PREFACE

The task of making available to the world of scholars the benefits of study and research on Indian inscriptions would have remained incomplete without the reprinting of volumes of Epigraphia Indica (Arabic & Persian Supplement). This series, under the title Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, published from 1907 to 1940, was revived in 1949 and since 1951 in its present form. This valuable material is being published in 13 volumes. The present one is 11th in the series and will be followed in quick succession by subsequent ones.

I wish to record my thanks to Shri N.M. Ganam, Superintending Epigraphist, for the planning of the series. Shri J.C. Gupta, Production Officer, Archaeological Survey of India, has the credit for its speedy execution and production.
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FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTION OF QUEEN RADJIYYA FROM UTTAR PRADESH

BY DR. Z. A. DESAI

In his study of the inscriptions of the successors of Itutmish, the late Dr. G. Yazdani had, while referring to the fact that no inscription of the reign of that monarch's immediate successors, Ruknu'd-Din Firuz and Radjiyya were known, expressed the hope that this lacuna in the mural records of the dynasty could be filled if a diligent search for inscriptions was conducted in the old city of Delhi, and in such places as Hansi, Samana, Amroha, Koil and Budaun.1

Dr. Yazdani's hope has at last been fulfilled, however partially. A search at three of the last mentioned places did not yield any such epigraph, but an inscription of queen Radjiyya has been recently discovered from another place.

This unique, but unfortunately fragmentary, inscription of the famous queen who created history in medieval India, was found at Bulandshahr, headquarters of the district of the same name in Uttar Pradesh, by Mr. A. A. Kadiri, Epigraphical Assistant in our office, who visited different places in that state to trace and copy Arabic and Persian inscriptions. Bulandshahr, or the more celebrated Baran of older times, is a place of great antiquity, situated on the right bank of the Kali Nadif (river) in 28°15' N. and 77°52' E. Its present name is locally believed to be a Persianised version of Unchahar—elevated city, so called on account of its elevated position on the river-bank. Like Budaun and other places in the north, Bulandshahr is one of the towns which were subjected to Muslim rule from its very early days. As is well-known, Radjiyya's father Itutmish himself was for some time governor of Baran and the neighbourhood, before he became king.2

There are quite a few ancient remains in the city of sufficient interest to the historians and antiquarians.3 Having come across a statement by Dr. A. Fuhrer in his valuable list of the antiquities of the province, that an inscription said to be of the time of Muhammad bin Sām appeared on the Dargah of Makhdum Shah in the town,4 I particularly desired Mr. Kadiri to locate and copy the same. But unfortunately, no such epigraph was found on the monument.

Tradition no doubt associates a mosque in the Kot-Mahalla of the town, with the name of Shihābu’d-Dīn Ghori, as Muhammad bin Sām is popularly known. And it is on this mosque that

1 Epigraphia Indica-Mostemica, 1913-14, p. 13. Strictly speaking, no inscription of Muhammad bin Bahram has been found so far, for the inscription of his reign published by Dr. Yazdani (ibid., p. 16, pl. IV) does not contain his name. Its date no doubt falls in his reign.
2 Minhaj-i-Siraj, Tabaqat-i-Nasir (Lahore, 1952), p. 80.
4 Fuhrer, op. cit., p. 5.
the fragmentary tablet containing the incomplete record of Raḍiyya is found. The tablet in its present state measures 1.18 m. by 23 cm. and is built up into the brick-wall of the courtyard of the mosque which also forms the northern wall of the court of an adjacent residential building. The mosque itself, also of brick, has no claim to architectural pretensions of any order and moreover, does not appear to be old. A grave on a platform nearby and two just without, contain undated religious epigraphs which, from their style of writing, seem to have been inscribed in the eighth century A.H.

The surviving text of this epigraph, consisting of a single line, records only part of the titles of the queen and part of the date. It is inscribed against floral background in Nashā letters of the prevalent style, which is further distinguished by a refined, delicate and, if one may say so, effeminate touch. Judging from the size of the letters, and the extant tablet, it would appear that the original inscription was of considerable size, necessitated, evidently, by the dimensions of the building for which it was intended.

Strictly speaking, there is no reason to think that the slab is not in situ in the sense that it could have been recovered from the older building on the site of which the present mosque was built. But at the same time, it could have belonged to the immediate neighbourhood as well. Anyway, it is not possible, in view of the meagre text before us, to determine the nature of the building constructed, though it is a reasonable guess that it was a mosque. Again, it cannot be ascertained whether Raḍiyya was the builder or her name only appears as the reigning queen. Likewise, the date of the record is lost, except that it was Sunday and second day of the month. It is difficult to arrive at the month and the year, since Sunday, the 2nd, fell twice in every year during the period of Raḍiyya’s reign, i.e. from A.H. 634 to A.H. 638.

Thus, the historical information supplied by this unique epigraph is quite meagre and does not add in any way to our present knowledge of her history. And yet, it is an extremely valuable record, if only because it constitutes the sole surviving mural documents of this accomplished daughter of Itlutumish, who has had the distinction of being the only woman to sit on the throne of Delhi.

Before quoting the text and translation of this inscription, it is only necessary that the basis on which the inscription has been assigned to queen Raḍiyya may be described here. For, in the absence of the name and the date, and even of full title, the assignment can be reasonably doubted. But there are two points which should dispel any such doubt: Firstly, the palaeography proclaims the epigraph to be of the early Mamlāk period, i.e. of the first half of the seventh century A.H. or thirteenth century A.D. And secondly—and this should be, I believe, considered quite conclusive—the text has ʿa’s-Sultān, bint ʿa’s-Sultān, which can only mean that the surviving titles ʿdunyā waʿd-Dīn preceding it, referred to a lady, which fact is further indicated by the use of the feminine preposition ʿā in the phrase khalladallāhu mulkabā. This grammatical usage alone is sufficient to prove beyond any doubt the identification of the reigning sovereign.

The epigraphical tablet has been exposed to elements of nature for centuries, and consequently, the letters thereon have been slightly affected. But the writing is on the whole legible.

I have read the text as follows:—

**TEXT**

Plate I(a)

النَِّدُوُيَا وَ الْدِّينِ السَّلَطَانَ بُنتُ السَّلَطَانَ خلَدَ اللهُ ملُكِها في يومَ الأحدِ الأَلَّمِ (؟)

............................................لا

---

MAMLUK INSCRIPTIONS

(Plates I-IV)

(a) Fragmentary inscription of Queen Ragiiyya (p. 2)

Scale: 1.15

(b) Epigraph of Itutmish, dated A.H. 629, from Bari Khata (p. 6)
TRANSLATION

Dunyā wa’d-Dīn, the sultān, daughter of the sultān, may Allāh perpetuate her kingdom, on Sunday, the second (?) of.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that contrary to the usual practice of the use of one set of regal titles, those used for her in the coins are: Jalālatu’d-Dunyā wa’d-Dīn and Raḍiyyatul’Dunyā wa’d-Dīn. It is difficult to account for the set of two titles adopted in her coins, quite satisfactorily. Had this inscription survived in full, it would have been possible to know what title was used in her inscriptions and thus throw some light on this problem.

---

1 H. N. Wright, *The Coinage and Metrology of the Sultans of Delhi* (Delhi, 1936), p. 76.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE MAMLUK SULTANS OF DELHI

BY DR. Z. A. DESAI

It was five decades ago that all the then available inscriptions of the Mamluk rulers of India were published in this series. Since then, one more record, which was subsequently found at Kaman in the erstwhile Bharatpur State and now Bharatpur district of Rajasthan, was published about twentyfive years ago. Though most of these epigraphs were published much earlier by scholars like H. Blochmann, P. Horn and the like, they were properly studied only by Maulvi M. Shu'aib, Dr. J. Horovitz and Dr. G. Yazdani.¹

During the next two decades after the last one, from Kaman, was published in 1938, hardly three more Mamluk inscriptions were brought to light. In the past decade, however, a few more inscriptions belonging to this dynasty were found by the Persian and Arabic Inscriptions Branch of the Archaeological Survey of India. These are from Bari Khatu in Rajasthan and Bulandshahr, Meerut, Budaun and Bilhaur, all in Uttar Pradesh. Of them, the Bulandshahr inscription represents the only and newly discovered, but unfortunately fragmentary, record of queen Ra'diyaa, the daughter of Itutmish, who earned the unique distinction of a lady occupying the throne of Delhi. In view of its unique character, it has been published separately in the present issue (p. 1).

The three inscriptions referred to above as having been published in thirties and forties, are from Aligarh in Uttar Pradesh, Bari Khatu and Budaun. Attention to the Bari Khatu epigraph of the reign of Itutmish, was first drawn by the late Ḥāfiz Ṣahmūd Ḵān Sheraṇī of the Oriental College, Lahore, one of the greatest Persian scholars and researchers of the present century.² But the credit of publishing its full text goes to Dr. M. 'Abdu'llāh Chaghtāi, then of the Deccan College, Poona, and now of the Panjab University, Lahore, in the papers he read before the 8th Session of the All India Oriental Conference and of the Indian Historical Congress, in 1935 and 1945 respectively.³

The second inscription of the reign of Itutmish, which is fragmentary, was found at Aligarh. It was edited by Dr. A. B. Halim, then of the Aligarh Muslim University, in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1949.⁴ And the third epigraph, also fragmentary, was found at Budaun, and its one-line surviving text was quoted by M. Ṭalḥa'd-Din of Budaun, in his Urdu history of the city of Budaun.⁵ These three epigraphs are also published here along with their facsimiles with necessary comments.

¹ M. Muhammad Shu'aib, 'Inscriptions from Palwal', Epigraphia Indo-Islamica (EIÜ), 1911-12, pp. 1-3; J. Horovitz, 'The Inscriptions of Muhammad Ibn Sam, Quṭbudd Din Aibeg and Itutmish', ibid., pp. 12-34; and G. Yazdani, 'The Inscriptions of the Turk Sultans of Delhi, etc.', ibid., 1913-14, pp. 13-46 and 'Inscription of Sultan Balban from Bayana, Bharatpur State', ibid., 1937-38, pp. 5-6. A. Cunningham, Archaeological Survey of India Reports, vol. XX (Calcutta, 1885), p. 56, noticed an inscription of Itutmish from the Chaumath-Khamba mosque at Kaman.
² Ḥāfiz Ṣahmūd Ḵān Sheraṇī, Prithviraj Rāsā, in Urdu (Delhi, 1943), p. 178.
⁵ M. Ṭalḥa'd-Din, Kāznat Turāf (Budaun, 1907), p. 71.
Of the remaining six inscriptions which are noticed here, I believe, for the first time, unfortunately only one has survived in full. It is from Meerut, a district headquarters town in Uttar Pradesh and is dated in the reign of Nasiru’d-Din Mahmūd, son of Itutmish. The rest are fragmentary epigraphs, of which two are found at Bari Khatu and one each at Budaun, Bulandshahr and Bilhaur, in Kanpur district of Uttar Pradesh. One of the two Bari Khatu records has proved to be a new record of Ghiyāthu’d-Din Balban, dated A.H. 666. This record was also known to Dr. Chaghtāi who had displayed its inked rubbing, along with those of others, in the exhibition held under the auspices of the Ḥāfiz-i Ma’ārib’-Islāmiyya, Lahore, in 1936. But I do not think he has published its text anywhere.

The other two fragmentary records, one each from Bari Khatu and Budaun, do not contain the name of the reigning monarch, but I have no doubt that they originally formed part of Mamlūk inscriptions. Likewise, in the case of the Bilhaur record, the text, engraved on a stone-beam of a tomb, has disappeared except for the first few honorific titles of the reigning monarch. In the epigraph from Bulandshahr too, nothing more than few titles of the king has survived. On palaeographical grounds, these epigraphs can be assigned only to the Mamlūk period.

These records, particularly those found at Bari Khatu, are historically important, as they indicate the political subjugation of this part of Rajastan by the Muslims, immediately after the foundation of their rule in northern India. Then, epigraphs from Uttar Pradesh enable us to rectify the exaggerated, and in some cases utterly wrong, statements made in Dr. A. Führer’s The Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh and copied without any scrutiny in the District Gazetteers of United Provinces of Agra and Oudh (now Uttar Pradesh). A few inscriptions at Bulandshahr and Budaun, for example, are stated to date from the time of Maḥmūd of Ghazna or Muhammad bin Sām, popularly called Shihāb’u’d-Din Ghori, as I shall have occasion to point out at the proper place. Palaeographically too, they are worth notice. They are inscribed in almost the same calligraphical style as marks the contemporary epigraphs from other places in North India.

In this article, I have studied first those inscriptions which contain the name of the reigning king and are thus assignable to him beyond any doubt. Next follow those fragmentary inscriptions in which attempt has been made, where possible, to assign them to the reigns of particular monarchs on the basis of the titles, palaeography, etc.

The first inscription is engraved on a tablet, which is now fixed into the wall of the western verandah in the tomb of Maqribi Shāh, at Bari Khatu. As has been stated above, Ḥāfiz Maḥmūd Khān Sherānī was the first to draw attention to this epigraph in the thirties. Subsequently, it was published by Dr. Chaghtāi, who did not, however, illustrate his study.

Bari Khatu or Khatu Kalan as it is called to distinguish it from Khatu Khurd, a few miles away, is situated in the Jael tahsil of the Nagaur district of Rajastan. It lies on the Doganā-Ratanagar section of the Northern Railway. The place, known for its yellowish hard stone quarries, forms one of the old sites of the district. The ancient structures here comprise the ruined fort wall with the remains of the plinths of five temples, a dilapidated mosque, two tanks and a deep rock-cut well, overlooking the village proper, which contains a number of mosques with

---

1 Vide p. 9, No. 132 of its catalogue published at Lahore in 1936.
2 One more fragmentary inscription at Bari Khatu, containing only the royal title Ghiyāthu’d-Din, is assigned by Dr. Chaghtāi to Balban, but its palaeography as well as the style of its text make its assignment to Ghiyāthu’d-Din Tughluq Shāh more probable (Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy (ARI), 1962-63, p. 36 and No. D, 194).
4 Sherānī, op. cit. The matter of Sherānī’s work was first published in 1937 or so in the Oriental College Magazine, Lahore.
5 Chaghtāi, PAIOM, 1935, where an eye-tracing was illustrated.
or without tombs. The most outstanding mosque is the Masjid-i-Aqṣā which stands on the hill and is attributed to Itlutmish, on account of its style of architecture which resembles the Aḥṣāi-Din-kā Jhompā mosque at Ajmer. The most celebrated among the tombs are those of the saints Bābā Iṣḥāq Maqhadībī, popularly called Maqhadībī Shāh and Samman Shāh.

The epigraphical tablet does not belong to the tomb of the saint Maqhadībī Shāh, since the text purports to record the excavation of a tank. It is not possible to say to which of the couple of tanks in the village and the hill-fort, the tablet originally belonged. But that it may not belong to the tank called Mulūk Tālāb is almost certain, for on a platform on its bank is fixed another inscription, also recording the excavation of a tank. It is likely, therefore, that the tablet came from a rectangular stepped-tank with plastered floor situated on the north-western side of the fort.

The tablet, which measures 1 m. by 1.35 m., is inscribed with Arabic text of nine lines, in the prevalent Nashī script, which is remarkable for the boldness of its letters. In the first line, a reference is made to the fact that the pond or tank was ordered to be excavated in the reign of the king Shamsu'd-Din Abu'l-Muzaffar Itlutmish, whose name and royal as well as honorific titles occupy as many as seven lines of the text. These titles are found, in twos, threes or fours, but not all in one place, in the inscriptions of Itlutmish found on the Qutb-Minār at Delhi and also elsewhere. It is very likely that these titles as a whole may have also been used in an inscription, found on the enclosure of Mīrān Mulhām Shāhīd at Budaun. It is difficult to assert this categorically, since the epigraph in question is fragmentary. But from its style as well as from the present state of the epigraph in which the portion of the text to the left is lost, it appears that the sets of titles and the order in which they are used therein might have been the same as those employed in the inscription under study.

The last two lines contain the name of Mas'ūd, son of ʿAlī, son of ʿUmar al-Khalj, who gave orders for the excavation of the tank, as stated in the first part of line 1. The record bears the date Ramadān 629 (June-July 1232). The text thus purports that the tank was excavated by Mas'ūd and not by Itlutmish, and that the excavation took place in the time of the latter. Therefore, Dr. Chaghtāi's interpretation that the inscription records the construction of a reservoir by Itlutmish and that the construction took place under the supervision of Mas'ūd, is misleading.

The following reading prepared by me differs from that of Dr. Chaghtāi in very few places only; in particular, he was unable to read the second part of the invocatory phrase occurring in the last line.

TEXT

Plate 1(b)

الذين نقلهم للعالم من السماوات العظام ملك العرب ملكت كرباء الدم [ ل]

2 The information regarding the monuments and tanks of the town was obtained from the inspection-report of the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Baroda, who visited the place in 1938.
3 Horovitz, op. cit., pp. 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 34.
4 Ibid., p. 34.
5 Chaghtāi, PAIOC, 1935, pp. 632-34.
TRANSLATION

(1) The construction of this tank was ordered during the time of the government of the magnificent Sultan, lord of the necks of the nations, chief of

(2) the kings of Arabia and Persia, shadow of Allāh on the earth, helped (by the support) from the above, rendered victorious over the enemies,

(3) Shamsu'd-Dunyā wa'd-Dīn, refuge of Islām and the Muslims, the most just among the kings

(4) and the sultāns, the protector of the cities of Allāh, the reliant on the help of Allāh,

(5) the saviour of the countries of the world, the manifestation of the lofty word of Allāh, the bright star in the firmament of caliphate, the spreader of

(6) justice and kindness, surety of safety for the men of Faith, inheritor of the kingdom of Solomon,

(7) master of the seal in the kingdom of the world, Abū'l-Muẓaffar İltu[t]mīsh, the sultan, helper of the Commander of the Faithful,

(8) may Allāh perpetuate his kingdom and sovereignty and elevate his order and glory by the creature Mas'ūd, son of (?) Aḥmad, son of 'Umar al-Khalīj,

(9) may Allāh rectify his condition and may the scale (of) his (actions) be heavy on account of this charitable deed! In the auspicious month of Ramadān, year (A.H.) twenty-nine and six hundred (Ramadān 629: June-July 1232).

It is not possible to ascertain the identity of Mas'ūd who might have been an official of rank in the region around the findspot of the record. A few noblemen of İltutmīsh with the Khalīj surname find mention in historical works, but the name of Mas'ūd or even his father appears to be absent there.¹ The mention of this tribal name in the text is also not without interest, though it is rather unfortunate that it does not throw any light on the significance of that term which has not yet been satisfactorily known.

¹ Minhāj-i-Sirāj, Tabqāt-i-Nāṣirī (Lahore, 1952), p. 88.
The second inscription of Itutmish is from Aligarh. It is, as already stated above, fragmentary. Its tablet is lying, or at least it was so until the end of 1961 when I saw it, in the premises of the Maulana Azad Library of the Muslim University, Aligarh. It was through the courtesy of Mr. Baghiruz Din, the learned Librarian, that I got its impressions prepared. It is from these impressions that the inscription is edited here. I am thankful to him as well as to the University authorities for their co-operation.

That the record is neither mentioned in Führer’s work nor in the district gazetteer is not surprising from what Dr. Hallm, who was the first to bring it to light in 1948, has to say about its discovery. He came to know of the existence of the inscribed slab in the house of the late Mr. Amiruz Din of the Mahalla Itashbazan, one of the most elevated parts in the city of Aligarh. The slab was used as building-material in place of bricks in the verandah of the outer-house by Mr. Amiruz Din’s father, who had purchased heaps of masonry, stone and the like material from the vicinity of the Jama’ Mosque in Balla Qala, in a public auction. It was at the suggestion of Dr. Hallm that the tablet was shifted to the Library by Mr. Amiruz Din, shortly before his death.

Dr. Hallm has discussed the various aspects of this inscription in some details, but he has overlooked certain points. The style of calligraphy, for example, was not properly or correctly described, nor was the facsimile of the record published, as it should have been, being an essential requirement in epigraphical studies. It will be seen from the accompanying illustration (pl. II a), that the writing is a fine specimen of calligraphical style. The script employed is epigraphical Naske, remarkable for its Rig or flourishing. To term it as Tughra, typical of the seventh century Hijra found in Egypt and other Middle East countries as Dr. Hallm has done, would not be correct. But before proceeding to examine Dr. Hallm’s other remarks on the inscription in details, it will be better to describe its purport and calligraphical peculiarities.

The extant text is inscribed on a slab of yellow stone, in Naske cum Rig characters of a fairly high order. Its language is Persian, which is remarkable in itself, since, as is well-known, all the available inscriptions of Itutmish are in Arabic. The style of writing too, is somewhat different from that of any inscription of Itutmish found in northern India. No doubt, it is possible to find some trace of similarity between the styles of this and almost contemporary Bihar Sharif inscription of Tughril dated A.H. 640, but it will be observed that the curves and flourishes of the letters and their disposition and the ligatures in this inscription, are more akin to a considerable extent, to those of the Bihar inscriptions of Shamsu’d-Din Firuz of Bengal, dated A.H. 709 and 715. In particular, some of the ligatures in the earlier of these last-mentioned two epigraphs are almost similar to those in our epigraph, as a comparison of the two will show. This style of Bihar inscriptions, of which quite a few delightfully beautiful specimens of the Tughluq period—covering about a full century—exist, is, broadly speaking, so refined and represents such a fully


2 Hallm, op. cit., pp. 1-2. The inscription was to be fixed up, according to Dr. Halim, in the Nizam Museum, now used as the History Seminar Room, of the University, but stated above, it was still lying in the Library until 1961.

3 Ibid., pp. 2-3. As a matter of fact, the epigraphical Naske in vogue in India in the thirteenth century was quite different from that employed at the same time in Syro-Egyptian boundaries. For the view of Professor van Berchem on this point, see EIM, 1913-14, p. 46, Appendix C.

4 EIM, 1913-14, pl. V.

5 Ibid., 1917-18, pls. VI b and XII b.

6 See, for example, Epigraphica Indica, vol. II (Calcutta, 1894), plate facing page 292; Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persia Supplement (EIAPS), 1955 & 1956, pl. II; ibid., 1961, pls. VI-X.
developed phase that the emergence of such a mature style in mural records in Bihar, in the first decade of the eighth century Hijra, appears too sudden in the absence of any earlier specimens. It is here that the inscription under study, which, though fragmentary, is definitely of the time of Ilutmish, may be taken to provide a missing link. It would not be wrong to hold that the perfectly beautiful style of the above-quoted records from Bihar, are a more developed form of the calligraphical style of the present epigraph. Incidentally, this style of writing disappears almost as suddenly after the first decade of the ninth century in Bihar, as it had emerged there. The present epigraph is, thus, palaeographically, quite important.

The extant two-line text states that 'an auspicious abode' was constructed in the time of the king of Islam, Shamsu’d-Dunyâ wa’d-Din, during the governorship of Khwaja-i-Jahan Nizâmu’ll-Mulk, the counsellor (dastur) of the king and the chief among chiefs of ministers. The title Shamsu’d-Dunyâ wa’d-Din as well as such of the honorific titles as have survived, and the name of the minister by whom evidently the well-known Nizâmu’ll-Mulk Junaidi is meant, leave no room for doubt that the king referred to here is Ilutmish. Unfortunately, the date of the epigraph and the name of the builder are lost.

It will be seen that the text does not specify the nature of the edifice constructed, but merely mentions it as ‘an auspicious abode’. Now Dr. Halim is inclined to connect it, on the basis of circumstantial evidence, with a mosque, stated to be the first cathedral mosque built by the Muslims in the city of Kol, i.e. Aligarh. He may or may not be right therein, but his conclusion that the first Jama‘ mosque to which the inscription appertained, might have been begun by Qutbu’d-Din and finished by Nizâmu’ll-Mulk Junaidi during the reign of Ilutmish, is certainly not supported by the present epigraph. Even the circumstantial evidence quoted by Dr. Halim, which is mainly confined to a statement of the author of the Askbaru’l-Jamal, an eighteenth century work on the local history of Aligarh, that the mosque, first built by Aibak, was reconstructed by Muhammad bin Tughluq, according to an inscription seen by that author, goes against Dr. Halim’s conclusion. Moreover, there is no basis whatsoever even for the assumption that the inscription belonged to a mosque (or for that purpose, any other edifice), which might have been constructed, let alone finished, by Nizâmu’ll-Mulk Kamalu’d-Din Junaidi. On the contrary, the surviving text points to some one other than the minister as the builder. As it is, the text refers to the reign of the king and to the governorship or chiefship of the minister, which means, as students of Indo-Muslim epigraphy know, that the text did contain the name of the builder, other than these two dignitaries, which must have occurred in the portion of the text in the second line after the name of the minister. Also, the text indicates that the monument, whatever its nature, was built, from commencement to completion, only in the reign of Ilutmish.

The term iyâlat, which no doubt, ultimately suggests governorship only, indicates that Kol (Aligarh) and the region around was included in the chief of the minister, a little known fact, brought to light by the present record only. This, it may be pointed out, is indirectly corroborated by a statement in the history of contemporary Minâhaj, that it was towards Kol that Nizâmu’ll-Mulk had fled after Ilutmish’s son and successor Ruknu’d-Din Firuz, had advanced his army from the capital to chastise the defiant nobles. It would appear that at least about this time, the chief of Kol was exclusively meant for the minister of the kingdom, since we find that Nizâmu’ll-Mulk’s successor in office had also appropriated it on his assumption of power.

While Nizâmu’ll-Mulk Junaidi’s identity is quite well-known, it is rather surprising that contemporary historians give very few details of his life. All that Minâhaj says, apart from making

---

1 Halim, op. cit., p. 3.
2 Ibid.
3 Minâhaj op. cit., p. 93.
4 Ibid., p. 106.
a passing reference to him in connexion with the defeat of Naṣiru'd-Din Qubācha and another
two three, to his son, is that he was a minister of Ilutmish, but had trouble with Ruknu'd-Din
Firūz, as referred to above—and also with the latter's sister and successor Rādiyya Sultān, after
whose accession to the throne, he was compelled to retreat to the hills of Sirmur, where he died
after some time.¹

The above details contained in a contemporary historical work, are certainly meagre, more
so since they relate to a person who held sway as next to king only, for a considerable period. But
fortunately, a few more details about him are contained in the encomiums showered upon him
by Muḥammad 'Auīfī, who, as is well-known to students of literary history, resuscitated his Jawāmi'ī-
ul-Hikāyah wa Lawāmi'ul-Riwayāt at his instance and also dedicated it to him later. Unfortu-
nately, this work is yet to be published in entirety, and it is only from the table of its brief contents
given in his excellent Introduction to that work by Dr. M. Niẓāmu'd-Dīn,² that we can quote a few more details: Abī Ḥāmid Muḥammad bin Abī Sa'd al-Juna'īdī, Qiwāmu'd-Dīn,³
entitled Niẓāmu'l-Mulk, the master of both the sword and the pen, was praised for his energetic
rule and administrative as well as literary talents. He was of Arab descent. He is said to have
established true religion by his mighty efforts. 'Auifs also refers to the mild policy adopted by him
after the surrender of the fort of Bhakkar and the defeat of Naṣiru'd-Din Qubācha.⁴

The epigraphical tablet, in its present state, measures 75 by 43 cm. and the text reads as
under:

TEXT

Plate II (a)

لاهل الامان[ ] [ ]

دو نوبل ابالت خواجه جهان دنستور صاحب تران نظام الملك ملك

الملوك الوز[ ] [ ]

TRANSLATION

(1) The construction of this auspicious edifice (took place) in the time of the reign of the king
of Islām, Shamsu'd-Dunyā wa'd-Dīn, surety of peace for the men of Faith

(2) during the time of the siefship (iyālat) of the master, Khwaja-i-Jahān, the minister of the
lord of happy conjunction² (i.e. the king), (viz.) Niẓāmu'l-Mulk, the chief among the chiefs of
ministers.

¹ Minhāj, op. cit., pp. 84, 89, 93, 96.
² Dr. M. Niẓāmu'd-Dīn of Hyderabad (Dn.), who had quite some time back published his excellent work
Introduction to the Jawāmi'ul-Hikāyah wa Lawāmi'ul-Riwayāt (London, 1929), is currently engaged on its publi-
cation, and it is being seen through the press. Maliku'āsh-Shu'ara Bahār had published a much abridged version
of the work in 1324 Shamsi, and in recent years, Dr. M. Morin of the Tehran University, Iran, has published a few sec-
tions from this work, the first of which appeared in 1335 Shamsi.
³ Ibid., p. 89, gives Kamālu'd-Dīn, which may be a copyist's error. Ḥalīm, op. cit., p. 2, follows him.
⁴ Niẓāmu'd-Dīn, op. cit., pp. 142, 206, 209, 220, 225, 245, etc. It is possible that some more details can be
gathered from 'Auifs's work; but it is a matter of regret that no manuscript of the Jawāmi' was available to me
at the time of writing those lines.
⁵ The translation 'Lord of the Two Conjunctions' in Ḥalīm, op. cit., p. 2, is evidently through oversight.
Dr. Hālim is not sure of his reading of the word الکلا. He confuses the issue by reading [الکلا] in the text, and then stating in the foot-note that it 'can be read as الکلا on account of the dot clearly visible after the الکلا. But he translates the word as 'ministers' only. It will be observed that traces of an alif also have survived on the tablet. It may be pointed out in this connexion that these very titles including مکن ملک الکلا are also used by 'Auff.'

The third inscription of the present study comes from Meerut, a district headquarters town in Uttar Pradesh, situated in 29°1’ N. and 77°43’ E. The inscribed slab, which measures 1·82 m. by 18 cm., is built up into the inner side of the wall of the courtyard, above the entrance leading into the Jāmi’ mosque. According to the local account, quoted by Führer and others, the Jāmi’-Masjid was built by Hasan Mahdī, minister of Maḥmūd of Ghazna, in 1019 and was repaired by Humāyūn. Evidently, the local tradition, has, as usual, associated the mosque with a greater antiquity than is actually the case.

It is difficult to say if our epigraph belongs to the present monument. Its position on the monument makes it rather unlikely. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the text to indicate the exact purport since, its one-line text merely refers to the reign of Abu’l-Muẓaffar, Nāširu’d-Din, the lord of the world and the sultan of the universe, and contains the date A.H. 647 (1249-50 A.D.). Mr. A. A. Kādirī, Epigraphical Assistant in our office, who copied this epigraph, informs me that there are only Quranic verses engraved inside the mosque assignable to the sixteenth century, but no historical record was noticed by him. It is therefore, not known on what basis, Dr. Führer has assigned the repairs of the mosque to the time of Humāyūn as stated above. One might be tempted to take the epigraph under study as fragmentary and no doubt, a separate tablet could have contained the first part, if there was any, of the text. But it is equally true that even in its present state, the epigraph could be quite complete, for inscriptions merely referring themselves to the reign of a king and containing a date are not uncommon.

It is really surprising that this epigraph has not been published so far. Neither Dr. Führer nor Mr. Nevill has noticed it, though it is quite likely that the local tradition assigning a much earlier date to the mosque, as seen above, was based on this epigraph, which being presumably illegible, was thought to be of an early period. In the alternative, it may be that the inscriptive tablet was lying unnoticed in some corner of the mosque or was brought in recent years from some other place, before it was built up into its present position. Mr. Kādirī also informs me that the writing was almost hidden under heavy coating of whitewash, and that may also be one of the reasons of its being not so widely known.

In any case, the inscription is an important addition to the Mamlūk records, which as we have already seen above, are not found in good number. As a matter of fact, this is the third, or rather the fourth, record of this monarch. Its text is quite brief, consisting of one line in Persian which is inscribed in usual Nasḵ characters of the period. It will be observed that the language of this record, unlike in the case of other epigraphs of Nāširu’d-Din, is Persian. And, not only

1 Hālim, op. cit.
4 This is probably a mistake for Maimandi.
6 E.I.M., 1913-14, pp. 21-22 (pl. VIII a) and 23 (pl. XI a). The third undated inscription from Hansi, edited by Dr. Horovitz in E.I.M., 1911-12, p. 25 (pl. XIX), is taken by him to have been set up in the reign of Itutmīsh.
the text contains very few of such honorific titles and phrases as were, so to say, almost a necessary part of the early Mamlük inscriptions, but also, the name Mahmûd is conspicuous by its absence. The titles used for him in his Kol Minaret inscription are same as, but fewer than, those used in the Bari Khatu inscription of his father.\textsuperscript{1}

But it would be a mistake to interpret the absence of titles as indicating any doubt about the genuineness of the record, since this feature too is not so unusual in Indo-Moslem inscriptions. Moreover, above everything else, the palaeography of the inscription fully conforms to the style in vogue and undoubtedly bears out the date quoted therein. There is little doubt that it was set up in that year.

The text reads as under:

\textit{Plate II (b)}

\begin{quote}
در عهد همايون خدامگان عالم سلطان العالمين ابر المظفر المعظم ناصر الدنيا و الدين
شهر سنة سبع و أربعين و ستامية
\end{quote}

\textbf{TRANSLATION}

In the auspicious reign of the lord of the world, the sultân of the universe, Abu’l-Muzaffar, the magnificent Nâşiru’d-Dunyâ wa’d-Din, (in) the months of the year (A.H.) forty-seven and six hundred (A. H. 647-1249-50 A.D.).

The fourth inscription of the group and the last one to contain the name of the king is from Bari Khatu, the findspot of the earlier inscription of Itutmîsh studied above. Its tablet is at present lying loose in the tomb of Magazine Shâh,\textsuperscript{2} but the original place from where it came is not known. This record is again, unfortunately, fragmentary. It has lost some portion on the right, but it does not appear that much of the text is lost. It can be said with some amount of certainty that only two or three words in each line are missing, for in almost all the records of Balbân known so far, only the kumâja and name, i.e. Abu’l-Muzaffar Balbân, occur between his title and the word sultân;\textsuperscript{3} here, too, the second line ends with his title, and the third begins with sultân. Therefore, the first two words in line 3 must have been Abu’l-Muzaffar Balbân.

The slab in its present state measures 72 by 55 cm. and is somewhat weather-beaten. As a result, the letters thereof have lost their prominence of relief. The surviving text, consisting of six lines in Arabic, refers to the reign of Ghiyâthu’d-Dîn and records the name of Maliku’sh Sharq, Saifu’Daulat wa’Din Hûsain Sultanî as the builder of some edifice in A.H. 666 (1268 A.D.). The portion of the text in the first line which must have specified the nature of the building constructed by the Maliku’sh Sharq is missing, and hence it is not possible to determine it beyond doubt. But traces of a couple of letters visible on the stone, seem to be part of the word “العمارة”. If so, the epigraph must have belonged to some edifice, probably a mosque. From the catalogue of Dr. Chaghtâi, referred to above, it would appear that the epigraph belonged to a reservoir. He has described it as: Fragment (Reservoir) Balbân Ghâthî-ud-Dîn Ulugh khan.\textsuperscript{4} But the statement is too vague to indicate for certain that the tablet was found by him on a tank. In any case, the traces of the word al-ismârât leave no doubt that the epigraph belonged to some edifice and not a tank.

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{EIM}, 1913-14 p. 23.
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{ARIE}, 1958-59, No. D, 171.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{EIM}, 1913-14, pp. 27, 29, 30, 32. Only in one inscription (ibid., p. 28), one more phrase occurs.
\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Vida} Catalogue, loc. cit., p. 9, No. 132.
INScriPTIONS OF THE MAmlUK SULTANS OF DELHI

I have not been able to establish the identity of the builder, Maliku'sh-Sharq Ḥusain Sulṭānī. None of the noblemen mentioned by Minhāj with the title Saifu'd-Din, seems to be identical with him. The name Ḥusain is found along with his titles in one place, but it would appear to be an interpolation, for in the corresponding passage of Major Raverty's English translation, the name is absent. Moreover, he had died much earlier than the time of our epigraph.

That Maliku'sh-Sharq Ḥusain was an official of rank, is clear from the titles used for him. It is quite likely that he was the governor of the locality in the reign of Balban.

The inscription, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is published here for the first time. Dr. Chaghtāi seems to have procured its impression as stated above, but not published it in any of his two papers on the inscriptions of Bari Khātū or elsewhere.

My reading of the text is as under:

**TEXT**

**Plate III(a)**

(1) ...[العما]دة في عهد السلطان المظعم شهنشاه ملك ملوک العرب واهمغام غيات الدنیا و الدین
(2) ...[السال]طان ناصر امیر المومنین خلد الله ملكه و سلطانه
(3) ...سيف الدولة و الديم ملك ملوک الشرق حسين السطانی دام إقباله في
(4) ...[الحادي عشر من(؟) جماد (2)] المرة سنة ست و ستین و ستماية

**TRANSLATION**

(1) building in the reign of the magnificent sultān, emperor
(2) the king of the kings of Arabia and Persia, Ghīyāthu'd-Dunyā wa'd-Dīn
(3) the sultān, helper of the Commander of the Faithful, may Allāh perpetuate his kingdom and sovereignty,
(4) Saifu'd-Daulat wa'd-Dīn (lit. sword of the state and religion),
(5) Malik-i-Mulāk'i'sh-Sharq Ḥusain a's-Sulṭānī, may his good fortune last for ever, on the eleventh of the month of Jumāda'l-Ākhar, year (A.H.) six and sixty and six hundred (11 Jumādā II, 666=27 February 1268).

It may be pointed out that in none of the available inscriptions of Balban, the honorific title ملك ملوک العرب و العجم is used.

The next five inscriptions are fragmentary and damaged. The name of the ruling king is missing in each of them, and in one, the surviving text only contains the name of a person, who may perhaps have been the builder. But as has been explained above, from the style of these inscriptions, particularly such royal titles as have survived and palaeography, they are assignable to the Mamlūk Sulṭāns.

---

1 Minhāj, op. cit., p. 143.
2 Raverty, **Tabaqāt-i-Nāqshī** (London, 1881), p. 730.
The first such record and the fifth of the article is from Budaun, headquarters of the district of the same name in Uttar Pradesh.\(^1\) It is inscribed on the headstone of a grave in the courtyard of the mosque of Makhdu\m{um} 'Alam in the N\=as\=ar\=un-Mah\=a\=ulla of the town.\(^2\) The tablet measuring 95 by 52 cm. is inscribed with a four-line text in Arabic, most of which has been obliterated due to the weathering of the stone, consequent upon its constant exposure to the elements of nature. The letters in the first and the last lines have completely flaked off, and in the second and the third lines too, a considerable portion is lost.

However, it is possible to assign this record with a certain amount of certainty to Ilutmish. From the style of writing, the record can be assigned, without any fear of contradiction, to the Maml\=uk period. In addition to this, the titles used for the reigning king, would heavily weigh against a post-Maml\=uk date for the epigraph. Now, all the surviving titles in the text of this epigraph, viz. inheritor of the kingdom of Solomon, lord of security for men of Faith, right hand of the vicegerent of Allah, helped by the support from the above, rendered victorious over the enemies, are those found in the records of Ilutmish. On the other hand, the only other Maml\=uk king for whom an epigraph uses the honorific title ‘inheritor of the kingdom of Solomon’ is N\=as\=iru'd Din Mah\=m\=ud. Thus, the upward limit of the date of the record under study can be brought down, at the most, to the time of N\=as\=iru'd-Din.

But then it is only in one of the three records of N\=as\=iru'd-Din Mah\=m\=ud that this title is used.\(^3\) No other title from the present list is used for him in any of these. Added to this is the fact that the title ‘right hand (yam\=in) of the vicegerent of Allah’ is used for Ilutmish in the Ganganampur inscription of N\=as\=iru’d-Din, dated A.H. 647 (1249 A.D.).\(^4\) We have also to bear in mind the close association of Ilutmish with Budaun, of which he was governor immediately before he ascended the throne, and where at least two inscriptions of his are found even today.\(^5\) All this tends to show that the person for whom these titles are used in the epigraph can be none other than Ilutmish.

Despite the badly damaged nature of the record, it has been possible to decipher almost the whole writing as it exists on the stone. The date portion and the king’s name, kunya and regal titles are lost. The extant text, apart from the honorific titles quoted above, seems to record the construction of a well. It is a matter of regret that only the name of the person who constructed the well has defied decipherment. His father’s name Mah\=m\=ud is legible.

I have deciphered the text as under:—

**TEXT**

Plate IV(b)

\[\text{(1)}\]

\[\text{السلطانين وارث ملك سليمان ذي الأمان الأهل} \text{اليمان بين خليفة [الله]}\]

\[\text{(2)}\]

\[\text{الموبد من السماه} \text{[المظهر على الإعداء]}\]

---


2 ARIE, 1960-61, No. D, 239. This appears to be the tomb of Alham Shahid of Führer, *op. cit.*, p. 22, where the inscription is stated to be in Kafi, of the time of Ilutmish. See also Nevill, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

3 *EJ.M*, 1913-14, p. 23.


6 Engraver’s mistake for لاهل.


TRANSITION

(1) .................................................................................................................

(2) .................................................................................................................

(3) .................................................................................................................

And this well was constructed by the weak creature, hopeful (of Allah’s mercy) and fearful (of His wrath). son of Mahmūd.

(4) .................................................................................................................

The second fragmentary inscription and the sixth of the article is from Bulandshahr, also a district headquarters in Uttar Pradesh. The present name of the town was given to Baran in modern times. It has the distinction of containing the unique, though fragmentary, record of Queen Radjiyya, daughter of Itutmīsh, as has been referred to above.

The broken tablet bearing this incomplete record measures 1.45 m. by 33 cm. and is fixed into the miḥrāb, situated to the north of the pulpit, of the ʿIdgāh of the town. The present building of the ʿIdgāh is not old, but it is apparently constructed from the debris of an ancient mosque, for there are in the walls several inscribed slabs. If the one, fixed into the central miḥrāb is in situ, the ʿIdgāh would date from the time of Humāyūn only.

The text comprises only one line inscribed in Nashā characters of the usual type, which are remarkable for their boldness. The size of the letters can be judged from the fact that practically the whole of the surface is taken up by the single-line writing. The surviving text, which appears to be in Arabic, merely contains a set of titles of the king, to wit, ‘the refuge of Islam and Muslims, son (Shams) among the kings and chiefs’. Other details are lost.

The style of writing of this epigraph conforms to the early records of the Mamlūk period. It will also be observed that there are three dots beneath the letter s of Shams. This peculiarity is also found in the early epigraphs—in the inscription of the Quwwatul-Islām mosque recording

---


2 Führer, op. cit., p. 5, states that these are in Kāf character, but here as elsewhere, Kāf is a mistake for Nashā. These fragments, which constitute not less than three records of the Ghori or early Mamlūk period, were copied too late to be incorporated here; regal titles occur in seven of them (ARIE), 1960-66, Nos, D, 570-71, 577, 579, 581, 583, 585.


4 See note to above.
the conquest of Delhi and the foundation of the said mosque, as well as in Ilutmish's own inscriptions on the Qutb-Minar and elsewhere. The title, refuge of Islam and Muslims, is found in his inscriptions on the Qutb-Minar. The other title, Shamsu'L-Maluk wa's-Salatin (literally, the sun among the kings and sultans), also points to the fact that Ilutmish is the object of this praise, though, it must be admitted, this title is not found in any of his extant inscriptions. Taking all these factors into consideration, one would not be wrong to assign this epigraph to the early part of Ilutmish's reign, if not still earlier. It may be recalled that Baran (i.e. Bulandshahr) was conquered by Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aibak, and Ilutmish himself was the governor of the place for some time.²

The epigraph has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate III(b)

...... غياث الإسلام و المسلمين شمس الملوك و السلاطين دارا .......

TRANSLATION

...... the refuge of Islam and the Muslims, the sun (Shams) among the kings and sultans

The third incomplete record, forming the seventh inscription of this article, is from Bari Khatu. It is engraved on a fragmentary piece of arch-slab which was found lying loose, by Mr. W. H. Siddiqi, Senior Epigraphical Assistant in our office, in the courtyard of the mosque in the Qasī-Mahalla of the village.³

As in the case of the other fragmentary records studied above, this one also contains merely parts of the titles of the king, other details having been completely lost. The calligraphical style, which is pretty Naskh, conforms to the type of the epigraphs of the early thirteenth century. The surviving titles, which are preceded by a reference to the reign of the king, are: the magnificent sultan, the king of the land and sea, the emperor. The main title occurs simultaneously not only in one of the epigraphs of Ilutmish,⁴ but also in the earlier Qutb-Minar record of Muḥammad bin Sām.⁵ In view of these facts, it is fairly certain that this inscription was put up in the reign of Ilutmish if not in the reign of Muḥammad bin Sām. However, on the grounds of palaeography, it can be more appropriately assigned to the time of Ilutmish.

¹ EIM, 1911-12, pls. XI; VI, No. 1; XVIII, No. 2; XXVIII; etc.
² Minhāj, op. cit., p. 80.
³ A farmān of Mu'tizza'd-Dīn Muḥammad bin Sām is said to have been in the possession, at least some time ago, of Mr. Ḥasan Barani, advocate of Bulandshahr, according to Dr. A. B. M. Ḥabibullāh, The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India (Allahabad, 1961), p. 367, Appendix A. The latter who received a brief descriptive note from Mr. Barani in 1944, has rightly remarked that its genuineness cannot be asserted beyond dispute, until it can be examined in detail.
⁵ EIM, 1911-12, p. 30, pl. XXIII, where it is the amir of the land and the sea.
⁶ Ibid., pp. 16-17, pl. III, where it is 'sultan of the land and the sea'.

