīshā explicitly records as follows the origin of this epithet:—‘Two days after the death of Sooltan Hooshung, Ghizny Khan was crowned at Mando, and, assuming the title of Sooltan Mahomed Ghoory, ordered that his capital might henceforth be called Shadiabad Mando, or ‘the City of Joy’; and public prayers were read and coin struck in his name.’

The following table gives the years of the dated coins in my collection that record their mints:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint.</th>
<th>Silver.</th>
<th>Copper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadnagar</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Each year from 829 till 846.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muṣṭafābād (with or</td>
<td>884, 894, 895, 905</td>
<td>879, 880, each year from 882 till 892, 906.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without the ‘urf Chām-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pānir).</td>
<td>895, 896, 897, 898,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>900, 902, 903, 904.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khānpūr ??</td>
<td>921, 922</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the first four mints in this table, not one seems to have been active for more than a very limited period, and I feel sure that all coins that do not themselves record their place of mintage may safely be assigned to the mint at Ahmadalbād. In this connexion it is instructive to note that in Akbar’s time at least this city, the erewhile capital of the Gujarāt Salṭanat, bore the title of Dār al Darb, ‘the Seat of the Mint’.

* British Museum Catalogue of Indian coins, Muḥammadan States, No. 446. This coin is not improbably the same as No. 78 on Plate VI. of the present article.
† Br.-F. IV., 191.
As to the existence of any square coins of the Gujarāt Saltanat, I am very sceptical. If any such were issued, their number was extremely small. Certainly the typical coins of the period were, with more or less precision, round in shape. The following lists, based upon measurements and weighments of copper coins, all of the reign of Ahmad I, demonstrate the futility of the attempt to classify them according to the length of their diameters. These lists show not only that coins of the same diameter may vary widely in their weights, but also that comparatively light coins may have a large, and comparatively heavy coins a small, diameter.

### Diameter of .8 inch: weight in grains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter range</th>
<th>Weight range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>146, 142, 140, 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>145, 70, 69, 68, 67, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>142, 140, 138, 73, 72, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>69, 67, 66, 64, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>70, 61, 57, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>70, 69, 34, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45</td>
<td>35, 33, 31, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diameter of .55 inch: weight in grains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter range</th>
<th>Weight range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diameter of .7 inch: weight in grains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter range</th>
<th>Weight range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diameter of .75 inch: weight in grains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter range</th>
<th>Weight range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact is the "make" of these coins is quite too rough, and their thickness too arbitrary, to admit of their classification by size. It is, I am convinced, only by a comparison of the weights of the coins that we may hope to arrive at an approximately correct classification.

Regarding the gold coins, indeed, no difficulty presents itself. In all only nine varieties have hitherto been catalogued, and of these seven weigh 185 grains each, one 179, and one 177. Clearly all the nine are thus of one and the same denomination.

But when we pass on to the consideration of the silver and copper coins of Gujarāt, it becomes no easy matter to determine the different denominations current at one period or another, and the standard weight of each. So far as I am aware, no mint-records have survived to the present day, and of the coins themselves that have come down to us many are such poor specimens, so worn and battered through the vicissitudes of four hundred years, that one can at times do no more than hazard a guess as to their original weight. Certainly a large margin must be allowed for loss, but no data are available for determining the percentage of the total weight that may fairly be deducted over against such loss. Some proportion, however, must be postulated, and it has seemed to me that for the lighter copper coins we shall be within the mark if we assume that the loss through wear may equal one-seventh of the original full weight. The proportionate loss in the heavier copper coins and in all the silver, which were certainly in less circulation than the copper, would probably be not quite so large, and I have accordingly assumed that for these coins the loss by wear would not exceed one-tenth. Accepting these assumptions, a copper coin of originlaly, say, 49 grains in weight may be supposed to weigh now anything between 49 and 42 grains, and a copper, or silver, coin of originally, say, 150 grains may weigh anything between 150 and 135 grains.