(a) Record, dated A.H. 666, of Balban, from Bari Khatu (p. 13)

(b) Fragmentary epigraph, from Bulandshahr (p. 16)

(c) Another fragmentary record, from Bilhaur (p. 17)
(a) Incomplete record, from Bari Khatu (p. 17)

(b) Another incomplete epigraph, from Budaun (p. 14)

(c) Another fragmentary record, same place (p. 18)
The writing occupies a space of about 75 by 18 cm. on the stone and has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate IV(a)*

*********

**TRANSLATION**

....the reign of the magnificent sultan, the king of land and sea, emperor

The fourth incomplete epigraph and the eighth of this group was also recently found by Mr. Siddiqi, at Bilhaur, a *taksil* town, situated in 26°50’ N. and 80°4’ E. at a distance of about 55 kilometres north-west of the district headquarters Kanpur in Uttar Pradesh. It is inscribed on the inner side of a stone beam in the tomb locally called *Hagira*, which stands on the right side of the Grand Trunk Road, outside the town.¹

The writing that has survived comprises hardly a few phrases referring to an ‘auspicious abode’ and to ‘the just and magnificent king’. The stone-beam appears to be an original part of the tomb, in which case, the term ‘auspicious abode’—*al-buq’atu’t-mubarakata* in the original—would signify a tomb. Also, it would indicate that Bilhaur, lying as it is on the main road to the east, is a place of sufficient antiquity.² Incidentally, the only monument at Bilhaur, recorded by Führer, is a mosque of Aurangzeb’s time.³ From the text of our epigraph, which is easily assignable to the Mamluk period, on palaeographical grounds, it is clear that the present tomb or at least some building of note was constructed by one of the Mamluk sultans himself, which would mean that Bilhaur was quite an important place in those days. It is a pity that the remaining part of the record is lost.

The text occupies a writing space of 1.38 m. by 31 cm. on the stone-beam and reads as under :

**TEXT**

*Plate III(c)*

*********

**TRANSLATION**

....this auspicious abode by the magnificent and just sultan.

The ninth and the last inscription of this study and the fifth fragmentary one, is engraved on a loose slab lying in the mosque of the tomb of Jangi Shanhid situated in the *Chah-Mir Mahalla* of Budaun.⁴ The tablet, which evidently formed part of a bigger one, measures 82 by 16 cm. and contains a one-line text, evidently in Arabic, recording the name of Abu Nasr Mahmud, son of ‘Umar Dahistan, preceded by the term *al-‘abd*, thus indicating him to be the builder of some

---

² An inscription engraved in Siddharamatrics on a pillar in the tomb is assignable on palaeographical grounds to the 9th century (*ibid.*, No. B, 655).
³ Führer, *op. cit.*, p. 168. For the inscription on this mosque as well as another one, see *ARIE*, 1964-65, Nos. D, 368-69.
construction, if the epigraph related to any, or at least the person responsible for some such action. On the basis of the calligraphical style, the record may be assigned to the time of Ilutmish. M. Radju’Din, who published a reading of this inscription, was inclined, on account of the style of its letters, to assign it to the time of Mahmud of Ghazna or thereabouts. He also could not determine the building or tomb to which it might have originally belonged.¹

The text is executed in bold Naska of the prevalent type and has been deciphered as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate IV(c)*

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

**TRANSLATION**

....... the creature, Abū Naṣr, son of Maḥmūd, son of 'Umar Dahistānī, may Allāh prolong...

It is difficult to establish the identity of Abū Naṣr. The size and style of the epigraph would indicate, if at all, that he was a person of some position in the town.

---

¹ Radju’Din, op. cit. His reading is correct except in two places.
TWO INSCRIPTIONS OF GHIYATHUD-DIN TUGHLUQ
FROM UTTAR PRADHEAS

BY DR. Z. A. DESAI

I propose to re-edit in this short article two inscriptions of Ghiyāthu’d-Din Tughluq Shāh, from Zafarabad and Mahoba, situated respectively in the Jaunpur and Hamirpur districts of Uttar Pradesh, which were published quite some time back. Apart from the fact that these two epigraphs are among the very few records of Tughluq Shāh that have been found so far in that province, they are extremely important as they mention three noblemen of great status. But since the portions containing their names were left unread in the published texts of these records, the noblemen remained unidentified, and the importance of the epigraphs was overlooked. But what constitutes even a more important feature of these records is that with their help, the correct spelling of the names of two of these nobles, transcribed variously in historical works, can now be determined once for all. It may be recalled here that the correct spelling of the name of yet one more high official of the reign of Ghiyāthu’d-Din Tughluq Shāh, viz. Malik Juljīn, was also determined by an inscription.

The earlier of these two records is from the Dargāh of Makhdūm Shāh at Zafarabad near Jaunpur. The epigraphical tablet, which measures 1.66 m. by 83 cm., is fixed above the entrance of the enclosure and contains a text of ten verses in Persian, which are engraved in relief in five lines in bold Nasḵ letters, characteristic of the inscriptions of the early Tughluq period. The weathering of the tablet has slightly affected the condition of its letters, but except in one place, in the fourth line, to be exact, where the letters have been mutilated, intentionally as it were, the text is fairly legible.

A detailed description of this epigraph including its text and translation was first given by A. Führer, but unfortunately, the reading supplied to, and quoted by, him is hopelessly corrupt and incomplete too. An almost bewildering aspect of his account is that he has assigned the inscription to the reign of Firūz Shāh Tughluq. To quote him, the epigraph 'is written in ten lines, mostly in Arabic and partly in Tughrā and Shafiya characters over the entrance door of the maqar or dargah of Makhdūm Sāhib Chirāgh-i-Hind, built by Zafar Khān in the reign of Firūz Shāh A. H. 781, or A.D. 1379... the last two lines are partly illegible, being very much defaced'.

Subsequently, the inscription was republished by Major Vost, whose reading, though a great improvement upon Führer's, still suffers from mistakes. More than his inability to decipher

---

2 The only other record of this king published so far, is from Asarva Khurd in Allahabad district (Epigraphia Indo-Musulmica, 1937-38, p. 7, pl. IIIb).
3 Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1955 and 1956, p. 110.
6 It is probably Vost’s reading which has been copied in Iqbal Ahmad, op. cit., pp. 1012-13.
the name of the builder, Malik Mal, it was perhaps his wrong reading "قائم" in place of "dığında" in the fifth line, which prompted him to hazard a guess that it was likely that the eighth verse contained the name of Malik Zafar, the third son of Tughluq Shāh. He was also not able to decipher the portion of the text in the fourth line indicating the object of construction, viz. a fort.

In the opinion of Mr. H. R. Nevill, who wrote after Vost, the inscription records that 'on account of political victory gained in 1319 (721 H.) by Ghias-ud-din Tughlaq, the town was to be populated and called Zafarabad'. A glance at the reading quoted below will show how faulty are the readings of Führer and Vost, on which some of their statements as well as those of Nevill are based.

The epigraph states that in the reign of Ghiyāthu’d-Din Abu’l-Muzaffar Tughluq Shāh, a fort with a lofty gate was constructed through the efforts of Malik Mal. It further states that since the city prospered on account of the fort, its name Zafarābād would remain for ever. It bears the date Monday, 28th Rabi’ I 721 (27th April 1321).

The text has been deciphered by me as follows:

**TEXT**

Plate V (a)

(1) بعد ملك ذو القرنين ثانية

(2) غياب دين و دنيا بو المظهر

(3) شه افاق تغلتشاع اعظم

(4) حصار خان ايوان بر آن مد

(5) دو شنه بست هشتم روز بوده

(6) همايون ساعت و موقع مسعود

(7) شد اين دروانه گردون سانته

(8) نا ملك مل به وا

(9) زلقش به دش معمور اين شهر

(10) زچشم بد نگه دارش خدا بداد

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the reign of the king, the second Dhu’l-Qarnain (i.e. Alexander), layer of the ‘foundation of ṣkar’ (i.e. religious code) through justice,

Ghiyāth-i-Din-u-Dunyā Bu’l-Muzaffar, one with Soloman’s signet and Jamshid’s crown,

---

1 The letters in this portion of the fourth line are mutilated.
2 Vost, op. cit., p. 142.
3 Nevill, op. cit., pp. 333-34.
TUGHLUQ'S INSCRIPTIONS

(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 721, from Zafarabad (p. 20)

Scale: 0.08

(b) Epigraph, dated A.H. 722, from Mahoba (p. 24)

Scale: 0.11
(2) king of the horizons, the great Tughluq Shāh, on whom sovereignty has been bestowed, was constructed this fort whose portico is sky (and) which, in height, has exceeded the height (lit. forehead) of Saturn.

(3) It was Monday and twenty-eighth day (of) Rabī‘ul-Awwal, the praiseworthy month, at a blessed hour and auspicious time; from Migration it was (year) seven hundred and twentyone (28 Rabī‘ I 721–27 April 1321),

(4) (when) this gate of sky-like threshold was constructed through the efforts of the world famous Malik Mal, servant and.............................................the court.

(5) Since this city prospered on account of (the construction of) the fort, its name remained in the world as Zafarābād.

May God be its protector from Evil Eye! And may the king endure as long as its name remains!

Though Malik Mal, the builder, was an important official under the Khalijis and the Tughluqs, unfortunately, not much is known about him. Even the spelling of his name is a matter of difference among the historians, early as well as modern. His name is variously written as كلک، بل، مخ، مل. For example, the printed text of contemporary Barani’s work has ملك اختيار الدين مل أفغان on pages 240-41 and مل on page 448, but بل on page 379 and مخ on pages 449 and 454. In the printed edition of the versified history of another contemporary ‘Iṣāmi, the name occurs as بل on page 384, but مل on page 387. Among the later historical works, the printed texts of Yahyā Sirhindī and Ḥājjī Dabīr have مل, while that of Firigha has كلک.

This fact of confusing spellings has been duly noted among others, by Dr. S. A. A. Ridaawi and Dr. A. Mahdi Husain who have, however, refrained, and understandably too, from any attempt to determine its correct form. The former uses the variants خُل (مل) and بل, while the latter has مل and مخ or مخ. Our epigraph which clearly transcribes the name as مل should thus settle the problem of the correct nomenclature once for all.

As stated above, not much is known about Malik Mal from historical works. Barani includes him in the list of the nobles of both ‘Alā‘u’d-Din Khalji and his son Qutbū’d-Din Mubārak. A noble of senior rank, he was involved, along with Malik Timur, Talbagha and others in the incident of Khusraw Khān’s intended rebellion in A.H. 720. His name also occurs in a similar affair concerning Ulugh Khān, later on Muḥammad bin Tughluq, in the course of the latter’s Telangana expedition in A.H. 721, but this ultimate fate is not reported by the contemporary historians describing the event. For example, Barani simply says that Malik Kāfūr Muhrdār, the poet ‘Ubaid...

1 Dīyā‘u’d-Dīn Barānī, Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī (Calcutta, 1864). The omission of his name from ملک أفغان in ibid., p. 399, appears to be a printing mistake.
5 Mahdi Husain, op. cit., pp. 65, 66.
6 Barani, op. cit., pp. 241, 249, 379, 399, 448, 449. It may be pointed out that he is not mentioned in ‘Iṣāmi’s account of the earlier incident (op. cit., pp. 355-56).
and other seditious persons were put to death. This may, if one is so inclined, be interpreted to mean that Malik Mal was also executed, though Barani does not explicitly name him as one to receive the penalty of death.

But there is clear evidence that Mal had survived this affair. For, another contemporary writer Ibn Baṭṭūta refers to Malik Mal, and there is little reason to doubt the identity of Malik Mal of Ibn Baṭṭūta with Malik Mal of our epigraph. Now Ibn Baṭṭūta has narrated the episode of the painful death that overtook Malik Mal while he was confined in one of the dungeons of the Daulanabad fort. It may also be mentioned that it was Malik Mal's son, according to Ibn Baṭṭūta, and younger brother, according to Barani and others, who successfully rebelled against Muhammad bin Tughluq and ascended the throne at Daulanabad under the title Nāṣiru’d-Dīn. While neither Ibn Baṭṭūta nor Barani calls Nāṣiru’d-Dīn by his first name, ‘Īṣāmi and subsequent writes speak of him as Ismā’il or Ismā’il Makh. Now, as we have seen above, the transcription of the name Makh may be a copyist's error for Mal, which is the actual case in some places, and there may be an ʾidāfat-i-ibni between Ismā’il and Makh (recte, Mal), which would bear out Ibn Baṭṭūta that the relationship of son and father existed between Sultān Nāṣiru’d-Dīn and Malik Mal. On the other hand, Fīrishta also states that Malik Mal (in the printed text Guî), an eminent nobleman of Muhammad bin Tughluq, who was then stationed in Malwa, was in a position to give immediate help to his younger brother Sultān Nāṣiru’d-Dīn who had rebelled at Daulanabad. Fīrishta seems to follow Barani who, as we have already seen above, also calls Malik Mal an elder brother of Nāṣiru’d-Dīn. Thus according to Ibn Baṭṭūta, the former was the father, and according to Barani and Fīrishta, elder brother, of Nāṣiru’d-Dīn. I am inclined to credit Ibn Baṭṭūta's statement with correctness. It is very likely that another son of Mal was concerned in the event. The mistake may have occurred on account of the omission, through the copyist's error or so, of the name of this son before Malik Mal in the original manuscript of Barani's history which seems to have been the main original source for the history of the period for subsequent writers including Fīrishta. This seems to be the only reasonable explanation for this confusion in relationship. There is no reason to doubt Ibn Baṭṭūta's statement in this regard which is not only clear but informative. In short, Ibn Baṭṭūta's statement that Nāṣiru’d-Dīn was a son of Malik Mal seems to be nearer the truth.

Apart from this, no other particulars about Malik Mal himself are available from historical works. The epigraph under study provides the valuable information that the Malik was posted at Zafarabad during the time of Tughluq Shāh, if not earlier, at least, in Rabī’ I 721. But the question again arises: In what capacity was he associated with Zafarabad? Though not so specified, from the context, he appears to have been a man of authority in the place. Again, the text clearly testifies that the town was called Zafarabad after it was provided with a fort by him. On the other hand, Barani and others aver that Tughluq Shāh gave charge of Zafarabad to his adopted son Tatār Khān, immediately after his accession, that is to say, some time during the latter part of the year A.H. 720. But our epigraph clearly indicates Malik Mal's association with

1 Ibn Baṭṭūta, The Rehla, ed. A. Mahdi Ḥusain (Baroda, 1953), p. 170. It is interesting to note that Ibn Baṭṭūta, is the only authority to mention this episode.
2 Ibid., pp. 114, 115, 170; Barani, op. cit., pp. 454, 514; ‘Īṣāmi, op. cit., pp. 493, 494, 496, 497, 505, 506, 507, 509, 513, 523, 534, 538 and 539 (but he does not mention any relationship); ‘Ali Ṭabāṭābāʾi, Burhad-i-Muḥammad (Hyderabad, 1936), pp. 12, 14, 18; Ḥājī Daibr, op. cit., pp. 169, 882 (quoting Ḥusain Khān’s Tarikh-i-Bahādur Shāh); Fīrishta, op. cit., pp. 142, 275; etc. This relationship between the two is not so widely known.
3 In the printed texts of their works, this name too variously written as Makh, Fath, Manj, etc.
4 Fīrishta, op. cit., p. 275.
5 Barani, op. cit., p. 428.
Zafarabad in official capacity as late as in Rabi’ I 721. This again poses a problem. Is it likely that Tatār Kḥān being a minor (khurd-sāl) during the reign of Tughluq Shāh, Mal acted as his deputy? In the alternative, Barani may have just advanced Tatār Kḥān’s appointment to the governorship of Zafarabad by a few months. In that case, Tatār Kḥān’s appointment might have taken place sometime in A.H. 721, during which Mal was either put to death or imprisoned, but not before Rabi’ I of that year, the date of our record. Sir Wolseley Haig also places Tatār Kḥān’s appointment in the year following Tughluq’s accession, but he does not quote his authority. Thus, it is likely that Tatār Kḥān came to Zafarabad after Mal’s tenure of office there.

There is yet one more possibility which may be considered: Our epigraph does not specifically mention Malik Mal as the governor, which may be taken to mean that he had acted on behalf of somebody. That somebody could have been prince Zafar Kḥān who, as we know from a contemporary inscription, was granted Zafarabad by his father Tughluq Shāh. According to this epigraph occurring on the door of the tomb within a bastion at the north-east corner of Tughluqabad at Delhi, Kḥān-i-A’zām Zafar Kḥān, then a mere child, who was given Zafarabad, seized the country as far as the boundary of Lakhnauti and was going to subdue that region, but died an untimely death consequent upon which his tomb was constructed by Tughluq Shāh. This Zafar Kḥān is evidently the third son of Tughluq Shāh. Under the circumstances, it is reasonable to suppose that if he was granted Zafarabad by Tughluq Shāh on his accession, Malik Mal may have acted as his deputy. The naming of the newly fortified town as Zafarabad is easily explained by this. This may also lend weight to the surmise that Zafar Kḥān was succeeded by Tatār Kḥān in the appointment of Zafarabad on his death.

In any case, the epigraph discloses the fact, not mentioned elsewhere, of Malik Mal’s association with Zafarabad. Another important aspect of the inscription is that it furnishes authentic information, though meagre, on the history of the Zafarabad town. Dr. Führer, as we have seen above, attributes the designation of the town to Fīrūz Tughluq’s son Zafar Kḥān, while according to Major Vost, the change of the name of the village Menaih to Zafarabad took place to commemorate the name and history of Tughluq Shāh’s third son, Zafar Kḥān, who is stated by him, on the authority of the Manāqib-i-Darwīshiyūya, to have conquered the place.

But as we have seen above, our record clearly states that since the town prospered on account of the newly constructed fort, its name became Zafarabad (Lit. abode of victory). No doubt the possibility is there that Malik Mal, through whose efforts the fort was constructed, resulting in the renaming of the town, may have intended it to be called after Zafar Kḥān. Incidentally, the mention of the name Zafarabad in our epigraph may be construed to indicate that Zafar Kḥān must have died after Rabi’ I 721, or in the alternative, his above epitaph was engraved after that date.

---

1 This piece of information, given by Shams Sirāj ‘Affī in his Tāriḵ-i-Fīrūz Shāhī (Calcutta, 1891), p. 389, has not been taken notice of by any one so far as I know.
4 List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments, vol. IV (Calcutta, 1922), p. 4; ARIE, 1900-61, Nos. D, 54, 55. The epigraph which is partly damaged is undated, but there is no doubt about its contemporaneity.
5 No contemporary or non-contemporary work makes mention of prince Zafar Kḥān except in the account of the honours and titles conferred on his kinsmen and nobles by Tughluq Shāh. There does not appear to be any basis for Sir Wolseley’s statement (op. cit., p. 133) that Tatār Kḥān was entitled Zafar Kḥān.
7 Vost, op. cit. For other popular versions about Zafarabad and its history, see Iqbal Ahmad, op. cit.
The second inscription to be re-edited is from the tahsil-headquarters Mahoba in the Hamirpur district. Engraved on a tablet measuring 1.7 m. by 50 cm. which is fixed above the eastern doorway of the Shahi mosque, situated outside the Bhainsa-Darwaza of the fort, its text runs into ten couplets of Persian verse, which are inscribed in five lines in Nashka characters of a fairly good type. The quality of verses is also quite good.

The inscription was first published by H. Blochmann from the rubbings sent to him by Major-General A. Cunningham. Blochmann’s reading is fairly correct, but it does suffer from quite a few errors of which two are of no mean consequence: he has omitted to read the name of the father of the governor during whose time the mosque was constructed, and that was why he could not identify him. And secondly, he could not decipher the day of the month.

The record states that the construction of the mosque in Mahoba took place in A.H. 722 (1322 A.D.) during the reign of Chiyathu’Dunya wa’d-Din Tughluq Shah and in the time of Malik Taju’D-Duwal Ahmad. It further supplies the interesting information that Taju’D-Duwal Ahmad was a son of Talbagha. It may be noted that the name of Ahmad’s father Talbagha, himself a renowned nobleman under the Khaljis, is spelt in the text as تلبقه.

The text has been read by me as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate V (b)*

(1) يفضل آيزدی آمد بشارت
که مسجد در مهوره ثب عمارت
بیعهد بادنشه هفت اقلم
مادر مالک ملجمه اسلام
(2) غیات الدين و دلیا دؤمین جم
چناندازی که زخم گرز و خنجر
شمش شنیب مالک چون سکندر
پیکتی تخت و ملکش جاوادان باد
(3) فلک سان در زمانه شهرمان پاید
که شد در نویست مسجد بانتام
کمیته بنده شاه تکه تام
بندعل خلق نیکو اسم احمد
(4) ملکک تاج الدول با پخت سرمد
سکلک عون یزدان در کشیده
زبجر تلبقه در گزیده
در و دیوار و صحن مسجد آرانت
(5) چویر هفصد نیوزن شد بست و در راست
گنشته یک دهه کاين کر آساد

---

4 The dot of ِ is absent in the plate.
5 Thus on the stone, but it does not rhyme with Iqlim: Perhaps Iwlum was intended.
(1) By the divine grace, good news came that a mosque was constructed at Mahoba, during the reign of the king of seven climes, pivot of the kingdom and shelter of Islam, the sovereign who has, by the blow of his mace and dagger, subjugated kingdoms, like Alexander.

(2) Ghiyathu’d-Din wa Dunya, the second Jamshid, one whose audience-hall is sky, Tughluq, Shâh (i.e. king) of the world, the precious (lit. select) pearl from the ocean of Talbagha, a pearl which has been strung through the help of god.

(3) May he, like the sky, be overwhelming in the world, (and) may his throne and kingdom last for ever on earth!

The humble servant of the king of good name, in the tenure of whose governorship the mosque was completed,

(4) is Malik Taju’-Duwal with everlasting luck, (who is) Muhammad-like in disposition and Ahmad by name, the precious (lit. select) pearl from the ocean of Talbagha, a pearl which has been strung through the help of god.

(5) When it was exactly twenty-two above seven hundred, he decorated the doors, walls and courtyard of the mosque.

From the Migration, the month was the second Rabi’, (of which) a period of ten days was over, when this work was completed (10 Rabi’ II 722-28 April 1322).

The epigraph is quite important in that it mentions the relationship of the governor Taju’-Duwal Ahmad with Talbagha, himself a nobleman of first rank. The latter’s name is variously written in historical works, as in the case of Malik Mal of the previous record, but before discussing the spelling of his name, it will not be out of place to draw attention to the fact that historical works mention Talbagha, son of Yagha and Talbagha Nagauri, i.e. of Nagaur in Rajasthan, as two contemporaries, taking part in political affairs simultaneously.

What is worth more than passing mention here, is the way in which the name Talbagha is spelt in the text. Historians or to be more correct, the printed editions of their works, give various spellings of the name: Among the contemporaries, Amir Khusraw has تَلْبَغَة, Barani, تَلْبَغَة in one place and تَلْبَغَة and تَلْبَغَة in one place each, تَلْبَغَة in two and تَلْبَغَة in three places. Of the later writers, Yahya Sirhindî تَلْبَغَة has in both the places, Badayuni تَلْبَغَة, also in both places, and Hajji Dahir تَلْبَغَة in one and تَلْبَغَة in the other place. In view of this, it is no wonder that modern writers should have shown no inclination to determine the correct form of this name: majority have been in favour of Talbagha or Talbagha, and few of Taliga. For example, among the latest


3 Yahya, op. cit.; Badayuni, op. cit.; Hajji Dahir, op. cit.
writers, Dr. K. S. Lal writes Tālgha and Dr. Riḍawi has (in nāgari transcript) Tālgha and Tālgha, while Dr. A. Mahdi Ḥusain, the latest to write, prefers Tālgha.¹ It is on this point that the present epigraph provides important evidence, according to which the correct form of the name is Tālgha with the quiescent ɬ and movent ɮ.

Not much is known about Tālgha’s son Malik ʿAḥmad entitled Tāju’d-Duwal, who is spoken of in the record as one during whose tenure of office the mosque was constructed. He is almost ignored by the historians. Now, Barani includes one Malik Tāju’d-Dīn with the name ʿAḥmad in his list of the nobles of Qutbu’d-Dīn Mubārak Shah Khalji,² and very likely, he is identical with the Mahoba governor. But beyond this, Barani has nothing to say. It is only ‘Iṣāmi who furnishes an important piece of information about him which is not to be found elsewhere. ‘Iṣāmi, it may be stressed, clearly calls him ʿAḥmad, son of Tālgha, and states that he was given charge of Tirhut by Ghiyāthu’d-Dīn Tughluq Shāh before the latter left for Delhi, after the conquest of that region.³ One more link in the career of Malik Tāju’d-Duwal ʿAḥmad is now supplied by the present epigraph, according to which he was governor of Mahoba in A.H. 722.⁴ This fact is also extremely important in indicating the extent of the Tughluq authority in Bundelkhand.

---

² Barani, op. cit., p. 379.
³ ‘Iṣāmi, op. cit., p. 406. Incidentally, among the modern authors, only Mahdi Husain mentions this fact.
⁴ While editing the Junagadh inscription of Tāju’d-Duwal ʿAḥmad dated A.H. 726, sometime back, I had suggested as somewhat likely that he might be identical with the Mahoba governor. But at that time I had not been able to decipher the father’s name Tālgha in the Mahoba record. Now, in case the doubtfully read name Ayāz in the Junagadh inscription (EIAPS, 1955 and 1956, p. 90), is found correct, as is very likely the case, Tāju’d-Dīn of the Mahoba epigraph would be different. In that case, it would mean that the Mahoba official had either expired or received another title by the time Junagadh inscription was set up in A.H. 726, i.e. within four years of his Mahoba assignment.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE QUTB SHAHI KINGS

By M. F. Khan

It is at the suggestion of Dr. Z. A. Desai, the editor of this journal, that I have selected for study in this article such Qutb Shahi inscriptions as are on the record in our office. A number of epigraphs of these rulers were earlier published by Major T. W. Haig, Dr. G. Yazdani, Bashiruddin Ahmad, Ali Asghar Bilgrami, Khwaja Muhammad Ahmad and Dr. Z. A. Desai, in the previous issues of this series and elsewhere.\(^1\)

Out of these eight inscriptions, two each represent the reigns of Ibrahimm Qutb Shah and Muhammad Quli Qutb Shah, and the remaining four pertain to the time of 'Abdu'llah Qutb Shah. These epigraphs are important both historically and palaeographically and are studied here in chronological order.

The first two records belong to the same monument and are therefore identical in purport. They were first discovered by my colleague, Shri S. A. Rahim, Epigraphical Assistant, on the gateways of a ruined mosque at Gazinagar, now a pettig village of no importance in Devarkonda tehsil in the Nalgonda district of Andhra Pradesh. Both the epigraphs purport that the mosque, designated in one of them as Bait-i-Ibrahim Qutb Shahi (lit. house of Ibrahim Qutb Shah), was constructed in 1576-77. But in neither record, the name of the builder of the mosque is quoted.

The first of the two is carved on a slab measuring 1.47 m. by 33 cm. fixed over the eastern gateway.\(^2\) Its text comprises the First Creed, as modified by the Shi'a and a tradition of the Prophet, inscribed in the middle panel in six lines, and two verses engraved in two lines each in the side panels, which record that the mosque, built through the will of God, was named the house of Ibrahimm Qutb Shah and that it was A.H. 984 (1576-77 A.D.), when the construction took place. The date is given in words. The style of writing is Naskh of no particular merit.

\textbf{Text}

\textit{Plate VI (a)}

\textbf{(a) Right panel.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [1] اين مسجد معمور بناء شد از خواست الهی
  \item [2] نام نداده شد بیت ابراهیم قطشیاهی
\end{itemize}

\textbf{(b) Middle panel.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [1] لا إله إلا الله محمد
  \item [2] رسول الله على ولي الله
\end{itemize}

\(^1\) Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica (EIM), 1907-08, pp. 23-28; ibid., 1913-14, pp. 48-55, 57, pls. XVII a & b, XVIII a & b, XIX a & b, XX a; ibid., 1915-16, pp. 19-40, pls. V a & b, VI a & b, IX b, X a & b; ibid., 1917-18, pp. 48-55, pls. XVIII c, XIX a & b, XX a & b, XXI, XXII, XXIII a & b; ibid., 1925-26, pp. 23-24, 26-27, pls. X b, XI a, XII; ibid., 1933-36, pp. 61-62, pl. XXXIX; ibid., 1937-38, p. 49, pl. XVII a; Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement, 1953 and 1954, pp. 23-33, pls. VII b, IX a & b, X b; S.A.A. Bilgrami, Landmarks of the Deccan (Hyderabad, 1927) and Bashiruddin Ahmad, Wagi't-i-Mamlakat-i-Bijapur, vol. III (Agra, 1918).

(3) قال النبي صلى الله عليه و
(3) سلم من تكلم كلام الدنيا
(4) في المسجد احباط الله من عمل
(5) ببكة سبعين سنة

(c) Left panel.

(1) ز نصف قرون بود هشتاد چار
(2) بسم هوش بشنو ای هوش دار

TRANSLATION

(a)(1) This well populated mosque was built by the divine will.
(2) It was designated Bait-i-Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shāhī.
(b)(1) There is no god but Allāh, Muḥammad is
(2) the Prophet of Allāh, ‘Ali is the Friend of Allāh.
(3) Said the Prophet, on him be Allāh’s blessings and
(4) peace, ‘He who talks of worldly affairs
(5-6) in the mosque, Allāh renders all the good deeds he may have done at Mecca
for seventy years’.

(c)(1) It (i.e. the date) was eightyfour above nine hundred (A.H. 984=1576-77 A.D.).
(2) Remember this, O sensible person with the ear of sense!

The second inscription, appears above the southern gate of the same mosque¹ and also
contains a tradition of the Prophet, different from above but commonly found in mosque
epigraphs, and the date in figure, in the middle panel and one verse in each of the side panels.
The style of writing of the Arabic text is Thulth and that of the Persian, Nasta’liq. It will be
observed that the calligraphy of this epigraph is much superior to that of the preceding one.

The tablet measures 1-36 m. by 30 cm. Its text is quoted below:—

TEXT

Plate VI (b)

(a) Middle panel.

(1) لا لله الا الله محمد رسول الله
(2) على ولي الله حتقا و ان
(3) المساجد تها فلا تدعوا مع الله احدا
(4) سنة 983

¹ ARIE, 1933-64, No. D, 18.
Plate VI

(9) Epigraph of the time of Ibrahim, dated A.H. 984, Gajner (p. 27)

(10) Another version of the same inscription (p. 28)
PLATE VII

(a) Epigraph, dated A.H. 1045, of ‘Abdu’llah, Hyderabad (p. 31)

(b) Inscription registering an endowment, same place (p. 34)

(c) Epigraph, dated A.H. 1011, of Muḥammad Ḥußain, Medak (p. 29)
(b) **Right and left panels.**

(1) كشادئ باد بدولت همیشه این درگم بحق اشهد ان لا إله إلا الله
(2) هر کس که به اخلاص در مسجد دو آید.

**TRANSLATION**

(a)(1) There is no god but Allāh, Muḥammad is the Prophet of Allāh (and)
(2) 'Ali is the friend of Allāh, for certain. *And verily,*
(3) the mosques are for Allāh (only); hence invoke not any one else with Allāh.'
(4) Year (A.H.) 984 (1576-77 A.D.).

(b)(1) May this threshold remain always open, by the grace of God and through the blessing of (the Creed) *I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh!*
(2) He who enters this mosque, through sincerity of heart, whatever he wishes, gets from God.

The name of the builder is not quoted in the above records. But from the Shiite First Creed, quoted in both the epigraphs, he appears to have professed the Shi‘a creed.

The third inscription to be studied here is an important record of the time of Muḥammad Quli Qūtb Shāh. It occurs on the side of a bastion, towards east, of the Bālā-Hiṣār fort of Medak, a ṭūbka-headquarters in the district of the same name, in Andhra Pradesh. Situated in 18°3’ N. and 78°26’ E., this one-time strongly fortified town formed part of the ancient kingdom of the Rāja of Warangal. In 1309, Malik Kāfūr, the famous general of Alāu’l-Dīn Khalījī, marched with a large army against the Rāja and took Medak. In the second half of the 14th century, it was part of the Bahmanī dominion, and subsequently passed on to the Qūtb Shāhī dynasty in the time of Jāmshīd Qūtb Shāh in 1545.

This epigraph was first noticed by Bashīru’l-Dīn Aḥmad, who did not illustrate it. His reading is very faulty. He read مدرک for میدرک and also failed to read the portion containing the date in words. The huge epigraphical tablet, measuring 2.10 m. by 35 cm., contains only one line of text, comprising, what is evidently intended to be, two Persian verses, which do not appear to bring any credit to the composer. The style of writing, likewise, is Thuluth of no particular merit, except that it is remarkable for its boldness. The epigraph records that the bastion of Medak was completed in the month of Rabī’ I 1011 (August-September 1602), during the reign of Muḥammad Quli Qūtb Shāh and that it was constructed by Aḥmad.

Its text is quoted below :

**TEXT**

*Plate VII(c)*

پنا كر دانم تاریخ دو شاهان که مسلمان محمد قائل تخلان شاه هجری جد مسلم تعیین ملی لواصل مثال و پرنگ شاپ م栄 میدان کهش تمام

---

1 Qur’ān, chapter LXXVII, verse 18.
4 Bashīru’l-Dīn, op. cit., p. 645.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid. takes it to be in prose.
TRANSLATION

Ahmad constructed, in the month of Rabī’u’l-Awwal, during the days of Sultan Muhammad Quli Quṭb Shāh.

(In the year of) the Migration of (the Prophet) Muḥammad, peace and salutation be on him, one thousand, six and five years, the bastion of Medak was completed (Rabī’u’l-Awwal 1011 = August-September 1602).

We have no information about Ahmad, the builder of the bastion of Medak, whose name even would have remained in oblivion but for this record, but there is a strong possibility that he was an official. The epigraph thus provides important piece of information about the history of the construction of the Medak fort.

The fourth inscription of the article is an unpublished record of the same king. Its tablet which is unfortunately fragmentary, was found lying loose in the Khazāna building at Golconda, and on examination by Dr. Z. A. Desai in the course of a visit to the fort, was found to contain a farmān of Muhammad Quli Quṭb Shāh, recording the grant of 30 bighas of land to a saintly family. It only quotes the dynasty-name Quṭb-ul-Mulk for the king.¹

The epigraphical tablet, measuring 30 by 32 cm., contains a record of six lines in Persian, executed in Nasta’liq characters of a fairly high order. It will be seen that the upper part of the slab is inscribed with a three-pronged figure, which may stand for the hand-impression found on certain categories of royal letters.

The text has been read as follows:

TEXT

Plate VIII(a)

(1) جوں پیک قطعہ زین بوضعب
(2) فرمان محمد قلن قطب الملك ارا
(3) خسی بیگہ زین پاس سید سیدانقل(؟)
(4) حسنعلی عرب فرندل میران(؟) سید يوسف
(5) مخدوم جہانیان مسیم سامان
(6) محدود است کسی مراحم گرزند طلاق است

TRANSLATION

(1) Since a piece of land, in accordance with
(2) the order (farmān) of Muḥammad Quli Quṭbu’l Mulk,
(3) measuring thirty bighas, (was allotted) in the name of the asylum of chiefship (i.e. Sayyid),
(4) Hasan ‘Ali ‘Arab, son of Mirān (?) Sayyid Yusuf
(5) Makhdum Jahāniyān, of pious actions ..............
(6) bounded, whosoever obstructs (the aforesaid person), will run the risk of divorce.

I am not in a position to say anything about the persons mentioned in the record. The text, being unfortunately incomplete, does not contain the usual details regarding the

(a) Grant of Muhammad Quli regarding land, Golconda (p. 30)

(b) Epigraph, dated A.H. 1069, of the time of 'Abdu'llah, Hyderabad (p. 34)
village or town where the land was situated, the family background of the grantee, the purpose of the grant, etc.

The fifth inscription of this study is one of the four records pertaining to the reign of 'Abdu’llāh Qutb Shāh. Its tablet is fixed over the main entrance of the Muḥiyu‘d-Daula mosque, locally called Ḥusainī Masjid, which is architecturally an insignificant building, situated in the Kūch-i-Nasīm in Makhūl Kāmān at Hyderabad.1

Attention to the presence of two interesting inscriptions, each on this mosque as well as another one situated in the neighbourhood, as will be mentioned shortly, was first drawn by the late Sāyyid ʿAlī ʿAsghar Bilgrāmī in his book on the archaeological remains of Hyderabad city and suburbs entitled Landmarks of the Deccan, published in 1927. But unfortunately, he did not notice the inscriptions of both the mosques in full or in detail. Moreover, his reading, probably noted from memory, was not accurate either. Nevertheless, to him goes the credit of discovering these records.

The Ḥusainī-Masjid, which is otherwise a small mosque of no architectural merit, has its central mihrāb built wholly of black basalt. It bears two inscriptions: one is above the main entrance of the mosque and the other on the three sides of the rectangular frame enclosing the said niche. Bilgrāmī who has only quoted the concluding portion, which is historical, of the second of these two inscriptions, has misread the date as A.H. 1046 instead of A.H. 1045.2

The tablet fixed over the main entrance measures 1.20 m. by 43 cm. and is inscribed with a four-line text which begins with a Quranic verse and ends with a tradition of the Prophet and also contains a Persian fragment of five couplets. The writing is signed and dated by the calligrapher, viz. Mīr ʿAlī, son of Mīr ʿAlī Jān Maskhādī. While there is nothing very particular about the poetry of these verses, though it is certainly better than that of a good many such epigraphs, its style of writing is decidedly of a very good order. As a matter of fact, it was in regard to the calligraphical aspect of the other inscription on this very mosque that Bilgrāmī had occasion to point out that record. The style is a fine specimen of Nashīḥ which should determine the position of its master, Mīr ʿAlī, among the calligraphists of first rank.

The epigraph states that in the reign of the just king 'Abdu'llāh Qutb Shāh, Ḥājī Husainī constructed the mosque, through Divine guidance, in A.H. 1045 (1635 A.D.). The text, which was written on the 22nd Rabi‘ I of the said year (26th August, 1635), has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate VII (a)*

(1) وان المسجد ننه فلا تدعوا هو اللهم

در عهدِ بادشاه جوان بخت کامران

عتبد ان سهی شا شام مہنات

سلطان با عدل وا داری با وقائ

در خمس و اربعین زهیر پس از هزار

هجی حسنی ایکه بتوافق ای رنگ

کرد این (۳) بنای سریند برفش روح بخش

بور ایمین اینکه جدا در این شمار

زبر که این بیشین زا حمد شد آتشکار

اندر پهشخ خاناته سریند عطا

2 Bilgrāmī, Landmarks of the Deccan (Hyderabad, 1927), pp. 53-54, f.n.1.
3 It is surprising that this beautiful inscription should contain this orthographical mistake. The correct phrase is either باد او or باد او.
TRANSLATION

(1) 'And verily, the mosques are for Allāh; hence invoke not any one else with Allāh'.

During the reign of the most fortunate and successful king, Quṭb (i.e. the pole-star) among the Shāhs (i.e. monarchs), the refuge of the people, the shadow of God,

'Abdu'llāh, that sky of generosity,

(2) the king who puts Jamāḥīd on the throne, a just sovereign and a dignified Daraius,

Ḥājī Ḥusainī who by Divine guidance, in (the year) five and forty of Migration after one thousand, laid this

(3) foundation of the bountiful and soul-nourishing mosque, in the hope that God may, at the time of reckoning (on the day of judgment),

bestow on him a house in Paradise, because this saying has been quoted of (the Prophet) Ahmad, (viz.)

(4) 'He who builds a mosque for Allāh, Allāh builds for him a house in Paradise'. Written by the humble creature, Mir 'Ali, son of Mir 'Ali Jān Mashhādī, (on the) 22nd of the month of Rabī‘ul-Awwal, 1045 (26th August 1635).

It is not possible to establish the identity of the calligrapher, but according to Mr. Bilgrāmī, it was also this Mir 'Ali who designed the Quranic inscription occurring on the Rahīm Khān’s mosque, in Hyderabad, which was built in A.H. 1053 (1643-44 A.D.). Though, in the absence of an illustration it is difficult either to accept or reject this identification, the time factor is in its favour. But Mr. Bilgrāmī is definitely wrong to state that our Mir 'Ali was a contemporary of Mir 'Aliu‘l-Kātib and Mir 'Ali Tabhrīzī. Mr. 'Aliu‘l-Kātib, who is, incidentally, identical with Mir 'Ali Tabhrīzī, flourished more than two centuries earlier. Even Mir 'Ali Hirawī had died in A.H. 924.

The other epigraph on the Ḥusainī-Masjid, which forms the sixth record of this study, is carved in one line along the three sides of the rectangular frame of the central mihrāb. The top side has one additional line above, containing a famous tradition of the Prophet about offering prayers and repentance before it is too late. The major part of the text is taken up by the Shi‘ite durād, and it is towards the end that the historical portion occurs. This comprises what I take to be a hemistich in Arabic, containing the name of the builder, followed by the name of the scribe Mir 'Ali and the date.

This inscription was also referred to by Mr. Bilgrāmī in his work. But the historical portion quoted by him is not the correct rendering of this epigraph. According to him, the said portion reads: In the year 1046 A. H. Written by the servant Mir Ali and Haji Mubarak. The Hussainī Mosque.

Mr. Bilgrāmī has thus confused the words of the text. From the reading quoted below, it will be observed that the text mentions Mir 'Ali as the scribe independently. It gives the name

---

1 Qur‘ān, chapter LXXVII, verse 18.
2 EJ M, 1917-18, p. 48; Bilgrāmī, op. cit., p. 3, f. n.2.
3 Bilgrāmī, op. cit., p. 53.
6 Bilgrāmī, op. cit.
Inscription, dated A.H. 1045, of the time of 'Abdu'llāh, Hyderabad (p. 33)
of Haji Husaini along with the mosque, of which he was the builder. The correct reading of
the date is, likewise, A.H. 1045 and not 1046.

The text occupies the writing space of 1.88 m. by 16 cm. each on the right and left sides,
and 90 by 18 and 70 by 15 cm. on the top side, of the prayer-niche. It provides, particularly
in the portion containing the Shiite durūd, an excellent specimen of Thulūṭ writing while,
the part containing the names of the builder and the scribe is inscribed in Nasīḥ which is not
so exquisite.

The text has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate IX

(a) Top side, upper line.

عجلوا بالصلاة قبل الفوت عجلوا بالموت قبل الموت

(b) Right side.

اللهم صل على محمد المصطفى وعلى المرتضى و البغول فاطمة و السبطين الحسن و الحسين و صل على زين العابد و على الباقر محمد و الصادق جعفر و الك암م موسى و الرضا على

(c) Top side, lower line.

و صلى محمد و النبي عليه السلام و الزي العسكري حسن و صلى على الحجة القائمة

(d) Left side.

الخلف الصالح الأولم الهمام و المنتظر المظهر المهدي محمد صاحب الزمان و قطع البارحان و خليفة الرحمن و سيد الأنس و الجان سلوات الله و سلام لمسجد مبارك و حاجي حسن بن العبد مير علي فی 1050

TRANSLATION

(a) Hasten with prayer before its expiry (and) hasten with repentence before death (overtakes).

(b-d) Shiite durūd in full.

Verily, the mosque is auspicious, and (so be) Haji Husaini.

Written by the humble creature, Mr. Ali, in (A.H.) 1045 (1635 A.D.).

The seventh inscription of the present study is from a mosque called Quṭb Shāhī-Masjid
which is situated near the Gandi-Bāoli lane in the Irānī Gali, in Hyderabad, not far from the above
mosque. It was also first mentioned by Mr. Bilgrāmī, according to whom, ‘the excellence of its
calligraphy, justifies its placing on record’. As in the case of the other mosque, there are two
epigraphs here, both on the central miḥrāb, but Mr. Bilgrāmī had noticed only one. The larger
of the two inscriptions is engraved on the three sides of the rectangular frame of the miḥrāb; and
the other, occupying less space, is inscribed on the architrave above the same miḥrāb.

The former consists of Shiite durūd in a slightly abridged form than in the previous epigraph
and a line in Persian purporting that the builder of the mosque which was completed in the reign
of ‘Abdullāh Quṭb Shāh, was Sāliḥa, wife of Bāqir Shāhī and daughter of Dargāh Quli. It was

1 The word looks like المسجد, but the | is nothing but the top shaft of | of مبارك.
2 Bilgrāmī, op. cit., pp. 53-54, f.n.1.
This inscription also furnishes a fine specimen of calligraphical style in mural records. The script is Thuluth of a high order. The text, which occupies a writing space of 1.75 m. by 16 cm. on the right and left sides each, and 1.05 m. by 16 cm. on the top side, of the prayer-arch, has been deciphered as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate VIII (b)*

(a) Right side.

اللهم صل على المصطفى محمد و المرتضى علي و البطل فاطمه و السبطين الحسن و

الحسين و صل على زين العابد و علي الابتر محمد و

(b) Top side.

وسيداد جعفر و الكاظم موسى و الرضا علي و الخليفة محمد و النقي علي

(c) Left side.

و الزكي العسكرى محمد بن الحسن صاحب الزمان صلوات الله عليهم اجمعين بالله مسجد

صالح زوجة قرياحب بن داركه قل در زمان سلطان عبد الله قطبشاه تمام شد كتبه محمد علي

سنة 1069

**TRANSLATION**

(a-c) Shīte durūd. The builder of the mosque (is) Ṣaliḥa, wife of Bārē Ṣāḥib (and) daughter of Darqāh Qulū. It was completed during the reign of Sultan 'Abdu'llah Qutb Shāh. Written by Muhammad 'Ali, (in the) year (A.H.) 1069 (1658 A.D.).

The other inscription on the mosque is inscribed in Nuskh of no particular merit, on the architrave above the central mihrab. Running into one line of Persian prose, this important record registers the grant of some property as endowment for the maintenance of the mosque. It states that the income from the garden of the mosque was to be used for the stipends of the mu'ādhāhin (caller-to-prayer) and forgāh (sweeper) and for the prayer-carpets, oil for lamp, and repairs of reservoir. It ends with an imprecation against any one seeking to interfere with the bequest. No trace of the garden, mentioned in the text, which must have originally enclosed the mosque, remains today. As a matter of fact, the land around is taken up by residential houses.

The text, which occupies a writing space of 45 by 7 cm., has been deciphered as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate VII (b)*

حاصلي باغ مسجد حبيت و تلفجه موذن و فرس و حصير و روغن جراح و حوض و وضوء

وفي قومه شده مر كه تخلف ورد و مانع كردد لعله خدا يرد او

**TRANSLATION**

The income accruing from the garden of the mosque has been endowed for meeting the expenditure in respect of the salaries of the caller-to-prayer and the sweeper, prayer-mats, oil for lamp, and (repairs of) the cistern of water for ablution. Whosoever disobeys or interferes, the curse of God will be upon him!
INSCRIPTIONS OF JAHANGIR IN THE PATNA DISTRICT

BY DR. Q. AHMAD

The political history of the Mughal period being well-known in its general outlines, the utility of inscriptions as a supplementary source of information for the period is, comparatively, limited. But the same cannot be said about the history of some of the outlying provinces of the Mughal kingdom.

Our knowledge of the political history of Bihar, for example, is, at best, sketchy. For some periods, we have only the names of the provincial governors, and even this is not quite true for the whole period. Therefore, in so far as some of the inscriptions help to fill some minor detail of the provincial history, they are important. They also provide us with some details about the career of the provincial governors and other officials. These details, along with such other information as is available in the contemporary chronicles, enable us to determine their career a little more fully and precisely. It is from this point of view that the present inscriptions of the time of Jahangir have been studied in this article.

Among the Mughal emperors, Jahangir is fairly well represented by his extant inscriptions in Bihar. We know of ten inscriptions of his, of which five are found in the district of Patna (four being in Patna city itself) and five, at other places. The present article deals with the first five epigraphs, leaving the rest for some subsequent occasion.

Palaeographically, they do not present much of a problem, all of them having been inscribed in fair and bold Nasta‘liq. While all these epigraphs have been listed in the Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy, three of them were also published and translated into English some time back. But the published readings are not always free from mistakes, and on some points, they suffer from serious errors. Also, no attempt was made to identify the persons concerned or to collect such information about them as is available in contemporaneous chronicles. In this article, I propose to offer improved readings of the texts and relevant information about the personages mentioned therein. It will thus add a little more substance to the shadowy outlines of their career as we know at present.

I. II. INSCRIPTIONS, DATED A.H. 1023 & 1025, FROM PATNA

These epigraphs come from Mirzâ Ma‘ṣūm’s mosque. This mosque is the earliest dated monument of the Mughal period in Patna city. It is situated on the main road, near the Pachchhim Darwâza in Ma‘hallā-Gurī. Its full view is obstructed by the various shops situated in its katra, but one gets a fine view of this beautiful three domed mosque, once he enters through the richly carved and polished door-frame of black basalt, on the northern side. The door-frame as well as the two top steps leading thereto are decorated with fine flowered carvings. These slabs belonged, perhaps, to some ancient local palace or temple. According to Syed Mohammad, who published the text of this epigraph, these probably belonged to Gaur in Malda district of West Bengal. In this connection, it may be mentioned that the undated Hāji Tâtâr mosque, situated

---

3 ARIE, 1955-56, No. D, 94.
4 Mohammad, op. cit., p. 342.
in Maḥalla-Ḥājīganj, also has some strips of similarly carved stone along its front wall and the central arch.

There are three inscriptions in the mosque, of which the one in Persian verse is historical and the other two, in Arabic, contain Quranic text; one of the latter is also dated and is studied next. The Persian inscription is engraved on a slab measuring 1 m. by 67 cm., which is fixed above the central arch in the facade. Its text runs as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate X(a)*

(1) بدور شاه جهانگیر میرزا مصوص
(2) باخت مسجد جامع بقیه باد رجال
(3) جو سال او ز خرد خواستم ز هاتف گیب
(4) ندا رزید که بیت العتبق شد تحقیق

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the reign of emperor Jahāngīr, Mīrzā Mā’sūm
(2) built a Jāmi‘ mosque. May it be associated with bounty!
(3) When I sought the date of its (construction) from the Angel of the Unseen,
(4) a voice called out, ‘Verily, it is (like) the Old House (i.e. Ka‘ba)!’

The chronogram contained in the last line, when worked out, yields A.H. 1023 (1614-15 A.D.).

The dated Arabic record referred to above contains Quranic text enjoining the observance of the Friday prayer and is dated A.H. 1025. It is inscribed in three lines in Naṣīkhum-Thuṣīk, on a slab of stone, measuring 64 by 52 cm., which is fixed above the central miḥrāb. Its calligraphy is of a fairly high order. The text reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate X(b)*

(1) يا إيها الذين آمنوا إذا نودى للصلاة من يوم الجمعة فاسعوا
(2) إلى ذكر الله و ذروا الباع ذلکم خير لكم إن كنتم تعلمون
(3) فاذا قضيت الصلوة فاستروا في الأرض و ابتدعو من فضل الله سنة 1025

**TRANSLATION**

(1-3) Qur’ān, chapter LXII, part of verses 9-10. Year (A.H.) 1025 (1616 A.D.).

It will be observed that the Persian epigraph is dated A.H. 1023, but the Arabic one is dated two years later. This may be taken to mean that the mosque was commenced in A.H. 1023 (1614-15 A.D.) and was completed about after two years.

The main point of interest in the epigraph is the builder of the mosque, Mīrzā Ma’sūm. Several persons bearing this name are mentioned in some of the contemporary historical works.

---

1 The undated Arabic inscription contains Quranic text (chapter III, part of verse 39).
3 Mohammad, *op. cit.*, p. 342, thinks that the later date may refer to the completion of the work inside the hall.
INSCRIPTIONS OF JAHANGIR

(Plates X—XII)

(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 1023, from Patna (p. 36)

(b) Epigraph, dated A.H. 1025, same place (p. 36)
The Bahūristān-i-Ghaibī of Mirzā Nathan alone, mentions six persons of this name, but only one of them, viz. Maṣūm Khāfī (Khwāfī), bears the significant prefix of Mirzā. The various references about him in the above work also make it probable that he was the builder of the mosque.

As related by Mirzā Maṣūm himself to Mirzā Nathan, he was a relation of Shamsūd-Dīn Khān Khwāfī, the divān and, later on, the cāzīr of Akbar. Mirzā Maṣūm and his father met him at Gujarat, after they had been robbed and had suffered some other disasters which rendered them penniless and without shelter. Shamsūd-Dīn helped them generally, and soon after, probably through his recommendation, they entered Imperial service. Shamsūd-Dīn was later on transferred to Bihar, and he was one of the important imperial officers captured by the rebels, during the great uprising of 1580-81. He somehow escaped from their clutches and sought shelter with Rājā Sangrām Singh of Kharaṣpur. It is quite likely that Mirzā Maṣūm too came to Bihar along with his distinguished relation and patron.

Mirzā Maṣūm is again referred to in the early years of Jahāngīr’s reign. During the course of an expedition sent by Islām Khān, the governor of Bengal, against Bāyazid Karrānī for the conquest of Sylhet, he found himself in need of some reinforcements and replacement, to guard the capital in the absence of the army. The emperor, accordingly, ordered Aḥfājl Khān, the governor of Bihar, to depute the officers of the province to Islām Khān under the command of Mirzā Imām Qūlī Bāy Shāmīlī, a brother-in-law of Jahāngīr Qīl Khān, with Sazāwals in their company. The contingent was duly sent, and it presented itself, within fifteen days, before Islām Khān. He ordered for cash payment of six months’ expenses to each of them, and after a week’s stay, despatched them with Mirzā Maṣūm, who was appointed as Sazāwal. It is not quite clear from the above-noted reference, whether Mirzā Maṣūm was appointed Sazāwal from Bihar itself or later on from Bengal. The former possibility is, however, more likely, since the governor of Bihar was specifically ordered to appoint Sazāwals to accompany the troops, and he must have done so. The fact that the name of the Sazāwal is not mentioned at the first stage, is of not much significance.

Mirzā Maṣūm rendered distinguished military service in Assam. He was among the various Khāns and Mangabārs appointed by Islām Khān for his expedition against Kuch and displayed conspicuous valour in the attack on the fort of Dhubri and also served, from time to time, as a frontier officer of the Mughal empire in the newly conquered areas of Assam. But, after the death of Islām Khān (1613), quarrels grew up between the officers appointed by him, including Mirzā Maṣūm and those appointed by the new governor to check their muster-rolls. Mirzā Maṣūm, who was then at Gilhaney, and some others refused to show their muster-rolls and returned to Jahangirnagar (Dacca).

The deputation of Mirzā Maṣūm from Bihar must have occurred some time between 1608 and 1612, representing the period of the governorship of Aḥfājl Khān. He returned to Bihar some time after the death of Islām Khān, and it was after his return to Bihar that the mosque was built.

1 Maṣūm Khān; Maṣūm Khān Kābulī, the famous rebel chief of Akbar’s time; Maṣūm Khān, father of Mirzā Mu’min; Maṣūm Khān Māsunād-i-A’lā; Mirzā Maṣūm Khwāfī; and Shaikh Maṣūm, son of Nāṣīr Khān Turkmān. For them, see Mirzā Nathan, Bahūristān-i-Ghaibī, Eng. tr. Dr. M. I. Borah, vols. I and II (Gauhati, 1936), pp. 898-99 of Index.
2 Although it is written as Khāfī in Nathan, op. cit., p. 166, it is actually Khwāfī, i.e. a resident of Khwāfī, a place in Khūrāṣān noted for its distinguished inhabitants.
3 At some places, the name is also written with the prefix Mr.
4 Nathan, op. cit., pp. 281-82.
6 Nathan, op. cit., p. 166.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid., pp. 216, 222, 230, 231, 235, 275, 287, 293, etc.
An interesting reference to Mirzā Maṣūm is provided in a Manuscript of the collection of letters of Lālā Ujāgar Chand Ghārib, who flourished in the early part of the 18th century. One of these letters records Guzrī-Mirzā Maṣūm as the name of a Mahalla in the city, which was perhaps the same as the one in which the mosque is situated. It is quite likely that Mirzā Maṣūm, after his services in Assam, returned to Bihar, built the mosque in Patna and also established a market (Guzrī) and, perhaps, settled there.

III. INSCRIPTION DATED A.H. 1028, FROM PATNA

The third inscription is to be seen over the southern entrance of the domed mausoleum of Shāh Arzānī, situated in the enclosure, popularly called Dargāh. The Dargāh, named after the saint, is the most well-known in the city, being the place of the immersion of Taʿziyās on the 10th of Muḥarram every year. There is an extensive walled cemetery nearby, containing the tombs of the Sajjāda-Nashīms (spiritual successors of the saint). Small four-walled structures, with or without domes, have been built over these tombs. The mausoleum of Shāh Arzānī, as is to be expected, is the most imposing. It is almost a contemporary structure, which, according to the inscription on the main gate, was built in A.H. 1052 (1642-43 A.D.).

The inscription recording the demise of the saint is carved on a tablet which measures 75 by 40 cm. It comprises two verses in Persian, which are inscribed in Nastālig of a fairly high order and records, in a chronogram, the date of the death of the saint, who is spoken of as Quṭb-i-Zamān (the Pole-star of the time). The chronogram yields A.H. 1028 (1618-19 A.D.), which is also quoted in figure.

The text has been read as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XI(b)*

\[
(1) \text{الله}
\]

\[
(2) \text{نقل قطب زمن پاسان بييض بهشت نورالي}
\]

\[
(3) \text{سال فويش ملهم غيب كفت دل شام جنت اذالگن سنخ 1028}
\]

**TRANSLATION**

(1) The Quṭb (Pole-star) of the Age went with ease to the gardens of the Illumined Paradise.

(2) Allāh.

(3) (For) the year of his death, the heart (*Dil*), through the bounty of the Inspier of the Unseen, said, ‘Arzānī (became) the lord of Paradise’. Year (A.H.) 1028 (1618-19 A.D.).

Shāh Arzānī, who was thus a contemporary of emperor Jahāngīr, was an inhabitant of the North West Frontier tribal area. A collection of his Pugtū verses is reported to have existed in the valuable library attached to the Dargāh, but is now missing. Very little is known about

---

1 The Manuscript was originally discovered by Professor S. H. Askari (*Hindustan Review*, 1938), and is unfortunately not extant now. I owe the above reference to Professor Askari.


3 The tomb of Shāh Arzānī also finds mention in a late eighteenth century biographical work, *viz.* *Gulār-i- Ibrahim* of All Ibrahim Khan Khalil (Aligarh, 1834), on page 135.

him. He came to Patna perhaps during Jahāngīr’s reign and settled down in what was then an uninhabited area. It is significant that extensive remains of a big Buddhist monastery-cum-hospital have been recently excavated at a site quite nearby. It is likely that as was common with many Sūfī saints, he also settled near the site of a deserted Buddhist monastery.

According to H. Blochmann, Shāh Arzānī died in A.H. 1040 (1630 A.D.) in the time of Shāh Jahān, but this is incorrect.⁴ Again according to him, the famous Birhbmīn saint Shāh ‘Abdu’l-lāh Kirmānī, who is renowned for his power over serpents, went to Bengal at the request of Shāh Arzānī, who gave him a toothpick of jasemine and asked him to remain at the place where the twig would become fresh and green. It was only when Shāh ‘Abdu’l-lāh came to Khushitīrgī, a village in Bhirbhmī, that the miracle happened.⁵ Incidentally, the Dargāh of Shāh Arzānī is also famous for snake-bite cure.

IV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1036, FROM THE SAME PLACE

The next inscription of the time of Jahāngīr is from the Pattihar-ki-Masjid, which is situated just on the main road in the Mahalla of the same name, midway between Bankipur and the city area. As the name itself indicates, the mosque is built largely of stones which were procured, as the text of the inscription says, from the demolished fort and temple at Majhauli, conquered by the builder of the mosque, viz. Nazar Khwāshgī, an officer under Prince Parviz, the son of Jahāngīr.

Parviz succeeded Muqarrab Khān as the governor of Bihar in Jahāngīr’s 16th regnal year. He, however, does not seem to have come here at all, or at least stayed only for a short time, for he presented himself before his father in the same year, on hearing of his illness. He again met Jahāngīr in the 18th regnal year.⁶

The tablet containing this epigraph is fixed above the central arch of the facade.⁷ It measures 60 by 70 cm. and contains a poetical fragment of five verses inscribed in as many lines and preceded by the First Creed and Takbīr contained in three lines. The text, which was composed by one with the poetical name Khasāmī, purports that in the time of Parviz Shāh, son of Jahāngīr Bādshāh, Nazar Khwāshgī, a staunch follower of the creed of Prophet Muḥammad, built the mosque out of the stone and wood material of the idol-house which, along with the fort of Majhauli, he had destroyed. The date, A.H. 1036 (1626 A.D.), yielded by a chronogram, is also confirmed by figure.

The text, inscribed in Nasta’liq of a tolerably good type, reads as follows:—

**TEXT**

Plate XI (a)

allah (1)

(2) أَكْبر

(3) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(3) در عهد نور پارساً جهانگیر، پادشاه ہرزیان شاه عادل و بازیل بُعلاط و رلے

(5) کیپریا سپانہ و جمشید سلاطنت بر نتک سمندر جہان کشیا

---

³ _Jahāngīr, Tuzuk-i-Jahāngīr_ , ed. Sayyid Ahmad Khān (Aligarh, 1864), pp. 327, 330, 335, 339, etc.
⁴ _ARIE_ , 1933-36, No. D, 102. It was first published in the Patna College Magazine (March 1913), p. 96 and subsequently by Mohammad, _op. cit._ , p. 344. The latter’s reading was commented upon by Kurashi, _op. cit._ , pp. 45-47 and plate.
(2) Allâh is great!
(3) There is no god but Allâh, Muhammed is His Prophet.
(4) In the period of the light of Jahângîr's eyes (i.e. son), Parviz Shâh, the just and generous (and endowed) with reason and judgment,
(5) the Kaikhosraw of the Age and the Jamshid of the kingdom, (who occupies) the throne of the kingdom like the world-conquering Alexander,
(6) this special building was constructed by Nâzar Khwâshgî, who in his compliance of the religious code of (Prophet) Muhammed, is firm like the mountain.
(7) He demolished the fort of Majhaulî and the temple (there), and out of stone and wood of the temple, was built this auspicious structure.
(8) I asked the old man of Wisdom about the year of its construction. He said, "Say, O Kharâmî, 'this place is the best place'." Year (A.H.) 1036 (1626 A.D.).

The third couplet was wrongly read and translated by Syed Mohammad, who having failed to read the name Nâzar, missed the name of the builder. He also missed the point that Kharâm does not form part of the chronogram, but is the pen-name of the composer of the text. We know nothing about Kharâmî, but his above verses do not indicate him to be a poet of much merit.

The builder Nâzar Khwâshgî is a well-known figure. He was born and brought up in the town of Qasur near Lahore, and belonged to the Khwâshgî clan of the Afghâns, which is famous for the nobility and integrity of its members. He was one of the chief attendants of Prince Parviz and held a rank of 1500 in Jahângîr's reign. As a reward for his fidelity and integrity, he was appointed governor of Sambhal sardâr in the second year of Shâh Jahân's reign, and after an eventful life of valour and distinguished service, he died at Lahore in A.H. 1062 (1652 A.D.).

Nâzar Khwâshgî was renowned for piety and 'lived like a darvish', which shows that the statement in the text about his being a staunch follower of the religion of the Prophet is no empty boast. Like a loyal officer of Parviz, he mentions his master's name with grandiloquent titles in the inscription of the mosque he had constructed. The phraseology of these titles speaks of Parviz as Parviz Shâh, etc., which may strike to some as arrogation of royal titles to himself. But I do not think much significance can be attached to it, in the absence of any other evidence.

But the importance of the inscription lies more in the fact that it furnishes a new piece of information on the career of Nâzar Khwâshgî: his conquest of Majhauli and demolition of the fort. This is all the more important since nothing is known about his earlier career in Bihar. It is only from this inscription that we know of his posting in Bihar. It is a reasonable surmise that Parviz who did not stay for very long in Bihar of which he was the governor, had appointed him as his deputy. In any case, the present epigraph furnishes the information, not available in contemporary works, that the successful career of Nâzar Khwâshgî had its beginning in Bihar.

---

1 Mohammad, op. cit., pp. 344-45. For Kuraighi's comments, see Kuraighi, op. cit., pp. 46-47.
(a) Inscription of Parviz, dated A.H. 1036, Patna (p. 39)

(b) Epitaph of Shah Arzai, from the same place (p. 33)

Scale: .19
Inscription of a mosque, A.H. 1013,
from Hilsa (p. 41)
It is difficult to identify Majhauli, as there are several places bearing this name in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.

V. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1013, FROM HILSA

The village Hilsa to which the inscription studied below belongs is a place of considerable antiquity. It contains the Dargâh of Shâh Jamman Madârî, with an inscription dated 1543, which records its repairs by Daryâ Khân Nûhânî in the time of Sher Shâh. Among the modern writers, Buchanan was the first to notice this Dargâh and its inscription, of which he did not give any detail.

The loose tablet bearing the inscription under study originally belonged to a mosque, which must have been, as the purport indicates, the mosque in the Dargâh itself. Buchanan, in his above-mentioned account, refers to a mosque near the Dargâh. The present mosque attached to the Dargâh is a small one built in recent times. But it is quite likely that it stands on the site of the earlier one to which the inscription belonged.

This inscription was first noticed in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey, Bengal Circle, 1902. Buchanan while mentioning the mosque does not refer to any inscription. Perhaps, the tablet had got detached as early as that time (1811-1812). The epigraphical tablet was 'rediscovered' in 1947, jointly by Prof. Askari and the late Mr. Fašîhu’d-Din Balkhî, who found it lying upside down, in a toddy shop. When I obtained its estampage in 1959, it was still lying in the same place and position. It is now reported to be lying in the house of the Mutawalli of the Dargâh.

The epigraph is engraved neatly in seven lines on a tablet measuring 54 by 74 cm. But the style of writing, which is Nasta’lîq, is ordinary and of no particular merit. In the first line is an invocation to God by His attributes and a phrase in Arabic purporting that the builder, the composer and the writer of the text were one and the same person. The last line not only works out the chronogram in that its each component letter is inscribed above its numerical value, but it gives the date in figure as well as in words in Arabic and Persian. The record proper comprising five verses in Persian states that in the Dargâh of the saint Shâh Jamman, a mosque was built in A.H. 1013 (1604-05 A.D.), in the time of the king Salim, son of Akbar, by one Râdî, who is described in the text as an ardent follower of Murtâdâ (i.e. Ḥadrat ‘Ali).

The text has been read as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plate XII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The earliest reference to this Dargâh is contained in the Travel Diary of ‘Abdu’l-Latif who passed through Bihar in company of his master, Abü’l-Hasan (later on Asaf Khân), in 1608, for which see *JBOAS*, vol. V (1919), p. 569.

2 S. H. Askari, 'A Review of Bihar during the Turko-Afghan Period', *Current Studies* (Patna College, Patna), 1954, p. 21, n. 2. A very brief description of this inscription was given by A. Cunningham in *Archaeological Survey of India Reports*, vol. XI (Calcutta, 1881), p. 64. It was later on published by Mr. R. D. Banerjee in *JBOAS*, vol. IV (1918), pp. 186-87.


4 AIE, 1960-61, No. D, 23.
(6) O Lord of the kingdom! By its builder, composer and writer.
(2) In the Dargāh of the saint of God, Jamman Shāh who was one of the men of God,
(3) during the reign of Shāh Salīm, (son of) Akbar, that king who was the protector of the
shāfī of Muṣṭafā (the Prophet Muḥammad).
(4) a man, who was a sincere friend of Murtadā (i.e. Ḥaḍrat ‘All), laid the foundation of a
mosque.
(5) Wisdom enquired, ‘ (Who is) this man, who is the founder? Tell (me) his name, what
is the date and from where was he?’
(6) A voice from the Unknown called out, ‘O wise man, say that the name (of the builder)
and the date (of the building) both (are contained in the phrase,) he was Riḍā.’
(7) R-200; D-800; A-1; B-2; W-6; D-4. Year one thousand and thirteen (A.H.)
1013 (1604-05 A.D.).

This inscription is of considerable historical importance. Jahāngīr’s rebellion in the closing
years of Akbar’s reign and the defection of some of the officers of the eastern provinces to him is
well-known. The present inscription provides definite corroborative evidence of it, so far as Bihar
is concerned. It is dated A.H. 1013 (1604-05 A.D.), when Akbar was still alive, but, interestingly
enough, it mentions the name of Shāh Salīm (not Jahāngīr, which title was assumed later) and
that of Akbar as his father only. It clearly shows that the governor of Bihar1 had probably gone
over to Jahāngīr’s side, or at least, had considered it politic to do so, for Jahāngīr was very near,
at Allahabad. In any case, he was not an ordinary rebel, but one, whom it was safer to play along
with. We can in no other way explain the inscription with this particular wording. Only a
governor who had joined hands with Jahāngīr or at least connived at his rebellious activity, could
have permitted such an inscription to be set up in public.

We do not have any information about Riḍā, the builder of the mosque. Perhaps, he was
some enthusiastic pro-Jahāngīr official of the province. As has been stated above, the inscription
was composed and written by him.

Palaeographically too, the inscription is quite interesting. The last line after the versified
chronogram mentions the date of construction in three different ways—in numerals and in
Arabic and Persian words. It also illustrates the working of the Abjad system of reckoning by
specifying the letters constituting of the chronogram Riḍā būd and giving the numerical value
of each letter under it. In this way, even those not familiar with the working of the system can
follow it easily. This is a unique feature of this inscription in that no other inscription of Bihar
contains this novelty. However, a few inscriptions which follow this method are known in other
parts and one such, has been published in a recent issue of this series.2

1 Prince Salīm appointed Sharīf Khān as the governor of Bihar in 1604, but he was displaced in the same
year, by Āṣaf Khān, the last governor of Bihar during Akbar’s reign (R. R. Diwakar, ed. Bihar Through the
2 Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement, 1983, pl. XXIIIe. (Another in which almost similar
method is employed is published in this issue, at p. 57.—Ed.)
MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM PANCHGAWHAN

BY S. A. RAHIM

I have studied in this article eight inscriptions copied recently by me from Panchgawhan, a village situated at a distance of about 25 kilometres from the taluka headquarters Akot, in the Akola district of Maharashtra.

These inscriptions are extremely interesting. Seven of these were set up to the memory of different members of an important family, who laid down their lives in the service of Jahangir and Shâh Jahân. Not less interesting is the eighth, which is an unique record of Jahândar Shâh, son of Shâh ‘Alâm Bahâdur Shâh I, who had succeeded in the contest for the throne against his brother ‘Azimu’ah-Shâh on the 17th March 1712, only to be defeated and murdered by the latter’s son Farrukh Siyar about a year later.¹

Despite the fact that these records were first noticed, however briefly, as early as in 1916, by Râo Bahâdur Hirâlâl,² they have practically remained unknown to students of Mughal history. Hirâlâl himself was not satisfied with his notice of these records which was ‘based on the copies furnished by Tahsildar of Akot, and may be taken for what they are worth’.³ Hirâlâl’s fear is not misplaced. The whole account is full of confusion of dates and facts, as will be pointed out in the respective places. But it is not understood how nobody followed up Hirâlâl’s notice and attempted to bring out the correct purport of these epigraphs, which furnish quite useful information.

Then, it is surprising that the village Panchgawhan which was associated with these Mughal officials, should find no mention in historical works. The place is now said to consist of thirty-six villages with separate officers, but in earlier days, it was a cluster of five villages, which fact accounted for its name, meaning literally ‘five villages’. It was the headquarters of a pargana under the Nizâms of Hyderabd.⁴

Seven of these eight records are carved on the headstones of the graves situated in and outside the four-walled enclosure of the tomb, locally called Dargâh Niknâm Sâhib, to the south of the village. The remaining one appears on the mosque standing to the west of the said Dargâh. The epitaphs are interesting, as they enable us to unravel the history of this now desolate village, which must have been either the place of the residence of the deceased or of their fief.

Of these seven epitaphs, five belong to one single family of Mir Muḥammad Yusuf Niknâm, who and his four sons were in the employ of Jahângir and Shâh Jahân. The father and two of the sons were killed in the two battles fought by them in Jahângir’s army in 1610 and 1616, while the other two brothers died natural death in places of their duty, namely Dharrur in Bir district

² R. B. Hirâlâl, Descriptive Lists of Inscriptions in the Central Province & Berar (Nagpur, 1916), pp. 136-37. In the second edition of this book, published in 1932, there is no change, as far as the notice of these epigraphs is concerned.
³ Ibid., p. 136, f.n. 1.
⁴ C. Brown, Central Province and Berar District Gazetteers, Akola Distriet (Calcutta, 1910), pp. 373-76.
and Mulher in Nasik district. It may be pointed out that these places are quite far off from Panchgawhan, and therefore, the fact that their dead-bodies were brought from there for internment to Panchgawhan, shows their deep attachment to the said village.

The sixth epigraph, set up in the reign of Jahāndār Shāh, records the date of the death of Bulāq Baig, a native of Shāhjahānābād (i.e. Delhi), who is described as the fāujdār, evidently of the pargana or the town of Panchgawhan. As has been referred to above, this is the only epigraph of this emperor known so far. Incidentally, we have an inscription, at Dewas, a district headquarters in Madhya Pradesh, which speaks of his being its jāgīr-holder in 1707, during the reign of his father.¹ The seventh epitaph merely contains a Persian hemisticium, which comprises the chronogram yielding 1673-74. The eighth inscription records the construction of the mosque on which it appears, by one of the sons of Niknām Khān, only a few days before his death.

The above brief résumé should amply bear out the historical importance of these inscriptions. But their calligraphy is also of a particularly high order, with the exception of that of the epitaph of Bulāq Baig. In other words, the style of writing in the epitaphs and the mosque inscription of the Niknām family, is extremely pleasing, and must have been designed by a professional scribe.

The graves of Mir Muḥammad Yūsuf Niknām and three of his sons, namely, Mir Shāh Hussain, Mir Farīdūn Ḥusain and Mir Sharaqū’d-Dīn Ḥusain, entitled Ḥimmat Khān, are situated on one platform, while that of the fourth son, Mir Muḥammad Ḥusain, lies; along with one more, on a smaller platform to the east. The grave with the epitaph which does not mention any name, is also built on another platform to the south-east, while the grave of Bulāq Baig is situated without the enclosure, immediately to the south of the mosque.

The first inscription is the epitaph of Mir Muhammad Yusuf Niknam. Inscribed on an arch-shaped tablet measuring 46 cm. in width and 1-22 m. from apex to bottom, fixed at the head side of the second of the four graves, from east,² it runs into eight lines of writing in Persian, of which the first two comprise a well-known verse of the famous Iranian poet Sa’di, and the remaining seven purport that the grave is that of Mir Muḥammad Yūsuf Niknām 'Alawi, who was killed with his eldest son, kinsmen and servants on Thursday 19th 1 Safar 1019 (3rd May 1610) in the battle which he fought, in the time of emperor (Jahāngīr), against the enemies from Dakhan who had blocked the way of the Muslims (i.e. the Mughal army). The year is indicated by a chronogram. Hirālāl gives the year A. H. 1025,³ which is perhaps due to the faulty calculation of the chronogram.

The text is inscribed in elegant Nasta’liq and reads as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XIII (a)*

(1) الله باکی

(2) سعدیا مرد تکو نام تمبرد هرگز

(3) مرد آنت که نامش به تکوی نبرد

(3) این لوح مرقد پرفیق مرک مهد يوسف تیکنام

² Ibid., No. D, 84.
³ Hirālāl, op. cit., p. 138.
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(5) علیکم السلام گاه در سلطنت جهانگیر پاسخ فغان
(6) دکشان که سر راه مسلمانان شده بودند چنگ و
(7) جدل نموده با پر کلان و خوشان و نوکران
(8) دوز پنجشنبه نوزدهم ماه صفر بدرجه شهادت رسیدند
(9) در سالی که تاریخ آن از قبیر يوسف ثانی هوا دیگر می‌گردید

TRANSLATION

(1) Allâh is Eternal!

(2) O Sa'dî! A person who has acquired good name never dies.

(3) A dead man is one whose name is not remembered with respect.

(4) This tablet is of the bountiful grave of Mir Muḥammad Yūsuf Niknâm

(5-9) Alawi, who in the reign of Jahângîr fought with the enemies from Dakhan who had blocked the way of the Muslims and attained the status of martyrdom along with his eldest son, relatives and servants, on Thursday, the 19th of the month of Safar, in the year, which is apparent from the words: the grave of the second Joseph.

The year yielded by the chronogram is 1019 (19 Safar 1019=3 May 1610).

This record is quite important. It refers to a battle fought between the forces of Jahângîr and the Dakhanis, by whom evidently the army of Malîk 'Ambar is intended. The latter had proved a formidable foe in Deccan and gave a trying time to the Mughal army. While this major engagement between Malîk 'Ambar and the imperial forces is not wholly ignored in contemporary works, no details thereof are available.1 The record under study supplies few details on the personal side, but unfortunately, it omits to record the name of the place where Mîr Yûsuf laid down his life. It is quite likely that the site was somewhere in Berar. The Dakhanî enemies of the text appear to have been one of the Marâtha predatory bands which were used in his guerrilla warfare, by Malîk 'Ambar. One such band seems to have blocked the way of the contingent, of which Mîr Yûsuf Niknâm and his kinsmen and servants were members.

It is surprising that no mention of this official is available in chronicles, except as being the father of Mîr Shâhru'd-Dîn Hûsain, entitled Himmat Khân and Mir Muḥammad Hûsain. Incidentally, Mîr Yûsuf Niknâm is now venerated as a saint.2

The second epitaph belongs to the eastern-most grave on the same platform.3 It records that Mîr Shâh Hûsain, son of Mîr Yûsuf Niknâm, was killed along with his father in A.H. 1019 (1610 A.D.). The year is afforded by a chronogram. Hirâlî's statement that he predeceased his father (whose death, as we have just seen, he places in A.H. 1025) and that his tomb (i.e. epitaph) is 'silent about his merits which were perhapps non-existent', are ill-conceived. The epitaph clearly states that Mîr Shâh Hûsain suffered martyrdom in the company of his father.

---

1 For a concise account of the Deccan campaign in 1610, see Burn, op. cit., pp. 159-60.
The present record is the only source mentioning Mir Shāh Ḥusain, and as such, its importance cannot be overstressed.

The arch-shaped tablet, on which its text of seven lines is inscribed in beautiful Nastaʿlīq characters, measures 46 by 96 cm.

The text is deciphered as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate XIII (b)*

(1) اللّهُ اٌلّهُ بَالٌ

(2) اگر صد سال پانی ور یکی روز

(3) بیاید وقت ازین کاخ دل انروز

(4) این لوح قبر میر شاه حسین ولد میر یوسف

(5) نیکنام است که برفاقت پدر بزرگوار خود

(6) از دست سالی وضویان جرده شهادت توقیدند

(7) در سالی که تاریخ آن از لفظ شهادت واضح میشود

**TRANSLATION**

(1) Allāh is Eternal!

(2) Whether one lives for a hundred years or for a day,

(3) he has to depart from this heart-illuminating place (i.e. world).

(4) This tablet indicates the grave of Mir Shāh Ḥusain, son of Mir Yūsuf

(5) Niknām, who, in the company of his respected father,

(6) drank the draught of martyrdom at the hands of the cup-bearer, (viz.) the keeper of Paradise,

(7) in the year which is evident from the words: the honey of martyrdom.

The numerical value of the letters of the last phrase add up to yield the date A.H. 1019 (1610 A.D.). Therefore, the date A.H. 1025 given by Hirālāl for Mir Yūsuf’s martyrdom is shown to be incorrect by this record too.

The arch-shaped tablet bearing the third epitaph is fixed at the headside of the third grave from east, on the same platform.¹ It measures 47 cm. by 1.02 m. The epitaph consists of eight lines and states that Mir Farīdūn Ḥusain, son of Mir Muḥammad Yūsuf Niknām, attained martyrdom, having fallen in the battle of Khirki against the marauders of Dakhan on the 25th Muharram 1025 (3rd February 1616). According to the text, the Mir was a ḥāṣ of the Qur’ān, that is to say, he had learnt it by heart. Hirālāl’s statement that Mir Farīdūn Ḥusain was killed less than a month before his father,² is wrong.

² Hirālāl, op. cit., p. 137.
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(a) Epitaph of Mir Muḥammad Yusuf Niknām (p. 44)

(b) Epitaph of Mir Shāh Ḥusain, A.H. 1019 (p. 46)
(a) Epitaph of Mr. Faridun Husain Niknam, from Panchgawhan (p. 47)

(b) Epitaph of Mr. Sharau'd-Din Husain same place (p. 48)
This inscription is also very important. The battle of Khirki mentioned in the text is one of the many battles fought between the Mughal army and that of Malik 'Ambar. But it should not be confused with the capture of Khirki and its devastation by Shāh Jahān later on in 1621.

As a matter of fact, Jahāngīr, while describing the events of the Deccan at the time of our record, states that on the 26th Bahman of his 10th reign year, the imperial forces having defeated 'Ambar, set out for Khirki, occupied it for some days and demolished its buildings before marching back to Rohinkhed.\(^3\) It is to be noted that Jahāngīr does not give any satisfactory reason for this withdrawal, except that 'giving details thereof would be unnecessary.'\(^4\) Incidentally, Mullā 'Abdu'l-Bāqī Nihāwandi has described these battles in detail in his Ma‘āthīr, devoted to the life and achievements of Mirzā 'Abdu'rr-Rahīm Khān Khān-i-Khanān, but his account is not to be accepted without reserve.\(^5\)

This battle of Khirki in which Mir Farīdūn Ḥusain was killed, evidently took place on the 25th Muharram 1025 which works out to 1st Isfandārmuz, since 1st Muharram was 7th Bahman.\(^6\) The Mughal army which as stated above, had set out for Khirki, from a nearby place, on the 26th Bahman, i.e. on the 20th Muharram, must have reached there within a couple of days to occupy it. The battle, according to our epigraph, took place on the 25th Muharram, i.e. 1st Isfandārmuz,\(^7\) which can be reasonably interpreted to mean that on or before that date, Malik 'Ambar's army had carried out a sudden attack on the Mughal army, which was ultimately, if not at that very moment, compelled to retreat unto Rohinkhed. Otherwise, there was no reason for the victorious Mughal army to march back to Rohinkhed. It is but natural that Jahāngīr did not want to mention this unsavoury affair.\(^8\)

It is not known what position in the Mughal army, Mir Farīdūn Ḥusain held at the time of his death. But it is likely that he may have been a man of rank. None of the historical works at my disposal seems to mention him. The inscription states that he knew the Qur'ān by heart, a considerable achievement in itself.

The text is inscribed in Nastā‘īlig, which is, as in the case of the previous epigraphs, of a very high order. It has been deciphered as under:

**Text**

**Plate XIV (a)**

\(1\) اللَّهُ بَارَکَ

\(2\) هِرَ کَہ آمدَ دَرِ جِهَانِ پِرِ زُور

\(3\) عَاقِبَتُ مَی پَائِش رَفْتَن بَکُور

\(4\) اِن لُجَہُ قَبِیر مِیر فرِیدُوْن حَسِین وَلَد مِیر نُحْجُد یوْسف

---

\(^{1}\) In Buldana district of Maharashtra State?


\(^{5}\) Incidentally, 'Abdu'l-Bāqī op.cit., pp. 522-25, also mentions a heavy battle having taken place on this day, between 'Ambar himself and Mughal army between Khirki and Samawātī(*)). But according to him the Mughals, after initial reverses, were victorious.

\(^{6}\) The above three paragraphs are by the Editor.
TRANSLATION

(1) Allâh is Eternal!

(2) He who is born in this bustling world,

(3) has perforsce, in the end, to go to the grave.

(4-5) This tablet belongs to the grave of Mir Farîdûn Husain, son of Mir Muhammed Yusuf Niknâm, who was a hâfiz (i.e. had learnt the Qur’an by heart) and had, in the battle

(6) of Khirki, which took place between the forces (lit. well-wishers) of Jahângir and themarauders of Dakhân (i.e. Malik ‘Ambar’s forces),

(7) attained martyrdom in the year which from (the phrase) ‘the liver

(8) is full of holes’, is obtained (i.e. A.H. 1025), on the 25th Muḥarram (25 Muḥarram 1025=3 February 1616).

The fourth epitaph is inscribed on the head-stone of the fourth grave from right on the same platform.1 Written in Nasta’lîq characters of a high order, its text runs into ten lines of Persian prose and verse and states that the grave is that of Mir Sharafu’d-Din Husain, entitled Hîmmat Khân, son of Mir Muhammed Yusuf Niknâm. It further describes him as being very brave andgenerous and states that he expired on Thursday, 15th Safar 1047 (29th June 1637), in the fort of Fathabad alias Kajj-Dharur, of which he was in charge, in the reign of Shâh Jahân.2

The text occupies a space of 47 cm. by 1.13 m. and has been read as follows:—

TEXT

Plate XIV (b)

الله باکی

(1) بارگ عیشی

(2) بگور هیویس فرست

(3) کس تمراد ن پس تو پیس فرست

(4) این لوح قبر میفرز پناف میر شرک


2 Hirâtîl, op. cit., gives 22nd of Safar and spells Kajj-Dhärur as Kanjdhâro.
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(5) الدين حسين مخاطب بختي خان ولد مير محمد يوسف
(6) لیکنام اسکه اشجع و سخی زمان خودن بودند وفات
(7) ایشان در قلمه فتح آیاد عرف کیچ دهارود که در ایام
(8) خلافت شاه جهان پادشاه غازیه ایالت قلمه مذكور بختی
(9) مرحم مقرر بود واقع ند در سال که تاریخ آن
(10) ازجهان مردانه وقت لابی میشود بتاریخ 10 شهر صفر روزپنجشنبه سنه 1036

TRANSLATION

(1) Allâh is Eternal!

(2) Send the provision of life (i.e. good deeds) to your own grave.

(3) Nobody will bring it afterwards. (Therefore), you send it yourself in advance.

(4-10) This tablet belongs to the grave of the pardoned Mir Sharafu’d-Din Husain, entitled Himmât Khân, son of Mir Mu’hammed Yusuf Niknâm, who was the most brave and generous person of his time. His death took place in the fort of Fatkhâbâd alias Kajj-Dhârûr which, in the time of the caliphate of Shâh Jahân, was in the charge of the late Khân, in the year, of which the date is evident from (the phrase) ‘he passed away from the world like a man’, on the 15th of the month of 'Safar, Thursday, year (A.H.) 1047 (15 Safar 1047=29 June 1637).

The deceased Mir Sharafu’d-Din Husain, entitled Himmât Khân, appears to have been the most prominent member of the Niknâm family. He is one of the two brothers who find mention in historical works which, however, do not furnish much details of his life. According to these, he was among the officers of the right wing in the army of Aqâf Khân which fought Shahryâr in 1627, gave a good account of himself in the battle and was suitably rewarded, received the title of Himmât Khân in the first year of Shâh Jahân’s reign, on the 1st Shawwâl 1037 (25th May 1628) to be exact,† and expired in the tenth regnal year.‡ Our epigraph not only corroborates the year of death, but also specifies the day and the month as well.

Another important piece of information afforded by the epitaph is that Himmât Khân was the qâ’adâr of Dharur, at the time of his death. Historical works mention the conquest of Dharur fort by A’zâm Khân in January 1631,§ but nowhere it is recorded when Himmât Khân was appointed to its charge. The custody of this important fort should indicate his official status. The fort was entrusted to the charge of Nur Muhammed ‘Arab who also received the title of ‘Arab Khân,‖ about a month and a half after the death of Himmât Khân.

A note on Kajj-Dharur, the alias of Fathabad may not be out of place here: Kajj is situated at a distance of about twelve kilometres on the Dharur-Kallam road. Dharur was then called Kajj-Dharur to distinguish it from another place with the same name, viz. Dharur in the Adilabad district of Andhra Pradesh.

§ Ibid., part i, pp. 339-43.
‖ Ibid., part ii, p. 278.
The next record to be studied here, relates to the mosque built by Himmat Khan. Its tablet is built up into the base of the right minaret of the stone mosque, a building of sufficient architectural interest, which is situated to the immediate west of the Dargah of Niknam Sahib.1 Measuring 46 by 60 cm., it contains a text of two Persian verses inscribed in four lines purporting that the mosque was constructed by Himmat Khan in A.H. 1047 (1637 A.D.), during the reign of Shah Jahan. This means that the mosque must have been constructed before 29th June 1637, the day on which Himmat Khan died.

The style of writing is excellent Nasta’liq, and the text reads as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XV (a)*

(1) در عهد شهنشاه زمان شاهچهان
(2) بنیاد نباد سیدنی همت خان
(3) تاریخ بنای آن بجستم ز خرد
(4) کفتا که بگو بختم خیر آبادان

۱۰۳۴

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the reign of the emperor of the time, Shah Jahan,

(2) Himmat Khan laid the foundation of a mosque.

(3) I sought the date of its construction from Wisdom.

(4) It replied, ‘Say, (it is a) populated good place’. Year (A.H.) 1047 (1637 A.D.).

The sixth inscription of the present study is again an epitaph. The grave to which it belongs lies on another platform, which is to the right of the big platform containing four graves.2 The arch-shaped inscriptive tablet, measuring 43 by 88 cm., contains twelve lines of Persian prose and verse, executed in Nasta’liq characters of the same elegance as in the case of the previous records. The last line of the text is unfortunately very badly damaged, due to the weathering of the stone. As a result, the year of death, which was contained in the chronogram as well as given in figure is lost.

The epitaph purports that the grave is that of Mir Muhammad Hussain Niknam, son of Mir Muhammad Yusuf Niknam ‘Alawi al-Husaini, who expired during his tenure as qal’adär of Mulher and favijdar of Baglana, which was conferred upon him in the reign of Shah Jahan. It will be noted that in this epitaph, the cognomen Niknam is also used with the name of the deceased, which indicates that the sobriquet was intended as a family name.


(b) Epitaph of Mir Muhammad Husain Nikān, same place (p. 51)

(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 1017, from Pandshwarhān (p. 50)
The epitaph is quoted below:

TEXT

Plate XV (b)

(1) اللہ ب اقی من كل نفس
(2) هر کھم آمد در جہان بر زمین
(3) عاقبت میا جاک و ویران منزل
(4) بی بن جاک چون بل
(5) برکت رہ مسی و مشو اپنیا قیم
(6) هویجک را نیست زین منزل گذیر
(7) این لوحة موقت فیص منیر غفران پناہ میر محمد حسن نیکنام واد
(8) میر محمد یوسف نیکنام علیوی الحسینیہ فوات ایشان
(9) در قلع دادی ملیب و فو جدارہ یگلاته ہک
(10) در عبد خلافت شاه جہان پادشاه غازیہ
(11) مترود بود واقع شد تاریک وقت شريف شان
(12) نیکنام[ ]

TRANSLATION

(1) Allāh is Eternal, all else is perishable!
(2) He who is born in this bustling world, has perforce to go to the grave in the end.
(3) This world is like a bridge on the road to the next world; it is a transitory place and a desolate stage.
(4) Do not attach your heart to this bridge, full of dread and fear; prepare provision for the journey and do not make a sojourn here.
(5) No one can escape this stage (i.e. death), whether he be a pauper or king, young or old.
(6) This tablet (is) that of the grave, illuminated with bounty, of the pardoned Mir Muḥammad Ḥusain Nīknām, son of
(7) Mir Muḥammad Yusuf Nīknām ‘Alawī al-Ḥusainī His death

1 One word is redundant here.
(8) took place in the time of (his) qal’adārī of Mulher and fawājdārī of Baglāna which
(9) in the time of the caliphate of Shāh Jahān Bādshāh Ghāzī,
(10) were assigned to him. The date of his noble death
(11) is evident and clear from this hemistich,
(12) ‘Niknām………………….. left this world’. Year………………

From the above, it is perfectly clear that Hirālāl’s statement that Mir Muḥammad who
was a fawājdār and a qal’adār fell in A.H. 1025 along with his father in a battle, is wrong.¹

Mir Muḥammad Ḥusain Niknām initially held the rank of 1000 men, 1000 horse.²
A month and a half after the death of his brother Himmat Khān, he was appointed to the
command of the fort of Zafarnagar.³ In the following year, he was granted an increase in rank
and created an officer of the rank of 1500 men, 1500 horse. It was on the 26th Dhi’l-Qa’da 1056
(24th December 1646), that with a further increase in rank, he was appointed as the governor of
Baglanā.⁴ ‘Abdul-Hamīd has not referred to the charge of Mulher fort being given to Mir
Muḥammad Ḥusain. But our epigraph calls him the fawājdār of Baglāna as well as qal’adār of
Mulher. This shows that the fawājdār of Baglāna was also supposed to hold the charge of the
Mulher fort, which was the headquarters of the region.