Further, it is every way probable that some unit of weight was adopted such that the original weights of the coins of different denominations, when issuing from the mint, should be certain integral multiples of that unit. A careful study of the weights of the different coins in my collection inclines me to the opinion that both for silver and for copper this unit was 7-4 grains, or precisely four ratis, on the basis of Mr. Maskelyne's estimate of the weight of a ratti. Of
this nit the following multiples are represented in the silver coins of the Gujarāt Saltanat:

5, 10, 15, 20; 6, 12, 24; 8, 16, 32;

and in copper the multiples are

4, 8; 5, 10, 20, 30, 45; 6, 12, 24;

thus evidencing ten different denominations both in silver and in copper. It does not seem, however, that coins of all these denominations were current simultaneously. The long reign of Maḥmūd I supplies us seven denominations of silver coins and the same number of copper; but in no other reign were coins struck of so many denominations. In the two following tables the silver and the copper coins of the Gujarāt Saltanat are classified by weight. In these tables any two numbers connected by a hyphen indicate the superior and inferior limits of weight expressed in grains, and a subscribed number in brackets represents the number of coins known to me between these limits. Thus 111-107 (13) means 13 coins ranging in weight from 111 to 107 grains. For the rest, the tables are self-explanatory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit = 7.4 grains</th>
<th>5 units</th>
<th>6 units</th>
<th>8 units</th>
<th>10 units</th>
<th>12 units</th>
<th>15 units</th>
<th>16 units</th>
<th>20 units</th>
<th>24 units</th>
<th>32 units</th>
<th>Multiples of units</th>
<th>No. of denominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILVER</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44 1/4</td>
<td>50 2/3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88 8/9</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>118 4/5</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>177 2/3</td>
<td>236 2/3</td>
<td>8. 16. 32.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 7/8</td>
<td>38 1/2</td>
<td>50 7/8</td>
<td>65 1/4</td>
<td>76 1/2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106 6/7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>213 2/3</td>
<td>5. 10. 15. 20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176-172 (2)</td>
<td>24. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.s. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qutb al din Ahmad II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146-137 (5)*</td>
<td>20. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud I</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44-43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66-63</td>
<td>88-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146-123 (8)</td>
<td>7. 5. 10. 20. 6. 12. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzaffar II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111-104 (16)</td>
<td>15. 12. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahadur</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57-54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>103-101</td>
<td>117-110</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168-164 (2)</td>
<td>5. 16. 20. 10. 15. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad III</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>114-110</td>
<td>174-170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzaffar III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These five coins are of billon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit = 7.4 grains</th>
<th>4 units</th>
<th>5 units</th>
<th>6 units</th>
<th>8 units</th>
<th>10 units</th>
<th>12 units</th>
<th>20 units</th>
<th>24 units</th>
<th>30 units</th>
<th>45 units</th>
<th>Multiples of units</th>
<th>No. of denominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>177.6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>4.8, 5.10, 20.30, 45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6, 12, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad I</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.31</td>
<td>57.55</td>
<td>73.61</td>
<td>146.135</td>
<td>215.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8, 5.10, 20.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad II</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72.64</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5, 10, 20.30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quṣṭ al dīn ʿAbd al-ʿAmīd II</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70.67</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 20, 30.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 20, 30, 45.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6, 12, 24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugaffār II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 20, 30.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12, 24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahādur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8, 20, 30.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12, 24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmūd III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8, 10, 20, 30.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 20, 30.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12, 24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugaffār III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 20, 30.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12, 24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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That there should be so many as ten different denominations of silver coins, and the same number of copper is of itself a sufficiently formidable objection to the classification here tabulated; but what more than all else imparts to me in this connexion a certain sense of defeat is the fact that there still remain over a few coins that cannot be assigned a place in any of the above classes. Some in- deed of the much worn copper specimens would find admission if the proportions of one-seventh and one-tenth, which we conjectured might perhaps represent the loss by wear, were slightly increased; but even after subtracting these we have a small irreducible residuum of coins that are with only one exception in good condition, yet all of eccentric weight. Three such are of silver. One undated, but of Muṣṭafar II's reign, is but slightly worn, and weighs 92 grains; so that its proper place would be in a 13-unit class. The second is the unique, and every way extraordinary coin of Bahādur, dated H. 933, and shown on Plate IV, No. 51. In fairly good condition, it now weighs 130 grains, and is thus suggestive of an 18-unit class. The third, also in good condition, would fall into the same class, as its weight is 131 grains. This coin was struck by Maḥmūd III in H. 960.