Mir Muḥammad Ḥusain, like his brother Himmat Khān, died while in service at the place
of his duty. His dead body was brought to Panchgawhan to be interred near the graves
of his father and brothers. As stated above, the year of his death cannot be ascertained from
the epitaph, but he must have died some time after his assignment to Baglana, in December 1646.

The seventh epigraph, also an epitaph, is engraved on the arch-shaped tablet fixed at
the head-side of the grave situated on a platform in the south-east side in the same Dargāh.⁵ It is difficult to ascertain the name of the occupant of this grave, as the epitaph does not
quote any. According to Hirālāl, another epitaph at the same place records the death of one
‘Ābida Bibi of the Niknām family, of which the date was not clear.⁶ I did not find any
such epitaph there. And even if there existed one, ‘Ābida would most probably not be
her name, but the phrase qualifying for a devout lady, not uncommonly used in epigraphs.
In any case, there is little room for doubt that the grave belongs to a member of the Niknām
family, as is clear from its situation as well as the style of writing of our epitaph.

The tablet on which the epitaph is carved is of almost the same size as in above, but
the engraved text occupies a space of 33 by 30 cm. only. It consists of two lines, the first being a
well known formulae about the everlastingness of Allāh and the second, a hemistich in Persian,
which may be translated as ‘and he (or she) was given place in the highest Paradise’. This
hemistich, in all probability, forms a chronogram for the date of the death of the occupant of
the grave. This would be A.H. 1084 (1673-74 A.D.).

¹ Hirālāl, op. cit.
³ Ibid., p. 278.
⁴ Ibid., vol. II (Calcutta, 1866), pp. 112, 624. Baglana was conquered about a decade earlier by Aurangzeb
who appointed Muhammad Tāhir to the charge of the Mulher fort. The territory of Baglana was bounded on
the north by Nandurbar and Sultanpur, on the south by Nasik, on the west by Surat and on the east by Chandor
( Ibid., pp. 105-09).
⁶ Hirālāl, op. cit.
(b) Epitaph, datced in the reign of Jahangir
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The style of writing is Thulth and fine Nasta’liq. The text reads as under:

TEXT

Plate XVI (a)

(1) اَللَّهُ يَأْتِي وَكُلُّ فَتْنَةٍ
(2) جَالِى وَيِدُ دَرَّ جَنَّتِ الْمَازِيَ شَهِدَ

TRANSLATION

(1) Allāh is Eternal, and everything else is perishable!
(2) The highest Paradise has become his (or her) abode. (A.H. 1084=1673-74 A.D.).

The eighth inscription from Panchgawan, with which I conclude the present study, is the unique record of the Mughal emperor Jahānār Shāh, referred to above in the introductory lines. It forms the epitaph of Bulāq Baig, whose grave is situated to the south of the Dargāh of Niknām Shāhib.¹ It consists of seven lines written in Persian prose and verse inscribed in quite ordinary Nasta’liq, which is in sharp contrast to the elegant style of the previous records. It states that the faujdār Bulāq Baig, a resident of Shāhjahānābād, i.e. Delhi, expired on Thursday, 6th Sha’bān of the first regnal year of Jahānār Shāh, i.e. 1124 (28th August, 1712). The place of which Bulāq Baig was the faujdār is not specified in the text. It was either the village Panchgawan or the pargana in which it lay. It stands to reason to suppose that he was in charge of the pargana. This is also corroborated by a piece of information recorded in the district gazetteer on the basis of old papers, that Mirzā Bulakhibeg, the māmlatdar, built the Jāmi mosque of Dahihanda in the same taluka.² Evidently, Bulakhibeg of the gazetteer is none other than Bulāq Baig.

This epitaph was also noticed by Hirālāl, according to whom, Bulāq Baig (whom he writes as Bulag—perhaps a misprint) was appointed faujdār in the reign of Jahānār Shāh.³ This is incorrect, at least in so far as the epigraph does not categorically say so. It simply refers to his being a faujdār, and he could as well have held the post from the time of the preceding ruler or rulers. Hirālāl was also unable to give the date.

The inscriptive tablet is square in shape, measuring 44 cm. a side, and the text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate XVI (b)

(1) اللَّهُ بَالِكَ
(2) تِلْكَ وَيَدُ جَنَّتِ هُمَّ بِبَاَيْدِ مَرْد
(3) خَوْنُكَ بُنُكَ كُفَّ كُلُّ نَيْكَ بَرْد
(4) يَتَّارِخُ شَهْمُ شُبَائِنِ سَنَةً اِحْدَ اَحْنَادَرَ بَدَاشْاء

¹ ARIK, 1964-65, No. D, 89.
² Brown, op. cit., p. 333. The mosque does not contain any inscription.
³ Hirālāl, op. cit., p. 137.
(5) Bulāq Baig, son of 'Abdu'r-Razzāq Baig, inhabitant of Shāh Jahān-
(6) ābād (i.e. Delhi), who had come (here) as faujdār, departed
(7) from the transitory (abode) to the permanent home, on Thursday, at three pahār.

It will be seen that the execution of the epigraph is quite poor. Also, the word dār is left out after as in the last but one line.

The importance of this record has been already pointed out above. Here we may just mention that the date removes the confusion in the dates of the reign of Jahāndār Shāh. According to Khāfi Khan, Shāh 'Alam Bahādūr I. died in the beginning of A.H. 1123,1 which cannot be correct. Our epigraph corroborates the year A.H. 1124 given by other historians, in that, 6th Sha'bān of A.H. 1124 and not A.H. 1123 was Thursday, and hence Sha'bān of the 1st regnal year must have belonged to A.H. 1124 only.

---

1 Khāfi Khan, Mushāqāb'ul-Lubāē, vol. II (Calcutta, 1874), pp. 683-84.
INScriPtiONS OF THE SIDI CHIEFS OF JANjIRA

By A. A. KADIRI

The fortified island of Janjira, first capital of the erstwhile state of the same name, is situated in the Kolaba district of Maharashtra, at a distance of about sixty-five kilometres due south of Bombay. The island fort which lies just within the entrance of the Danda-Rajpuri creek about 800 metres from the mainland, in the region called north Konkan on the western coast, is remarkable indeed for the engineering skill of its master-builders. Its location made it the most impregnable fort of the region. More than anything else, it enabled the small but powerful principality of the Sids, who held sway in this region from the close of the fifteenth century onwards, to resist successfully the attempts of the Marātha rulers including Shivaji to annex it.

It was Malik Ahmad, the founder of the Nizām Shāhī kingdom of Ahmadnagar, who reduced the fort of Danda-Rajpuri after a long siege of ten months in 1489 and put Janjira, then only fortified by a wooden kot, in charge of a Sidi named Yaqūt Khān. On the fall of Ahmadnagar in 1600, the Nizām Shāhī possessions in Konkan passed to the Mughals, and though soon afterwards Malik 'Ambar recovered most of them, this part still seems to have continued under Mughal authority at least until 1618, according to local records, which mention Allāh (?) Khān and Ibrāhīm Khān as governors of Danda-Rajpuri in 1612 and 1618 respectively. In the last mentioned year, Malik 'Ambar is said to have appointed one Sidi Surūr, as the governor. The latter was succeeded in 1620, by Sidi Yaqūt, and in the following year, by Sidi 'Ambar Sānak. However, according to Mr. B. K. Bhonsle, author of a Marathi history of Janjira State, who claims to have based his account on local records, Sidi 'Ambar was appointed governor in 1617 by, and received the pargana between Bankot and Nagothana, from Murtaza Nizām Shāh II. But it is worthwhile to note that Murtaza II was not alive at that time.

According to a captain of the East India Company who visited Danda-Rajpuri in February 1628, there was dissension there, on account of Ḥabash Khān's appointment as a new governor by Malik 'Ambar. In the following month, Captain Altham visited Danda-Rajpuri and found that Sidi 'Ambar was besieged in the Janjira fort by Ḥabash Khān. But Sidi 'Ambar seems to have maintained his ground, for in 1636, when the Nizām Shāhī Konkan was transferred to 'Adil Shāh, Sidi 'Ambar was confirmed in his post. He was required to maintain a marine for trade and conveying pilgrims to Mecca. He is also stated to have received the title of vazīr.

---

1 For a detailed description of the fort and the history of the Sidi rulers, see Gazetteers of the Bombay Presidency (BG), vol. XI, Kolaba and Janjira (Bombay, 1883), pp. 430-40; Maharashtra State Gazetteers (MSG), Kolaba District (Bombay, 1964), pp. 77-94, 103-05, 808-10; etc.
3 BG, vol. XI, p. 435; MSG, Kolaba District, p. 80 (f. n. 4).
4 Ibid. In these works, the name Surūr is wrongly spelt as Sirul and Surul respectively.
5 Bhonsle, op. cit., pp. 24-25, but on p. 28, he gives the year 1621.
6 D. R. Bānāji, Bombay and the Sids (Bombay, 1932), pp. 1-2. But since Malik 'Ambar had died in 1626, the new governor was perhaps appointed by his son Fath Khān.
7 Ibid.
8 Mirzā Ibrāhīm Zubairī, Barāltu′s-Ṣulṭa (Hyderabad edition), p. 303.
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'Ambar died in 1642 and was succeeded by Sidi Yusuf, who was overthrown in 1648 by his son Sidi Fath Khan. The latter who is, incidentally, stated to be an Afghan by Khafi Khan and following him, by Shah Nawaz Khan, continued to be in charge of Janjira till 1670 when, being pressed by Shivaji, who had taken Danda-Rajpuri and had besieged Janjira, he was ready to hand over the fort to the Marathas. But the Sidi chiefs, Sumbul and the two brothers, Yaqut and Khairiyat, imprisoned him and so heroically defended Janjira that the Marathas were compelled to raise the siege. After Danda-Rajpuri was wrested from the latter, the two brothers elected Sumbul as their chief.4

It is from about this time that we start getting inscriptions of the Sidis at Janjira, Danda-Rajpuri and Khokri.

The sixteen inscriptions studied in the following lines range in their dates between 1676 and 1727-28 and belong to the first three Sidi admirals of the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb and the first independent chief, Sidi Surur alias Yaqut Khan II. They are important records: they provide first hand information about these chiefs, particularly, about the dates in their career and about the members of their families and, also throw light, as will be pointed out in the following lines, on the events which have not been correctly recorded in contemporary chronicles.

Sidi Sumbul

Sidi Sumbul first emerges as a chief of considerable importance, from the beginning of the Marathas-Sidi clash over Janjira in 1659. He refused to cede Janjira fort to Shivaji, consequent to the treaty of Purandar in 1665, concluded between Raja Jai Singh and Shivaji, without express orders from the emperor. He fought on the side of the Mughals in the siege of Bijapur in 1666. He was, as we have seen above, one of the three chiefs who prevented Sidi Fath Khan from surrendering Janjira to Shivaji in 1670 and sought help from the Bijapur king and the Mughal governor of Dacca. The latter conferred on him a rank of 400 men, 200 horse, and a fief near Surat. He was appointed admiral of the Mughal fleet in 1671.

Sumbul constantly engaged the Marathas and in October 1672, he came to Danda-Rajpuri from Surat to assist the garrison at Janjira. He burnt and plundered all of Shivaji’s sea-forts, destroying about 500 of his vessels. This diversion from sea caused the Maratha siege of Janjira to be abandoned. In December of the same year, he anchored at Bombay and finally left for Surat in 1672.

In October 1673, Sumbul again entered Bombay harbour and laid waste the country around Pen and Nagotha, capturing many Maratha trading vessels and ships of war. On his return to Surat in December, he got involved in a quarrel with the governor of Surat over the expenses incurred by him.10

---

1 MSG, Kolaba District, p. 81.
2 Bhonale, op. cit., pp. 33, 33. But according to MSG, Kolaba District, p. 81, he ruled till 1655.
5 Bhonale, op. cit., pp. 34, 39.
7 Khafi Khan, op. cit., p. 225; Shah Nawaz Khan, op. cit., p. 496; Duff, op. cit., p. 202; Sarkar, op. cit., p. 262. According to Banaji, op. cit., p. 15, the Sidis were made Mughal admirals as early as in 1660.
8 Banaji, op. cit., pp. 15-16.
9 Sarkar, op. cit., p. 266; Banaji, op. cit., p. 18.
10 Banaji, op. cit., p. 20.
In March of the next year, he attacked Shivaji's admiral Daulat Khan in the Sattavli river, in Ratnagiri district, but suffered defeat. In April, he landed at Mazgaon much against the wish of the English, and left for Surat in September. His cruise of the Marathah coast in January-February 1675, did not meet with any success, but towards the end of that year, when Shivaji besieged Janjira, Sumbul sailed down the coast to Vengurla, plundered and burnt that town and having come to Janjira, forced Shivaji once again to raise the siege. The Surat Factory records tend to indicate that some time before the 8th October 1675, Sumbul was superseded by Siddi Qasim Yaqut Khan as the Mughal admiral, probably as a result of his quarrel with the governor of Surat mentioned above. But Sumbul did not hand over charge and postponed the transfer of the fleet on one pretext or the other, till April 1676, when both Qasim and Sumbul came to Bombay.

By this time, Sumbul's influence was decidedly on the wane, and he left Bombay for Janjira on the 8th April, 1676, probably to take his family to Surat. It was on his reaching Janjira that he was murdered, as we shall presently see.

I. EPITAPH OF SIDI SUMBUL, FROM JANJIRA

The first of these inscriptions is engraved in relief in Thuluth characters on the headstone of one of the graves on a platform, near the Jami-Masjid in the Janjira fort. The arch-shaped tablet measures 40 cm. in width and 50 cm. in height and contains five lines in Arabic, which register the death of Siddi Sumbul, son of Raihan. He is stated to have died the death of a martyr on Thursday, 9th Safar 1087 (13th April 1766). The date is given both in words and by way of chronogram; the numerical value of the two words forming the chronogram are also written below.

The text reads as under:

**TEXT**

**Plate XVII (a)**

(1) ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ 

(2) ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ 

(3) ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ 

(4) ﷶ ﷶ 

(5) ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ ﷶ 

(6) ﷶ ﷶ 
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---

1 Sarkar, op. cit., p. 267.
2 Banaji, op. cit., p. 21.
3 Sarkar, op. cit., pp. 267-68.
5 Banaji, op. cit., p. 23, avers that it was due to Sumbul's embezzlement of the money belonging to the community.
8 This should be either أَشْهَدَ or أَعْتَشِهْدَ.
TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.
(2) Sīdī Sumbul, (son of) Raiḥān, attained martyrdom on Thursday, 9th
(3) of the month of Saʿfār, (in the) year one thousand and seven and eighty after the Migration
(4) of the Prophet, may the best of salutations and peace be upon him! (9 ʾSaʿfār 1087=13 April 1676).
(5) And its date has come to be (contained in the phrase) ‘He entered (634) paradise (453)’.

The year A.H. 1087 is obtained, as stated above, by adding 634 and 453.

There is no reason to doubt that Sīdī Sumbul of the above record is other than the first Mughal admiral of Janjira. The date of his death is in keeping with the known dates of his career. Particularly, the last date in his career we know is 8th April 1676, on which he left Bombay for Janjira to fetch his family. Nothing definite is known about him after this date. It is, therefore, almost certain that he was put to death on his arrival at Janjira. Moreover, the other graves on the same platform are those of the wife and children of Sumbul’s successor Yāqūt Khān I. This also points to the fact that the grave in question is that of this Sumbul, particularly when we remember that none but the members of the family of the Sīdī chiefs Yāqūt Khān I and Yāqūt Khān II is found buried inside the fort. All these facts prove that Sumbul of the present epitaph is none other than the famous Mughal admiral.

This record is thus an important document, as it helps us to dispel the mist of confusion about Sumbul, partly created by English records. Firstly, the text has preserved the correct name of this chief, which is variously spelt as Somboolee, Sambhole, Sambholi, Sumbhol, Sambbul and Sambal in English and Marathi writings.

Secondly, it furnishes the exact date of his death, and thereby, the year of the taking over by his successor, which is generally believed to be 1677. Thirdly, it proves as totally baseless, the generally accepted fact that not only Sumbul lived after 1676, but he went over to the Marathās in 1677 and worked as commander of their fleet until 1682. Incidentally, the fact that Sumbul was already succeeded by Qāsim to the command of the Mughal fleet before June 1676, is clearly proved by a letter from Surat to Bombay. Fourthly, we get only from this epigraph, the name of his father, which none of the chroniclers seems to have recorded. Then, the statement of Duff and Sir Jadu Nāth Sarkār that from 1670 onwards, the general title of Yāqūt Khān was conferred on successive Sīdī admirals is negativated by our record, which does not use this title. The very fact that Sīdī Surūr who succeeded Qāsim Yāqūt Khān is mentioned as Yāqūt Khān II in his inscriptions (pp. 74-75 infra), also shows that Qāsim and not Sumbul was the first to receive the title.

Sīdī Khāriyāt

Khāriyāt Khān, the next Sīdī chief, was one of the leaders of the revolt of 1670, as stated above. He had become the governor of the land dominions of the Janjira region, early in 1671,

1 The only other platform containing graves inside the fort is near the Ḥujra. It contains the mortal remains of the children of Yāqūt Khān I (see pp. 64, 65, 66, 67, infra).
2 Sarkār, op. cit., pp. 268-69; MSC, Kolaba District, pp. 85, 87.
3 Pārsamis and others, op. cit., p. 91. Sīdī Qāsim’s command of the fleet in July 1676 is also proved by Bānājī, op. cit., p. 24.
with a rank of 200 men, 100 horse. According to Bhonsle, he was made a subedar as early as 1659, and it was he who commanded the Siddis against Shâmrâj Pant in that year and defeated him and also defeated the fresh body of troops which Shivâji had sent under Raghunâth Pant. But he has not quoted any evidence.

Sidi Khairiyat along with Sidi Qâsim captured Danda-Rajpuri which was taken as early as in 1661 by Shivâji, who for the next nine years was striving in vain to capture Janjira itself, and killed Raghunâth Ballâl, the Marâthâ commandant. In reward for this achievements, both the title of Khan and increase in rank. Khairiyat Khan tenaciously defended his charge of received Danda-Rajpuri which Shivâji tried to wrest from him till the death of the latter in 1680 and also foiled the attempts of his successor Sambhâji to take Janjira. On the 28th August 1682 (5th Ramâdân 1093), robes of honour were sent through Bahramand Khan to Sidi Khairiyat and Sidi Yâqût by Aurangzeb for meritorious service. By 1690, Khairiyat completely recovered the possessions lost to the Marâthas in 1659. According to Bhonsle, under order of the Mughal emperor, Khairiyat went with his army to reinforce the siege of Sinhgarh and conquered the fort, and was rewarded with the title of Khân-i-‘Alî Shân. Khairiyat Khan died in 1696 at Raigarh, and his body was brought to Khokri and interred in the tomb constructed by himself. In view of the date of his death, which is explicitly given in the record under study, it is clear that the attribution to him, of the conquest of Anjanvel which took place in 1699, is wrong.

II. EPITAPH OF KHAIIRIYAT KHÂN, FROM KHOKRI

The second inscription of the group is chronologically a little later than the following ones, but it is studied here, as it refers to Khairiyat Khan, who was, as we have just seen above, the next chief.

The slab measuring 82 by 40 cm., is fixed over the door of his tomb, situated at Khokri, about two kilometres from Danda-Rajpuri. It contains four lines of writing in Arabic, recording that Khairiyat Khan expired on Thursday, 7th Rabî‘ I 1108 (24th September 1696). The letters, particularly in the first line, are damaged due to the weathering of the stone. The style of writing is Thulût of quite a pleasing type. It will be observed that a curious mistake occurs in the fourth line of the text: the positions of the second and the third digits of the year are interchanged. The correct date is given in words.

---

1 Sarkâr, op. cit., p. 262; MSG Kolaba-District, p. 85; Khâfi Khan, op. cit., p. 225.
2 Bhonsle, op. cit., pp. 35, 37. Sarkâr, op. cit., p. 257 and MSG, Kolaba District, p. 82, do not associate Khairiyat Khan at all with these engagements.
4 Khâfi Khan, op. cit., p. 228; MSG, Kolaba district, p. 86.
5 Khâfi Khan, op. cit. p. 266, but on p. 268, Sidi Qâsim is stated to be the governor of Danda-Rajpuri.
6 Sâîl Mustâ‘îd; Khân, Ma‘âîsîr-i-Âlamgîrî (Calcutta, 1871), p. 221.
7 Duff, op. cit., p. 309; Bhonsle, op. cit., p. 54.
8 Bhonsle, op. cit., p. 56.
9 MSG, Ratnagiri District (Bombay, 1962), p. 735. Incidentally, MSG, Kolaba District, p. 94, tends to suggest that Anjanvel was conquered about a decade earlier.

---

The text of the epitaph has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate XVII (b)

(1) بسم الله الرحمن [الرحيم]

(2) الحمد لله وحده وذ للإله وحده وبد من

[نَمَدَّهُ الاَوْلِيَاءِ]

(3) سنة ثمانية وعشر من الهجرة النبوية أفضل الصلاة والسلام على صاحبها

(4) سنة 1018

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allâh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) Praise be to Allâh who is the One! Khâ'iriyat Khân, may Allâh have mercy on him, passed away on Thursday, the 7th of Rabî‘ul-Awwal.

(3) (in the) year eight and one hundred and one thousand, from the Migration of the Prophet, may the best benedictions and salutations be on him!

(4) Year (A.H.) 1018 (recte 1108) (7 Rabî‘I 1108 = 24 September 1696).

Sidi Yaqút Khan I

Khâ'iriyat Khân was succeeded by his brother Sidi Qâsim entitled Yaqút Khân, as the governor of the land dominions as well.

The next eight inscriptions in this study refer to Yaqút Khân I and different members of his family. Their importance as an important source cannot be overstressed, since they constitute the only records which furnish any information about the family of this great Sidi chief, who himself does find mention in the chronicles of the period, particularly the English Factory Records. Of these epigraphs, those except Nos. IV and IX form the epitaphs of his wife, sons and daughters respectively; the wife, according to her epitaph, had predeceased him, while the two sons and three daughters had survived him. It is only these inscriptions which have preserved the names of these members of the family of the Sidi admiral.

Yaqút Khân, whose original name was Qâsim, was distinguished in his community for bravery, capacity and cunning. In 1670, he received the rank of 300 men, 100 horse and was made the governor of Janjira in 1671, as already seen above. The so-called conferment of the title Yaqút Khân on the successive Sidi admirals by the Mughal emperor, has already been commented upon in the preceding lines and need not be repeated here. But it may be noted here that his name Qâsim, used in the Factory records, does not appear in the Persian sources nor in any of the inscriptions studied here. Khâ'f Khân merely calls him Sidi Yaqút.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) This is engraver's mistake for 1108, as stated above.

\(^2\) Sarkâr, op. cit., p. 263.

\(^3\) Khâ'f Khân, op. cit., p. 228.
INSCRIPTIONS FROM JANJIRA

(Plates XVI—XXII)

(a) Epitaph of Sidi Sumbul, A.H. 1087, Janjira (p. 57)

(b) Epitaph of Sidi Khairiyat Khan, A.H. 1018 (sic.), Khokri (p. 60)
In 1671, Yaqūt Khān received the title with an increase in rank consequent upon the conquest of Danda-Rajpuri. About October 1675, he was appointed to succeed Sumbul as the admiral of the Mughal fleet. The latter was reluctant to hand over, and it was only on his murder in April 1676, that Qasim Yaqūt Khān took over command of the fleet. In the same year, Moro Pant, Peshwa of Shivaji, besieged Janjira and prepared floating platforms, to escalade the walls, but Yaqūt Khān appeared with his fleet, broke the line of investment, burnt the floating platforms and forced the Maratshas to raise the siege in December 1676.

Towards the end of November 1679, Yaqūt Khān joined the British off Khanderi and directed a cannonade on the Maratshas for some days. But as the Maratshas could not be dislodged from that island, he fortified another island opposite it named Underi, in January 1680, much to the consternation of the English and made it his base. On 26th January, Daulat Khān, the Maratshā admiral, attacked the Sidi base at Underi, but sustained defeat with the loss of four warships, several vessels and five hundred men. The English, who were not reconciled to his possession of Underi, entered into an agreement with Shivaji not to allow Yaqūt Khān to winter at Bombay, whereupon the latter entered the harbour with his whole fleet on 27th February 1680, landed on the south shore, burnt some villages and captured many men. He again molested the English at Bombay in May 1680. About three months later, a party of Maratshas landed in the dark at Khanderi, but Yaqūt Khān, receiving intelligence, hastened to the island and captured or killed majority of them. He stayed at Bombay till the end of December 1680. Sometime in the beginning of 1681, he went to Surat and on some pretext, seized the goods of the East India Company, maltreated their servants and besieged the Factory, leaving for the English no alternative but to bribe him to the tune of Rupees 30,000. Later on, he captured some Maratshā subjects as prisoners from the shores of Bombay. In 1682, he defeated the Maratshā fleet under Sidi Migri, a near relation of Sidi Sumbul, who was made a prisoner, and captured or sunk many Maratshā vessels. Early 1683, he again in molested the English at Bombay, and left that place in October only.

Yaqūt Khān again appeared at Bombay in April 1684, but not getting permission to anchor, went to Underi. He must have repaired to Danda-Rajpuri some time after this, for in February 1686, we find him leaving Danda-Rajpuri to capture the fort of Kalyan, which he besieged. He had to raise the siege after two days to go in pursuit of Prince Akbar. He invaded Bombay under Aurangzeb’s orders and had almost conquered the island in 1689-90. In 1699, he captured Gualkot and requested the English to help him to carry a big gun to Janjira.

It was Yaqūt Khān who took up the work of the reconstruction of the Janjira fort, shattered by the Maratshas in 1682, under the supervision of his governor Sidi Surūr, in 1700, as recorded in inscription No. XI. According to Bhonsle, he sent parties to plunder the Maratshā country to provide funds for this expenditure, but on account of the representation from the Maratshās, he was sent for by the emperor, who on being apprised of the correct position, bestowed on him the title of Khān-i-Amārat-Nishān.

Yaqūt Khān died on the 30th Jumādā II 1118 (28th September 1706), according to the epitaph on his tomb. This epitaph is non-extant now, in the sense that the letters on the tablet have completely flaked off due to weathering. Fortunately, Prof. B. D. Verma of Poona had

1 Khāt Khān, op. cit.
3 Bānāji, op. cit., pp. 31, 32, 33, 35.
4 Bānāji, op. cit., pp. 37, 38, 39, 40, 53, 57; Bhonsle, op. cit., p. 39.
5 Bhonsle, op. cit., p. 58, places it in 1701.
6 Ibid., pp. 59, 60.
7 Ibid., p. 61.
prepared its impression quite some time back. In view of this, the statement that he died in 1707 is wrong.¹

III. EPITAPH OF YĀQŪT KHĀN’S WIFE

The earliest of the eight inscriptions, referring to Yāqūt Khān and his family, is the epitaph of his wife Sittī Zuhra. Engraved on an arch-shaped tablet, measuring 40 by 65 cm., fixed at the head of another grave on the above-mentioned platform near the Jāmi’-Masjid in the Janjira Fort,² it contains nine lines of Arabic text carved in Thulūh letters of a tolerably good type. It purports that Sittī Zuhra, wife of Yāqūt Khān, passed away on the night of Friday, 18th Šafar 1098 (24th December 1686).

The text has been read as under:—

TEXT

Plate XVIII (a)

(1) Bism Allah al-Rahmān al-Rahīm
(2) al-Hammah ṭālwa wa’dhama amma ba’da ṭafqāt
(3) min dar al-fnay ala dar al-bnay muqbalu ‘alá rdbah
(4) al-kafur al-a‘la al-marahmah al-marjūzah sūrí zurhū
(5) zujah yāqūtixan ‘ilma al-jam‘ah thamāni‘a ‘ashr khānu fan
(6) shahr sa‘īr panī‘ah wa ta‘sun ba’da al-‘ashr min al-hijra
(7) zul‘wiyah ‘alá sāhiba ‘afzul al-sulwah wa sālim rhamah
(8) al-lah rhamah al-‘abr w iṣkanah fi qitnāh wth al-xjarah

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.
(2) Praise be to God, who is the One! To come to the point: Passed away
(3) from the transitory abode to the everlasting abode, received (into His proximity) by her Nourisher (who is)
(4) the Pardoner, the creature who is shown mercy, the recompensed, Sittī Zuhra,
(5) wife of Yāqūt Khān, in the night of Friday, the 18th of the
(6) month of Šafar, year eight and ninety above one thousand, after the Migration
(7) of the Prophet, may the best of benedictions and salutations be upon him! May Allah

¹ MGR, Kolaba District, p. 94.
² ARBE, 1959-60, No. D, 144.
(8) have on her mercy, like unto the pious ones and give her abode in His Paradise, along with the righteous ones!

(9) Year (A.H.) 1098 (18 Safar 1098-24 December 1686).

The epigraph, so far as I know, is the only document which quotes the name of the wife of Yaqūt Khān I and the date of her death.

It is also important in that it corroborates the fact that the title Yaqūt Khān was conferred on Sidi Qāsim, during the lifetime of Khairiyat Khān whose death occurred a decade after the date of this epigraph.

IV. INSCRIPTION OF THE PALACE OF YAQŪT KHĀN

The slab bearing the second inscription of Yaqūt Khān I and fourth of the group is fixed on the gate of the ruined palace called Hāthi-Mahal, at Rajpuri on the mainland. It measures 1.82 m. by 32 cm. and contains two lines. The first is in Arabic comprising Bismi'llah, which is inscribed in Nashk characters. The second line contains two verses in Persian, written in Nasta'liq, recording, in a chronogram, the construction of the house (i.e. palace) of Yaqūt Khān in 1692-93. The name of the composer reads like Mahdawi. The date is also inscribed in figure.

The record is quite important, as it provides a concrete proof of the fact that by 1692, the Sidis felt completely secure against the danger of the Marāthā attack and were in such a strong position that they could not resist the temptation of building a palace on the site of the ruined fort of Danda-Rajpuri, which was, we are told, destroyed by accidental explosion of the powder magazine in 1671, when the Sidis took the place from the Marāthās.²

The text which is damaged in some places, has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate XVIII (c)

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(2) [ش]د بناي خانه ياقوت خان در زمان اسد از فضل خدا

ياقت اين را مهدوي(؟) ز الهام غيب سال تاريخ پنا بيت السخا

1103

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) The house (i.e. palace) of Yaqūt Khān was constructed at the most auspicious time, through the bounty of God.

Through the inspiration from the Unseen, Mahdawi found the year and date of construction in (the words) 'the house of generosity'. (A.H.) 1104 (1692-93 A.D.).

The chronogram contained in the last phrase works out to A.H. 1104, also given in figure.

² Sarkār, op. cit., p. 262.
V. EPITAPH OF Yaqût Khân’s Son

The fifth record of the article is the epitaph of one of the sons of Yaqût Khân. The arch-shaped tablet measuring 40 by 40 cm. appears as the headstone of one of the graves on a platform, near the building locally called Hujra in the Janjira fort.\(^1\) Comprising eight lines in Arabic, inscribed in fairly exquisite Thulth, the epitaph records Monday, 21st Shawwāl 1120 (23rd December 1708), as the date of the demise of Sidi Ishaq, son of Yaqût Khân. The 21st Shawwāl, it may be pointed out fell on Thursday and not on Monday.

The text has been read as under:

\begin{center}
\textbf{TEXT}
\end{center}

\textit{Plate XVIII (c)}

(1) Bism Allah al-Rahman al-Rahim
(2) al-Hamdu lillâh wa ashârî yâd al-'Ilnâ
(3) dar al-fânâ' ala dar al-fânâ' mina râbi' al-âshqâf
(4) al-murâhin al-musawwim wa al-sâhib al-dâkhân wa yâqût al-âshqâf
(5) 'ish'ir wa 'ish'ir tuwâwash min shahr 'ish'ir wa ghâlib wa ma'iyya
(6) bi'd al-lâmi' min al-'ahdâ al-dâkhân fî al-fâlq wa al-salam
(7) wa al-salâm al-tâj al-Âlî al-Ârâf wa aš'ârâf fi al-jâhîn wa al-Âlî
(8) al-sâhî fî al-fâlq al-Âlî fî al-jâhîn

\textbf{TRANSLATION}

(1) In the name of Allâh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) Praise be to Allâh who is the One! To come to the point: Passed away

(3) from the temporary abode to the everlasting one (and) accepted by his pardoning Nourisher,

(4) the deceased, the innocent, Sidi Ishaq, son of Yaqût Khân, on Monday,

(5) 21st of the month of Shawwâl, year twenty and one hundred and one thousand

(6) after the Migration of the Prophet, may the best of benedictions and salutation

(7) be on him! May Allâh have mercy on him as in the case of the pious ones and provide him place in Paradise along with the righteous ones!

(8) Year (A.H.) 1120 (21 Shawwâl 1120-23 December 1708; which was Thursday).

\(^1\) ARIE, 1961-62, No. D, 148. The other graves belong to other members of Yaqût Khân’s family, as will be seen from the following lines.
(a) Epitaph of Yaqut Khan's wife, Janjira (p. 63)

(b) Epitaph of his son, same place (p. 64)

(c) Inscription from his palace, A.H. 1104, Rajpuri (p. 63)
Nothing is known about Ishāq's career from any source. His very existence would have remained unknown but for this epigraph. Bhonsle wrongly puts his death as well as that of his brother (see p. 67 infra) in the lifetime of Yāqūt Khān himself.¹

VI. EPITAPH OF YĀQŪT KHĀN'S DAUGHTER

The sixth record to be studied in this article and fourth pertaining to the family of Yāqūt Khān I, is engraved on the headstone of another grave on the same platform, near the Hujra.² The slightly weathered arch-shaped tablet, measuring 40 by 65 cm., is inscribed with eight-line Arabic text, in Nashā character in relief. According to it, the death of Sittī Zainab, daughter of Yāqūt Khān, occurred on Friday, 30th Shawwāl 1120 (31st December 1708). It may be pointed out that Zainab expired within ten days of the death of her brother Ishāq.

The epitaph reads as follows:—

TEXT

Plate XIX (a)

(1) Bism Allāh ar-Rahmān ar-Rahīm
(2) Allāhumma ṣallīma wa ṣallīma ala man nāfis
(3) ilā dār al-ḥabīb tālīmulla ala dhī al-ṣināwa
(4) al-mutawwaṣṣatī zainab bint yaqut khān yūm al-jummā thulūn
(5) hilm allāh min shahr shawāl sanā' al-khidam wa mara'ā bi'l-wlād
(6) min al-hijra al-nabīya faṣl al-ṣalāla wa al-salam ala mishāhīrah
(7) rahma allāh rahma al-ʿabrā wa iskenīfī al-jinnah al-akhīf
(8) sanā' 1120

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.
(2) Praise be to Allāh, who is the One! To come to the point: Passed away from the abode
(3) of transitoriness to the everlasting abode (and) accepted before her pardoning Nourisher, the deceased,
(4) the innocent, Sittī Zainab, daughter of Yāqūt Khān, on Friday, 30th of
(5) the month of Shawwāl, year twenty and one hundred and one thousand
(6) after the Migration of the Prophet, may the best of benedictions and salutations be upon him!

¹ Bhonsle, op. cit., p. 61.
(7) May Allāh have mercy on her along with the pious ones and provide an abode for her in Paradise in the company of the righteous ones!

(8) Year A.H. 1120 (30 Shawwāl 1120=31 December 1708).

VII. EPITAPH OF ANOTHER DAUGHTER OF YĀQŪT KHĀN

The next inscription of the group and fifth mentioning Yāqūt Khān I, is engraved on the arch-shaped headstone of a third grave on the same platform, measuring 42 by 53 cm. It comprises eight lines of Arabic writing which purports that Sitti Kulthūma, daughter of Yāqūt Khān, died on the night of Friday, 13th of Jumādā I 1126 (16th May 1714). Here also, 13th Jumādā I of this year fell on Sunday and not on Friday. The style of writing is Nasīḥa of a fairly odd type.

The text has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate XIX (b)

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(2) الحمد لله وحده إما بعد فقد إنقلت من دار القباء

(3) إلى دار الفناء مقبلة على ربه (كذا) الغفور الرحيم المسومة

(4) إلى كلاهما ينافتون ليلة الجماعة ثلاثة عشر

(5) خلوا من شهر جمادى الأول سنة 1126 وعشرين وعشرين وعشر

(6) من الهجرة النبوية أفضل الصلاة و السلام على صاحبها

(7) رحمها الله رحمة الأبرار و إسكنها في الجنة مع الآخيار

(8) سنة 1126

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) Praise be to Allāh who is the One! To come to the point: Passed away from the temporary abode

(3) to the everlasting abode (and) was accepted before her pardoning Nourisher, the deceased innocent,

(4) Sitti Kulthūma, daughter of Yāqūt Khān, on the night of Friday, the 13th

(5) of the month of Jumādā I, year 1126, twenty-six and one thousand and one hundred

(6) after the Migration of the Prophet, may the best of benedictions and salutations be on him!

(7) May Allāh have mercy on her along with the pious ones and provide an abode for her in Paradise in the company of the righteous ones!

(8) Year (A. H.) 1126 (Friday, 13 Jumādā I 1126=16 May 1714).

13th Jumādā I of this year was Saturday-Sunday.

VIII. EPITAPH OF ANOTHER SON OF YĀQŪT KHĀN

The eighth inscription of this study and sixth of Yāqūt Khān's family, belongs to the fourth grave on the platform near the Ḥujra.¹ The arch-shaped headstone measures 42 by 62 cm. and contains an eight-line text in Arabic, carved in relief in Nasṭārīh characters, recording Thursday, 10th Jumādā II 1127 (2nd June 1715) as the date of the death of Sīdī ‘Abdu’l-Ghafūr, son of Yāqūt Khān. It will be noted that ‘Abdu’l-Ghafūr had not predeceased Yāqūt Khān as stated by Bhonsale.²

The text has been read as follows:—

TEXT

Plate XX (b)

(1) Bism Allāh al-Rahmān al-Rahīm

(2) al-hamdu lillāh wa-hadīd āma bayd fard al-ʿānāl min da'ad

(3) al-faqrāni lā dar al-faqrāni mubtala al-riyād al-fawwar al-ḥaram

(4) al-musūm sīdī Abī al-fawwar Abī Yaḥyā al-ḥayyī al-ḥayyī al-ʿĀshūr

(5) al-khulūn min sharīr jamādī al-ʿāshīh saʿīda wa ʿasīra wa maʿā wa bayd

(6) al-alf mīn al-hijrāt al-nabīya afḍal al-ṣalāh wa al-salām al-qāmi al-khāṣṣa

(7) waḥdah Allāh rahmah al-ʿādār wa ākamūna fi al-jannat bi al-akhīrān

(8) Shara 1127

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) Praise be to Allāh who is the One! To come to the point: Passed away from the abode

(3) of transitoriness to the everlasting abode (and) accepted before his pardoning Nourisher, the deceased,

(4) the innocent, Sīdī ‘Abdu’l-Ghafūr, son of Yāqūt Khān, on Thursday, the 10th

(5) of the month of Jumādā II, year seven and twenty and one hundred after

(6) one thousand, from the Migration of the Prophet, may the best of benedictions and salutations be on him!

² Bhonsale, op. cit., p. 61.
IX. EPIGRAPH ON A MOSQUE AT KHOKRI

This epigraph, the seventh to mention a family member of Yāqūt Khān, appears over the central mihrāb of the mosque, near the Sidi tombs in Khokri, near Rajpuri. The first of its five-line text, is devoted to Bismi’llāh and is executed in Naskh characters, the next three contain a Persian fragment, carved in Nasta’liq characters, and the last line records the year. It states that the mosque was built by Ḥabībā Bibi, daughter of the deceased Yaqūt Khān, a brave man who strove in the path of Allāh. The date, contained in a chronogram composed by one Tuḥfa and yielding A.H. 1134 (1721-22 A.D.), is also given in figure. There is nothing particular about the style of writing.

The text, engraved on a tablet measuring 64 by 12 cm., is quoted below:—

TEXT

Plate XX (a)

(1) Bismi Allāh arham alrahim

(2) Masjid e karzeh bana bahr e salwa

(3) Qabil e daulat ho azaализ baid mard bad az habib bibi

(4) Kafir naqsh e tairah tawaf e qul

(5) 1134

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) This mosque was built for offering prayers — and the pillar of religion has acquired elevation through it — by

(3) the daughter of Yaqūt Khān the brave, who strove in the path of Allāh and was taken into His mercy.

(4) Wisdom conveyed to Tuḥfa, the date of its completion (in the words) ‘this best of place is (built) by Ḥabība Bibi’.

(5) Year (A.H.) 1134 (1721-22 A.D.).

X. EPITAPH OF A THIRD DAUGHTER OF YAQŪT KHĀN

The tenth record of this article and the eighth inscription referring to Yaqūt Khān, is the epitaph of the above-mentioned Ḥabība Bibi. One of the sarcophagi in the tomb of Yaqūt Khān situated at Khokri, contains the remains of this lady, according to the inscription of seven

(c) Inscription of a mosque built by another daughter of Yaqūt Khān, Khokhr (p. 63)

(d) Epitaph of another son of Yaqūt

Khokhr, Janjira (p. 67)
lines in Arabic prose and Persian verse engraved on its top. It records A.H. 1141 (1728 A.D.) as the date of the death of Sittī Ḥabība, daughter of the late Yāqūt Khān. The date is given in figure only.

The style of writing of the Arabic text is Nasḵh and of the Persian, Nasta’līq.

The text which occupies a writing space of 17 by 77 cm., has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XXII (b)*

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(2) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله
(3) سَتَي حبيبَه دخْتَر جَنَّت مَكَّان يَافوْنَخَان
(4) شَرْبُت مَرْكِي بِخُورَد و كَرَدَهْ حَتِي تَسْلِيمَجَان
(5) وقت رَحلَت جَوْن رَسِيد و هَاتَفَّ شَفَاءٌ دَاذَ
(6) جَنَّت الفَرْدوس رَأ ز بَهْر أو برَ گل کَشَهُ
(7) سنة 1141 هجري

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.
(2) There is no god but Allāh, Muḥammad is the Prophet of Allāh.
(3) Sittī Ḥabība, daughter of Yāqūt Khān, the dweller in Paradise,
(4) tasted the syrup of death and submitted her soul to the Lord.
(5) When the time of her departure came, the invisible angel called out to her (and)
(6) opened the highest paradise, full of flowers, for her.
(7) Year (A.H.) 1141 (1728-29 A.D.)

**Sidi Surur**

The next five inscriptions contain the name of Sīdī Surūr, the first chief after whom the Janjira a principality became hereditary. He was one of the ablest Sīdī commandants of Yāqūt Khān I, who according to Bhonsle, ravaged the Marāṭhā country and exacted tribute from Mudkhhora, sometime after 1701, to meet the cost of extensive repairs being carried out to the Janjira fort. On the death of Yāqūt Khān, in 1706, Surūr who was at the time in command of the island-fort of Pādmadurg near Jānjira, was unanimously elected as the Sīdī chief. He adopted the title of Yāqūt Khān II. It was during his regime that Bālājī Vīshvānāth and Kanhī Angrey attacked

---

3. *MSG*, Kolaba District, p. 94.
Janjira in 1714 and forced the Sídís to surrender eleven forts.¹ In about 1731, Janjira was attacked by Chimáji Appá, but he had to retreat. Surūr was not only able to defend his possessions, but also to take the offensive resulting in much loss to the adjoining Maráthá territories. Being wary of constant warfare, he adopted a policy of compromise and ceded to the Pëghwá, half of Rajpúri, Tala, Ghosalá, Nizampur, Goregaon, Birwádi and half of Govele. Two years later, he succeeded in beating off an attempt to capture Janjira fort by Angrey and the Pëghwá, who had entered into a secret treaty with the Sídí chief’s best officer Ya’qúb Khán.² Surūr died in 1734 and was buried in the grand mausoleum, built during his own life-time, at Khokri. It is a pity that the inscripational slab over the entrance of his tomb was removed in recent times by some one for unknown reasons.

XI. INSCRIPTION FROM THE JANJIRA FORT

This inscription, eleventh of the present study, was set up when Surūr was yet subordinate to Yaqút Khán. The epigraphical tablet measures 60 by 75 cm. and is fixed on the inner side of the right bastion of the imposing main entrance of the Janjira fort.³ It is inscribed with three Persian couplets carved in six panels in fairly good Nastás’Liq style. The poetry of the epigraph is quite mediocre. The text records that the two hulmuk-bastions⁴ were built by Sídí Surūr in the year A. H. 1111 (1699-1700 A. D.), afforded by a chronogram. It may be noted that the date must be that of the commencement of the construction, since according to the other inscription on the opposite side, which is studied next, the two bastions are stated to have been completed five years later.

The text has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate XXI (b)

(1) Ya Allâh! Fasal tu Shd ab Nbi Khair al-`anam
(2) Birkht xatim lbi Sidi Surûr yash Madam
(3) Nîk tami dh Janan yibiat usul shd `azhar
(4) hdul hal makr ber jad seer ina Sidi Surûr
(5) yakmakal usl tu fula jaz ber jazhir seer sour
(6) an bana berj ra tariq keshtha `az `azhar

TRANSLATION

(1) O Allâh! Thy grace was bestowed on the Prophet, the best of mankind.
(2) May Sídî Surūr live for ever, through the blessings of the last of the Prophets!
(3) His fame became manifest in the world through his lofty fortune.

¹ MSG, Kolaba District, p. 97; Bhosale, op. cit., p. 61.
² MSG, Kolaba District, p. 102.
⁴ Hulmuk means a sort of protecting bastion in front of the main gateway of a fort. For details and some interesting literary references, please see Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement, 1953 & 1956, p. 76.
(a) Epitaph of Hulma, daughter of Yajûj Khan II, from Janjira (p. 79)

(b) Inscription on a bastion of the main entrance, Janjira Fort (p. 70)
(a) Epigraph on another bastion of the main entrance,
Janjira Fort (p. 71)

(b) Epitaph of Yaqūt
Khān's daughter,
Khokri (p. 69)

(c) Inscription from the Anjanvel Fort, now in the
Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay (p. 73)
(4) Both the *hulmuk*-bastions were constructed by Sidi Surūr.

(5) You have illuminated the fort of Jazīra (i.e. Janjira), by the perfection of your wisdom.

(6) Hence, the date for the foundation is contained in the word ‘manifestation’!

The numerical value of the last word adds up to A. H. 1111 (1699-1700 A. D.)

This is an important record furnishing valuable information about the history of the construction of, or repairs carried out, to the fort of Janjira. It will be observed that the name of the place is spelt as *Jazīra*, the Arabic word for island, of which Janjira is said to be the corruption. Also, the epigraph settles once for all the correct spelling of the name of this Sidi chief, which like that of one of his predecessors Sidi Sumbul is written by some as Surūl and even Rasūl.1

XII. ANOTHER EPIGRAPH FROM THE JANJIRA FORT

The record on the opposite wall, though dated five years later, is, in a way, continuation of the preceding record.2 Engraved in relief on a slab measuring 87 by 60 cm., it consists of five lines in Persian, and the style of writing is *Nasta‘liq* of a fairly high order. It runs to the effect that the two bastions which flank the main gate, were completed through the efforts of Sidi Surūr, on the 17th of Dhi’l-Qa‘da 1116 (2nd March 1705). In other words, it took five years to complete the construction.

The text is read as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XXII (a)*

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(2) بِنِعَامَاتِ دَاوُدٍ ذَوِّ الْجَلَالِ وَتَوْنَافِقَاتِ بَارِيِّهِ لَا يُزَالُ بِنِيَادِ أَبِي أَبَادِ
(3) اِنْ هَرَّبَ دَوَشَ بَيْعَادٍ بِحَسْنٍ ثُقَالَتِهِمْ لَمْ تَمْسَدَ سِيرَةِ سَوُرَ بَشْامَ دَالَّارِ
(4) دِرَّ مَا ذَكَّرَ تَارِيْخَ هَنِذَا يْمَهُمْ سَنَةٌ ۱۱۱۶ اَنْ هِجَرَتِ صَفْوُهُ صَبوُهُ
(5) عِلْيَهُ وَآَلِهِ وَسَلِمِ صَوُرتُ سَرَانِجَ وَضَيْسِنِّ نَظَامٍ دِرِيَاسَت

**TRANSLATION**

1. In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

2. Through the kindness of the Glorious Judge and guidance of the Eternal Audience-Hall, the everlasting foundation of

3. Both of these strong bastions, through the good intention and sublime magnanimity of the pivot of government, Sidi Surūr, the brave,

4. On the 17th of the month of Dhi’l-Qa‘da, year 1116 from the noble Migration of the Prophet,

---

(5) may the peace and salutations of Allah be upon him and his progeny, attained the shape of completion and grace of foundation (17 Dhi’l-Qa’dah 1116-2 March 1705).

XIII. INSCRIPTION FROM THE ANJANVEL FORT

This record is unfortunately fragmentary and the name of the ruling chief is lost, except the first letter S, evidently of the word Sidi, in the second hemistich. But there is no doubt that it belongs to Sidi Surur, as the missing name can only be read as Sidi Surur to rhyme with the first hemistich.

Its loose epigraphical tablet, originally fixed on the wall of the Anjanvel fort in the Ratnagiri district, was long back removed to the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. Now measuring 85 by 55 cm., it has lost some portion on the left and contains a five-line text in Persian prose and verse, inscribed in ordinary Nastaliq characters, recording that in the time of the Chief (Sidi Surur), the strong and matchless fort (of Anjanvel) was constructed by Sidi Sa’id, the qa’tadār. It is dated the 10th of Dhi’l-Hijja 1119 (21st February 1708), in the first regnal year. This regnal year must refer to the reign of the Mughal emperor Shāh ‘Alam I (1707-12) and not of Surur, who had succeeded to the chiefship more than a year ago, and moreover, in another record from Janjira (p. 74), Shāh ‘Alam’s suzerainty is clearly acknowledged.

In the gazetteer of Ratnagiri district where a corrupt translation of this record is given, Anjanvel fort is stated to have been attacked and captured in 1699, by Khairiyat Khān, while in the revised edition of the Kolaba district gazetteer, it is asserted that Anjanvel was given by the Mughal emperor to Sidi Qāsim in 1689, in reward for help rendered in the capture of Raygad. These statements are somewhat confusing. Khairiyat Khān died in 1696 (see p. 60, eṣtepre) and was succeeded by his brother Sidi Qāsim Yaqūt Khān I as the governor of Danda-Rajpuri. It was actually the latter who captured the fort of Anjanvel, soon after the death of his brother. He also took another fort nearby, called Govalkot in 1701. Sidi Qāsim died in 1706 and was succeeded by Sidi Surur alias Yaqūt Khān II, who had seven governors under him. One of them was Sidi Sa’d, the builder of the fort mentioned in the record, who held charge of the fort of Govalkot and Anjanvel.

The record is quite important. It gives the correct spelling of the name of Sidi Sa’d, who is called Sidi Sat or Saat by the modern writers. Sād was a competent officer. For some personal reasons, he attacked the shrine of Parshuram, near Chipilun, in February 1727. As a result, Bākājī Nāyak, a subordinate of the Angreys, laid siege in 1732 to Anjanvel and Govalkot, which were ably defended by Sa’d, and the siege was raised through the intervention of the Pratidhī. In 1735, Sa’d took Bankot, and captured Rewas in a sudden attack in the next year. Shāhu, being wary of Sidi Sa’d’s growing power, directed Vishvanath to subdue him at any cost. Sa’d died a hero’s death, defending himself bravely near Alibag in that year.

1 ARIE, 1963-64, No. D, 173.
2 For the history of Anjanvel under Bijapur rule, based on old records, see Proceedings of the Bhārat Itikās Samahodhak Mandal Śaka 1835, pp. 319-41.
3 The fort of Anjanvel is said in ibid to have been built during the ‘Ādil Shāhī rule. Therefore, either Sa’d built it afresh or repaired it. The text has ‘constructed’.
4 MSG, Ratnagiri District, p. 735.
5 MSG, Kolaba District, p. 94; Sinha, op. cit., p. 56.
6 Bhonsle, op. cit., pp. 56, 58.
9 Sardessai, op. cit., p. 136, 137.
10 Srinivasan, op. cit., pp. 91, 92.
The text of the record has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

Plate XXII (c)

(1) هر که آمد عمارت نوسخت این

الله باقی و لک فان

رخت و منزل پدیگری پرداخت این عمارت

(2) چون که شد حکم از حضور پر نورد

رفعت و سلطوت پناه سیدی سوردار

(3) قلعه را ساخت و چوکی

سیدی سعد قلیدار

(4) تحریر فی التاريخ دهم ذی الحج سنه احد سنه هجری یکهزار یکهزار و نوزدهم در

**TRANSLATION**

(1) Allah is Everlasting and everything else is perishable!

Whoever came, built a new edifice, (but) left it to others when he passed away.

This........................................this building .........................

(2) Since it was ordered by the illuminated presence of the asylum of loftiness and majesty, [Sidi Surur],

(3) Sidi Sa'd, the qal'adār, constructed a fort, a chaqchī and..............................

(4) Written on the 10th of the month of Dhi'l-Hijja, (regnal) year One, Hijri year one thousand and one hundred and nineteen in..................(10 Dhi'l-Hijja 1119-21 February 1708).

**XIV. EPITAPH OF SIDI SURUR'S DAUGHTER**

The second inscription of the time of Sidi Surur Yaqut Khan II, is an epitaph of his daughter. The slightly damaged arch-shaped stone on which it is inscribed measures 37 by 60 cm. and is fixed at the head-side of a grave on the platform, near the Jami-Masjid in the Janjira fort, referred to above.¹ The text records that Sitti Halima, daughter of Sidi Surur alias Yaqut Khan, died on the 23rd of Jumada I 1120 (29th August 1708). Nothing is known about this lady.

The text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

Plate XXI (a)

(1) باسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(2) الحمد لله وحده اما بعد فقد انتقلت

(3) من دار البقاء الى دار البقاء مقبلة عل ربه (كذا)

(4) الغنور المرجومة المعصومة مستر حليمه بنت

(5) سيدی سوردور عزف يافوتخان يوم الأحد ثلاث عشرون [؟]

(6) خلون من شهر جمادي الأول في سنة عشرين

¹ ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 145.
(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) Praise be to Allāh who is the One! To come to the point: Passed away

(3) from the temporary abode to the everlasting one and was acceptable to her Nourisher,

(4) the Pardonor, the innocent, the deceased, Sitti Ḥalima, daughter of

(5) Sidi Surūr alias Yāqūt Khān, on Sunday the twenty-third(?)

(6) of the month of Jumādā I of the year twenty

(7) and one hundred above one thousand, after the Migration of the Prophet,

(8) may the best of benedictions and salutations be upon him!

(9) May Allāh have mercy on her along with the pious ones and provide her a place in Paradise in the company of righteous ones!

(10) In the year (A. H.) 1120 (23 Jumādā I 1120 = 29 August 1708).

XV. ANOTHER INSCRIPTION FROM THE JANJIRA FORT

The third inscription of Yāqūt Khān II is fixed on the facade of the inner gate of the Janjira fort. The huge slab measuring 2.85 m. by 20 cm. has weathered considerably, affecting its two-line writing. Greater portion of the text has, however, been deciphered. According to it, the fort of Jazīra (Janjira), was originally constructed by Fāhīm Khān during the time of Nizām Shāh the king of Dakhān (Deccan), in the year A. H. 984 (1576-77 A. D.), and that the bastions, walls and the gate were reconstructed wholly by Yāqūt Khān the Second, in A. H. 1122 (1710-11 A.D.), during the reign of Shāh 'Alam I, who is described as the Lord of the land and the sea.

The importance of this record is obvious. Apart from being one of the very few known records of the Mughal emperor Shāh 'Alam I, it shows that the Sidis even after Aurangzeb's death continued to acknowledge Mughal suzerainty. The epigraph also helps to determine the history of the construction of the Janjira fort which took place at different times and periods.

The record has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate XXIII (b)

(1) از عون و فضل صانع مان ذوالمن
دور نظامشاه آن(?) فرمان ده دکن
کنگت از فیض خان چو تعمیر این حصار

2 The original Niẓām Shāhī inscription is now fixed into the north-wall of the Musāfaron-ki-Masjid, built on the rampart of the fort (ARIÉ, 1959-60, No. D, 149).
TRANSLATION

(1) By the help and grace of the Beneficent and obliging Creator, in the reign of Nizām Shāh (Murtaḍā I), the king of Dakhān,
in the auspicious year nine hundred and eighty with four (A. H. 984=1576-77 A. D.), this fort was constructed by Fāhīm Khān.

For the second time, all the bastions, the fort-wall and the gate were constructed

(2) in the reign of Shāh 'Ālam, the lord of land and sea. Yāqūt Khān II, the generous, has rebuilt it in such a way that it has raised its head to the dome of the Saturn.

When the date of this blessed fort was written, it was found to be in the phrase 'lo, Jazīra has become a match to the wall of Alexander'.

Year (A.H.) 1122 (1710-11 A. D.).

XVI. ANOTHER EPIGRAPH FROM THE JANJIRA FORT

The last inscription of this study and the fifth of the time of Yāqūt Khān II, is fixed above the main gate of the Janjira fort,1 at a considerable height, and it was a veritable achievement in itself to get its impressions prepared. As a matter of fact, but for the active help of Mr. 'Abdu'll-Ghafūr Sha'bān, a leading resident of Janjira, it would not have been possible to copy it. Also commendable is the fortitude of Shri 'Abdu'l-Qādir Siddiqi, Mechanic of our office, who prepared the impressions, precariously perched on a rope-along, with the roaring sea below.

The inscriptive tablet was damaged by a cannon ball in 1733, when the Marāṭhās had besieged the fort,2 and a portion of the writing is also affected by weather. It measures 1.4 m. by 87 cm. and contains seven Persian couplets incised in beautiful Nastāʾīq characters, preceded by Bismīllāh which is inscribed in Naskh.

The epigraph states that Yāqūt Khān established himself in Kōkan and constructed anew the strong fort of Jazīra (i.e. Janjira) in A. H. 1140 (1727-28 A. D.). It also records A. H. 1118 (1706 A.D.), as the date of his accession to the throne, evidently on the death of Yāqūt Khān I.

The text has been deciphered as under :—

TEXT

Plate XXIII (a)

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(2) از فضل رب السطمان والا ملس ياقوتخان

در ملك كوكن گشت چون بر مسئله (؟) دولت مکین

2 Sardessai, op. cit., p. 129.
(3) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) By the grace of God whose aid is sought, when Yāqūt Khān of great magnanimity established himself firmly on the seat of government in the region of Kokan,

(3) the high and low (i.e. everyone) was benefited by the bounty of his favours. No one has seen a Hātim-like (i.e. generous) man like him on the surface of the whole earth.

(4) In the assembly of generosity, only those pearls which are in the sea are left over (and) in the battle, his victory over the enemies is a clear victory.

(5) His ever-increasing good fortune (has spread) fame of (his) dispensation of justice into the six directions (i.e. universe), with hundred thousand praises.

(6) (For the date of his) accession, the word 'very fortunate' was heard from the sky. ............... wisdom. ............... (A. H.) 1118 (1706 A.D.).

(7) He constructed anew the fort of Jazīra (i.e. Janjira) in such great strength and height that the whole world says that there is no (fort) like it.

(8) When the fort was completed, the angel from the Unseen said for its date, 'The strong fort was completed with all embellishments, (and) the Time has not witnessed a like thereof'. (A.H.) 1140 (1727-28 A.D.).

The chronograms contained in lines 6 and 8 give A.H. 1118 and 1140 respectively as the dates of the accession of Yāqūt Khān II and the completion of the fort.

1 The meaning seems to be that only such pearls as were in the ocean could not be gifted away.
### INDEX

#### A—contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilbag, in Kolaba district of Maharashatra</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigarah, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>4, 8 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali Jān, Magḥbādī, Mir, father of Mir 'Ali</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali Tabrizi, Mir</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali u'l-Kāsīb, Mir</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allahabad, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allāh Khan, governor of Danda-Rajpuri in Konkan so named</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altamash, variant of Ilutmish (s.v.)</td>
<td>4 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altham, Captain of the East India Company</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ambar, Malik, Nizām Shāhi minister</td>
<td>45, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ambar, Sīdī, a governor</td>
<td>55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ambar Sānak, Sīdī, a governor</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amrūd-Dīn, Mr., inscriptional tablet donated by</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amroha, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angrey, Kanhoji, Marāthā chief</td>
<td>69, 70, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjanvel, in Maharashatra</td>
<td>59 (f.n. 9), 72 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Arab, Sayyid Ḥasan 'Ali, see Ḥasan 'Ali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Arab Khān, title of Nūr Muḥammād (s.v.)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arzānī, Shāh, a saint</td>
<td>38 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Āṣaf Khān, Abūl-Ḥasan, governor of Bihar</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; (f.n. 1), 42 (f.n. 1), 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asarva Khurd, near Allahabad</td>
<td>19 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurangzeb Muhammad emperor</td>
<td>52 (f.n. 4), 59, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayāz, name doubtfully read as</td>
<td>26 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'gam Khān, Muḥāl official</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Āṣimūl-Ḥaṣān, Muḥāl prince</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B—contd.</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balban, Ghīyāḥu’d-Dīn, Abu’l-Muṣaffar</td>
<td>4 (f.n. 1), 5 (f.n. 2), 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankot, in Ratnagiri district of Maharashtra</td>
<td>55, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baran, old name of Bulandshahr in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>1, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bārī Shāh, husband of Sāliḥa</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāri Khut, in Nagaur district of Rajasthan</td>
<td>4 (f.n. 3), 5 (f.n. 2), 12, 13, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayana, in Bharatpur district of Rajasthan</td>
<td>4 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāyāzīd Karrānī</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berar, region</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibi Ḥabība, see Ḥabība</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhakkar, in Sind</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharatpur, in Rajasthan</td>
<td>4 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>8, 9, 35, 39, 40, 41 (f.n. 1), 42 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar Sharif, in Patna district of Bihar</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijapur, in Mysore</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilhaur, in Kanpur district of Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>4, 5, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharīmūm, in West Bengal</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birwadi, in Kolaba district of Maharashtra</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay, in Maharashtra</td>
<td>55, 56, 58, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budaun, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 6, 14 (f.n. 1), 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulandshahr, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 15 (f.n. 1), 16 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulakhībeg, variant of Bulāq Baig (s.v.)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulāq Baig, ʿawādīr of the pargana of Panch-gawan</td>
<td>44, 53, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundelkhand, region</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandor, in Nasik district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chīmāji Appa, Marāṭhā official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipplun, in Ratnagiri district of Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D—contd.</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>6, 16, 26, 44, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devarkonda, in Nalgonda district of Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewas, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhubri, in Bihar</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharur, in Bīr District of Maharashtra</td>
<td>43, 48, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——, in Adilabad district of Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fahrūkh Siyar, Mughal emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fath, variant for Mal (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathābād, Kājī-Dhārūr so named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fath Kān, Sūd, governor of Janīra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fath Kān, Sūd, son of Malik Ambar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAwādīr, a post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firūz, Ruknū’d-Dīn, son of Iltutmish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firūz, Shamsu’d-Dīn, Bānl Shūlān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firūz Shāh, Tughluq king</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gangarampur, in West Dinajpur district of West Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaur, in Malda district of West Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazinagar, in Nalgonda district of Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gharib, Lāla, see Ujīgār Chand (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazna, in modern Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghīyāḥu’d-Dīn, see Tughluq Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghīyāḥu’d-Dīn Balban, see Balban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghīyāḥu’d-Dunyā wa’d-Dīn, title of Tughluq Shāh (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghori, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghosala, in Kolaba District of Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilhaney, in Bihar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goregaon, in Kolaba district of Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govalkot, in Ratnagiri district of Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govele, in Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ḥabak Khān, governor of Janīra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥabība, Bibi, daughter of Yaqūt Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥājī Ḥussain, a builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥājī Tātūr, mosque of, in Patna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥalima, Sitti, daughter of Yaqūt Khān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamirpur, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>Junagadh, in Gujarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husni, in Hisar district of Panjab</td>
<td>Junaidi, Nişāmu‘l-Mulk, see Nişāmu‘l-Mulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan ‘Ali ‘Arab, Sayyid, son of Mirān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Yusuf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan Barani, Fārān, of Mu’inudd-Din</td>
<td>Kāfār, Malik, general of ‘Alā‘udd-Din Khalji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad bin Sām in possession of</td>
<td>Kāfār muḥarrar, Malik, official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan Mahdi, Ghaznavid minister wrongly</td>
<td>Kajj-Dhārur, Fatḥābād, Dhārur so mentioned in an epigraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>called</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan Maimandi, Ghaznavid minister</td>
<td>Kalyan, in Thana district of Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kamālu‘d-Din, title of Nişāmu‘l-Mulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilla, in Patna district of Bihar</td>
<td>Junaidi (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himmat Khan, title of Mir Sharaufu‘d-Din</td>
<td>Kaman, in Bharatpur district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hūsain (s.v.)</td>
<td>4 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humāyūn, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>Kanhoji, Angrey, see Angrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hūsain, Mir Muhammad, epitaph of</td>
<td>Kanjāddhār, Kajj-Dhārur, wrongly read as 48 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hūsain, Mir Sharaufu‘d-Din, entitled Himmat</td>
<td>Kanpur, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khān (s.v.), guldār of Dhurrur</td>
<td>Kāhīf, variant for Khwāf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hūsain Sultanī, Malik ‘Abdur-Sharq, Saiyfuddin Mamluk official &amp; builder</td>
<td>Kha‘riyat Khān, Sidi chief 66, 58, 59 (f.n. 2), 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad, in Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>31, 32, 33, 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I

| Ibrāhīm Khān, governor of Danda-Rajputri | J—contd. |
| Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh, Golconda king | Kāhīf, variant for Khwāf | 55 | 47 |
| Iltutmish, Shamsu‘d-Din, Abu’l-Muzaffar | Kān’s, a poet | 1, 2, 4 | 39, 40 |
| (f.n. 1, 3), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 | Khatu, in Nagaur district of Rajasthan | 4 (f.n. 3) |  |
| 12, 14, 15, 16, 18 |  | 5 |  |
|  | Kalān, i.e. Bari Khatu | 5 |  |
|  | Khurī | 5 |  |
|  | Khirki, old site of Aurangabad | 46, 47 (f.n. 5), 48 |  |
|  | Khokri, in Kolaba district of Maharashtra | 56, 59, 68, 70 |  |
|  | Khoshtigar, in Birbhum District | 39 |  |
|  | Khosraw Khān, Khaliji official | 21 |  |
|  | Khwāf, in Khurāsān | 37 (f.n. 2) |  |
|  | Khwāfī, variant of Khāfī | 37 (f.n. 2) |  |
|  | Khwāja-i-Jahān, title of Nişāmu‘l-Mulk |  | 9, 10 |
|  | Junaidi (s.v.) |  |  |
|  | Khwāhish, clan of the Afghan | 40 |  |
|  | Kōl, i.e. Aligarh | 1 |  |
|  | Kork, variant for Konkan (s.v.) | 75, 76 |  |
|  | Kōl, variant of Kōl | 4 (f.n. 6), 9, 12 |  |
|  | Kolaba, in Maharashtra | 55, 72 |  |
|  | Konkan, region on the west Coast | 55 |  |
|  | Kulkhuma, Sitti, daughter of Yaqūt Khān I | 66 |  |
|  | Kuch, in Assam | 37 |  |

### J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J—contd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jahāngīr Shāh, Mughal emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahāngīr, Mughal emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāmān Mādārī, Shāh, dargāh of, at Hīla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janghīd Qutb Shāh, Golconda king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jangī Shah, tomb of, at Budaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janjira, in Kolaba district of Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunpur, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāsīra, variant for Janjira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juljīn, Malik, Tughluq official</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### L

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L—contd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakhnauti, old capital of Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāli Ujāgar Chand Gharib, see Ujāgar Chand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 11, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 2), 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 37 (f.n. 1), 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M—contd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulham Şahid, Mi'jan, a saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulher, fort of, in Nasik district of Maharastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu'imin, Mirzā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muqarrab Khan, Mughal governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaš, i.e. fourth caliph 'Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaši Nişām Şah II, Ahmadnagar king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṣṭaľa, i.e. the Holy Prophet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagaur, in Rajasthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagothna, in Kolaba district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalgonda, in Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandurbar, in Dhulia district of Maharastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naşib Khan Türkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişār-ud-Din, Sultan, probable identification of Malik Mal with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişār-ud-Din Mahmūd, son of Itutmish (a.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişār-ud-Din Qubāsha, see Qubāsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāẓar Khwāshgh, Mughal official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişām Khan, see Muhammad Yusuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişām, family-name of Mughal officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişām Şahib, dargāb of, at Panchgawān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişāmpur, in Kolaba district of Maharastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişams, of Hyderabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişām Şah, Ahmadnagar king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişām Şahi, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişām-ul-Mulk Junsidi, Abū Ḥamid Muhammad, Qiwāmu'd-Din, Mamluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nur Muhammad ‘Arab, entitled ‘Arab Khan, Mughal official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padmadurg, fort in Konkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palwal, in Gurgaon district of Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panchgawān, in Akola district of Maharastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parviz Şah, Mughal prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patna, in Bihar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen, in Kolaba district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshe', a post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prtinidā, Marathā official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purandhar, treaty of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qūr'adār, a post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāsim, Sīdī, see Yaqūt Khan I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qasūr, near Lahore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiwāmu'd-Din, title of Nişām-ul-Mulk Junsidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubāsha, Nişār-ud-Din, Multan king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubş Şah, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubş-ud-Din, Aibak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubş-ud-Din Aibeg and Aibak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubş-ud-Din Mubarak Şah Khalji, see Mubarak Şah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubş-ul-Mulk, see Muhammad Quli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rādiyya, Sultan, queen, daughter of Itutmish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahgunth Ballāj, Marathā official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahgunth Pant, Marathā official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahim Khan’s mosque, in Hyderabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāhi, father of Sīdī Sumbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raigarh, in Konkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja, of Varangal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja Jaisingh, Mughal official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja Sangrām Singh, of Kharagpur, see Sangrām Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajpuri, in Kolaba district of Maharastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasūl, variant for Surūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratnagiri, in Maharastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raygad, variant of Raigarh (a.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewas, in Kolaba district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right, builder, composer and scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohankhed, in Buldana district of Maharastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruknu'd-Din Firuz, see Firuz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saah, variant for Sa’d (a.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’d, Sīdī, qūr'adār of Anjanwel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’i’d well-known poet of Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāfūr-ud-Din, title of Maliku’ṣ Shār, Hussain Sulṭāni (a.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šāliha, wife of Bara Şahib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salīm, name of Mughal emperor Jahāngir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samana, in Patiala district of Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samawati, a place in Deccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambal, variant for Sumbul (a.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S—contd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhājī, son of Shivājī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhal, sarārī, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhōle, variant for Sumbul (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambolee, variant for Sumbul (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammān Shāh, a saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangrān Singh, Baja, of Khargpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat, variant for Sa’d (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satavli, a river, in Ratnagiri district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Yūsuf, Mirān, grant of land to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saiybī, a poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh ‘Abdu’llāh Kirmānī, see ‘Abdu’llāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh ‘Alam Bahādur Shāh I, Mughal emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh Arzānī, see Arzānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh Jamman Madārī, see Jamman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh Jahān, Mughal emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāhjahanābād, i.e., Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh Jamman Madārī, see Jamman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahrār, Mughal prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāhu, son of Sambhājī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakhshū‘ām, son of Naṣīb Kān (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāmīr Bānās, Marāthī official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamsu’d-Dīn, Ābul-Muṣaffar, titles of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illūmnigh (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamsu’d-Dīn, Firūz, of Bengal, see Firūz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamsu’d-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamsu’d-Dīn, Khwāli, died and viceroy of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shārafu’d-Dīn, Husain, Mīr entitled Himmat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khān, see Husain, Mīr Shārafu’d-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharīf Khān, Mughul governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shīr Shāh, Shīr kīng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shīhābūd-Dīn Ghorī, Muhammad bin Šām (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birām (s.v.) also known as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shivājī, Marāthī king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’s, of Janjira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī, ‘Abdu’l-Ghāfūr, see ‘Abdu’l-Ghāfūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī, Ambar, see Ambar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī, Ambar, Sānāk, see Ambar Sānāk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Fāth Khān, see Fāth Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Lābāq, see Lābāq, Sid’ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Khairiyat, see Khairiyat Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Mīrī, see Mīrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Qāsim, see Yaqūt Khān I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Sa’d, see Sa’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Sumbul, see Sumbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Surūr, governor of Janjira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Yaqūt Khān I, see Yaqūt Khān I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid’ī Yūsuf, see Yūsuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singhgar, in Poona district of Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirmūr, hills of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S—contd.</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sirūl, variant for Surūr (s.v.)</td>
<td>55 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittī Ḥabība, see Ḥabība</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittī Ḥallma, see Ḥallma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittī Kulğhama, see Kulğhama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittī Zainab, see Zainab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittī Zuhra, see Zuhra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumboolee, variant for Sumbul (s.v.)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultanpur, in Dhuṣlia district of Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>52 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūliūn Raḏiyya, see Raḏiyya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumbhol, variant for Sumbul (s.v.)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumbul, Sīdī, chief of Janjira and famous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughal admiral</td>
<td>56,57 (f.n. 5), 58,61,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumbhol, variant for Sumbul (s.v.)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat, in Gujarat</td>
<td>52 (f.n. 4), 56,57,58,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surūl, variant for Surūr (s.v.)</td>
<td>55 (f.n. 4), 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surūr Sīdī, see Yaqūt Khān II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylhet, in East Pakistan</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T

Tājū’d-Dīn Ahmad, Malik, see Ahmad, Malik Tājū’d-Dīn.
Tājū’d-Duwal, title of Malik Ahmad, son of
Talbagha (s.v.) 24, 25, 26 (f.n. 4)
Tājū’d-Duwal, title of Malik Ahmad (s.v.)
of Junagadh inscription 26 (f.n. 4)
Tala, in Kolaba district of Maharashtra 70
Talbagha, Khaļī & Tughluq official 21, 24, 25
Talbagha, son of Yaghīda, another official 25
Talīgha, variant for Talbagha (s.v.) 25, 26
Tātār Khān, Tughluq governor 22, 23
Telangana, region in Andhra Pradesh 21
Timūr, Malik, Khaļī & Tughluq official 21
Tīrhuṭ, in Bihār 26
Tughluq, a dynasty 8, 21, 26
Tughluqabad, in Delhi 23
Tughluq Shāh, Ghiyāshu’d-Dīn Abūl-Muṣaffar 5 (f.n. 2), 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23
Tughril, Mamlūk official 8
Tuhfa, a composer 68
Talbagha, variant for Talbagha (s.v.) 25, 26

U

‘Ubd, a poet 21
Uchāṅgāra, i.e., Bulandshahr 1
Ujjāgar Chand, Gharīb, Lāla, letters of 38
Ulūgh Khān, see Muḥammad bin Tughluq...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U—contd.</td>
<td>Y—contd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar al-Khalīj</td>
<td>Yāqūt Khān I, Sīdī Qāsim, Janjira governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar Dāhistānī</td>
<td>55, 56, 57, 62 (f.n. 1, 3), 59 (f.n. 5), 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underī, near Bombay</td>
<td>Yāqūt Khān II, Sīdī Sūrūr, Janjira chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55, 56, 58, 61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Yūsuf, Makhdūm, Mīrān Sāyīd (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vazīr, title of Sīdī' Ambar</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vengurla, in Ratnagiri district</td>
<td>Yūsuf, Sīdī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīshvānāth, Mārāṭhā official</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Zafarābad, near Jaumpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warangal, in Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>19 (f.n. 4), 20, 21, 22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>Zafar Khān, title of Tātār Khān (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 (f.n. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zafar Khān, Khān-i-A'zam, third son of Tughluq Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19, 20, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Zafarnagar, in Deccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yāghāda, father of Tālaghāda</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya'qūb Khān, Sīdī official</td>
<td>Zainab, Sītī, daughter of Yāqūt Khān I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yāqūt Khān, Sīdī</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zuhra, Sītī, wife of Yāqūt Khān I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KHALJI AND TUGHLUQ INSCRIPTIONS FROM RAJASTHAN

By Dr. Z. A. Desai

So far, not many Arabic and Persian inscriptions of the Delhi Sultans from the areas now comprising the State of Rajasthan, particularly its western part, have come to light. Whatever epigraphs were discovered in the past, have been either noticed or published by Major-General A. Cunningham and his collaborators in the Archaeological Survey and by Dr. J. Horovitz, Dr. Ghulam Yazdani, Dr. M. A. Chagattai, Dr. A. Mahdi Husain and myself in the Archaeological reports or the previous issues of this journal. These inscriptions are from Ajmer, Ambayana and Kaman, Chitorgarh, Jalor, Sambhar, Pari Khatu, Didwana, Ladnun and Nagaur, respectively in Ajmer, Bharatpur, Chitorgarh, Jalor, Jaipur, Nagaur and Sawai Madhopur districts. But the published readings of quite a few of these epigraphs are either incomplete or incorrect, and their revised versions are worth publication.

Since then, no new inscription of the Mamlak, Khalji and Tughluq dynasties was reported until during the past decade and a half, when tours of Shri N. G. Gharam, Exploration Assistant, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, then stationed at Jodhpur, Shri I.A. Omeri, now in the National Museum, New Delhi, Shri W. H. Siddiqi, Senior Epigraphical Assistant of my office and myself to different parts of the State brought to light some more interesting and historically important epigraphs of, or assignable to, the above dynasties. On the other hand, none of the inscriptions which were briefly noticed previously received any further attention until

---

2 Cunningham, *op. cit.*, vol. XX (Calcutta, 1885), pp. 56, 70, 72, 76, 131; *EIM*, 1917-18, pp. 20, 39, 41; *ibid.*, 1937-38, pp. 5-6. A few inscriptions of the Auhail chiefs of Banyana were published in *Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement* (EIAPS), 1961, pp. 50-53.
4 EIM, 1935-36, p. 49; *ibid.*, 1949-50, p. 32.
5 EIAPS, 1955 and 1956, p. 57.
9 Cunningham, *op. cit.*, vol. XXIII (Calcutta, 1887), pp. 64, 67 (account by Mr. H. B. W. Garrick).
10 EIAPS, 1957 and 1958, p. 34.
11 These have been listed in the *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy (ARIE)*, for 1955-56, Nos. D, 119, 135; *ibid.*, 1962-63, Nos. D, 198, 204; *ibid.*, 1965-66, Nos. D, 338, 341, 343, 349. Apart from these, there are some inscriptions of about the same period, which do not contain the names of the reigning monarchs.
recently: three such inscriptions of Shamsu’d-Din Ilutmish and Ghiyathu’d-Din Balban, from Bari Khatu, were studied by me in details in the last issue of this journal.\(^1\)

It is proposed to study in this article eleven inscriptions. Four of these each come from Bari Khatu and Nagaur, and one each from Bayana, Chatsu in Jaipur district and Mandor in Jodhpur district.

Two of the four Bari Khatu inscriptions studied here are new, while the other two were briefly mentioned by Chaghtai. One of the last mentioned two was fragmentary and the portion of its text containing the king’s name and the date was lost, but on the basis of the surviving title Ghiyathu’d-Din, Chaghtai assigned it to the reign of Ghiyathu’d-Din Balban.\(^3\) For reasons quoted in the proper place, I feel that it is an inscription of Ghiyathu’d-Din Tughluq Shâh. It is included in the present study (Inscription No. IV). Chaghtai’s notice of the other epigraph (Inscription No. I) was substantially correct, but it omitted to give the name of the builder of the mosque.\(^4\)

As for Nagaur, only one of its four epigraphs (Inscription No. VII) was previously noticed. But its details as given by Mr. H. B. W. Garrick are incorrect.\(^5\) One each of the other three (Inscriptions Nos. II, III and V), found by me in the course of my recent tour to that place, belongs to the time of ‘Alâu’d-Din Khalji, Qutbu’d-Din Mubârak Shâh and Tughluq Shâh.\(^6\)

All the remaining three inscriptions, which are, one each, from Bayana, Chatsu and Mandor are unpublished. The impressions from which they are published here were prepared in the course of my tour to these places in 1955.

A king-wise break up will show that three of these epigraphs belong to the Khalji dynasty: two are of ‘Alâu’d-Din and one of his son Qutbu’d-Din Mubârak Shâh. The rest pertain to the Tughluqs: two were set up in the time of Tughluq Shâh, and three each belong to the reign of Muhammed bin Tughluq Shâh and Firuz Shâh. Again, one epigraph each of ‘Alau’d-Din, Tughluq Shâh and Muhammed bin Tughluq Shâh and all the three of Firuz Shâh, are fragmentary.

Since not much authentic information is available about the history of Rajasthán during the early period of the Muslim rule, these epigraphs are bound to be of sufficient interest to the students of medieval history. It may be recalled in this connexion that the inscriptions of ‘Alâu’d-Din Khalji, Tughluq Shâh and his son Muhammed Shâh from Chitorgarh, have helped to determine the history of that place under ‘Alâu’d-Din Khalji and Muhammed bin Tughluq and exposed the legendary character of the bardic accounts that had found favour even with serious students of history.\(^7\) Coming as they do from different regions in the erstwhile Bharatpur, Jaipur and Jodhpur states of Rajputana, the records under study can be absolutely relied upon as the most authentic contemporary documents on the political status of these places under the Muslim rule.

Then, these epigraphs, as usual, provide either some new names in the political hierarchy of officials or a little more information about them. For example, it is only from the Bari Khatu

---


\(^2\) **EIAPS**, 1966, pp. 4-18.

\(^3\) **PIHC**, 8th Session (1945), p. 236.

\(^4\) ibid., p. 287.

\(^5\) Cunningham, *op. cit.*, vol. XXIII, pp. 64, 69.

\(^6\) I also found at Nagaur a fragmentary epigraph of Muhammad bin Sam. It is dated A.H. 594 (1197-98) and is, thus, the earliest Muslim record found so far in Rajasthan (*ARIE*, 1965-66, No. D, 235). It is proposed to be published in the next issue.

\(^7\) **EIAPS**, 1959 and 1960, pp. 69-70.
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record of Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh (Inscription No. VI) that we know that Malik Nānak Sulṭānī, the ākbur bek-i-maiyara—who held the same post, it will be recalled, in the time of 'Alāu'd-Dīn Khaljī—was entitled Saifu'd-Daulat wa'd-Dīn and held the iqtā' of Ajmer. The same epigraph also furnishes the name of the muḥarrir of the region. Another epigraph from the same place though fragmentary, provides the important information that Firūz, son of Muḥammad, held the post of šahna bek of the yāqūt-i-khāṣṣ-ī-qadīm and the iqtā', presumably, of the region. It also mentions Tāju'd-Daulat wa'd-Dīn, of royal extraction, whose name is unfortunately lost, but who apparently held a high rank.

In short, these inscriptions are quite important historically. From the palaeographical point of view too, they represent the styles of the mural records of the fourteenth century in different parts of Rajasthan, and should be of sufficient interest to students of calligraphy.

'Alāu'd-Dīn Khaljī

Three inscriptions of 'Alāu'd-Dīn Khaljī which were found after his only inscription from Rajasthan, the one at Bayana, was published some fifty years back,1 were published in a previous issue of this Series.2 Of the two records studied below for the first time, one was found only recently, but though the other was briefly described some time back, its text was not published (see p. 2, infra). Incidentally, a Sanskrit inscription of his was found in the north-western part of the Jodhpur district: it mentions Tāju'd-Dīn 'All as his governor at Medta and records the construction of a well in 1302-03.3

I. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 702, FROM BARI KHATU

This inscription which was first mentioned and briefly described by Chaghtāi about two decades ago,4 is from Bari Khatu, situated in the Jael taksīr of the Nagaur district. It is engraved around the rectangular border of an arch of red sandstone, which is now built up in the inner side of the wall, to the left of the main entrance, of a mosque situated in Mahalla-Sayyidān.5 The frame was lying loose in the basement of the mosque when Chaghtāi first found it.

Occupying a total space of about 2·75 m. by 11 cm., its text, which is in Arabic, records that a mosque was ordered to be built by one Muḥammad, during the reign of 'Alāu'd-Dunyā wa'd-Dīn Abū'l-Muẓaffar Muḥammad Shāh in A.H. 702 (1302-03). The other titles used for the king are Sīkandar-i-Thānī and Nāṣir-i-Amir-i-Mu'mīnūn which are known from his other epigraphs also.6

A few letters being damaged on account of the weathering of the stone, the parental name of the builder could not be deciphered. It was doubtfully read as al-Fakhrī in our annual report for 1962-63, but now I feel certain that in any case, the name is not al-Fakhrī. Unfortunately, I have not yet been able to decipher it satisfactorily, nor could Mr. Șiddiqī who had examined the tablet, make it out. The undeciphered name ends in ī which would make it more like a nisba than a.

---

1 EIM, 1917-18, p. 20. The epigraph does not exist now. The mosque on which the inscriptive tablet was set up was demolished in the communal disturbances of 1947.
2 EIAPs, 1959 and 1960, pp. 72, 73.
4 PIHC, 8th Session (1945), p. 267.
6 EIAPs, 1964, p. 2; EIM, 1917-18, pp. 25, 29.
proper name. And a nisba for a parental name, though appearing somewhat unusual, is not quite unlikely, particularly in cases of men of Arab descent. In any case, it has not been possible to read the word.

The style of writing is usual Nashâh, conforming, in broad outlines, to the style of contemporary records. But one aspect of its calligraphy calls for some remarks: The letters in the right panel would appear, even to a casual onlooker, to have been somewhat differently executed; these have more angular flourishes than the rest. This sort of variation in the calligraphy of the same epigraph, is not usually met with. The reason for such an occurrence is difficult to determine, but the possibility that the designer originally intended to write it in the same hand, but changed over to the usual style for want of space, is indicated by the fact that the writing in the left panel is much more than that in the left panel. Another possible explanation is that the designing of the text was done by different hands.

The text, reading anti-clock-wise from the right bottom, is as under:—

**TEXT**

Plate I(a)

(a) **Right Panel.**

إمَرٌ بِهَا هذَا الْمَسْجِدُ فِي عَهْدِ السَّلَاتَا

(b) **Top Panel.**

ْمَعَةً عَلَى الْدُنْيَا وَالْدُنْيَا وَالْدُنْيَا وَالْدُنْيَا وَالْدُنْيَا وَالْدُنْيَا وَالْدُنْيَا

(c) **Left Panel.**

[السَّلَاتَا نَاصِرُ الْعُمَومَ الْبَيْنِيَّةَ الْفَضُّلُ مُحَمَّدُ بَنُ... اصْلَحِهِ اللَّهُ عَلَّمَهُ...]

**TRANSLATION**

(a) The construction of this mosque was ordered in the reign of the Sultan,

(b) the magnificent, ‘Alâ‘u’d-Dunya wa’d-Din Sikandar-i-Thâni, Abu‘l-Mu‘assaf Mu‘ammad Shâh,

(c) the Sultan, helper of the Commander of the Faithful, by the weak creature Mu‘ammad, son of .................................., may Allah reform his actions, in the year A.H. 702 (1302-03).

The identity of the builder cannot be established. Also, in the absence of any titles, etc., it is difficult to say if he had anything to do with the administration of Bari Khattu, the findspot of the inscription, or its neighbourhood.

**II. FRAGMENTARY RECORD, DATED A. H. 705, FROM NAGAUR**

The second inscription of ‘Alâ‘u’d-Din Khâlij is from Nagaur, headquarters of the district in the former Jodhpur State as well as in Rajasthan. It is a picturesque town lying on the Jodhpur-Bikaner section of the Northern Railway, nearly one hundred and ten kilometres south-east of
(a) Epigraph of 'Alāu’d-Din, dated A.H. 702, from Bari Khatu (p. 4)

(b) Fragmentary record, dated A.H. 705, from Nagaur (p. 6)
Bikaner and one hundred and sixty kilometres north-east of Jodhpur. A wall more than six kilometres in length surrounded the town once, but it is now being dismantled in stages by the local Municipality. This is all the more regrettable, since in the battlements and walls were—and still are—embedded a number of Arabic and Persian inscriptions, which indiscriminately get destroyed along with the wall. It is, however, gratifying that a few epigraphical tablets that have escaped the ravage through the active interest of Mr. Raḥmatu’llah Raunq ‘Uṭūmānī and others are preserved in different mosques of the town. Quite a few of these bear inscriptions of the time of the Khānznādās of Nagaur. Even now, at least two such tablets were shown to me in that part of the city-wall that still stands towards the north.¹

Nagaur, in the Siwalik hills, seems to have come into contact with Muslim authority, from an early period. It seems to have been part of the Ghaznavid empire, and it is here that Muḥammad Bahālīm, the recalcitrant governor of Panjab, is stated to have built a fort, in the time of Bahārām Shāh (1118-59). Subsequently, it passed on, along with the territory surrounding it, to the authority of the Delhi Sultāns right from the time of Muhammad bin Sām, whose inscription has been recently identified by me there. Since then Nagaur remained under the Delhi Sultāns. Among its first governors is Malik Karīmu’d-Dīn Ḥamza (early 13th century). The subsequent governors of Nagaur and Siwalik region during the Mamlūk period include Malik ‘Īzzu’d-Dīn Balban (c. 1242-52), Kīghlū Khān, brother of Ulugh Khān, later Ghīyāthu’d-Dīn Balban (c.1252) and Ulugh Khān himself.² No specific mention of its governors under the Khaljīs and Tughluqs could be traced in works available to me. On the disintegration of the Tughluq empire, Nagaur’s governor Shams Khān, a brother of Muṣaffar Shāh of Gujarat, established independent rule. His successors ruled for more than a century and are known as Khānznādās. Incidentally, the town lay on the main road from Sind to Delhi, and travellers from foreign countries arriving by road through Sind halted at or passed through it.³

In the centre of, and rising above, the town, is an extensive fort with a double wall about 2 kilometres in circumference, its thickness varying from more than 9 metres at the base to about 3.5 metres at the top. The outer wall is about 7.5 metres and the inner, 15 metres above the ground. In the wall of the fort as in the case of the city-wall, may be seen even today, numerous Persian and Arabic inscriptions (and other parts such as carved mihārs, blind niches, etc.) obtained from the mosques demolished by Mahārājā Bakht Singh.⁴ In the words of Mr. Garrick, ‘according to the accounts rife at Nagaur, Aurangzeb himself never destroyed more temples than did Bakht Singh mosques, and this may—and indeed does—account for the numerous Arabic and Persian inscriptions which I found built topsy-turvy into the main circumvallation of the city—some upside down, some diagonally, and others so that the lines of writing stand up vertically’.⁵ Surprisingly, Erskine and Garrick, who have described the Fort in some details, do not refer to the

¹ A couple of tablets seen by me previously were found missing in October 1966.
⁴ Erskine, op. cit., p. 206.
⁵ Cunningham, op. cit., vol. XXIII, p. 63.
epigraphical tablets in its wall, as they did in the case of the city-wall. Through the kind permission of the Superintendent of the Household of His Highness the Maharaja of Jodhpur who owns the Fort and under the guidance of Shri Navranglal Bhat, the watchman and Mr. Raunq 'Uthmānī, I visited the fort in company of Mr. Ghānam, and found not less than ten historical inscriptions, not to mention an equal number or even more, of those comprising religious texts. Five of these ten records belong to the time of the Khāṇzādās, and of the remaining five, one each refers to the rule of Muḥammad bin Sām, ‘Alāʾ ud-Dīn Khalji and Ghiyāthu’ d-Dīn Tughluq Shāh, the date of one falls in the reign of Fīrūz Tughluq and yet one more may be assigned on palaeographical grounds, to the same period.¹

The stone-fragment on which the inscription under study is engraved, is built up into the southern upper wall, not far from the step-well.² It evidently formed the upper part of a rectangular door or very likely, a miḥrāb-frame. It is now rectangular in shape, the two side panels having been either hewn off or broken and lost. It measures 1 m. by 30 cm. Considerable portion of the writing inscribed in two lines all along is lost. The surviving text comprises a variation of the First Creed inscribed horizontally and the royal name Muḥammad Shāh, title ‘the second Alexander’, and the date A.H. 705 (1305-06), vertically. The purport of the record cannot be determined, but it is very likely that as in the case of the inscription of Qutb’ud-Dīn to be studied next, which is also engraved on the frame of a miḥrāb, it originally belonged to a mosque.