The "irreducibles" in copper are the following four:—

Bahādur, H. 943, much worn, yet weighing 257 grains.
Maḥmūd III, H. 944, a good specimen, 237 grains in weight (Plate V, No. 58).
Maḥmūd III, H. 947, weighing in its present fair condition 151 grains.
Maḥmūd III, H. 948, a coin not of pure copper, but of mixed metal, weighing 132 grains (Plate V, No. 61).

These four coins suggest classes of 40 (or 38), 33, 22 and 18 units respectively.

From the above discussion it would seem safe to draw the following as approximately correct general conclusions—any more precise statement being as yet unwarranted:

(a) Of silver coins there are at least six different classes, the weights ranging between 60-30, 90-60, 120-100, 150-130, 180-160, and 240-220 grains.
(b) In copper also the denominations were at least six, represented by the weights 60-25, 90-60, 150-130, 180-160, 220-200 and 330-300 grains.
VIII. "Cumulative" Legends.

The legends on the different coins issued during the reign of any one Sultān are not all identical. Occasionally, indeed, one lights upon coins bearing distinctly exceptional legends, and each such coin naturally calls for special notice and detailed description. Leaving these, however, for the time being out of consideration, it will be found that on some of the coins of a given king, certain wonted phrases or titles are shown, and others on others. Now it has seemed to me that by merely massing, or combining, all this more or less normal legend-material, we shall obtain what we may call the 'resultant' or 'cumulative' coin-legend for each Sultān, which, as presenting a fairly complete register of the more usual coin-terms, may prove of service for purposes of reference. Accordingly, working on these lines, I have built up the following "cumulative" legends, distinctive of each of the nine Sultāns of Gujarāt whose coins have survived to the present day.

   
   **Obverse:**
   
   **Reverse:**


   **Obverse:**
   
   **Reverse:**


   **Obverse:**
   
   **Reverse:**
   
   **Also Obverse:**
   
   **Reverse:**


   **Obverse:**
   
   **Reverse:**
   
   **Also Obverse:**
   
   **Reverse:**

Compare the reverse of the coins of Ahmad I.
5. Mugaffar II., A.H. 917—932.

**Obverse:** مظفر شاه بن محمود شاه السلطان خلدون الله ملكه

**Reverse:** * شمس الدين والدين ابولانصراللودج باقيرال الرحمن


**Obverse:** بهادر شاه بن مظفر شاه السلطان

**Reverse:** قطب الدين والدين ابولافضل


**Obverse:** محمود شاه بن لطف شاه السلطان

**Reverse:** ناصرالدین والدين ابولافلج الواثق بالله البیتان ت


**Obverse:** [year] احمد شاه بن محمود شاه السلطان عهد

**Reverse:** فیاثالدین والدين ابولاعظامـ المعتصم بالله الرحمن ❧


**Obverse:** مظفر شاه بن محمود شاه السلطان

**Reverse:** شمس الدين والدين ابولانصراللودج باقيرال الرحمن

*Compare the reverse of the coins of Mugaffar II.*

**IX.—Catalogue of Coins on Plates I—VI.**

**Ahmad I., A.H. 813—846.**

No. 1. Copper: 142 grains: Mint? Date?

**Obverse:** احمد شاه السلطان

*with quatrefoil and circle over ح of ح*

**Reverse:** ناصرالدین والدين

No. 2. Copper: 34 grains: Mint?: Date?