The language of the record appears to be Arabic. The style of writing is ordinary Naskh, usually met with in the inscriptions of ‘Alāʾ ud-Dīn. The text reads as under:

**TEXT**

_Plate I(b)_

(a) **Horizontal portion.**

(1) لا الله إلا الله الملك الجبار

(2) محمد رسول الله النبي المرتبار

(b) **Right side.**

(1) محمد شاه إسكندر

السلطان

(2)...

(c) **Left side.**

(1) [الثاني خُلد] (؟)

(2) في سنة خمس و سبعمئة

**TRANSLATION**

(a) (1) There is no god but Allāh, the King, the Most Powerful.

(2) Muḥammad is the Prophet of Allāh, the Apostle, the Elected one.

---

² *Ibid.*, No. D, 341. Nearby is another fragment inscribed with two words from the Áyatu’l-Kursī in bold characters of the first years of the 13th century.
KHALJI AND TUGHLUQ INSCRIPTIONS FROM RAJASTHAN

(b) (1-2) Muḥammad Shāh, the Sultān, Alexander
(c) (1) the Second, may (Allāh) perpetuate.................................
     (2) in the year (A.H.) five and seven hundred (A.H. 705 = 1305-06 A.D.).

Quṭbu’d-Dīn Mubāarak Shāh

So far, only four records of Quṭbu’d-Dīn Mubāarak Shāh were known from the whole state: one from Jalor, also in erstwhile Jodhpur state and now a district town in the south-eastern part of western Rajasthan,1 and three from Bayana in eastern Rajasthan, almost bordering on Uttar Pradesh.2

III. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 720, ALSO FROM NAGAUR

This new record of the Khalji king, which is his only inscription to be found in central Rajasthan,3 can be reasonably taken to point to uninterrupted Muslim authority in the region. It is inscribed on the rectangular border of the central mihrāb in the mosque of Makhmûl Ḥusain Nāgauri, situated in the Phul-Maḥal locality at Nagaur.4 The horizontal stone-beam contains the Second Creed, while the historical text is inscribed on the right and left sides; the total area of historical writing is about 2.4 m. in length and 14 cm. in width. The style of writing is Nashk, and language, Arabic.

This epigraph is not new in the sense that it came to light for the first time during my recent visit; far from that, it was known to the Muslim residents of the town, including Ḥāfiz Mu’īn’u’d-Dīn and Mr. Raunaq ‘Uthmānī who has made it a point to locate and note down the readings of the inscriptions at Nagaur. But since they were unable to decipher it, they did not know its purport. On examination, I found it to contain a new record of ‘Alāu’d-Dīn’s son Quṭbu’d-Dīn Mubāarak Shāh.

Unfortunately, the writing, which is carved in one line, is badly damaged, and as a result, its letters have considerably abraded or even flaked off in places, rendering the decipherment of the text difficult. It seems to record the construction of the mosque in A.H. 720 (1320-21) during the reign of Quṭbu’d-Dunyā wa’d-Dīn Mubāarak Shāh. It will be observed that the king’s rule has been termed, as in the case of his coins and epigraphs, as caliphate. The name of the builder could not be deciphered, due to damaged writing, but in any case, the saint Makhmûl Ḥusain Nāgauri with whom the mosque is locally associated, has nothing to do with its construction, as he flourished at a much later date; he died in A.H. 901.5

Unfortunately, the month in which the construction took place is not clear, due to the damaged writing. And his other epigraph of A. H. 720, from the Ukha-Masjid at Bayana, too, does not specify the month. But if my tentative reading of the month as Muḥarram is proved to be correct, it would not throw any light on the subject. It will be recalled that the exact date of his death is differently given by different authorities. Contemporary Anīr Khusrav gives Jamālā II, and Yāhyyā Sarhindī, author of the Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī (who wrote about a century later), gives 5 Rabī’u’l-Awwal. Dr. K. S. Lāl prefers the earlier date given by the later authority.6

---

2 Ibid., 1937-38, p. 39-40, 42.
3 A Sanskrit inscription recording the construction of a step-well in V. S. 1373 (1316-17) during his reign was found at Ladun (Epigraphia Indica, vol. XII, pp. 23 ff).
5 Abdull-Ḥaqq Dihlawī, Akhīr-i-‘Akhīr Īrān-i-Abrū (Delhi, 1914), pp. 182-83.
6 Dr. K. S. Lāl, History of the Khaljis (Allahabad, 1950), p. 345 and f.n. 98.
The text reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate II(b)*

(a) Right side.

ف عهد خلافة السلطان الأعظم ظل الله في العالم اعد الخلافة مول(؟)

ابن المظفر(؟) مبارک شاه سلطان(؟)

(b) Left side.

ينا هذالمسمى العبد الراجی

.............................

الحرم(؟) سنة عشرين و سبعماية

**TRANSLATION**

(a) In the time of the caliphate of the great Sultan, shadow of Allah in the world, the most just in the caliphate, master (?).………….Abu'l-Muṣaffar (?) Mubārak Shāh Sultan (?),

(b) the construction of the mosque by the slave, hopeful………….., in………….Muḥarram (?), year (A.H.) twenty and seven hundred (Muḥarram 720=February-March 1320).

Ghiyāthu’d-Dīn Tughluq Shāh

So far only two inscriptions of Ghiyāthu’d-Dīn Tughluq Shāh have been found in Rajastan; they are from Chitorgarh and Jalor.1 His two inscriptions studied below, though fragmentary, are, therefore, significant. Both were found in Nāgaūr district. One of these is a new record discovered recently.

**IV. FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTION FROM BARI KHATU**

The first inscription of Tughluq Shāh and the fourth of this article, is an incomplete record in Persian from Fari Khatu. Chaghtai, who first described its gist in 1945, took it to be of Balban’s time. He did not quote it in full and omitted to give certain details.2 In 1959, I received its photograph for examination and report from the Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Paroda. Three years later, Mr. Siddiqi of my office was deputed to have its impressions and also those of others prepared.

The fragmentary inscribed tablet, measuring 68 by 60 cm., is set up on a platform on the bank of the tank called Mulìk-Talāb, near the western gateway of the town.3 It contains a six-line text in Persian, inscribed in bold Naṣiḥ letters of the early Tughluq period, which records that the excavation and construction of the tank called Firūz-Sāgar (i.e. sægar or tank) was done during the governorship of Malikuk’l-Umarā Firūz, son of Muḥammad, the chief superintendent (šahna- bek) of the royal stables (pāigāh-i-khāṣṣ) and muqti’ of the region, by Ṭāju’d-Daulat wa’d-Din. The latter’s proper name is lost, but he is mentioned with the sobriquet khalāfu’l-mulūk (lit. descendant of kings).

---

1 *Elaps*, 1955 and 1956, p. 67; *Elm*, 1949-50, p. 32.
2 *PIHC*, 8th Session (1945), p. 28f.
(a) Fragmentary inscription of Shiyāthu’d-Dīn Tughluq Shāh (p. 9)

(b) Quṭbu’d-Dīn Mubārak Shāh’s record, dated A.H. 720, from Nāgaur (p. 8)
It will be observed that the date and the name and titles of the king are lost, barring the part
of the regal title, Ḵiyāṭh, occurring at the end of the second line, which is preceded by the eulogistic
phrase ‘one selected by the Lord of the worlds’. The next, i.e. third line begins with a’s-Sultān,
followed by the phrase invoking perpetuation of the reign. It is reasonable to infer from the last
and first words in the preceding and following lines, particularly in the second and third lines,
that the lost portion of the text was not much; not more than four or five words at the most would
appear to be missing; for example, between Ḵiyāṭh in the second line and a’s-Sultān in the third,
it could only be ‘u’d-Dunyā wa’d-Din Balban or Tūghluq Shāh’, or after Maliku’l-Umarā in the
third line, there could be only one phrase like ‘Maliku’š-Sharq Malīk’ or the like, before Firūz
in the fourth line. In short, the missing text in the second line related to the titles and name of the
king and not to the eulogistic phrase as ‘Ḵiyāṭhu’l-Islām wa’l-Muslimīn’ or the like.

There should, thus, be little doubt that the epigraph was set up in the reign of either of the two
Delhi Sultāns, Balban (1266-86) or Tūghluq Shāh (1320-25). As stated above, Chaghātāi assigns
it to Balban, on the basis of the writing and the wording of the inscription. But it is precisely
on these very grounds that it may preferably be assigned to Tūghluq Shāh. The style of writing is
different from that of Balban’s inscriptions, and the text itself, it may be remembered, in Persian,
and particularly, the titles and designations like Maliku’l-Umarā, pāghā-i khāṣ-i-qādim, Khalafu’l-
Mulik, etc., make its assignment to a later period than Balban’s more likely. On the other hand,
Balban’s inscription from Bari Khatu itself is in Arabic and uses, moreover, his usual honorific
titles, which are absent here, and its style of writing is also different.

The text has been read as under:—

TEXT

Plate II (a)

(1) بنا حفر و عمارت حوض فیروز ساغر در
(2) برجیدت حضرت راب العالمین غیاث
(3) السلطان خلیف خلافته نموت ملك الامراء
(4) فیروز محمد شحصیک پایگاه خاص قدیم و ماقفع
(5) کرد خلاف الملوك تاج الدولة و الادین
(6) فی الخاصی عش[

TRANSLATION

(1) The work of the excavation and the construction of the tank Firūz-Sāghar (i.e. Sāgar)
in (the reign of)

(2) the one selected by the Almighty Lord of the worlds, Ḵiyāṭh

(3) the Sultān, may Allāh perpetuate his caliphate (and) during the time of Maliku’l-Umarā

---

¹ PIHC, 8th Session (1945), p. 286.
² EIM, 1913-14, pls. X a & b, XI b, XII, XIII a & b, etc.
(4) Firūz, (son of) Muḥammad, ʿshāhna-bek of the Old Royal Stables (pāigāh-i-khāns-i-qadīm) and muqṭī of ........................................

(5) was ordered by Khalafūl-Mulāk (lit. descendant of kings) Tāju’d-Daulat wa’d-Din. ........................................

(6) on the fifteenth ........................................

The date of the inscription, as stated above, is unfortunately lost. The invocatory phrase refers to the ‘caliphate’ of the king, a style adopted by Tughluq Shāh’s almost immediate predecessor,1 Quṭbu’d-Din Mubārak Shāh, and son and successor, Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh. This, if at all, may be taken to indicate that the epigraph belongs to the early part of his reign, since in none of his other known inscriptions, his sovereignty is termed as ‘caliphate’. If this be the case, the epigraph must have been set up towards the close of A. H. 721 (December 1321) or beginning of the following year.

It is unfortunate that the name and official status of the excavator of the tank are lost. His very title Tāju’d-Daulat wa’d-Din bespeaks of high status. The phrase Khalafūl-Mulāk may be reasonably taken to suggest that he came of royal stock. In view of the absence of name, his identification is difficult, much more so since, in the lists of the nobles of the Delhi Sultāns, right from Balbān to Tughluq Shāh, we have quite a few officials bearing this title.2 And, as we have already seen above (p. 3), one Tāju’d-Din had governed Medta (also in Nagaur district) on behalf of ʿAlāʾud-Dīn Khālji, about two decades earlier.

Likewise, Malikūl-Umarā Firūz is untraceable. For want of any data, it is difficult to say if he is identical with Firūz, who is mentioned in another record from Nagaur district, dated A. H. 772, as the father of Sipahsālār Muḥammad.3 Then, it is not quite clear to what qadīm in the phrase ʿshāhna-bek-i-pāigāh-i-khāns-i-qadīm qualifies: ʿshāhna-bek or pāigāh-i-khāns. Very likely, it qualifies the latter term. In that case, he was the chief superintendent of the Old Royal Stables. Again, the name of his ʿiqṭā is lost. But it must be Ajmer, since in another inscription from this place of the time of Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh (Inscription No. III), the governor is called the muqṭī of the maʾmūra of Ajmer.

V. INCOMPLETE INSCRIPTION FROM NAGAUR

The other epigraph of Tughluq Shāh is engraved on a slab of marble, which is built into the southern lower wall of the Fort at Nagaur, referred to above. The inverted tablet just overlooks the Dargāh of Bābā Badr on the Station Road.4

This inscription also, like most of those found in the Fort, is incomplete. About half of the text seems to be lost. But the tablet itself, as is apparent from the borders and the surviving text—the text in the first and the second line is continuous—is whole. This can only mean that there was another tablet below the present one in its original place of occurrence. It will be noted that here too, the text starts with the references to the reign of the king, as in the case of the inscription of Quṭbu’d-Din Mubārak Shāh studied above.

The surviving text only refers to the reign of the king and does not quote anything beyond the name and titles of the king and the prayer for his reign; incidentally, the phrase ‘Holper of the

1 Tughluq Shāh’s immediate predecessor was Khusrāw Khān, whose reign was very short.
Chief of the Faithful’ used here is not usually found in his other inscriptions. The text, likewise, contains neither the date and the name of the person who set up the epigraph nor any clue to the object of the record. But from the size, etc., of the present tablet, it may be reasonably surmised that it belonged to a monument of some importance and also of sufficient dimensions.

The style of writing is Naskh of a somewhat better variety than is found in most of the epigraphs of this monarch. It may be pertinent to note here the fact that like that of his Jalal inscription, referred to above, the calligraphy of the record under study is more akin to the inscriptions of, say, the Gujarat region. While it may be too early to generalise about the origin and spread of the calligraphical styles of the mural records in different parts of India, quite a good deal of epigraphical material has come to light in recent times, to point to some kind of relation between different regions as far as the similarity in the styles is concerned. I had, a couple of years back, drawn attention to this fact, while editing some inscriptions from Gujarat and Bihar. A new pattern of this relationship which seems to be emerging from the fresh material that is coming up in recent years, can certainly provide a new subject of research to the students of palaeography of the Arabic and Persian inscriptions of India.

The inscribed tablet measures 57 by 32 cm., and the two-line text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate III (a)*

(1) لَيْ نُوبَة سَلَطَةُ السَّلاطَةِ الْأَعْظَمِ غُياثُ الدُّنِيَا وَ [الدِّينَ]

(2) أَبُو المِلْمُتَفَّرَ تَغَلِّقُ شَاهُ السَّلاطَةِ نَاسِرُ وَأَمِيرُ الموْمِنِينَ خَلَدُ مَلكُهُ وَسِلَاطَانِهُ

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the time of the sovereignty of the great Sulṭān, Shiyāţh’ud-Dunyā wa’d-Din

(2) Abu’l-Muẓaffar Tughluq Shāh a’s-Sulṭān Nāsir-i-Amīr-i-Mū’minīn, may his kingdom and sovereignty last for ever!

**Muḥammad Bin Tughluq Shāh**

This is the fourth inscription of Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh to be found in Rajasthan. The three known epigraphs are—one each from Chitorgarh, Hindaun and Nagaur. Of these, the Nagaur inscription is included in this article and will be studied next.

**VI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 733, FROM BARI KHATU**

The sixth epigraph of the article is a new and important record of the time of Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh. It was found at Bari Khatu by Mr. Siddīqī in 1962. The marble tablet on which it is inscribed is broken into three pieces, jointly measuring 90 by 43 cm., which are now lying in the tomb of Haḍrat Maḥmūd Qattāl, situated on the hill.*

---

* 2. *EIAPS*, 1955 and 1956, p. 69; *ibid.*, 1957 and 1958, p. 34; Cunningham, *op. cit.*, vol. XXIII, pp. 64, 69.
Unfortunately, the exact findspot of the tablet is not known. Nor does the text provide any clue to the nature of the building for which it was meant. It simply states that a ‘building’ was constructed, and this could mean any edifice, including the dargāh of the above saint. Nevertheless, lack of information on this count, does not detract from its historical value, as we shall presently see.

The six-line text, which is composed in a curious mixture of Arabic and Persian—not an uncommon feature of the Persian and Arabic inscriptions of India—records that an edifice was raised in A. H. 733 (1333) during the reign of Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh. It also states that the construction took place during the time of Malik’Umarā Saifu’d-Daulat wa’d-Din Nānak Suṭānī, the ākhurbeke-i maṣṣara and muqti’ of the region or district (ma’mu’ra) of Ajmer, and the work was carried out by or under the supervision (kārkaḍ)1 of Mu’ayyad, son of Sirāj, son of Fākhru, who was the secretary or accountant (muḥarrir) of the district. The name Nānak is written without diacritical marks, and hence, its linear form would answer to a couple of more name-forms, but Nānak is, in all probability, the correct form as will be discussed shortly. The official is evidently identical with Malik Nānak Suṭānī who held the post of the ākhurbeke-i maṣṣara under ‘Alā’u’d-Din Khālījī.

The epigraph is executed in Nāshī style of the usual type. The writing is slightly damaged: small chips have come out from the edges of the slab at a couple of places, and as a result, a letter or two have been either lost or disfigured.

The text has been deciphered as follows:

TEXT

Plate III (b)

(1) In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) This edifice was raised during the reign of the magnificent Sultan, the lord of the necks of nations, master of the kings of

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2) This edifice was raised during the reign of the magnificent Sultan, the lord of the necks of nations, master of the kings of

---

1 In Deccan, in official documents and inscriptions, the term kārkaḍ usually means time or tenure. But here as elsewhere in northern India, the term seems to indicate charge, supervision, etc. Moreover, here the phrase may be better taken as kār-kār, meaning ‘he carried out the work.’
(a) Incomplete epigraph of Tughluq Shāh, from Naur (p. 11)

(b) Inscription, dated A.H. 733, of Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh (p. 12)
(3) the Turks, Arabs and Persians, the shadow of Allâh in the world, the striver in the path of Allâh, Abûl-Mu"azzâfîr

(4) Muḥammad bin Tughluq Şâh, the Sultan, may his caliphate be perpetuated, during the time of the iqtâ' of Maliku'larâ Saifû'd-Daulat wa'd-Din, the akhurbe ki-maisara

(5) and muqṭî' of the district (ma'mûra) of Ajmer, Nânâk Sultanî, may Allâh grant him strength! The work was carried out by the creature, hopeful of the Almighty Nourisher,

(6) Mu'sayyad, (son of) Sirâj, (son of) Fâhîr, the secretary or accountant (muḥarrîr) of the said ma'mûra, on the date, first day of the month of Jumâdâ I, year (A. H.) three and thirty and seven hundred (1 Jumâdâ I 733-18 January 1333).

Historically, the above inscription furnishes contemporary evidence of the continuous authority of the Delhi Sultanîs over this region in Rajasthan. It adds one more to the very few epigraphs of Muḥammad bin Tughluq Şâh found in this part of the country. Its text is also not without interest: the titles used for the Sultan, which were almost as a rule employed in the epigraphs of the Mamlûk kings, were generally omitted in those of their successors, the Khalîjîs and Tughluq Şâh. But their use here may perhaps be attributed to the influence of the earlier Mamlûk records from Bari Khatu. Then, also worthy of note is the use of the kunya 'Abûl-Mu'azzâfîr' for the king, instead of 'Abûl-Mujâhidî', adopted in all his inscriptions and coins known so far. It is difficult to account for this departure from the current usage. But it is certainly not that the present record is the earliest inscription of this king wherein this kunâa was adopted and replaced subsequently by Abûl-Mujâhidî. As against this, the use of the term 'caliphate' for reign is in conformity with the usage of his other inscriptions.

Another important aspect of this record is that it furnishes one important link in the chain of administrative machinery of the state, to wit, the muḥarrîr of a district. The post of muḥarrîr, so far as I have been able to ascertain, does not find mention in the works on the administration of the Delhi Sultanîta.

The exact duties of the office of the muḥarrîr are not recorded. The term is generally taken to mean a clerk, a writer, a scribe, an accountant. That the post enjoyed a much higher status is obvious from the fact that it was attached to a district. It may be taken to be equivalent to the secretary's post of our days and might have included accountancy as well. In any case, this Arabic designation was later changed to the Persian naâmisânda, which also must mean more than 'a clerk' the meaning given by Qureshî, or 'a writer assisting the shiqâdâr' as stated by Tripâthî.

Even greater importance of this record is that it furnishes new information regarding Malik Nânâk. It is strange that an official of his status, who imposed a crushing defeat on the Mongols,

---

1 EIM, 1933-34 (Supplement), pp. 27, 46; ibid., 1935-36, p. 5; EIPS, 1957 and 1958, pp. 34, 37, 39, 41, etc.
2 It may appear as likely that the reason was to avoid repetition of the term Mujâhid occurring in the preceding phrase. But this, if at all, cannot be seriously considered a valid reason.
3 For inscriptions with the usual kunya, dated prior to or later than our epigraph, see EIM, 1933-34 (Supplement), pp. 27, 46 and ibid., 1935-36, p. 3; ibid., 1939-40, p. 25.
4 EIPS, 1957 and 1958, pp. 37, 38, 39, etc.
5 Dr. I. H. Qureshi, The Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi (Karachi, 1958); Dr. R. P. Tripathi, Some Aspects of Muslim Administration (Allahabad, 1956); etc. The office of muḥarrîr also finds mention in two more epigraphs, both of 'Allâd-Dîn Khalîjî: in one, a muḥarrîr to the koṭwâl is mentioned (EIPS, 1964, p. 5), and in the other, a muḥarrîr to the district (ARIE, 1962-63, p. 36 and No. D, 59).
7 Qureshî, op. cit., p. 269; Tripâthî, op. cit., p. 298. Incidentally, the term naâmisânda is stated to be synonymous with pašwârî, a revenue official (Firîshâ, Târikh-i-Firîshâ, vol. I, Kanpur, 1884, p. 109).
should have received scant attention of the Historians. According to them, he received the fief of Sunam and Samana on ‘Alau’d-Din Khalji’s accession, and defeated the Mongol invaders ‘Ali and Turtaq in 1305.\(^1\) According to a contemporary foreign writer Wasagh Shiraz, he was despatched in 1309 to Telangana, along with Malik Naib and Zafar Khan by ‘Alau’d-Din.\(^2\) Nothing more is known about him or his subsequent career, except that Amir Khusraw casually speaks of him as being a Hindu.\(^3\) Very likely, it was he who saved ‘Alau’d-Din from the murderous attack of his nephew Sulaiman Shahr at Tupilat.\(^4\)

Our inscription supplies new information about his titles and extends his career from 1305 or even 1309 to 1333. It cites the titles Maliku’l-Umarai Saifu’d-Daulat wa’d-Din, not known from any other source. Then, it also indicates that he held the same post of akhurbe‘-i-maisara in 1333 under Muhammad bin Tughluq Shahr and, also states that he held the iqta’ of Ajmer.

But whether this was a continuous charge, it is difficult to say. His name is absent from Barani’s list of the nobles of either Qutbu’d-Din Mubarak Shahr, Ghiyathu’d-Din Tughluq Shahr and even of Muhammad bin Tughluq Shahr. This is rather surprising. A probable explanation may be that he was out of favour in the reigns of the first two Sultans. But in any case, he must have held the position some time before 1333, if not continuously after 1309. His official career seems to have come to an end some time in 1333, for in another inscription dated in the same year, from Daulatabad, in Deccan, Malik Qarun is mentioned as Malik Saifu’d-Daulat wa’d-Din Malik Safdar-Mulk akhurbe‘-i-maisara.\(^5\) Malik Nanaq must have relinquished his post and fief some time after 1st Jumada I 733 (18th January 1333), the date of the present inscription, but before the year A. H. 733 expired on 11th September 1333. Two nobles holding the same rank and title simultaneously is out of question.

It is difficult to determine the reason of this change. It could be either due to death, dismissal or elevation to a higher status. But very probably, it was subsequent upon his death, since he was quite a senior officer by 1333. That is also perhaps why his name is excluded from Barani’s list of the nobles of Muhammad bin Tughluq Shahr. Since Safdar-Mulk held, for the greater part of that monarch’s reign, the post of akhurbe‘-i-maisara and title Saifu’d-Daulat wa’d-Din, Barani included only him in his list.

A reference has been made above to the lack of uniformity and consequent confusion in the spelling of the name of Malik Nanaq, in historical works, both early and modern. The contemporary writers Amir Khusraw and Barani, the near-contemporary Ijam and subsequent historians of note, Yahya Sarhind, Nizamuddin Ahmad, Badayuni, Firuza and Haji Dahir mention him, most of them only once, in connexion with the Mongol invasion, and as is well known, the printed editions of their works are corrupt, particularly in regard to names of places and personalities.

---

\(^1\) Barani, op. cit., pp. 241, 320, 323, where the name is differently and again wrongly spelt; Amir Khusraw, Khanawal-Futak (EF), ed. Dr. M. Wahid Mirza (Calcutta, 1953), pp. 38, 40, introduction, p. 16, and ibid., ed. S. Mo‘inul-Haq (Allahabad, 1927), p. 41, where too the name is wrongly spelt; Ijam, Futak’s-Salatin (Agra, 1938), pp. 244–97, is the only one to call him Nanaq.

\(^2\) Abdullah al-Wasagh, Tajirat-ul-Amir wa Tajirat-ul-A‘gar, published under the title Wasef’ul-Hadrat (Bombay, A. H. 1269), p. 257. Zafar Khan was dead by this time, and no other Indian authority mentions Malik Nanaq as having joined this expedition.


\(^4\) Barani, op. cit., p. 273, where the text spells the name differently; Professor S. H. Hodaiwala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, vol. II (Bombay, 1957), p. 96.

Taking Amīr Khusrav first, Dr. M. Wahíd Mirzā’s edition of his Khaṣāi’nul-Futūḥ has  مانک —Mānik with a variant نايب —Nā’ib. 1 In the Aligarh edition of S. Mō’inu’l-Ḥaqī and in the English translation of Professor M. Ḥabīb—at whose instance, that edition was prepared and published in 1927—the name is spelt as نايك —Nāyak. 2 Ḥabīb has not tried to discuss the spelling of the name, beyond quoting the statement of an early seventeenth century author about Nāyaks being a tribe of outcaste Rajputs, and stating thereafter that ‘be this as it may, the surname ‘Nāik’ is common enough today’. 3 Thus, according to Ḥabīb, the official was Malik Nāyak. Dr. S. A. A. Rizvī in his Hindi translation of the relevant extracts, retains Mānik without comment. 4 Elliot’s translated extract does not contain the name. 5 In short, the three variants of this name as found in the Khaṣāi’nul-Futūḥ and its English and Hindi translations are:  مانک —Mānik, نايك —Nāyak and نايب —Nā’ib.

The other contemporary historian, Barani, mentions him thrice: the printed edition of his work spells the name  تاتک —Atābek, in the list of the nobles of ‘Alā’ūd-Din, Nāyak in the account of the Mughal invasion and تاتک —Tātak, in connexion with the grant of the sīf. 6 In one place, one  مانک —Mānik is mentioned as having saved ‘Alā’ūd-Din’s life as stated above, 7 and if he is identical with our official, as is quite likely, that would be the fourth variant.

Unfortunately, none of Parani’s translators, except Major Fuller, has made any effort to establish the spellings of place-names and personalities, which are so incorrectly given in the printed edition of his work. 8 The history by Elliot and Dowson contains only two of the above four extracts where the name is spelt as  مانک —Mānik and نايك —Nāyak. 9 Rizvī follows the printed text in three of the four places, 10 and has نايب instead of نايك —Nāyak in the fourth. 11 Fuller, in his translation, instead of  مانک —Mānik and نايك —Tātak of the printed text, spells the name as نانک —Nānak with a query. 12 But in the third place, translated and added by Mr. H. Blochmann, who edited Fuller’s translation, the spelling of the printed text was retained. 13 In short—and this is quite significant—Fuller’s manuscript had نانک —Nānak, in both the extracts he translated.

1 KF, p. 38. Wahíd Mirzā identifies him with ‘Malik Kāṣfur, called by Firīshṭa Malik Nā’ib’ (ibid., introduction, p. 16, f. n. 4).
3 Ibid., p. 29, note, where the statement that according to Firīshṭa, the commander was ‘Malik Mānik (an obvious misreading for Malik Nāik)’ is not to be found in the Nawalkhishore edition, which has نايب —Nā’ib (Firīshṭa, op. cit., p. 114).
6 Barani, op. cit., pp. 241, 320, 323. It was ascertained through the unsafing help of Prof. S. H. ‘Askari, Jt. Director, K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna, that in the Bankapore Public Library manuscript of Barani’s work, the name is twice transcribed quite clearly as Nānak.
7 Ibid., p. 273.
9 Elliot & Dowson, op. cit., pp. 172, 198.
10 Rizvī, op. cit., pp. 41, 60, 89.
11 Ibid., p. 88.
13 Ibid., vol. XXXIX, p. 40.
Thus, Barani's printed text and translations have (but in Rizvi who has followed the printed text in the other three places), and (in Fuller's translation).

In the Bombay edition of the work of Wassaf, the non-Indian contemporary, the name is spelt —Babak, but in Elliot's translation, the corresponding passage has —Nanak, with a note that the reading is doubtful.

The near-contemporary Isami mentions him only in connexion with the Mongol invasion, but he gives more details than both Amir Khusraw and Barani do. He describes the event under two sections, in the headings of which, as well as in eight places in the text, the name cited is —Nanak. In both the Agra and Madras editions of Isami's work, as well as in Rizvi's Hindi translation, the same spelling is found. In short, Isami repeatedly used the name —Nanak and like Wassaf, also adds the nisa Hindi.

Among the later histories, the printed text of Yahya Sarhindi's work has —Naiib with the variant —Nayak. In the Navalkishore edition of Nizamuddin Ahmad's history, it is spelt —Babak, while the Calcutta edition has —Naiib. The accounts of Badayuni and Firighta are rather confused and incorrect. The former mentions Malik Mannik as the commander of the Delhi army against the Mongols and identifies him with Malik Naiib Kazir Dinar. Firighta, also wrongly, makes Malik Naiib the leader of this expedition. Lastly, Haji Dahir has —Bana, in which the linear form of either —Nanak, —Babak or —Nayak is obtained, if the terminal alif is removed.

It will thus be seen that the majority of the variants preclude the possibility of the name being either —Mannik or —Naiib. This is also conclusively proved by our record, where neither the initial letter is nor the terminal one ; it is very unfortunate that the name is inscribed without diacritical marks, depriving us of undisputed evidence for the correct spelling of the name. Thus, the variants point to the linear form answering to any of these three names: —Babak, —Nayak and —Nanak, since the names and (which, if the initial alif is removed, would read as ) can be easily discarded as very unlikely, if not quite impossible.

Now which of the above three names was actually borne by the Akhurbek-i-Misrara? The modern writers are inclined to call him Malik Nayak only. For example, Dr. S. Roy, the latest to write on the subject, prefers Malik Nayak or Mannik. His argument for this, at least inasmuch as it provides an unfortunate example of confused and inconclusive thinking, and has not even the merit of originality, may be reproduced here. Roy says: 'Taran, p. 320, has Nayak; Amir Khusraw, Khazain-ul-Futuoh, p. 38, Mannik; 'Isami, p. 301-2, Nanak. The name was either Nayak

---

1 Wassaf, op. cit., p. 527.
2 Elliot & Dowson, op. cit., p. 49 and f. n. 1.
5 Badayuni, Manazhikhat-Tavarihi, vol. I (Calcutta, 1888), pp. 185-86.
6 Firighta, op. cit., p. 114.
or Mānik and the leader of the campaign was a Hindu as Khusraw states in the 'Ashiqā, p. 61. He is possibly the Mānik who saved 'Alā-ud-dīn from Ākat Khān's assault referred to by Barānī, p. 273. According to Firishtah, Malik Nāib and Ghāzi Malik Tughluq were leaders of the campaign.71

The above statement which needs no further comments, may be compared with what Dr. K. S. Lāl, has stated in his history of the Khalbīs, written almost a decade earlier: 'Khusraw says that Malik Naik was a Hindu. Barānī also names the commander as Malik Naik. 'Īşāmī incorrectly reads Malik Nānak. 'Alāuddīn had a païk Manik by name who had saved him at the time of Īkat Khān's assault (Barānī, p. 273). But the general who fought the Mughals was surely Malik Naik as mentioned by two contemporary authorities Barānī and Khusraw. Firishtah says that Malik Naib and Malik Tughlaq were sent.8

It is surprising that Lāl too has not taken into account the glaring misprints in the printed works of Barānī and others. He does not even seem to have consulted the original text, leave alone a manuscript, of Amir Khusraw's Khazā'in. Otherwise, as we have already seen above, where do Barānī and Khusraw, the two contemporary authorities, mention him beyond any confusion, as Malik Nāyak? The printed edition of Barānī's work has Nāyak only in one place and three different spellings in the remaining places where he is mentioned, and that of Khusraw does not have Nāyak at all. Lāl has only consulted the translation of Ḥabīb, who, as stated above, has arbitrarily adopted the form Nāyak. Then, secondly, Lāl has not cared to explain, leave alone prove, how is 'Īşāmī incorrect. As a matter of fact, both the Madras and Agra editions of his work have Nānak in not less than ten places.

It appears that neither Lāl nor Roy saw the pertinent note of Professor S. H. Hodīwālā, who, having revised his earlier note (in which he had accepted the spelling Nāyak), after 'Īşāmī's Futūḥ was published, stated that 'as he is repeatedly called Nānak Hindī Ākhur-bek-i-Maisara, in the Futūḥu's-Salāṭīn also (pp. 294-95; verses 5649, 5659, 5669), Nānak seems to be correct and may have been his old Hindu name.9

To me also, the name appears to be Nānak only. On the face of it, Nāyak as a proper name is quite unlikely, and the use of a surname or caste along with the official designation Malik, particularly without the definite article used before it, is almost improbable. Moreover, in the metrical work of 'Īşāmī, who elsewhere uses the word Nāyak in its original sense indicating a surname or status,4 its use as a proper name, without even Malik, is quite unlikely. Therefore, the name should either be Nānāk or Nānāk. But since the official was Indian (Hindi) as well as a Hindu, the name could only be Nānāk.5

VII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 733, FROM NAGAUR

This inscription is from a beautifully carved lofty gateway, called Baland-Darwāza, leading to the enclosure6 containing the tomb of the famous thirteenth century saint Ḥadrāt

---

71 Dr. R. C. Majumdar, ed. The Delhi Sultans (Bombay, 1960), pp. 29, 50 (f. n. 23).
72 Lāl, op. cit., pp. 168-69, f. n. 66.
74 'Īşāmī, op. cit., p. 514, line 10031.
76 It would not be correct to say that it stands in the middle of the enclosure (Cunningham, op. cit., vol. XXIII, p. 69). The impression is given by the fact that the enclosure wall has fallen and there are graves outside too.
Ha’midu’d-Din Suwâlî Şâfi Nâgauri, commonly known as Sultân u’t-Târikh. The Dargâh of Şâfi Şâhib, as the tomb is popularly known, is situated outside the Maya gate of Nâgaur and seems to have been originally fenced off by imposing four walls of stone masonry having a rounded tower at each corner; two of these in line of the gateway may still be seen in partial ruins. The gateway is also known as Atâr-kâ-Darwâza, after the saint’s title. This impressive structure, which is remarkable for its elaborate carving occupying its whole surface, is about 16 metres high. Two three-storeyed square towers, comprising four-sided balconied kiosks marked by crenellations and each surmounted by a dome, and built against the corners of the southern facade, add dignity to the whole building.

On the top of this gateway, into the inside face of the wall, immediately above the floor-level of the last but one landing between two side-stairs, is built up a long rectangular red sandstone slab which contains the record under study. Garrick, who was the first to describe its contents, assigned it to the time of Muhammâd bin Tughluq Shâh, but quoted A.H. 650 as its date and also held the erroneous view that the gateway was only repaired by the king. He also cited the local tradition attributing the commencement of the edifice to the saint himself and its completion to his heir Khâwâja Husain Chishti under the guidance of the architect Shaikh ‘Abdul.

The text of the record runs into six couples, of which the first is Arabic and the rest are Persian. It purports that the Dârâ’l-Karâmât (lit. Abode of Miracles), the tomb of Shaikh u’l-Islâm, the Shaikh among the abdâls (second in the hierarchy of saints), was constructed in the middle (i.e. 15th) of the month of Sha’bân 733 (1st May 1333), by the order of the reigning king, Muhammâd, son of Tughluq Shâh. Thus, the tomb of the saint was built and not repaired by the order of the Sultan, as Mr. Garrick was informed. Also, its date is A.H. 733 and not A.H. 630 or A.H. 633 when incidentally, the ruling king was Itutmish.

A point that may be noted here is that the inscription does not make any reference to the gateway itself. It is difficult to say if that is because the gateway was supposed to be part of the tomb and as such, was not separately mentioned. Incidentally, hagiographical works state that the four-wall enclosure of the tomb was built by the Sultan, and the gateway by Makhdoom Husain Nâgauri. But though the inscribed tablet fits in completely with the masonry and gives the impression of being a homogeneous part of the wall, it is extremely doubtful if the inscription was intended to record the construction of the gateway as well. Not only this slab is of red sandstone and the remaining masonry, of yellow sandstone, but—and this is very important—the construction of the gateway, on architectural grounds, must have taken place at least a century or so earlier, for the arches of the gateway and the squinches of its domed hall are built in

---

1 Mir Khurd, Siyaru’l-Auliya (Delhi, 1876), p. 156, quotes his full name as ‘Shaikh u’l-Islâm Ha’midu’d-Din Suwâlî Abû Ahmad a’s-Sâki n a’-Sâfi’.
2 A detailed description of the gateway will be found in Cunningham, op. cit., vol. XXIII, pp. 69-71, pl. XIV and ARAJ, 1921-22, p. 73
3 ARIE, 1901-02, No. D, 245.
4 Cunningham, op. cit., vol. XXIII, p. 69, but on p. 64, the date quoted is A.H. 633.
5 Here, evidently Makhdoom Husain Nagauri, to whom a reference has been made above, is intended. He was a descendant of the saint and himself a man of great piety and religiousity. He died in A.H. 901 (1496-96). This local belief seems to owe its origin to a statement of the seventeenth century author and scholar ‘Abdul’l-Haqq (op. cit., p. 183).
6 In Sufi hagiography, they are second in rank to qad and represent seventy persons, by whom God continues the world in existence. When one dies, his place is filled up by some one selected from the lower order. Evidently, the misreading of this word as Abdul gave rise to the fictitious identity of the architect Shaikh Abdul.
7 Cunningham, op. cit., vol. XXIII, pp. 64, 69.
(a) Fragmentary record of Muhammad Shah, Bari Khattu (p. 39)

(b) Inscription of the same monarch, dated A.H. 733, from Nagaur (p. 19)
KHALJI AND TUGHLUQ INSCRIPTIONS FROM RAJASTHAN

corbel style and not according to the true scientific principles, which had already come into vogue more than three decades earlier. Its having been built by Makhdum Husain Nagaari in the late fifteenth century is out of question.

It is indeed a pity that the record does not contain further details. For example, no mention is made of the muqta of the region, or the local official. It is also not stated if Nagaur was included in the Ajmer province, as Bari Khatu, about 60 kilometres to the east, was, as we have just seen above. Strangely enough, the text does not cite the name of the saint too. He was, as is well known, a disciple of the great Khwaja Mu'inud-Din Chishti of Ajmer, renowned alike for piety and scholarship, and endowed with literary talent. He died, according to one account, in A.H. 673 (1274) and according to another, in A.H. 659 (1259).^3

Though, the text in itself neither conforms nor rejects the identity of the saint, there should be little doubt about it. It calls him the Shaikh of the abdals and Shaikhul-Islam, and designates his tomb as ‘Abode of Miracles’. The very fact that the tomb was ordered to be built by Muhammed bin Tughluq Shah points to the saint’s greatness.

Not much significance may perhaps be attached to the wish expressed in the fourth couplet that the king might not have any rebel or denier. If at all, it may only indicate that the composer did take notice of the rebellions that had started troubling the Sultan.^4

The two-line text is engraved in relief. The long tablet which measures 2.47 m. by 40 cm., seems to have developed cracks, as indicated by the cementing in two or three places affecting the letters. The style of writing is usual Na’il.

The text has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate IV(b)*

(1) Dāru’l-Karūmāt (lit. Abode of Miracles) is the greatly venerated abode. It is as if a garden from the garden(s) of Paradise.

(2)

TRANSLATION

1 Cf. Cunningham, *op. cit.*, vol. XXIII, pl. XIV.

2 Some particulars of his life and beliefs will be found in Amir Hasan, *Fusūd: Fusūd* (Delhi, A. H. 1312), pp. 3, 70, 206; Mr Khurd, *op. cit.*, pp. 156-64; *Aghār-i-Ābūr*, Urdu translation of Hasan Ghaqiq’s *Gulār-i-Ābūr* (Agra, 1909), pp. 63-65 (who also cites a Persian quatrain of the saint); *Abdu’l-Ḥaq, op. cit.*, pp. 29-37; *Ghulām Sarwar, Khastamān‘i-Aṣfīā (Kanpur, 1902)*, pp. 306-09.

3 Cf. Mr Khurd, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

4 For the rebellions, see Dr. A. Māhdi Ḥussain, *Tughril Dynasty* (Calcutta, 1963), chapter VIII.

5 Thus on the stone.
The construction of this tomb (called) Dāru’l-Karāmāt, a much respected and the best of abodes, (took place) by the order of the sovereign of the time and age, Muḥammad, son of Tughluq Shāh, the Sulṭān.

(2) the origin of justice and benevolence, (A)bū’l-Mujāhid. May none turn a rebel against or denier, of him!

The edifice of the tomb of this Shaikh’u’l-Islām was completed in the middle (i.e. 15th day) of the month of Sha’bān.

From the Migration, the year was seven hundred and thirty and three (when), the tomb of this Shaikh among the Abdāls was constructed (15 Sha’bān 733—1 May 1333).

VIII. FRAGMENTARY RECORD FROM BARI KHATU

A small inscribed fragment of marble measuring 21 by 14 cm. was found by Mr. Šīdīqī in the mosque in the Maḥalla-Sayyidān—same as the one in which inscription No. I was found—at Bari Khatu.1 The incomplete two-line text merely comprises part of the honorific title and name of the Sulṭān in the first line and part of the titles of another person, presumably an official, in the second. From the name of the Sulṭān, viz. Muḥammad, followed by the word bin (i.e. son of) and the honorific title ‘Striver in the path of Allāh’ as well as from the calligraphy, the identity of the king is established beyond doubt.

The style of writing is Nāshī. The extant text reads as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate IV(a)*

\[\text{ف} \text{سبيل الله محمد بن} \]

(1) .......... (striver in) the path of Allāh, Muḥammad, son of ............... (2) .......... u’d-Daulat wa’d-Dīn .............

**TRANSLATION**

(1) .......... (striver in) the path of Allāh, Muḥammad, son of ............... (2) .......... u’d-Daulat wa’d-Dīn .............

It is not possible to determine the name of the official from the extant writing. The first two letters of the phrase indicating the name are م—m and ج—j or ح—h, and since there is not much space between these and the letters that immediately follow, the titular phrase could be either مجي الدولة or مجي الدولة. Could it be the latter? Mujīrū’Dīn Abū Rajā was a prominent official.2 If so, the epigraph would indicate that Khatu or Ajmer was under his charge, prior to his posting at Bayana, a piece of information not met with in any historical work.

**Fīrūz Shāh**

The last three inscriptions of this study are of the time of Fīrūz Shāh (1351-88). They are to be found at as far off places as Chatau in Jaipur District, Mandor in Jodhpur district and

---

1 ARIE, 1962-63, No. D, 294. It does not seem to have come to Chaghtāi’s notice.
Bayana. All the three are fragmentary, and two of them, undated. Nevertheless, their importance lies in determining the period and extent of the Tughluq rule in various parts of Rajasthan. It may be recalled here that of Firuz’s four known inscriptions from Rajasthan, three were found in Nagaur district and one in Jaipur district.¹

IX. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 783, FROM CHATSU

Chatsu or Chaksu as it is also called, is a tahsil town, about 40 kilometres to the south-east of the district headquarters Jaipur. It is an ancient town, but unfortunately, no old remains have survived in or about, except those of a few tanks.² Its most notable Muslim remain is the Chhatrī of Gurg ‘Ali Shāh (died 1568-69), which bears two inscriptions, one recording the date of his martyrdom, and the other, a visitor’s memento engraved by the famous Mīr Muḥammad Maṣūm of Akbar’s period.³

Both A. C. L. Carleyle and D. R. Bhandarkar who visited Chatsu in 1871-72 and 1909-10 respectively,⁴ had overlooked this inscription. It was first found by Rāi Bahādur Dayā Rām Sāhni, then Director of Archaeology and Historical Research, Jaipur State, who was, however, unable to give any details except the date and the occurrence of the name of Chatsu pargana.⁵

It is not exactly known when Chatsu first came to be occupied by the Muslims, but it may have, at an early date. That the region around Chatsu was occupied by the Tughluqs is testified by the present record, dated 1381. Bābur mentions it among his possessions in India.⁶ But some time before the sixteenth century, the Kachhwāhas appear to have gained control: They ruled, first from Amber near Jaipur and later on from Jaipur, either independently or as vassals of the Mughal rulers and of the British.

The loose fragmentary tablet on which this four-line epigraph is inscribed is lying in the Nilgaron ki-Masjid in the town.⁷ Measuring 54 by 31 cm., it seems to be a complete unit as there appears to be a border on the left. If so, it would mean that another same-sized slab which contained the remaining text is missing. Be as it may, considerable text is lost, and the full purport cannot be made out. But even whatever has survived is not without interest. The extant text does not contain the name of the king, but it refers to his reign, and since the date A.H. 783 (1381) is fortunately preserved, the king is none other than Firuz Shāh Tughluq.

The epigraph mentions the Bāzār-i Khās (Main Market). The phrase ‘is set up (in the) Main Market’ occurring in the third line, must refer to the setting up of the inscription there, and this would mean that the text might have contained some sort of instructions, a royal order or a decision perhaps, notified for general information. Also, the place-name is spelt in the record as Chatsū with t, which may be noted. Then, Chatsu is called a pargana, which shows that the town was already a pargana headquarters in old days. In short, the record indicates that Chatsu was a town of sufficient importance.

² For an account of the town and its remains, see Cunningham, op. cit., vol. VI (Calcutta, 1878), pp. 116-20 (account by Mr. A. C. L. Carleyle); PRWC, 1909-10, pp. 49-50; ARASI, 1927-28, p. 147; Dayā Rām Sāhni, Archaeological Remains and Excavations at Bāīrā, pp. 5-8.
³ ELM, 1923-24, pp. 21, 23. The chronogram for the death of Gurg ‘Alli Shāh is doubtfully read and worked out to yield A. H. 969 (ibid., p. 23), but the inscription is in Nasta’liq and according to my reading of the chronogram, the date of death would be A. H. 976 (1568-69). ARASI, 1925-26, p. 128, gives A. H. 979.
⁵ Sāhni, op. cit., p. 7.
The text refers to a freed slave ('atīq) of Khwāja Jahlān. The latter can be none other than the well-known Prime Minister of Firūz Šah. As to the former, it may be inferred from the phrase 'on behalf of the Maliḵu' š-Šarq' that he was in charge of the pargana. And most probably, the Maliḵu' š-Šarq, whose name is lost, was some one other than the Khwāja Jahlān. The first line of the text 'by his special (i.e. personal) attention, the humble creature hopeful of the mercy of the Nourisher' may be taken to convey that the said subordinate had ordered to undertake some work of public good, provided of course, the record begins with this sentence only, as is very likely the case. But if some portion of the text is missing in the beginning, the phrase would mean that he acted under orders of his master.

Thus, our inscription, fragmentary as it is, is quite interesting, and therefore, it is regrettable that it is incomplete. Palaeographically too, it is of sufficient importance. Executed in conventional Nasḵ, it gives an overall impression of being slightly inelegant, but that is due to the somewhat uneven alignment and spacing of letters. Otherwise, the calligraphy is of sufficient artistic merit, and in particular, the execution of the letter ـ d joined to a preceding letter, in several places in lines 1 and 4 recall to mind the much more developed and finer calligraphy of the Tughluq inscriptions of Bihar.  

The text which is in Persian, reads as under:

TEXT

Plate V(c)

(1) بتوجة خاصة خود بندة ضعيف اميدوار برحمت پروددار
(2) برگنده فاتسو عتبغ خواهم چهان کی از چهت ملک الشرق
(3) بازاز خاص نصب است در عهد خداوند عالمیانه
(4) بتاريخ دوم ماه محرم سنة ثلاث و ثمانی و سبعمیاه

TRANSLATION

(1) The weak creature, hopeful of the mercy of the Nourisher, by his personal attention .
(2) pargana of Chātsū, the freed slave ('atīq) of Khwāja Jahlān, who on behalf of Maliḵu' š-Šarq.
(3) is fixed up in the Bāzār-i-Khāṣ (Main Market), in the reign of the Lord, shelter of the world.
(4) on the second day of the month of Muḥarram, year (A.H.) three and eighty and seven hundred (2 Muḥarram 783=29 March 1381).

X. FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTION FROM MANDOR

The tenth inscription, from Mandor, in the Jodhpur district, published here for the first time, was copied by me in 1955, from the mosque locally called Shāh-Masjid or Royal mosque; 1 perhaps

---

1 EJAP, 1961, pls. VIII, IX.
2 ARlE, 1955-56, No. D, 165. Lāl, op. cit., p. 44, f.n. 16, refers to the existence of the inscription but does not give any purport.
Plate V

(a) Incomplete inscription of Firuz Shah, from Bayana (p. 24)

(b) Another fragmentary record of the same king, from Mandor (p. 23)

(c) Another record of the same ruler, dated A.H. 783, from Chatsau (p. 22)
the same as the mosque of Ghulām Khān of Garrick. A building of no merit, it is probably on account of the present record that it is known by this name.

This epigraph is a mere fragment. The extant two-line text in Persian refers to the construction of a mosque in the reign of Sultān Firūz Shāh. Other details including the date are lost. But on palaeographical grounds, the epigraph has to be assigned to the Tughluq king and not to the founder of the Khalji dynasty who conquered Mandor in 1292.

Mandor was the capital of the Rāṭhōr chiefs till 1459, when Jodhpur city was founded a few kilometres to the south. It is a place of considerable antiquity. The old fort, a hall of sixteen colossal hero-figures hewn out of a single natural rock and richly sculptured stone cenotaphs and chhatrīs, also remarkable for their carving, are among its chief archaeological remains.

The early history of Mandor during the Muslim period is not very clear. It was conquered in 1226-27 by Itutmish. In 1242, along with Ajmer and Nagaur, it was conferred on Malik 'Izzu'd-Din Balban, and must have also been included in the sīf of Ulugh Khān, later on Sultān Balban, who had succeeded Malik 'Izzu'd-Din. It must have relapsed to the Hindu authority some time before the rule of Jalālu'd-Din Khalji who conquered it again in about 1292. After that, the authority of his successor Alāu'd-Din had extended to Jalor and Siwana about 100 kilometres to the south-west.

One Malik Dā'ūrid was the governor of Jalor under Firūz Tughluq himself. The traditional account that right from about 1212, Mandor was the capital of the Parīhār chiefs, from whom it was wrested in 1381 by Rao Chonda, is disproved by the above, as well as by the present inscription of Firūz Tughluq (1351-88). The place, like Chateu and other places in Rajasthan, must have relapsed to the Rajput authority some time during the period of the disintegration of the Delhi Sultanate after the Tughluqs, if not still later.

The inscriptions of this mosque, in its present condition, is built up into the west wall of the said mosque and contains a two-line text, inscribed in Naṣkī of no particular merit, which has been read as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate V(b)*

```
(1) بناه این مسجد در تیم دو[ات]

(2) فیروز شاه السلطان[ن]
```

**TRANSLATION**

(1) The construction of this mosque, in the time of the government of

(2) Firūz Shāh, the Sultan.

---

1 Cunningham, *op. cit.*, vol. XXIII, p. 77.
3 For the history of Mandor and detailed description of its remains, including a few Muslim buildings, see B. N. Reu, *Mārājān-bā-Ihād*, in Hindi, vol. I (Jodhpur, 1938), pp. 8-10; Cunningham, *op. cit.*, vol. XXIII, pp. 73-85; Erskine, *op. cit.*, pp. 196-98; *ARASI*, 1905-06, pp. 135-40; ibid., 1900-10, pp. 93-103; *PRWC*, 1906-07, pp. 31-33; ibid., 1907-08, p. 29; etc. There is a small booklet entitled *Mandor*, giving an account of the buildings etc., about whose author or place and year of publication, no information is available. A paper entitled "History of Mandor," was read by Dr. K. C. Jain before the 22nd Session of the Indian History Congress held in 1959 at Guwahati.
5 Baran, *op. cit.*, p. 528.
6 Erskine, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
XI. FRAGMENTARY RECORD FROM BAYANA

The last record of this study was found in 1955 by me at Bayana, a sub-divisional headquarters in Bharatpur district. The fragmentary sandstone slab, measuring 24 by 14 cm., was recovered from the debris lying to the west of a mosque behind the 'Idghâh, outside the town.

Bayana was connected with the Muslim rule from its very inception. Its importance may be judged from the fact that it was usually conferred in siege upon nobles of great rank, the first in recorded history being Malik Bahâu’d-Din Tughrîl, the most trusted lieutenant of Muhammed bin Sâm. Among its subsequent governors were Nuğratu’d-Din Tâbi’î (1235), Qarâqash Khân (1242), Arsalân Khân and Nuğrat Khân (c. 1242-56), Qutlugh Khân (1252) and Sher Khân, a cousin of Balban (1259). Under the Khaljis, we only get the name of ‘Alâu’d-Din’s brother Ulugh Khân as the governor and under the Tughluqs, those of Malik Muqaffar and Malik Mujîr Abû Rajâ.

Naturally, therefore, the place had a considerable number of early buildings and numerous inscriptions, of which unfortunately no exhaustive survey seems to have been made earlier. When I visited the place in 1955, I did not come across any pre-Mughal inscription with the exception of a couple of epitaphs, one of which I have identified with that of Aühad Khân, founder of the Aühadî line of Bayana chiefs. No trace remains even of those Khalji inscriptions, which were fortunately published in a previous issue of this Series. These epigraphical remains met with destruction about two decades ago, along with the buildings, particularly mosques, on which they were set up. Those that have fortunately survived include a few records of the time of the Aühadîs, the Sûrs and the Mughals, mostly appearing on secular buildings at Bayana and the Bijaimandirgarh fort nearby.

Mainly from this point of view, the record may be considered important. It is the only known Tughluq record from Bayana, though on the nearby fort, a later inscription of Mâhmu’d Shâh Tughluq, as already stated above, is reported. But for this, the present fragment of the surviving text contains merely the name of the king and his kunya.

The style of writing is Naskh.

TEXT

Plate V(a)

..........................................

Abû’l-Muqaffar Firûz Shâh

TRANSLATION

..........................................

1 For the history, buildings and inscriptions of Bayana and nearby Bijaimandirgarh, see Cunningham, op. cit., vol. VI, pp. 40-73; ibid., vol. XX, pp. 60-88; ibid., vol. XXXIII, p. 64; EIM, 1917-18, pp. 20, 39, 42; ARIE, 1955-56, Nos. D, 113-25; EIAPS, 1959 and 1960, pp. 60-61. A paper on the history of Bayana was read by Dr. K. C. Jain before the All India Oriental Conference held at Bhubaneswar in 1959.

2 ARIE, 1955-56, No. D, 119. It was then removed to the P.W.D. Inspection Bungalow near the Railway Station.


4 Barani, op. cit., p. 272.

5 Ibn Baṭṭûṭa, op. cit., p. 152.

6 EIAPS, 1961, p. 61.

7 EIM, 1917-18, pp. 20, 39, 42.


LODI AND SUR INSCRIPTIONS FROM BIHAR AND UTTAR PRADESH

By W. H. Siddiqi

Senior Epigraphical Assistant

It is regrettable that the Afghan rule which forms an important epoch in the history of medieval India has not been properly recorded by the contemporary historians. Our knowledge of the Lodis and Surs is based almost entirely either on the Mughal histories or on the works of Afghan authors, which were compiled during the reigns of Akbar and Jahangir. In this perspective, any contemporary document, however fragmentary, is a valuable record for the history of the period. It is, therefore, a little gratifying that some epigraphical records of these dynasties have survived till this day.

In this article, I have taken up for study eleven such inscriptions. These epigraphs are interesting records from historical point of view, since they furnish information, particularly about personages which is not known from any other source and also yield valuable data about the monuments on which they are found. Some of these records were noticed previously, but their texts were copied, almost in all cases, without any critical acumen, and no historical description or notes regarding the personages were given.

For obvious reasons, the study of these epigraphs has been taken up region-wise: the first part deals with those from Bihar and the other, with those of Uttar Pradesh. I am thankful to Dr. Z. A. Desai for the help I have received from him in preparing the article in its present form.

Bihar

The history of Bihar during the last quarter of the fifteenth century is represented by the final phase of the Sharqi-Lodi struggle for territorial supremacy over the region. And though at the turn of the century, Sikandar Lodi succeeded in annexing Bihar or a part thereof to the Delhi kingdom, the political status of the province was yet somewhat complicated: different parts were under the suzerainty, at one time or the other, or alternatively, of the Lodis and the Bengal Sultans. This phase also witnessed the rise of the Afghan confederacy in eastern India, the Nuhans being the first to establish their authority which extended from Bihar in the east to Sambhal in the west. In short, for about fifty years (1522-1574), the various Afghan tribes, namely Nuhans, Karrans, Ishqaran and Suras, held sway over a large part of Bihar, successfully defying the Sultans of Bengal as well as of Delhi.

Babur invaded Bihar in May 1529, but having realised the superior strength of Nuhat Shah of Bengal, he was obliged to retreat after entering into an agreement. After Babur’s death, disorder prevailed in the province, and taking advantage of this, Farid, entitled Sher Khan, the leader

---

1 For inscriptions of the Bengal Sultans in Bihar, please see Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1961, pp. 35-44. The Sharqi records from Bihar have been studied by me in ibid., 1962, pp. 41-52.
of the Sūrs and a protege of the Nūhānīs, supplanted his rivals and ultimately established an all-India empire in A. H. 946 (1539). Henceforth, Bihar remained under the effective control of the Sūrs, until it was finally subjugated by Akbar in A. H. 983 (1575).\(^1\)

No Lodi monument of any architectural value has survived in the province, but we have one epigraph of Sikandar Lodi. On the other hand, there are quite a few buildings and inscriptions of the Sūr period, which is not surprising.\(^2\) Three of the four Bihar epigraphs studied in the following lines belong to Sher Shāh; they include one set up during his pre-kingship period.

**Lodi**

I. **INSCRIPTION OF SIKANDAR LODI, DATED A. H. 901**

The first inscription is quite interesting in that it contains useful, though scanty data, on the Lodi conquest of the province. The tablet on which it is inscribed measures 94 by 30 cm. and is built up in the northern wall of a four-wall enclosure marking the Dargāh of Shāh Faḍlullāh Gosā’in in the Dāira-Maḥalla of Bihar Sharif in Patna district. It was Professor S. H. ‘Askari of Patna College and now Honorary Joint Director, K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna, who discovered it first and brought it to the notice of Dr. Desai, having accompanied him to the place in January 1956. After removing the thick coating of whitewash the record was copied, deciphered and found to be that of Sikandar Lodi.\(^3\) The tablet is unfortunately badly damaged with the result that the text is not quite legible in parts. But it was more or less completely deciphered by Dr. Desai subsequently, and I have utilised his reading here.

Evidently not in situ, the epigraph refers to the conquest of Bihar in A. H. 901 (1496), by Sikandar Lodi and records the construction of ‘an eastern gate’ by Ḥāji Khān at the instance of the Bihar governor Daryā Khān Nūhānī, who is mentioned as the ‘minister of the kingdom’ immediately thereafter. It is not clear from the text of what building the eastern gate formed part. Very likely, it was the city-wall, since the text indicates that the construction took place on the last day of the month in which Bihar was conquered. Therefore, it is more than probable that the city-walls were repaired immediately after the event.

The record comprises four verses in Persian of mediocre quality. The style of writing, likewise, is an inelegant, if not crude, form of Nasḵā. This feature is also seen in the other epigraphs of this period in the State, and it is indeed a matter of surprise that in Bihar, the calligraphical style that had reached such a high level of excellence in the nural records of the Tughluq period should have deteriorated to this extent.

The text of the epigraph is quoted below:

**Text**

Plate VI (c)

\((1)\) شهنشاه علم آوا شا آفاق دین پرورد نسب فاک حسب رایق جهاندار است اسکندر
\(ب)\) ششم ماه اسم بوداست یک و نهمد از هجرت
\(ب)\) بهادر آمد پرست او ز فضل ازد اسکندر

---

2. Some Sūr inscriptions of Bihar were published in Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica (EIM), 1922-24, pp. 28-29.
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(3) Bada’i Sallâ, Zân-i Qâder-i Sultân, f. Aziyadâ, Shâhâdât-i Pârâ-Isfâhân

Moṣâs-i Kûrâl Ḥâjj-i Khânân, dar Shârîq-i Khârûn, Yâr-i Bûd, Muḥârûl

TRANSLATION

(1) The emperor who adorns the standard (of kingship), the king of the horizons (and) the protector of Faith, superior in lineage and distinguished in achievements, the possessor of the world is Ḥâjj-i Khânân (Sikandar).

It was sixth of the month, [al]-Aṣâmûm (i.e. Rajab), one and nine hundred (years) from the Migration (of the Prophet) (6 Rajab 901=21 March 1496), when the province of Bihar came into his hand by God’s grace, at the auspicious moment.

(2) After that, on the last day (of the same month), by the exalted orders of the minister of the kingdom, the adorer of Faith, Daryâ Khânân, who possesses the dignity of Farîdûn.

Ḥâjj Khânân has laid the foundation of the eastern gate (of the city-wall ?). Now O God ! May Nûhânî be the pivot of the sphere of the country and the nation !

Daryâ Khânân, referred to above, succeeded his father Mubârak Khân Nâhâni, the first Lodî governor of Jaunpur and Bihar, in the governorship of Bihar, on the latter’s death, in A. H. 901 (1495 A.D.). He is also mentioned as having been his father’s deputy (nâ‘îb) in Bihar at least in A. H. 894. As Amûrâ’-ur-rumar under Sikandar and Ibrâhîm Lodî, he was not only responsible for consolidating the Lodî possessions in Bihar, but also played an important part in most of the Lodî campaigns in the east. In the last years of Ibrâhîm’s unpopular regime, Daryâ Khânân revolted and was still deliberating over his plans, when death overtook him in 1522. As for Ḥâjj Khânân, the builder, it is not possible to say for certain if he is identical with Ḥâjj Khânân Tarîn, brother of Jâlî Khân, who seems to have served both Lodî and Sûr dynasties. This Ḥâjj Khânân had led the Afghan army, when Humâyûn marched on Gaur, and after killing the Mughal governors of Jaunpur and Kara-Manikpur, had occupied these places as well as Qannauj on behalf of Sher Khân, under whom he was an important officer. Sher Khân appointed him faujdar of Mewat in 1541.

Sûr

II. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 942, FROM AMTHUA

The tablet bearing this epigraph was lying loose in a mosque at Amthua in Gaya district, when Dr. Desai got its impressions prepared in 1956 in the company of Professor ‘Askari, who was also

---


2 Ni’mamu’d-Dîn Ahmad, Tâmapâ’t-i Akhâri (Lucknow, 1875), p. 159. Dr. K. R. Qanungo, Sher Khân (Calcutta, 1921), p. 281, however, says that Daryâ Khân held iṣf of Bihar from the days of the kings of Jaunpur.


4 Ni’matu’llâh, op. cit., p. 344. For subsequent career of Ḥâjj Khânân in Punjab, Malwa, Mewat and Gujarat, see ibid., pp. 344-49; ‘Abdû’l-Qâdir Badayûnî, Muntakhab-i-Tawârikhî, vol. I (Calcutta, 1868), pp. 431, 433; ‘Abdû’l’lâhî, op. cit., pp. 147, 148, etc.
responsible for its discovery.\textsuperscript{1} It measures 68 by 15 cm., and is slightly weather-beaten. The style of writing is also somewhat crude, and the letters are of uneven size. All these have made the decipherment of the text difficult. Moreover, the language of the record is quite hopeless. It will be observed that the sentence even is not complete. The text quoted below is the result of the efforts of Dr. Desai, who has permitted me to use the reading.

It is not possible to define the exact purport of the record. But since it contains the famous tradition of the Prophet commonly found in mosque inscriptions, it may refer to the construction of some mosque, erected in the name of a saint, whose name reads like Khwāja Budh (1) Chāyanda (†). The builder’s name is proposed to be deciphered as Bāzīd Nūḥānī Khīḍr Khālīf, a protege of Malik Mānīk Shāh-bāz Khānī, and the scribe’s name, as Mirān Dā’ūd Abdāl. The connexion between the few names mentioned in the text cannot be determined beyond doubt.

Another inexplicable aspect of the record is its date, which is clearly indicated in the text as ‘Shuhūr Sana nine hundred and thirtyfive, Monday, twenty-first of Sha‘bān, year 942’. Now the later date in which the year is given in figure is regular, since the twenty-first of Sha‘bān of A.H. 942 was Monday. But it is difficult to be exactly sure as to what the scribe meant by coupling this date with the date Shuhūr Sana 935. If the phrase Shuhūr Sana is taken literally, i.e. to mean ‘(in) the months of the year’, the date 935 would indicate the Hijra era, in which case the year should be that of the beginning of the construction. But the text does not warrant this assumption. Alternatively, the phrase Shuhūr Sana may be taken to refer to the Shuhūr era. This era, which was commonly used in Deccan, is generally believed to have started from A.H. 744 (1343).\textsuperscript{2} Now Shuhūr year 935 in vogue in Deccan was equivalent to A.H. 941 and not A.H. 942.\textsuperscript{3} But then, it may be remembered that no authentic or exact data are available about the starting point of the Shuhūr era and particularly about the months adapted for that solar-Hijra year that Shuhūr Sana represents. Then again, it is not known if the Shuhūr era as was in vogue in Deccan was current in North India as well. No doubt, the Shuhūr era was in vogue in North, as is known from an inscription at Narwar, in Sheopuri district of Madhya Pradesh, which is dated Shuhūr 909 and A.H. 914.\textsuperscript{4} But whether the Shuhūr era of north and south India were identical, it has not been possible to ascertain. It is likely that there was a different solar year adapted in the northern or even in the eastern region, as is perhaps indicated, to some extent, by an inscription from Budaun (p. 34, infra). In the absence of detailed data, no definite conclusion can be reached in this regard. Consequently, in the present case, it is difficult to explain satisfactorily the two dates for the present.\textsuperscript{5}

All the same, the epigraph is valuable. It belongs to the pre-kingship period of Sher Shāh who is designated therein as Ḥādīr-i-‘Ālī Shēr Khān. It thus confirms the fact that though Shēr Khān was virtual master of Bihar in the year A.H. 942 (1536), he had not assumed any royal titles till then.\textsuperscript{6} It also corroborates the statement of Nīmatu’llāh that Shēr Khān had become master of the kingdom of Bihar in A.H. 941 (1535), after the death of Dūdū, mother of Jalāl Khān Nūḥānī.

\textsuperscript{2} Dr. M. Nāzim, Bijapur Inscriptions, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 49 (Delhi, 1936), pp. 93-102.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 97.
\textsuperscript{4} EIAPN, 1965, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{5} This paragraph is by the Editor.
\textsuperscript{6} Nīmatu’llāh, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 276; ‘Abdu’llāh, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 115.
The epigraph runs into three lines beginning with the famous tradition in Arabic, commonly found in mosque inscriptions. The remaining text is in Persian. The style of writing is Naskh. The record has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

**Plate VI (b)**

(1) قال النبي عليه السلام من بني مسجد الله فين يوجد له بيتا مثله في الجنة بنده خان

اهظم شهابز خان شيخ بازیز نهبانی خضر خیل بر آوردنا ملک العادل ملک مانک شهابز خانی

(2) در عهد بانگی حضرت عالی شیر خان حسن سور دام عالیا باسم امام خواجہ بده

(3) شهہر سیم خمسہ تلہنی و تسمیہہہہہیوم [ا] لائزنیفیادی وعشرون من شهر شعبان سیم 932

**TRANSLATION**

(1) The Prophet, may peace (of Allāh) be upon him, has said, ‘He who builds a mosque for Allāh, Allāh builds for him a similar house in Paradise’. The servant (?) of Khān-i-A’zām Shahbāz Khān, (namiy) Shaikh Bāzīz Nūhānī Khayr Khālī (who was) raised by the just noble, Malik Mānik Shahbāz Khānī,

(2) (constructed this mosque ?) during the reign of His Majesty Ḥaḍrat-i-Ālf Sher Khān, son of Ḥasan Sūr, may he always be exalted (and) in the name of Imām Khwāja Budh (?) Chāyandā. Written by (?) Mirān Dā’ūd Abdāl.

(3) (In) the Shuhār Sana five (and) thirty and nine hundred, Monday, the twenty-first of the month of Sha’bān 942 (14th February 1536).

Khān-i-A’zām Shahbāz Khān of the epigraph appears to be identical with Shahbāz Khān Nūhānī, son-in-law of Sher Shāh who was a noble of high rank under the latter as well as under his son Iṣlām Shāh. About Bāzīz Nūhānī, presumably the builder, nothing is known from the historical records at our disposal. From our record, it would appear that he served Malik Mānik Shahbāz Khānī, who must have been a trusted subordinate of Shahbāz Khān. Also, we have no information about the last-mentioned and other saintly personages mentioned in the text.

**III. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 946, FROM JANA**

The third inscription is dated A. H. 946 (1539) in the reign of Sher Shāh after he had assumed royal prerogatives. There is no unanimity among the authorities as to the date and place of the accession of Sher Shāh. ‘Abbās Sarwānī does not mention the event at all. According to Nīzāmū’d-Dīn, Fīrīshṭā, Nī’mat’ullāh and others, Sher Khān sat on the throne in A.H. 946 after the victory at Chausa (27 June 1539) and assumed the royal title of Sher Shāh, while Qanūngū puts the event

---

1 Bādāyūnī, op. cit., p. 379, but Ranking in his translation (Calcutta, 1898), p. 490, makes Shabban Khān a brother-in-law of Sher Shāh, which is wrong. Fīrīshṭā, op. cit., p. 230; Nī’mat’ullāh, op. cit., p. 363 and n. 3.

2 Bādāyūnī, op. cit., p. 495; Nī’mat’ullāh, op. cit.

in about the beginning of December 1539. But N. K. Bhattasali, on the basis of coins, fixed the date of accession between the end of June and the middle of July 1538 (i.e. about the middle of Safar A. H. 945). It is a pity that in our record, the month is not quoted. Even then it makes it absolutely clear that there is no substance in S. R. Sharma’s assertion that Sher Khān proclaimed full independence and assumed the title of Sher Shāh in A. H. 947.

Carved on a black-tablet built into the facade of the Jāmi’ mosque at Jana in Patna district, the epigraph is apparently the earliest record of Sher Shāh’s period of kingship discovered so far. It would appear that the present writing was super-imposed on an earlier text without properly chiselling out the previous writing. Vertical lines particularly in th sides of the text coupled with the fact that the present epigraph does not occupy the whole area support this surmise. Also, the prolonged vertical strokes, in that case recalling to mind what is termed as Bow-and-Arrow variety of calligraphical style of Bengal inscriptions, would make the original record pertain to an earlier period.

The inscriptive tablet measures 68 by 22 cm. and contains a text of three lines in Persian, executed in relief in ordinary Naṣiḥ script, assigning the construction of a mosque to one Ismā’īl.

The text has been read as follows:

TEXT

Plate VI (a)

لا الله الا محمد رسول الله

(1)

عهد سلطان شیر شاه مسجد بنی کرد

(2)

شہور سنت و اربعین تسمایا کاتیحروب اسماعیل ابی الخیر اوحد

TRANSLATION

(1) There is no god but Allāh, Muḥammad is the Prophet of Allāh.

(2) (During) the reign of Sulṭān Sher Shāh, the mosque was constructed by the creature Ismā’īl.

(3) (in) the months of the year six and forty (and) nine hundred (A. H. 946=1539 A. D.).

Written by Abū’l-Khair Auḥad.

I have not been able to identify either Ismā’īl, the builder or Abū’l-Khair Auḥad, the scribe.

IV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 950, FROM HILSA

The fourth and the last inscription of Bihar comes from Hilsa in Patna district. The inscriptive slab measuring 82 by 33 cm. is fixed over the main entrance of the tomb of the famous saint

---

1 Qanungo, op. cit., pp. 206-08.
3 S. R. Sharma, Mughal Empire in India, part I (Bombay, 1934), p. 134.
5 I had previously deciphered it as پاندہ, but the correct reading is پندہ as suggested by my colleague Shri S. A. Rahim, to whom I am thankful.
6 The word Shuhūr is evidently used here in its literary sense.
Lodi and Sur Inscriptions

(a) Sūr inscription, dated A.H. 946, from Jana (p. 30)

Scale: 0.18

(b) Another Sūr inscription, dated A.H. 942, from Amthua (p. 29)

Scale: 0.27

(c) Inscription of Sikandar Lodi, dated A.H. 901, from Bihar Sharif (p. 26)

Scale: 0.2
Shâh Jumman Madârî, a small square-building, built in brick after the style of Malik Bayyâ’s mausoleum at Bihar Sharif.¹ This record was first noticed by A. Cunningham and later on its text was published without plate in the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society and also by Professor 'Askari.²

The epigraph, comprising seven lines of Persian prose executed in relief in ordinary Nâsîkh characters, mentions the fact that the tomb of the saint was repaired during the life-time of Miyân Shâikh 'Âlam, son of Âdâm, son of Jumman Madârî, in A. H. 950 (1543),³ during the rule of Sher Shâh. It also mentions Dâryâ Khân Nûhânî, either as the builder of the original tomb or as the one who carried out the repairs. The text further names Shâms Madârî as the supervisor of the construction.

The epigraph has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

**Plate VII (a)**

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله (اذ كذا) مربوط
(2) گنبد بنگی حضرت میران سید جمین مدراری قدس الله روحه بحضور
(3) بنگی میان شیخ عالم آدم شاه جمین مدراری در عمل بندگی
(4) حضرت سلیمان شیر شاه سلطان خالد الله ملکه و سلطانه
(5) بر آورده دریا خان زنگی هود نوحانی خاص خیل
(6) التسع و العشرين من ماه صفر ختم الله بالخير و الظفر
(7) سنه 950 کافرمان شمس مداری

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Prophet of Allah. (This is) an account of the repairs

(2) to the dome (i.e. tomb) of His Holiness Mîran Sayyid Jumman Madârî, may Allah sanctify his soul, in the presence of (i.e. during the life-time of)

(3) the revered Miyân Shâikh 'Âlam (son of) Âdâm, (son of) Shâh Jumman Madârî, during the time of His Majesty

(4) possessing the dignity of Solomon, (namely) Sher Shâh, the Sultan, may Allah perpetuate his kingdom and sovereignty, which were

(5) carried out by (? Dâryâ Khân Zangî Hûd Nûhânî Khâs Khâil

(6) (on the) twentyninth of the month of Ṣafar, may Allah end it with welfare and victory!

(7) of the year (A. H.) 950 (29 Ṣafar 950-3 June 1543). The supervisor (is) Shâms Madârî.


³ Cunningham, *op. cit.*, p. 164, wrongly considers that it is the date of the erection of the tomb.
The saint Jumman Madārī, a renowned representative of Madāriyya order of his time, was greatly venerated by the people of Bihar. It is difficult to satisfactorily establish the identity of Daryā Khān Zangi Hūd Nūhānī Khāṣṣ Khail mentioned in the record. The difficulty arises out of the fact that the language of the text is clumsy and indifferent. If the phrase barāvearda, whose infinitive barāveardan means 'to raise, to bring up, to carry out', etc., is taken to mean 'brought up by', then Daryā Khān of our inscription would be none other than Daryā Khān Nūhānī, Lodī governor of Bihar, already referred to in the preceding lines, and the record would supply an interesting piece of information of Sher Shāh's being a protege of his, as was pointed out earlier by Professor 'Askarī. But in that case, there would not be any mention in the record of the person who carried out the repairs. This omission would be supplied if we take the phrase barāvearda to indicate 'carried out' in which case Daryā Khān, who repaired the tomb, would be an altogether different person. There is yet another alternative. The phrase may be taken to indicate that repairs were done to the tomb which was originally raised or built by Daryā Khān. If so, Daryā Khān could be the famous governor. Also, in that case, the repairs must have been undertaken by Shaikh 'Alam, the saint's grandson. I am personally inclined to take the last-mentioned view. Likewise, nothing is known from the historical records either about Shaikh 'Alam in whose tenure as sajjāda—for that is how, I think the phrase ba-ṣughur can best be interpreted—the repairs were carried out or about Shams Madārī who supervised the work. Their very existence is known from our record only.

Uttar Pradesh

Most of the buildings of the Lodī-Sūr periods in Uttar Pradesh are now lying in ruinous condition and except few, are devoid of any epigraphical records. Of the seven inscriptions found in recent years in the province, two represent the independent rule at Budaun of A'zām Humāyūn Ahmad Khān, two belong to the time of the Lodis and the remaining three represent the reign of the Sūrs. They represent all the Lodī and Sūr kings except Buhilāl Shāh. In view of the paucity of sufficient historical information about the period under review, these inscriptions, it is hoped, will provide useful material for the history as well as for a study of mural calligraphy then prevalent. It will also prove useful for regional history.

Lodī

The first two records are dated in the reign of Aʿzām Humāyūn Ahmad Khān who seems to have ruled independently at Budaun.² Their importance lies in the fact that these are the only known records mentioning the independent chief, about which historical works are silent. They were first noticed by Cunningham and subsequently by Maulvī Raḍī'u'd-Dīn, but they were unable to decipher them correctly and fully, nor could they give any satisfactory account of Aḥmad Khān and his independent position.

V. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 882, FROM BUDAUN

The first of these two epigraphs, and the fifth of this study, appears on the southern door of a tomb situated to the west of the town.³ It is carved on two different-coloured sandstone slabs.

---

¹ An account of the saint will be found in Diwakar, op. cit., p. 423.
² For references to the history of Budaun and its monuments and inscriptions, see EIAPS, 1964, p. 7, f.n. 2, and ibid., 1965, p. 11, f.n. 5.
the one on the left hand being white and the other, red. Cunningham and A. Führer who apparently followed him, were mistaken in taking this single epigraph as two separate records on the basis of the different colours of the two tablets and two dates given therein.1 As will be seen presently, they contain only one epigraph.

The said tomb is a structure of about 8 metres square outside, with a square room inside. Cunningham who marked it as Tomb C, ascribed the tomb to ‘Alā‘u’d-Din ‘Ālam Shāh and Führer, to him and to his wife both, on the basis of the date A.H. 882 (1478) of the inscription. But though Rađu‘u’d-Din refuted their statements and correctly ascribed it to ‘Imādu‘l-Mulk, he was unfortunately puzzled by the two dates and like Cunningham, believed that the writing on these two slabs constituted two separate records.2

The inscriptive tablet measures 92 by 38 cm. and contains a four-line text in Persian prose, executed in relief in crude Nashī. The weathering of the stone has resulted in slight damage to the writing, which states that the tomb of Malik-i Sharq ‘Imādu‘l-Mulk was constructed in the reign of A‘zam Humāyūn Nawwāb Aḥmad Khān, at the instance of Malik-i Sharq ‘Imādu‘l-Mulk, son of the deceased, in A.H. 877 (1472-73). Its date of writing is given as A.H. 882 (1478). The name of the scribe is lost.

It will be observed that two dates are quoted in the text: one, 877, preceded by the words Shuhūr in which the construction took place and the other, 2nd Dhu‘l-Hijja (A.H.) 882, when the text was inscribed. If the first date is taken to be in the Hijra and not in Shuhūr era, it would mean that the slab was inscribed five years after the construction of the tomb, which is rather inexplicable. Why should it take so much time for the setting up of a mere inscription? What prevented from its being put up on the completion of such a time-consuming job of the construction of the tomb? This difficulty would be removed if both the years were identical, that is to say, if 877 represented some other era and corresponded to A.H. 882. On the face of it, one would appear to represent the solar era called Shuhūr San and the other, the lunar Hijra era. But as in the case of the Amthua inscription (Inscription No. II above), both the years do not tally. A.H. 882 ended on 3rd April 1478, while Shuhūr 877 was over on 24th May of 1477 itself, according to the system prevalent in Deccan.4 In view of the fact that even according to this reckoning, the difference is slightly less than one year, both in the case of this as well as the Amthua inscription, I feel that very likely, there is either some complication some where in the Shuhūr calculation, particularly when we know that we do not possess much details thereof, such as the actual duration of its months, etc. or in the alternative, in northern or eastern India, as stated earlier, there might have been in vogue another solar-lunar adaptation of the Hijra era. A definite conclusion can only be reached, when more definite data are available.

The style of writing is somewhat peculiar so far as the arrangement of letters and spellings of certain words are concerned. In quite a few places, the ligatures have been dispensed with and even certain letters are so engraved as to represent other letters. For example, the b of bandagi in the first line and the w of Nawwāb in the second are engraved as m and r respectively. All this tends to show the ignorance of the scribe.5

---

1 Cunningham, op. cit.; Führer, op. cit.
2 Ibid.
3 Rađu‘u’d-Din, op. cit., p. 60.
4 Nāẓim, op. cit., p. 96.
5 These two paras are by the Editor.
The rubbings of this epigraph were prepared by our office in 1960. Its tentative reading prepared by Shri S.M.A. Nadvi, then Junior Technical Assistant, was finalized by Dr. Desai and it reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate VII (b)*

(1) نَفَسَ [١] اِنْ كَتَبَ مَقْبُورَةَ بْنَذِگَى مَلِكْشَرَقِ عَمَادُ المَلِكَ دِرَ عَدَدِ دُوْلَتِ بْنَذِگَى اَعْلَى
(2) ﺃَعْمَاْمُ هُمُؤُوْنُ تَوْاَبَ اِهْمَدُ خَانُ دَمَ عْاليًا بِفَرَايْشِ مَلِكْشَرَقِ عَمَادَا
(3) لِمَلِكَ بِن عَمَادِ المَلِكَ شَهُورُ سَنَةِ سِعْنُ سُعْنَ يُوِى وَ ثَمَانِيَةٌ مُوُرُ
(4) خَالِدُٰمَا ذِي الْحَجَّةِ سَنَةِ اِنْطُيِى وَ ثَمَانِيَةٌ وَ ثَمَانِيَةٌ كَانَى

**TRANSLATION**

(1) The construction of this dome of the tomb of His Highness Malik-i-Sharq 'Imād-ull-Mulk (took place) in the reign of the government of His Exalted Highness.

(2) `Aẓam Humāyūn Nawwāb Aḥmad Khān, may he be ever exalted, at the instance of Malik-i-Sharbq 'Imād-

(3) u'1-Mulk, son of Imād-ull-Mulk (in) the Shuhūr (or months of the) year, seventyseven and eight hundred.

(4) Dated (i.e. written on) the 2nd Dhu’l-Hijja, year (A.H.) two and eighty and eight hundred (2 Dhu’l-Hijja 882=7 March 1478). Its writer is ............

Little is known about Aḥmad Khān whom the text calls the reigning chief. Contemporary historians are silent about his independent rule at Budaun. Very probably, he is identical with Aḥmad Khān, uncle of Buhūl Lodi, who, according to 'Abdu'llah, was permanently stationed at Budaun by his nephew to attend, in fact, to keep an eye, upon the Sayyid king 'Alā'ud-Dīn 'Ālam Shāh, then reigning at Budaun. But we do not know how and when Aḥmad Khān assumed independence and how long it lasted. Now at the time of the setting up of the record, the Sayyid king was alive. Then according to historians, 'Alā'ud-Dīn was succeeded by his son, and it was the latter who was overthrown by his kinsman Husain Shāh Sharqi of Jaunpur. This would rule out the independent reign of Aḥmad Khān. The only explanation for this, provided of course, the historians are correct, may be that Aḥmad Khān was all powerful and was de jure ruler of the place, which fact was perhaps, by way of flattery, mentioned as de jure by the composer.

As regards both Maliku’š-Sharq 'Imād-ull-Mulk the father and the son, we are not in a position to establish their identity, particularly since on one hand there were quite a few nobles of the Sayyid and Lodi kings who bore this title, and on the other, even about them, not much

---

1. Its incomplete and incorrect reading is quoted in Raṣīl-Dīn, op. cit., pp. 59-60.
2. 'Abdu'llah, op. cit., p. 16. There was one more important Lodi noble Ahmad Khān, son of Khān Jahān, who served both Buhūl and Sikandar Lodi (ibid., p. 64; Nīmu'tullāh, op. cit., p. 184). But he received the title of Aẓam Humāyūn as late as in A.H. 901 (1495-96), that is, nineteen years after the date of our inscription. Moreover, no reference to his association with Budaun is found in chronicles.
is known from historical works mentioning them.¹ According to Rażū'ud-Dīn, Ḥimād Khān was the brother of Aḥmad Khān mentioned in the inscription, ² but he has cited no authority for his statement. In any case, it is evident that both the father and the son were nobles of great rank and were connected with Budaun in some way or the other.

VI. UNDATED EPIGRAPH FROM THE SAME PLACE

The tablet bearing the second inscription of the same Aḥmad Khān is built up in the southern wall of the tomb near the above, called Gumbad-i-Rāpār, locally,³ or Tomb D by Cunningham.⁴ It is one of the largest tombs now standing at Budaun, being a square of 13 metres outside, with a room 8.5 metres square inside. Its dome, which is incidentally far loftier than that of Chimmī Khān's tomb, also at Budaun, is dwarfed by the great mass of building below. Had its corners been cut off, this would have been, according to Cunningham, one of the most striking tombs in Budaun. It was ascribed by him to Daulat Khān, evidently due to his wrong reading of the epigraph.⁵ On the other hand, Rażū'ud-Dīn also believed, on the basis of this epigraph, that the tomb contained the remains of Aḥmad Khān or some of his relatives, but there is nothing in the text to suggest this. As it is, the inscription refers to the reign of Aḥmad Khān indicating that he was then alive, though the possibility that he might have got it constructed for himself in his life time is there.

The epigraphical tablet, measuring 2.6 m. by 15 cm., contains Bismillāh and First Creed, followed by a Persian verse, all inscribed in a single line, purporting that when they constructed the edifice during the reign of Aḥmad Khān, Jūmman and Mājhi were the supervisors-in-charge (kārfarmana). There is unfortunately no date, nor is there any indication that the epigraph is incomplete. The writing is slightly damaged, and the script is crude Naskh.

It reads as follows⁶:

TEXT

Plate VIII (b)

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم َلا َالله الا لله محمد [رسول الله]

در عهد دولت خان احمد كور فرمان هر دو اين

جومن و ماچی َکه کردندين عمارت زود بین

TRANSLATION

In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful. There is no god but Allāh, Muḥammad [is the Prophet of Allāh].

In the period of the rule of Khān-i-Aḥmad (i.e. Aḥmad Khān), lo! both the supervisors were Jūmman and Mājhi who constructed this edifice.

¹ Rizvi, op. cit., pp. 22, 54, 68, 201, 204, 211, 225.
² Rażū'ud-Dīn, op. cit., p. 59.
³ Ibid., p. 58.
⁴ ARIE, 1960-61, No. D 249.
⁵ Cunningham, op. cit., p. 10.
⁶ The text of this epigraph was also finalized by Dr. Desai who had got its impressions prepared.
⁷ This reading of the name is suggested by Dr. Desai.
Needless to say that Khān-i-Āḥmad is none other than Aʿẓam Humāyūn Aḥmad Khān of the previous epigraph. Jūmman and Mājhi, who were the overseers supervising the construction, might have been local officials.

VII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 909, FROM SAMBHAL

The seventh inscription of the group and the first of Sikandar Lodī is a new and interesting record. It was first found by the late Maulvī Muḥammad Aẓhar al-Ḥusain, a former editor of this Series, immediately prior to his retirement. It was subsequently deciphered and listed by Dr. Dasei, and it is his reading that has been utilized here. The inscriptional tablet is reported to be built into the inner side of the eastern wall, near the entrance, of the Sarāi Tarīn mosque at Sambhal in Moradabad District.¹

The town of Sambhal, now a taksil headquarters, is a place of antiquarian interest. The ancient mounds and remains of old buildings are to be found in the town proper as well as in the vicinity. It had numerous sarās (inns), being in those days a halting stage for travellers between Delhi and Budaun; tradition avers that there were as many as 52 sarās at one time. From these, most of the present day localities have derived their name. It is a pity that most of these and other historical buildings are no more extant.²

Sambhal was conquered by the Muslims in the early period and remained a part of the Delhi kingdom thereafter. It was for sometime held by the Lodīs and sometime by the Sharqīs during their struggle for political supremacy.³ In A.H. 905 (1499-1500), Sikandar Lodī came to Sambhal and stayed there for four years.⁴

The tablet bearing the inscription measures 82 by 23 cm. and contains a one-line text in Persian, which assigns the erection of a mosque in 1503 to Miyān Dādū Malik, son of Mağhīlā, son of Ikhtiyār Khān, the chākhtī dīr of the Sultān.