**Obverse:** احمد شاه

*(with neither quatrefoil nor circle.)*

**Reverse:** السلطان (on Plate upside down).

No. 3. Copper: 138 grains: Mint?: Date?

**Obverse:** احمد شاه السلطان

**Reverse:** ناصرالدین والدين ابولافلج

*الموْيِدَتُ الْلَّهُمَـا الْرَّحْمَـينَ—The strengthened by the strengthening of the Merciful.

†الْوَاثِقُ بِاللَّهِ الْمَلِكُ—The truster in Allah the Gracious.

††المعتصم بالله الرحمن—The attendant on Allah the Merciful.
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No. 4. Copper: 69 grains: [Ahmadnagar]: H. 880.

**Obverse**: Square area
upper margin
left margin

**Reverse**: ناصرالدین والدین 830


**Obverse**: As 4, also lower margin
right margin

**Reverse**: As 4, but year 835


**Obverse**: Square area as 4, lower and right margins as 5.

**Reverse**: السلطان الأعظم ناصرالدین والدین 837

Muhammad II., A.H. 846—855.


**Obverse**: السلطان محمد شاه أبو الحمام

**Reverse**: السلطان فیاث الدنیا والدین

No. 8a. Copper: 210 grains: Mint?: H. 850.

**Obverse**: سکه سلطان فیاث الدین محمد شاه باد 850

No. 8b. Copper: 217 grains: Mint?: Date?

**Reverse**: تا بدار الضرب گردون قروس مهر و ماه باد

The legend on the obverse and reverse of No. 8 (a and b) forms the couplet,

May the coin of Muhammad Shah the Sultan, the Aid of the Faith, remain,
So long as in the sphere of the Seat of the Mint the orb of the sun and moon remains.


**Obverse**: محمد شاه السلطان 52

**Reverse**: فیاث الدنیا والدین


**Obverse**: السلطان محمد شاه 853
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Qutb al-din Ahmad Shāh II., A. H. 855—863.

   Obverse :
   Reverse :

   Obverse :
   Reverse :

   Obverse : As 12.
   Reverse : As 12, but year 861.

No. 14. Copper : 70 grains : Mint : H. 85 x or 86 x.
   Obverse :
   Reverse :

Mahmūd I., A. H. 863—917.

   Obverse :
   Reverse :

Mahmūd Shāh, Defender of the World and of the Faith, Father of Victory, Brother of Qutb Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, the Sultān.

   Reverse : As 15a, but with top line clearer, and year—73.

   Obverse :
   Reverse :

   Obverse :
   Reverse :

   Obverse : As 17, with addition of year 877.
   Reverse :

   Obverse : As 18, but year 877 (sic), doubtless for 877.
   Reverse : As 18.

Obverse: 

No. 21. Copper: 175 grains; Mustafabad : H. 870 or 879.

Obverse: Circular area

Margin

Reverse: As 18, with addition of year 870 or 871.

No. 22. Copper: 215 grains; perhaps Mustafabad : H. 880.

Obverse: Square area

left margin

other margins illegible.

Reverse: As 18, with addition of year 870.

No. 23. Copper: 171 grains; Mustafabad : H. 882.

Obverse: 

Reverse: As 18, with addition of year 884.

No. 24. Copper: 172 grains; Mustafabad : H. 883.

Obverse: As 23.

Reverse: As 18, with addition of year 884.

No. 25. Copper: 217 grains; Mustafabad : H. 886.

Obverse: Square area

upper margin

other margins illegible.

Reverse: As 17, but year 884.


Obverse: square area having peaked sides

lower margin 890 or 900

other margins illegible.

Reverse: 

No. 27. Silver: 80 grains; Mint? : H. 891.

Obverse: Circular area (compare 21)

margin illegible.

Reverse: As 26, with addition of year 891

No. 28a. Copper: 65 grains; Mint? : Date?

Obverse:


Obverse: Square area

upper margin

left margin

lower and left margins (doubtfully)
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Outer linear and dotted circles.

Reverse: As 26, with addition of year 896 (sic).
Outer linear and dotted circles.

Obverse: Square area margins illegible.
Reverse: As 18, with addition of year 897 (or 898).

Obverse: Square area having peaked sides right margin
upper margin left margin illegible.
lower margin
Reverse: As 26.

No. 32. Silver: 86 grains: Mint?: H. 900.
Obverse: Square area lower margin
other margins illegible.
Outer linear and dotted circles.
Reverse: As 26, also outer linear and dotted circles.

Obverse: Square area right margin upper margin left margin
lower margin
Reverse: As 26.

No. 34. Silver: 88 grains: Muḥammadābād 'urf Chāmpānīr: H. 903.
Obverse: Square area having peaked sides margins—lower, right, upper, left, lower—
Reverse: As 26.

No. 35. Silver: 65 grains: Mint?: H. 904.
Obverse: Square area margins illegible.
Reverse: As 18, with addition of year 906.
No. 36. Silver: 89 grains: Muṣṭafābād?: H. 905.

Obverse: Square area
   upper margin
   left margin
   lower and right margins (doubtfully)

Reverse: As 26, with addition of year 905
   and outer linear and dotted circles.

This coin is evidently closely related to No. 29.


Obverse: Curved diamond area
   margin lower and to right
   other margins illegible.

Reverse: As 26.


Obverse: Square area having peaked sides
   margins illegible.

Reverse: As 26, with addition of year 912.

No. 39. Silver: 176 grains: Muḥammadābād ‘urf Chāmpānīr:

Date?

Obverse: Scalloped circular area
   upper and left margins
   lower and right margins illegible.

Reverse: As 26.

No. 40. Silver: 160 grains: Mint?: Date?

Obverse: Square area
   margins illegible.

Reverse: As 26.

No. 41. Silver: 85 grains: Muḥammadābād: Date?

Obverse: Square area having peaked sides
   right margin
   upper margin
   other margins illegible.

Reverse: As 26.

No. 42. Copper: 141 grains: Mint?: Date?

Obverse: Square area
   margins illegible.

Reverse: As 18.
No. 43. Copper: 168 grains: Mint? : Date?

*Obverse:* Circular area معمود شاہ السلطان margin illegible.

*Reverse:* As 18.

Mugaffar II, A.H. 917—932.


[On the Plate the obverse and reverse of this coin occupy each the other's position.]

*Obverse:* * In wavy circle لسلطان مظرفر شاہ ضربت خانپور

*Reverse:* In plain circle الموعد بن شاه علی الرحمن شمس الدينیا والدين ابولنصر


*Obverse:* In square having doubled sides, each peaked: متمرفر شاہ بن معمود شاہ السلطان ۹۲۵

*Reverse:* As 44 (doubtful).

No. 46. Silver: 110 grains: Mint? : Date 927.

*Obverse:* In circle متمرفر شاہ بن معمود شاہ السلطان ۹۲۷

*Reverse:* As 44.


*Obverse:* In circle circumscribing a square whose sides are peaked: خلدا الله (؟) متمرفر شاہ بن معمود شاہ السلطان ۹۲۹

*Reverse:* As 44, with outer linear and dotted circles.


*Obverse:* As 45, but year ۹۳۰.

*Reverse:* As 44.


*Obverse:* In circle متمرفر شاہ بن معمود شاہ السلطان

*Reverse:* شمس الدينیا إلی ابولنصر [۹۳۲]

No. 50. Silver: 107 grains: Mint? : Date?

*Obverse:* In square having peaked sides: السلطان متمرفر شاہ خلدا الله علیها

* The legend in the lower half of the obverse of this coin is doubtful. For the provisional reading here given I am indebted to my friend Mr. H. Nelson Wright.
Reverse: As 44.

This coin may be of Murisfar III., to whom it is assigned in the Brit. Mus.

Bahadur, A. H. 932—943.


Obverse: قطب الدميا والدين وابوالفضل بهادر شاه بن مظفر شاه
Reverse: بن محمد شاه بن احمد شاه بن محمد شاه بن مظفر شاه 933


Obverse: In circle بهادر شاه بن مظفر شاه السلطان
margin illegible.

Reverse: قطب الدميا والدين وابوالفضل [مظفر] 934


Obverse: .................. بهادر بن مظفر شاه السلطان (2)
Reverse: As 52, but year 938 near the middle.


Obverse: As 53.

Reverse: As 52, but year 938 at bottom.


Obverse: In double circle, each scalloped, بهادر رشاه
Reverse: In double circle, each scalloped, السلطان سنة 941


Obverse: بهادر شاه بن مظفر السلطان
Reverse: As 52, but year 943


Obverse: In circle بهادر شاه بن مظفر شاه السلطان
Reverse: As 52, but date illegible — perhaps [4]41

Mahmood III, A. H. 943—961.


Obverse: Square area جمهور شاه السلطان
lower margin
other margins illegible.

* This most interesting coin merits especial notice. Both it and No. 55 were presented to me by Mr. H. Nelson Wright of Allahabad.
Reverse: Square area  
lower margin  
other margins illegible.

No. 59. Copper: 154 grains: Mint?: H. 945.
Obverse: مجموع شاه بن لطيف شاه السلطان  
Naṣṣar-ad-dīn wa-l-dīn abu-ul-fāṭīm  
Reversed: ئ(؟)

No. 60. Mixed coppery metal: 147 grains: Mint?: H. 945.
Obverse: In circular area  
lower margin  
remainder of margin illegible.
Reversed: Naṣṣar-ad-dīn wa-l-dīn abu-ul-fāṭīm

No. 61. Mixed coppery metal: 132 grains: Mint?: Date 948.
Obverse: In circular area, as 60.  
margin illegible.
Reversed: As 59, but year 948

Obverse: Square area  
right margin  
other margins illegible.
Reversed: Naṣṣar-ad-dīn wa-l-dīn 948

Obverse: In square having peaked sides,  
Naṣṣar-ad-dīn wa-l-dīn abu-ul-fāṭīm as-saltān
Reversed: Naṣṣar-ad-dīn wa-l-dīn abu-ul-fāṭīm as-saltān

No. 64. Silver: 54 grains: Mint?: H. 961.
Obverse: In circle  
Naṣṣar-ad-dīn wa-l-dīn abu-ul-fāṭīm as-saltān  
margin illegible.
Reversed: Naṣṣar-ad-dīn wa-l-dīn abu-ul-fāṭīm as-saltān

No. 65. Silver: 111 grains: Mint?: H. [95].9?
Obverse: As 64.  
Reversed: As 64, but year—9 (doubtful).

No. 66. Mixed bronze-like metal: 141 grains: Mint?: Date?
Obverse: In circle, as 60.  
margin blank.
Ahmad III., A. H. 961—968.

No. 67. Copper: 168 grains: Mint?: H. 961 or 964.
   Obverse: Square area
   margins illegible.
   Reverse: غياث الدنيا والدين ابوبالعمس وليد نهجه 1360)

No. 68. Silver: 222 grains: Mint?: H. 963.
   Obverse: In square having double sides, each peaked,
   احمد شاه بن صحمود شاه السلطان عبد 1363
   Reverse: غياث الدنيا والدين ابوبالعمس المعتصم
   بالله الرحمن

No. 69a. Copper: 71 grains: Mint?: H. 963.
   Obverse:
   احمد شاه 1363

No. 70a. Copper: 217 grains: Mint?: Date?
   Obverse: Square area
   margins illegible.

Mugaffar III., A. H. 968—980, and 991—992.

   Obverse: In square 1388
   Reverse: غياث الدنيا والدين ابوبالنصر الموهود بقنايد
   [الرحيق]

No. 72. Silver: 114 grains: Mint?: H. 969.
   Obverse: In scalloped circle, as 71 but year 1371
   Reverse: As 71.

No. 73. Copper: 144 grains: Ahmadasbad?: H. 970.
   Obverse: Square area
   margins illegible—perhaps traces of
   مظفر شاه 1370
   Reverse: غياث الدنيا والدين ابوبالنصر

No. 74a. Copper: 214 grains: Mint?: H. 971
   Obverse: In circle
   مظفر شاه 1371

No. 75. Copper: 175 grains: Ahmadasbad: H. 977.
   Obverse: Circular area
   مظفر شاه 1377
   margins illegible, but, from comparison with other
   specimens of this type, would seem to read
   شهر معظم احمد اباد
The Coins of the Gujarāt Sultānat.

Reverse: 

Some unusual symbols are present in both the upper and the lower portions of the reverse.

No. 76. Silver: 07 grains: Mint?: H. 978.

Obverse: Square area, peaked sides, مظفر شاه السلطن ۹۷۸ margins illegible.

Reverse: As 71.

No. 77. Copper: 138 grains: Mint?: Date?

Obverse: السلطان مظفر شاه شمس الدين والدين

Reverse: 

No. 78. Copper: 148 grains: Mint?: H. 971.

Obverse: In circle مظفر شاه ۹۷۱

Reverse: 

This reading of the difficult inscription on the reverse has been supplied by Mr. Nelson Wright, I.C.S. If we may take مظفر شاه as a periphrasis for "coin," the legend reads, 'May the coin remain as long as the orb of the sun and moon.' There seems to be some connexion between this inscription and that on 86.


Obverse: In double linear square with dots between the lines، السلطان مظفر شاه ابن صمود شاه احمداباد lower margin 

other margins illegible.

Reverse: In double linear square with dots between the lines، لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله the kalimah بصدق ابي بكر upper margin (probably) بعدل عمر right margin (probably) 

other margins illegible.

No. 80.* Copper: 85 grains: Aḥmadābād: [H. 991].

Obverse: مظفر شاه بن صمود [شاه]

Reverse: دارالضرب احمداباد

* Coins Nos. 79 and 80 were struck during Muzaffar III's second reign A.H. 991-992.
No. 81. Silver: 72 grains: Mint?: Date?

Obverse: अरायथण or 95 (for 958)

Reverse: As 72, but the legend is very degenerate.

A Kaṭār, or Rājpūt dagger, is represented in the lower part of the field of the reverse.

This coin is a Kaech Kori, struck during the reign of Rāyadhañ—probably Rāyadhañ I. (A.D. 1666–1697). The Rā'os of Kaech retained on their coins, along with their own names written in Devanāgarī, the name of Mu'ṭaffar (III.) of Gujarāt and the year 978, both in Persian characters. This type of coin continued to be struck until recent times, but, as the years passed, the figures of the date and the letters of the Persian legend on the reverse became ever more and more degenerate.

No. 82. Copper: 189 grains: [Navānagar]: Date?

Obverse: अरायथण or 95 (for 958).

Reverse: A very degenerate form of the legend on the reverse of Coin No. 72.

This is a copper coin of the Navānagar State, a rough imitation of the coins struck by Mu'ṭaffar III., before Akbar's conquest of Gujarāt.

For the admirable plates that accompany this article I am indebted to my esteemed and learned friend Mr. Henry Cousens, M.R.A.S., Superintendent of the Archaeological Survey, Western India. With his unfailing kindness he offered to take casts in plaster, and from them photographs, of all coins that I might select for the purpose; and it was this most generous offer of his—an offer entailing much tedious labour on his part—that more than all else encouraged me to undertake the writing of the present article. Never before have photographic plates been prepared representing so complete a set of the coins of the Gujarāt Saltanat, and by this valuable contribution Mr. Cousens has placed the readers of this Journal under a deep debt of obligation.

G. P. T.
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