The inscription is thus quite interesting. It was set up at a time when Sikandar Lodī was stationed at Sambhal. It also records the name and designation of one of his trusted officials who is not mentioned in any historical work. Calligraphically too, it is remarkable for its fine and artistic execution. The style of writing, which is Taḥlīl, with Taḥfīrā flourish, of a fairly high order, recalls to mind some similarly executed epigraphs of Bengal.

Its text is quoted below:—

TEXT

Plate IX (a)

بتاکرد این مسجد وقت سعد و اقبال صاحب العز و الکمال میان دادو ملکان مغلان بن اعتبار خان چاشنیکر سلطان سلطان سکندر بن بهول شاه سلطان روز کشیده
دوارذم ماه رابع الأول سنه چند و تصمایه

³ For the detailed history and archaeology of Sambhal, see ibid., pp. 141-69, 253-62; Cunningham, op. cit., vol. XII (Calcutta, 1879), pp. 24-27.
⁴ Abdullāh, op. cit., p. 54; Ni'matu'llāh, op. cit., pp. 189-91; Nīgāmū'd-Dīn, op. cit., pp. 163-64; Firğhāt, op. cit., p. 182.
Plate X

Epigraph of Shahr Shahr, dated A.H. 949, from Agra (p. 40)

Scale: 1:75

Epigraph of Shah Shahr, dated A.H. 927, from Agra (p. 37)
TRANSLATION

This mosque was constructed at an auspicious and propitious time by the lord of the dignity and perfection, Miyān Dādū Malik, son of Māghūlā, son of Ikhtiyār Khān, the chāhsānīgīr of the king of kings, Sulṭān Sikandar, son of Buhūl Shah, the Sulṭān, on Sunday, the 12th of the month of Rabī‘u’l-Awwal, year (A.H.) nine and nine hundred (Monday, 12 Rabī‘ I 909-4 September 1503).

It is difficult to trace the builder of the mosque, Miyān Dādū Malik, from available records. Even the information that he was the royal chāhsānīgīr (superintendent of the royal kitchen and food) and caused a mosque to be erected at Sambhal is furnished by the present record only. But his father and grandfather may possibly be identified with Māghūlā and Ikhtiyār Khān Karrānī who fought for Miyān Ḥusain Fārmūlī, fief-holder of Saran in Bihar under Sikandar Lodī, in his conquest of Champaran. Māghūlā lost his life in the engagement.

VIII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 927, FROM AGRA

The last Lodī record from Uttar Pradesh and eighth of the article, belonging to the time of Ibrāhīm Shāh Lodī, is from Agra. Historically, it is interesting in that it is not only one of the very few known records of this king, particularly from Uttar Pradesh, but also one of the very few pre-Mughal records found at Agra. Also, it mentions two personages and gives some new piece of information about them. Then, the mention of Delhi in the text as the capital is noteworthy.

The inscribed slab, measuring 1.02 m. by 40 cm., is set up over the central mihrāb of a mosque in Maḥalla-Athāin. It was copied by Shri S.A. Rahim. I have utilised the reading prepared by him. I am beholden to him as well as to Dr. Desai who suggested improved readings of a couple of words. The writing which is slightly damaged consists of three lines of Persian prose, executed in Naṣḵā characters of a fairly high order. The first line, written in large letters, comprises the First Creed, while the remaining two lines, in much smaller hand, assigns the construction of a mosque in 1521 to Ruknul-Dīn Mardānshāh Zafarābādī (i.e. of Zafarabad), a servant of Majlis-i-ʿĀlī Zafar Khān alias Miyān Makan.

The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate X (b)

(1) لا اله الا الله سأدع رسل الللة
(2) نع ماء الوجه سبع عشرين وتسعماة در عهد سلطان
ا خام واحسن شا شا النبلاء لودو بادشا دار الملك شهر دهل ركن الدين
(3) مردانشة ظفرابادی متعلق مجلس عالم ظفر خان عرف ميان میک این مسجد بنا
کناتید هرکه دری دوین مسجد نامز بگندارد بای را بدیع ایمان مراد برآورد بجی و فرضه

1 The chāhsānīgīr supervised the kitchen and tasted the food to be served to the king (I.H. Qureshi, The Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi, Lahore, 1942, p. 62).
2 Rizvi, op. cit., pp. 157-58. I owe this reference to Dr. Desai.
3 ARBE, 1965-66, No. D, 389. (It was first described in the Annual Progress Report of the Archaeological Surveyor, Northern Circle, 1909-10, p. 38, No. 125, but its notice is full of mistakes of dates and names.—Ed.)
(1) There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Prophet of Allah.

(2) On the twentyfirst of the month of Dhîl-Hijja, year (A.H.) seven and twenty and nine hundred (21 Dhîl-Hijja 927-22 November 1521), during the reign of Sulṭân Ibrâhîm Shâh, son of Iskandar (i.e. Sikandar) Shâh, son of Buḫlûl Shâh Lodi, king of the capital city of Delhi, Rukn u'd-Dîn 

(3) Mardânsâh Zafarâbâdî, a servant of Majlis-i-Ālî Zafar Khân alias Miyân Makan, got this mosque constructed. Whoever offers prayer in this mosque, should fulfil the desire of the builder by offering prayers for his faith. By His (God’s) Grace and Favour.

Nothing is known from historical works about Ruknu’d-Dîn Mardânsâh who built the mosque. According to our epigraph, he was in the employ of Majlis-i-Ālî Zafar Khân alias Miyân Makan and hailed from Zafarabad, near Jaunpur. He may have been posted at Agra by his master. Miyân Makan himself must have been a noble of very high rank, as his title Majlis-i-Ālî shows. But he does not find detailed mention in historical works. We know only one Miyân Makan, variously written as Makkhan or Makhan, a famous general of Ibrâhîm Lodi, who led the army against the forces of Râmi Sângâ.嚼 Nothing more is known about him. Evidently, he is identical with the Majlis-i-Ālî of our record, which thus furnishes us not only with his title Zafar Khân, but also with the correct spelling of his name Makan.

Sûrs

As stated above, we have so far had three inscriptions of the Sûr kings from Uttar Pradesh:嚼 Two bear the name of Sher Shâh and one, that of his son and successor Islâm Shâh.

IX. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 947, FROM SAKIT

The first inscription of Sher Shâh is from a mosque at Sakit, in Etah district.嚼 It was published along with other inscriptions from the place by H. Blochmann whose reading except of a few words is correct.嚼 The only misreading of some consequence is ‘Matî’ instead of the correct clan-name Bataî. But the epigraph was neither illustrated nor critically edited by him, and hence it is included here.

The large tablet measuring 1.96 m. by 60 cm. is inscribed with four lines of Arabic prose with an admixture of Persian words, which are executed in fairly good Naṣkh script. The text purports that a mosque was constructed in 1540 by the orders of Mas'ud Khân, son of Mas'ud Khân Bataî. It quotes the full titles of Sher Shâh, to wit, the Imâm, Farîdu'd-Dunya wa'd-Dîn Abu'l-Muẓaffar Sher Shâh 'Adîl. Incidentally, 'Adîl does not seem to have been used here in its literary sense, but as a title. Also, the titles Imâm, Farîdu'd-Dunya wa'd-Dîn, etc., used here, are not generally met with in the epigraphs of Sher Shâh.

1 Ahmad Yâdgâr, Târîkh-i-Shâhî (Calcutta, 1939), pp. 78-83.
2 There is one more epigraph of the time of Islâm Shâh at Agra, but its old impression preserved in my office was worn out and hence, it was not possible for Mr. Siddiqi to include it in this study. A new impression was subsequently prepared by me in 1966 after Mr. Siddiqi had left my office on temporary transfer. It was listed in ARIE, 1965-66, No. D, 374.—Ed.
A striking aspect of the text is that it suffers from grammatical mistakes: The last two invocations to the Divine attributes after the First Creed in the first line should have been without the definite article, the letter a is omitted in the first line in two places and the first phrase and the invocatory formulae in the last line, are grammatically wrong.

It reads as under:

**TEXT**

Plate IX (b)

(1) Bism Allah al-Rahman al-Rahim

(2) Bnana hizn al-masjid al-mawrida fil-aham al-anam-hu adhalma ba'd ashah bin Aadam Fird-ad-din

(3) Abu al-muzaffar shah sadad sultan-fil-Ahmad melk-fa'a sulhtanu wa qalatana wa ala amr او و شناست


**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Prophet of Allah. O Allah! O Beneficent! O Merciful!

(2) The construction of this auspicious mosque took place in the reign of the Imam, master of the world, king of the mankind, Faridu'd-Dunya wa'd-Din

(3) Abu'l-Muzaffar, Sher Shah 'Adil (lit. just), the king, may Allah perpetuate his kingdom and sovereignty and may his authority and dignity be exalted!

(4) by the order of Mas'ud(1) Khan, son of Mas'ud Khan Batani, may Allah accept his (good deed), (on) the seventh of the month of Sha'ban, year (A.H.) seven and forty and nine hundred (7 Sha'bân 947 = 7 December 1540).

I have not been able to trace Mas'ud Khan, at whose instance the mosque was erected. But he could be identical with a notable Suri noble Mas'ud Khan, governor of Amroha, who helped Prince Ibrahim Suri at Sambhal, the findspot of this record, in his contest for the throne, fifteen years after its date.¹

X. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 949, FROM ALIGARH

The other inscription of Sher Shah and tenth of this group is from Aligarh, a district headquarters. The old name of the city is Koil or Kol. Nothing definite is known of its history till

¹ This appears to be Sa'ud in the rubbing, and it was so read by Mr. Siddiqu. But I suggested that very likely, the letter m in the beginning has flaked off. The name Sa'ud Khan is generally not met with in Afghan histories.—Ed.

² Blochmann, P.A.S.B, 1874, correctly pointed out that this is intended for لقب الله منه.

³ Badayuni, op. cit., p. 423.
the twelfth century. It was taken by Qutbu’d-Din Aibak in 1194. Since then, it became the seat of a Muslim governor and finds frequent mention in contemporary Persian chronicles.

The slab bearing this record, which measures 72 by 35 cm., is built up in the southern wall of the tomb of the famous local saint Jamālu’d-Dīn Shamsu’l-‘Arīfīn. It is evidently not in situ, for it mentions the construction of a mosque. The tablet may have belonged to a dilapidated one-wall mosque attached to a tomb nearby, which dates from the Sūr period. An almost obliterated inscription of the time of the Sūr king, fixed in a ruined wall behind the mosque, was noticed by me recently. The inner surface of the wall and dome of the tomb under reference are also inscribed in the same fashion with quotations from the Qur’ān.

The epigraph comprises two verses in Persian. The writing which is slightly damaged, is executed in relief in Thulūh style of a fairly high order. It records the construction of a mosque in 1542 by Zainu’l-Ābidīn, son of Karimu’d-Dīn.

The text reads as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate X (a)*

(1) كردم ابن مسجد بعهد شاه عالم شیر شاه جنون برونهم بود از هجرت آن مصطفی
(2) بُسطم بود از ان علماوی ان و نهصد چهل

**TRANSLATION**

(1) This mosque was constructed in the reign of the king of the world, Sher Shāh, by the servant Zainu’l-Ābidīn, son of Karimu’d-Dīn.
(2) It was twentieth (day) of the month of Jumāda’l-Awwal, and the year from the Migration of the Prophet was nine hundred forty with nine added to it (20 Jumāda I 949=1 September 1542).

Zainu’l-Ābidīn must have been an official, but his identity is unknown.

**XI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 950, FROM BUDAUN**

The eleventh inscription with which the article is concluded represents the reign of Islām Shāh. It is engraved in relief on a tablet, measuring 65 by 45 cm., which is fixed above the eastern door of a tomb, locally called Jhujhār Khān’s Rauḍa in Sarāi-Mallān, near Maḥalla-Qabūlpūra of Budaun. Marked as Tomb F by Cunningham, the building stands close to the tomb of Chinmī Khān and is ornamented with a single band of dark-blue glazed tiles, and has a rather flat dome.

The text comprises five lines of slightly damaged writing in Arabic and Persian prose, which are executed in ordinary Naskh script. The first two lines contain religious text and in the

---

Footnotes:
3 The reading was finalised in consultation with Dr. Dessai.
4 *A.R.E., 1960-61*, No. D, 240. Its reading was prepared by Shri Nadvi and finalised by Dr. Dessai.
remaining three lines, which contain the historical information, it is stated that the tomb of Jujhār Kān alias Shaikh Buddhan, son of Sa’dūllāh was constructed by Miyān Fatū’lāh in 1550, during the reign of Islām Shāh.

The inscription was noticed earlier by both Cunningham and Raḍī‘u’d-Dīn.1 The latter quoted its date as A.H. 950 instead of A.H. 957, but Cunningham had assigned it to the time of Islām Shāh, having correctly read the date.

Its text reads as under:—

TEXT

Plate VIII (a)

(1) Nām Allah al-Rahmān.
(2) Lā ilāh illā ALLAH
(3) A’īn Qaṣb i Azan Jaiha‘r Khān ‘Arf Shīḥ Buhān
(4) Sīh Allah ‘Ala’ Sīhū wa Khamsīn wa Tasmā‘āh Dīr ‘Aulādi
(5) ‘Allām Shāh Firdawsī Mīan Fāṭīh Allāh

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent and Merciful.
(2) There is no god but Allāh, Muḥammad is the Prophet of Allāh.
(3) This dome (i.e. tomb) is that of Jujhār Kān alias Shaikh Buddhan.
(4) (son of) Sa’dūllāh (and was built in the) year (A.H.) seven and fifty and nine hundred (A.H. 95}?1550 A.D.), in the reign of
(5) Islām Shāh, at the instance of Miyān Fatū’lāh.

Jujhār Kān is not as obscure a figure as most of the persons mentioned in the previous line are. Raḍī‘u’d-Dīn, on the basis of the local tradition perhaps, says that his real name was Shaikh Shamsu’d-Dīn alias Shaikh Buddhan Quraishī Siddiqi; he was a descendant of ‘Abdu’r-Rahmān son of Abū Bakr the first caliph, and his great grandfather ‘Abdu’lāh Makkī had settled down at Budaun.2

Raḍī‘u’d-Dīn also quotes a contemporary reference to him, but has not given the details. Jujhār Kān’s townsman, Badāyūnī, who casually mentions him, states that he was one of the chief and leading men of Budaun, who also used to compose verses under the nom-de-plume Zāhid. He also cites one of his verses and the witty comments thereon of Mir Murtaṣā ‘Ilmī, sometime sīf-holder of Budaun. The reference is contained in this ‘Ilmi’s account.3

---

1 Cunningham, op. cit., vol. XI, p. 9; Raḍī‘u’d-Dīn, op. cit., p. 62.
2 Raḍī‘u’d-Dīn, op. cit., p. 62.
Thus, our inscription supplies additional information about his own name proper as well as that of his father. But what is yet more important is that it determines the correct spelling of the name. Neither RaḍJu’Din who had seen the epigraph, nor Sir Wolseley Haig, Badāyūnī’s translator, was able to establish the correct spelling. Both the manuscripts of Badāyūnī’s work which Haig consulted had Ḥijāz Khān, while the printed text has Ḥahjāz or Jahlāz Khān. On the other hand, RaḍJu’Din had read it as Jahlāj Khān. The name is clearly written on the stone as جهانخان – Jujhār Khān, which must be accepted as final.\(^1\)

---

\(^2\) RaḍJu’Din, op. cit.
\(^3\) These two paragraphs are by the Editor.
NIZAM SHAHI INSCRIPTIONS FROM GALNA

BY A. A. KADIRI

Epigraphical Assistant

Of about thirtyfive Nizām Shāhī inscriptions so far published, only three are from Galna in Nasik district of Maharashtra.¹ I propose to study here ten more inscriptions of this dynasty found in recent years from the village and the fort of Galna. These range in their dates from A. H. 974 (1566-67) to A. H. 1030 (1620-21) and represent the reigns of three Nizām Shāhī kings.

The fort of Galna situated in 20°46' N. and 74°32' E., which along with Salher and Mulher, is one of the nine impregnable strongholds of Baglana,² was from ancient times under the authority of the Rāṭhāor rājās of Baglana who styled themselves as Bhārji.³ Some time during the latter half of the 15th century, it became part of the Bahmani territory in the regime of the formidable minister Khwāja Maḥmūd Gāwān, but it does not seem to have remained long under the Muslim power. As a matter of fact, in the succeeding years, the fort was a bone of contention between the two, one dislodging the other from there, as and when any advantage offered itself.

On the death of Muḥammad Shāh III in 1482, Galna was retaken by Bhārji, but the Rājā was subdued by Malik Wajih and Malik Ashraf, the governors of Daulatābād and the neighbourhood, some time in 1487.⁴ In 1490, one Dastūr Khān was the commandant of the Galna fort, probably on behalf of Malik Wajih, according to an epigraph.⁵ However, the Rājā must have re-captured it some time during the confusion that prevailed on the murder of Malik Wajih, since we are told that the founder of the Nizām Shāhī dynasty, Malik Aḥmad Nizāmul-Mulk Bāḥrī, had to reduce the Rājā of Baglana in 1506.⁶

Once again the Rājā seems to have thrown off his allegiance and conquered the fort of Galna, probably on the death of Aḥmad Nizām Shāh I (1490-1510), and it was not until 1534 that Būrān Nizām Shāh I (1510-53) besieged and captured it.⁷ Rājā Bhārji again availed himself of the opportunity of taking it in 1543 from the garrison, when Būrān marched to Raichur to assist his confederate Rām Rāj.⁸ Thereafter, it remained in the possession of the Rājā till 1560, when Ḥūsain Nizām Shāh I (1553-65), after reducing the Antur fort, conquered it and appointed one of his officers, with instructions to strengthen and improve the defences of the fort in order to hold it securely.⁹

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1957 and 1958, pp. 13-16.
⁵ Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica (EIM), 1929-30, pp. 5-6.
⁶ Firāghta, op. cit., vol. II, p. 100.
⁷ All Ṭabāṭabā, Būrān-i-Muʿādhir (Hyderabad, 1936), p. 295.
⁸ ‘Ibid., p. 388.
⁹ ‘Ibid., pp. 390-92. According to Firāghta, op. cit., p. 124, Ḥūsain Shāh was the first to take the Galna fort from the Rājā.

(43)
From 1560 onwards, Gauna remained a Nizām Shāhī possession. But unfortunately, historical works do not contain any information about its administration or governors, etc. However, the epigrams from the place provide the names of at least six officials, four of whom are not known from any other source: Afṣāfūn Khān finds mention in four inscriptions, dated 1562-63, 1566-67, 1569-70 and 1570-71; Haibat Khān the Abyssinian, in two, dated 1557 and 1579; Pūlād Khān, son of Pūlād Khān, in two undated and two dated 1580 and 1583; and Mīr ‘Alī, Maḥālār Khān and Jamāḥīd, in one each, of 1585, 1604-05 and 1620-21 respectively.1 Of them, only Maḥālār Khān and Jamāḥīd Khān are known from historical works. From the above, it would appear that Afṣāfūn Khān was succeeded by Haibat Khān some time before 1577, and the latter was in turn succeeded by Pūlād Khān in about 1580. Then came Mīr ‘Alī some time during 1583-1585.

We have not much information about the governors of Gauna after this year. But some time before 1601, Saʿādat Khān seems to have held charge of the region including the fort, for in the March of that year, this fort, one of the best in the kingdom of Ahmadnagar, was surrendered by him to Khwājā Faṭḥu’llāh who appointed Yaʿqūb Baig Shīghāḥī and Saʿīd Baig Badakhshī to its charge.2 But after about six months, in October-November 1601, Rājū Dakhnī, a former official (maḥālār) of Saʿādat Khān retook it.3 Rājū defied the Mughal forces from his headquarters at Nasik. But it is not known if he posted any one at Gauna.

The next Nizām Shāhī official who is mentioned in connexion with the Mughal-Nizām Shāhī skirmishes in the region is Maḥālār Khān, a subordinate of Rājū’s rival, the more celebrated Malik ‘Ambar. His connexion with Gauna is not definitely known, but on the basis of his epigraph there, recording the construction of the tomb of ʿĀqā Sulaimān in 1604-05 (Inscription No. IX, infra), it may be reasonably inferred that he was in charge of that place. This guess is further supported by the fact, also known from an epigraph (No. X, infra), that it was Malik ‘Ambar who gave Gauna to one Jamāḥīd, some time before 1620-21, the date of the said record. This may also mean that Maḥālār Khān was in charge of the region until the appointment of Jamāḥīd. It is not known how long the latter held Gauna. It is difficult to say if the next commandant to find mention in historical works, viz. Maḥmūd Khān had succeeded him or some body else. The latter had, during the last stages of the Nizām Shāhī resistance, hard pressed as he was by Malik ‘Ambar’s son Faṭḥ Khān against whom he had rebelled, intended to hand over the fort to Shāhī Bhozsal, but was ultimately prevailed upon to surrender it to the Mughals on 7th October 1632.4 Maḥmūd was, thus, the last Nizām Shāhī official to command the Gauna fort.

Of the ten Nizām Shāhī inscriptions studied below, as many as eight pertain to the time of Murtadā I (1565-88), and one each is dated in the reign of Murtadā II (1600-10) and Burhān III (1610-31). Incidentally, it may be pertinent to point out here that the chronology of the Nizām Shāhī kings has not been correctly established so far. Sir T. W. Haig was the first to publish the most reliable and complete list of the Deccan dynasties in his Historical Land-marks of the Deccan. The same was incorporated by him in the Cambridge History of India.5 But the very existence of Burhān III was unknown to him. Also, his chronology is incorrect in some other respects too.

1 Except for those dated 1569-70, 1577 and 1585, which were published in EIAPS, 1957 and 1958, pp. 13-16, these epigrams are included for study in the present article.
3 Ibid., pp. 798-99. Abū’l-Faḍl states that the agents of the two Mughal officials gave away the fort to Rājū in consideration of 2,000 kōsās only.
It was Dr. Ghulām Yazdānī who established a new Niẓām Shāhī ruler in Burhān III on the basis of his inscriptions. He also tried to revise Haig’s chronology of the last three kings including Burhān III. Then, Dr. M. Nāẓīm corrected a few dates in a brief resume of the history of the dynasty in the course of his study of some inscriptions from Ahmadnagar and other places, but his chronology is also not without mistakes. Subsequently, Mr. V. S. Bendre wrote about the date of the death of Aḥmad Niẓām Shāh I.

Despite these attempts to correct Haig’s list, which was done piecemeal, we do not have a correct chronology of the Ahmadnagar kings. I have prepared one, after a close study of the findings of the above writers as well as of contemporary and later sources, and hope to publish it elsewhere shortly.

Murtadā Nizām Shāh I

I. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 974

So far twelve inscriptions of the reign of Murtadā I, have been published, and these range in their dates between A.H. 974 (1566-67) and A.H. 995 (1586-87).

Of his eight new inscriptions studied below, the first is fixed on the facade of the Iron gate of the Fort. The rectangular slab measuring 80 by 40 cm., is cut into three panels which contain three Persian couplets, the last panel containing also additional phrases of invocation to God by His attributes and the name of the composer who was also the scribe. The style of writing is Naskh of rather inelegant type, though the poetry of the verses is tolerably good. The record states that Afṣāṭūn Khān laid the foundation of a very strong fortification in this fort and constructed a lofty and strong bastion in A.H. 974 (1566-67). The date given in figure is 974, but the chronogram yields 978. It is therefore not possible in the absence of any other evidence to say if the figure represents Shuhūr year or Hijrā one. Therefore, I have taken it to be in Hijrā era.

The text, composed and written by Hūshī Shīrāzī, has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate XI(b)

(1) بناء بنهاد افلاتهون خانه درین قلعه خوار سکت محکم
(2) دران برجه مهیا کرد از سنگ که اماثی تدیبم چشم عامل
(3) ز رفعته برتر از چرخ فلک بود ازان تاريخ شد چرخ فلک هم
(6) يا لطیف سنه ۹۷۸ یا فتح قايلة و راقمه هوشی شیرازی

TRANSLATION

(1) Afṣāṭūn Khān laid the foundation of a very strong fortification in this fort.

(2) In it, he constructed (lit. provided) a stone bastion, the like of which was not seen by the eye of the world.

---

4 *New Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV (1941-42), pp. 243-44.
(3) It was higher than the heavenly sphere; hence, its date also has come to be ‘the heavenly sphere’.

(4) O Kind One! Year (A.H. ?) 974 (1566-67). O Opener! Its composer and writer is Hūshī Shīrāzī.

It has been pointed out above that the chronogram contained in the second hemistich of the third couplet works out to 978, while the figure given is 974. In some inscriptions from the Deccan, Shuhūr year is given in words and the Hijrā one in figure.¹ Even if it is presumed that here a reverse practice is adopted, that is to say, the figure indicates Shuhūr year, the equivalent of Shuhūr 974 would be 981. Therefore, the figure may be taken as representing the Hijrā year only, and the chronogram as defective.

Historical works are totally silent about both Afṣāṭūn Khān and the composer Hūshī Shīrāzī. Both of them are mentioned in another inscription from Galna, dated about three years earlier, which records some building activities of the former.² Afṣāṭūn Khān also finds mention in two more epigraphs, in the Fort, dated Shuhūr 970, A.H. 977 (1569-70) and A.H. 978 (1570-71), which will be studied presently. In two of the three records under reference, the phrase used before Afṣāṭūn’s name is dar kārkard which means that the inscriptions were set up in his time, i.e. governorship.³ It would, therefore, follow that Afṣāṭūn Khān was the Niẓām Shāhī governor in charge of the Galna fort (as well as, perhaps, of its dependencies) at least during the years 1566-71.

It may also be stated that the epigraph under study does not make any reference to the reigning king, but since his other inscriptions do, it was thought advisable to study it (as also four similar epigraphs) along with the rest. In this connexion, it may be noted that except in one of the remaining five inscriptions, the reigning king is not mentioned by name, but is merely referred to as king or Niẓām Shāh.

II. INSCRIPTION DATED SHUHŪR 970

The second inscription which is bilingual, is fixed on the inner side of the fort-wall to the right of the Iron gate, at a distance of one third of the total length of the wall.⁴ The arch-shaped slab measuring 54 by 54 cm. contains four lines of writing, in Arabic prose and Persian prose and verse, carved in relief in ordinary Nasḵi characters. The Nāgarī version is incised in one line in the left and lower borders, the portion in the latter being badly damaged. The legible portion records the Arabic phrase for the year 970 and Śaka year 1491.⁵

The Arabic portion of the text contained in lines 1-2, is except for the year, unhistorical, being religious in content, and the text in Persian prose occurring in line 1 only refers to the governorship of Afṣāṭūn Khān. The text in the remaining two lines comprises a fragment of two Persian couplets recording the date of the construction of the fort by the Khān, by whom evidently Afṣāṭūn Khān is meant.

The year given in Arabic numerals is 970, also indicated in the Nāgarī text: सन सवहृं व तिसामेया र प्रकृति. ¹⁷४२••••• Now this version clearly gives the Śaka equivalent 1491, which shows that the year 970 is to be taken in the Shuhūr era and not in the Hijrā one. The

¹ ELAPS, 1963, pp. 64, 65, 68.
³ The phrase dar kārkard has been generally translated as ‘under the supervision of’ which does not appear to be correct, particularly in the Deccan inscriptions. In Marāṭhī records, this very term is used to denote tenure of office.
⁵ Ibid., No. B, 471, where the Arabic phrase giving the date is not read.
(a) Bilingual epigraph, dated Shuhur 970, from Gaina (p. 47)

(b) Record of Murtada I, dated A.H. 974, same place (p. 45)
chronogram yields 978, but as the difference of 1 in calculation is admissible both ways, according to the science of chronogram, the year may be 977, which could be taken as the Hijrī equivalent, provided, as already stated above (p. 46), the figure 970 is taken to indicate the Shuhūr year. This would mean that the fort (ṣīğār) was constructed in Shuhūr 970, A.H. 977, Šaka 1491 (1569-70).

The text has been read as under:—

TEXT

Plate XI(a)

(1) O Allāh, O Muḥammad, O ‘Alī! He is [God]! During the time (i.e. governorship) of Afsāṭūn Khān.

(2) Help is from Allāh, and victory near. (Shuhūr) 970 (1569-70).

(3) Through the kindness of the king (Murtuḏā I), the Khān (i.e. Afsāṭūn Khān) constructed a fort, which is higher than Mars in loftiness.

(4) When I asked Wisdom about its date, it said ‘what a beautiful and strong fort!’ for its date.

The chronogram contained in the last line seems to have meant to give the Hijrī year. It yields 978, which may be taken to stand for 977, as explained above.

III. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 978

The third inscription, which is also bilingual, is fixed on the western wall of the enclosure of the Spring called in the record ‘Chaḥma-i Khīḍr’ (Spring of Prophet Khīḍr), which is situated to the north of the mosque in the Galna Fort. The tablet is arch-shaped, measuring 71 cm. from apex to bottom and 68 cm. from left to right. The Persian version is inscribed in six lines in ordinary Nastaʿlīq style in relief. The first line contains only the date and the name of the Spring, ‘Chaḥma-i Khwāja-Khīḍr’, and the remaining contain five couplets, composed by one Ḥakīmi. The Nūgūrī version is engraved in one line in the lower and right margin-borders, but the lettering is considerably damaged. It seems to contain only the date Šaka 14[92] [Pra]jmoda, Pausha ba. [13], Monday (22nd January 1571).³

According to the Persian text, Afsāṭūn Khān constructed the Spring to perpetuate his memory among the people of the world, in A.H. 978 (1570-71). From the text, it transpires that the cons-

¹ Qurʿān, chapter LXI, part of verse 13.
³ Ibid., No. B, 473.
truction referred to was not confined to the masonry steps, etc. of the Spring and a four-walled enclosure around it only, but the Spring was excavated by the Khān. The date is given both in figure and by chronogram.

The composer of the metrical text is one Ḥakīmī. It has not been possible to trace any information about him, but very likely it was he who had composed the text of another inscription, containing the chronogram for the death of Ghālib Khān, a Nizām Shāhī official, which took place in A.H. 977.1

I have deciphered the text as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XII(a)*

```
(1) في سنة 968
(2) في نظر حظ شهد شامل بحال افراتون
(3) ز حوض كوثر و جنت نشأة دارد
(4) زروى حممت خود ساخت خشمة افراتون
(5) نانأ آن طلب [5] خشمة زار آب حيات
(6) بيايد ان در حق تا بروز حشر نجات
```

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the year (A.H.) 978 (1570-71). The Spring of (Prophet) Khwāja Khīḍr.

(2) When Afsōṭūn was favoured with Divine kindness, he excavated (lit. brought out) at Gālna a spring (of sweet water) like sugar-candy.

(3) It bears a sign of the tank of Kauṭhaḥ and Paradise; by that water of the spring, (even) the dead are revived.

(4) Out of wisdom, Afsōṭūn constructed the spring, so that it may endure among the people as (his) perpetual mark.

(5) Since you ask for the year of its construction, seek it in (the words) 'place abounding in springs of the Water of Life'.

(6) O Ḥakīmī! End (these verses now) with a prayer that may Afsōṭūn attain salvation till the day of retribution from the threshold of God!

**IV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 987**

The tablet bearing the fourth inscription in the Fort is fixed on the wall to the right of the same Iron gate.2 Measuring 72 cm. by 1.1 m., it contains thirteen lines of Persian prose and verse carved

---

1 *EIM*, 1933-34 (Supplement), p. 9, where, however, it did not occur to Dr. M. Nāṣim who edited it that Ḥakīmī was the nom-de-plume of the composer. For the identity of Ghālib Khān, see *ibid.*, 1939-40, pp. 47-48.

2 One symbol seems to have been left out by the engraver.

in relief in Nastālīq characters. The metrical text of five couplets is an ill-feigned attempt at versification, rendering it difficult for the reader to catch up with the drift of the composer’s purport. It appears to state that a palace was constructed in the fort of Galna, and a bastion which was constructed earlier but was not very strong, was reinforced with stone. It also seems to record that the palace was built for the king and it was liked by all. It names Haibat Khān as the builder in the last couplet. The text was inscribed by Sayyid Ismā’īl, son of Sayyid Manā’ Husainī, on the 1st Rabī’ I 987 (28th April 1579).

Haibat Khān, who appears to be the next commander of the fort of Galna, after Affātūn Khān, during the reign of Murtaḍā I, is like his predecessor unknown to history. But he also has to his credit one more record, a fragmentary and bilingual one, at Galna itself; its epigraphical tablet is now in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. It is dated A.H. 985 (1577-78) and mentions him as Haibat Khān Ḥabashī Nizām Shāhī. The Nāgari text clearly refers to him as the thānadār of the fort. Incidentally, the text of the record under study, which also refers to a bastion constructed earlier, may be taken to suggest that the fragmentary inscription of A.H. 985 (1577-78) under reference, pertained to a bastion built by Haibat Khān.

As regards the scribe Sayyid Ismā’īl also, we have no information. Two more records in the Fort were inscribed by him as will be seen presently. In one of these two records, which was also composed by him, he lays a claim to poetical talent. In view of the mediocre quality of verse in the present record, it would not be surprising, if it was also composed by him. He does not appear to have been even a tolerably good calligraphist either.

The text has been read as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XII(b)*

(1) هو
(2) برج مراد ساله ز لطف و پناه عزت
(3) نامش تومی پسندي و ظفرش بهد بدولت
(4) در قلعه گلاده هم قصري مراد باشد
(5) تا زين خجسته قصري یادت خلق نصرت
(6) برجی که ساخت اول جندان نبود محکم
(7) زان رو بهنگ بست ازان شد مکرمت
(8) منزل که کردر بنالی در قلعه گشت مقبول
(9) شد تمام منزل ز بهر شاه ظفرت
(10) بارى چنین بروتی یک ساخت یادگاره
(11) بادا همیشه نامی از کردر خان هیبت

*NIAPS, 1957 and 1958, p. 15.*
(1) He is (Allāh)!
(2) The Murād bastion was constructed through the support and protection of honour.
(3) If you like its name, then (lit. and) grant it victory and (lit. in) prosperity.
(4) There should also be a Murād palace in the Galna fort,
(5) so that the people may obtain help from that (lit. this) auspicious palace.
(6) The bastion which was constructed earlier (by him?), was not very strong.
(7) Hence, it was reinforced with stone and it thus attained respectability.
(8) The palace (lit. house) constructed in the fort became popular.
(9) It was completed for the sake of the victorious king.
(10) Since, he has constructed such a beautiful memento,
(11) may it always be famous, on account of its being constructed by Haibat Khān
(12) Written by the creature Sayyid Iṣmā‘īl, son of Sayyid Manā Ḥusain,ī,
(13) on the 1st day of the month of Rabi’ I, year 987 (28th April 1579).

V. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 988

The fifth record of this group is fixed over the entrance of the Dargāh of Pīr Polād (Pūlād) in the village of Galna.¹ The slab, measuring 19 by 75 cm., is fixed length-wise above the door and contains fifteen lines of writing carved in relief in Nasta’liq characters. The text comprises a poetical fragment of 5 couplets written in ten lines (3-12), preceded by two lines of religious matter. In the last three lines occur the name of the composer and scribe, the above-mentioned Sayyid Iṣmā‘īl, son of Sayyid Manā Ḥusainī, and the date. This epigraph shows that Sayyid Iṣmā‘īl had adopted Sayyid as his poetical name. The reference to the help of Shāh Mardān, i.e. ‘Ali, may also indicate him to be a follower of the Shi‘a creed. As in the case of the previous inscription, the text presents yet another example of mediocre versification. It is worse than prose.

The text pretends to give an eulogistic description of the tomb and its surroundings: the ‘resplendent tomb’ is stated to be ‘popular in the fort’ (p. 52) by which perhaps, ‘venerated’ is meant, and to have been surrounded by ‘verdant trees and lofty edifices’. It assigns the construction to Pūlād Khān. It is dated 15th Sha‘bān 988 (25th September 1580).

It will be noted that the text does not mention the name of the person on whose remains the tomb was constructed. Locally, the tomb is called Dargāh of Pīr Polād, which could as well have been derived from the name of the builder Pūlād, occurring in the text. It does not appear to be likely that his own tomb was constructed in his life-time by Pūlād Khān, since the trend of the purport, as far as it can be judged from the phrases ‘auspicious’, ‘resplendent’ etc., used for the tomb, would suggest that it was built over the remains of some one who had already died. Could

that some one be Pūlād Khān's father, also entitled Pūlād Khān, mentioned as Pūlād Khān Senior, in the bilingual inscription to be studied next? Incidentally, one Pir Pūlād has been mentioned in a copper-plate issued in 1017 (1608), registering the grant of the village Akār in pargāna Gālna by (?!) Pir Polād to certain persons for cultivating the lands (belonging to the dargāh). Unfortunately, the language of this grant is not quite definite. But it is clear that if the grant is genuine, Pir Pūlād mentioned therein cannot be identical with the person, Pir Pūlād or any body else, occupying the tomb at Gālna. In any case, it is a reasonable surmise that the tomb was constructed by Pūlād Khān the son, for Pūlād Khān the father.

I have failed to trace any reference to Pūlād Khān, the builder, in the chronicles available to me. No doubt, 'Ali Ṭabatābā mentions one Fūlād (Pūlād) Khān as a nobleman of Ahmad Niẓām Shāh I and his son Burhān. But he could not have lived so long. Then, one Pūlād Khān is mentioned in an inscription from Kandahar in Nander district of Maharashtra. It is dated 1566-67, in the reign of Murtadā Niẓām Shāh. In case, both are one and the same person, it would mean that Pūlād Khān was transferred from Qandhar to Gālna some time before 1580, the date of the record under study, probably in succession to Haibat Khān Ḥabasah.

The text of the epigraph has been deciphered as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XIII(a)*

(1) هو الفتاح

(2) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(3) اين روضة مبارك ك در قلعة كشت مقبل

(4) اين دايره بحسن ارسته شد قبول

(5) آن شجرهای سبز و اين طرفة شد نقامي

(6) آن قصرهای عالی دارند عجب اوصول

(7) اين روضه مثور دارد تمام رونق

(8) از روى اين عمارت نورى بشد نزول

(9) از كرد خان بولاد اين شد عجب تشاده

(10) تا نزد خلق باشد اين منزلس(9) قبول

(11) سيد بكرت ثاتي شد شرح اين منزل

(12) از نطفه شام مردان اين روضه اش قبول

---

1. *EIM*, 1813-14, pp. 5-10, pl. II.
(1) He is the Opener!

(2) In the name of Allâh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(3) This auspicious tomb became popular (venerated?) in the fort,

(4) (and) the region has become adorned through its beauty.

(5) Those verdant trees and this wonderful spot,

(6) those lofty buildings, all these, have wonderful foundations.

(7) This illuminated tomb possesses utmost splendour,

(8) (and) from the face of this building, light is diffused.

(9) This wonderful memento is the work of Pûlâd Khân,

(10) so that this edifice (constructed) by him may become popular among (lit. accepted by) the people.

(11) Sayyid has eulogised and described these edifices.

(12) May this tomb (built by) him become popular (lit. accepted) through the favour of Shâh-i-Mardân (i.e. Ḥâdrat ‘Alî)!

(13) Came to end the speech of the writer, the creature,

(14) Sayyid Ismâ'îl, son of Sayyid Manâ Ḥusainî. Written

(15) on the 15th of the month of Sha'bân, year 988 (25th September 1580).

VI. INSCRIPTION, DATED ŠAKA 1503

The sixth inscription forms the second record of Pûlâd Khân. Its tablet, measuring 35 by 60 cm., is fixed on the wall to the right of the Iron gate, a short distance to the left of Inscription No. V. This again is a bilingual record consisting of ten lines of writing of which six are in Persian and four in Marâthî. The Persian text is carved in relief in Nasta’líq characters, and the Marâthî portion, in Nâgarî. The Persian version does not contain any date. It merely

---

1 This phrase is engraved in the preceding line on the stone.
comprises two couplets containing a prayer for the long life of the Nizām Shāh and a reference to the governorship of Pūlād Khān. The Marāṭhī portion, on the other hand, contains a little more historical information apart from the date, which is Śaka 1503, Vṛishā Vai ākha ba. 1 (19 April 1581). It refers to the construction of some structure by Khān Pūlād Khān and also gives the name of his father as Pūlād Khān, the elder.

The text has been read as follows:—

**TEXT**

Plate XIII (c)

(1) हो फत्ताह
(2) हर क्रा पंहत हमुनान पायंद
(3) दर रक्का शे नमान पायंद
(4) सायह कर्दगार शाह न्याम
(5) पाद पायले ता जीहान पायंद
(6) बकर कर्द पौलद खान

**TRANSLATION**

(1) He is the Opener!
(2) He, who is supported by good fortune,
(3) follows the king of the world.
(4) May the shadow of the Omnipotent God Nizām Shāh (Mūrtādā I)
(5) last till the world exists!
(6) During the regime of Pūlād Khān.

**TEXT**

(1) सके अियू वृषा संबत्सरे वैसा
(2) ख वदि १ तदोनी वकीजा पोज़ा
(3) द खानाचे पूत्र खा। पोज़ाळ्या ते ही
(4) सोच केवेल। सुमस्तु॥
TRANSLATION

(1-4) On this day, the first of the dark fortnight of Vaiśākha in the year Vṛṣha, in Śaka 1503 (19 April 1581), Khān Pūlād Khān himself, the son of the elder Pūlād Khān, accomplished (this). May (there) be prosperity!

The importance of this record in establishing the period of Pūlād Khān’s governorship as well as in supplying the important information about Pūlād Khān’s father, has already been pointed out above. As stated above, the author of the Burhān-i-Maʿāthir mentions one Fūlād (Pūlād) Khān as a noble of Aḥmad Niẓām Shāh I and Burhān I. It is likely that he is identical with Pūlād Khān Senior, of our epigraph.¹

VII. UNDATED INSCRIPTION OF PŪLĀD ĀN

The tablet inscribed with the third record of Pūlād Khān and the seventh of this article, is built into the wall to the left of the Iron gate.² It measures 38 by 40 cm. and contains six lines of writing in Persian prose and verse, carved in relief in Nastaʿlīq style. It records that a bastion was constructed in the Gālna kot, during the time of Pūlād Khān. The date of construction or writing is not mentioned. But it is quite likely that it is supplementary to the preceding inscription in which no mention of the object of construction was made. If that be so, this epigraph also must have been set up some time about April 1580.

The text of this epigraph was also written by Sayyid Ismāʿīl, son of Sayyid Manā Ḥusainī. It has been read as follows:

TEXT

Plate XIII (b)

(1) هو العزيز
(2) بموت گاندان برجي بنا شد
(3) بدور اکرمی ولاد خان شد
(4) نوشته شد بخط خادم اهل بيت
(5) رسول الله سيد اسماعيل ابن
(6) سيد مناحسين

TRANSLATION

(1) He is the Glorious!
(2) In the kot of Gālna, a bastion was built;
(3) it was during the time of the generous Pūlād Khān.

¹ Tabāṭabā, op. cit., pp. 233, 246.
(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 988, from Galna (p. 51)

(b) Undated record of Pulad Khan, same place (p. 54)

(c) Epigraph, dated Saka 1503, same place (p. 53)
Inscription of Murtadā II, dated A.H. 1013, from Galna (p. 57)
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(b) Inscription, dated A.H. 991, same place (p. 5b)

**Scale:** 0.1
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(4) It was written by the servant of the house of
(5) the Prophet of Allah, Sayyid Isma'il, son of
(6) Sayyid Manā Ḥusain.

VIII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 991

The next record from the Fort is engraved on a tablet measuring 76 by 54 cm., which is built up into the side wall of the Iron gate, to the left of No. VII above.1

This record is also bilingual. The Persian portion consists of seven lines of writing, carved in relief in Naskh characters and records that Pūlad Khān Ghāzi constructed a bastion in the Galna fort. It was written by Zahir Muḥammad in Rabi' I 991 (March 1583).

The Marāṭhī portion is carved in relief in one line below the Persian text and merely contains the date, Śaka 1505, Subhānu, Chaitra su. 1, Thursday, which fell on the 14th March 1583.2 The Persian record, thus, must have been engraved on about the 1st Rabi' I 991.

Pūlad Khān's name is written in the text as Fūlād Khān which is just a way of writing it after the fashion of Arabic which has no p sound, and need not be attached any significance. What is more important here is the fact that the record extends the period of his charge of Galna fort by at least about two years. Now, as we have already seen above, he must have been succeeded by Mīr 'Alī some time in or before A. H. 993 (1585).

But the epigraph has very important bearing on the significance of the word Shuhūr in indicating the era of that name. It is generally accepted that the term 'Shuhūr-i-Sana', at least in the inscriptions of the Deccan, should be taken to indicate Shuhūr era, when the month also occurs therein.3 But that this view may not be correct in all cases is proved by the present epigraph. Here the date given is 'Rabi' I in the Shuhūr-i-Sana 991 and Śaka 1505, Subhānu, Chaitra su. 1. Now the term 'Shuhūr-i-Sana', along with which the month is mentioned, cannot be taken in any sense other than its literary meaning of 'the months of the year', because the corresponding Śaka year's equivalent will only be A. H. 991 (almost to the day and month). If Shuhūr era were intended, the year would be Shuhūr 991 which corresponded with Śaka 1512 only. And there is no sufficient reason that may account for the gap of about seven years in the dates of the two versions. It may be mentioned that the Śaka date is absolutely clear.

The text reads as under :

```
TEXT

Plate XIV (b)

(1) هو
(2) بقلمه کانه یکه برج مانی
(3) بنا بهمود فولاد خان غازی
```

(1) He is!

(2-3) In the fort of Galna, the foundation of an enduring bastion was laid down by Fūlād (i.e. Fūlād) Khān Ghāzi.

(4) It was completed through the favour of Shāh-i-Mardān (i.e. ‘All).

(5) May it be everlasting and serviceable!

(6) The writer (is) the needy creature Zahir Muḥammad. In the month of Rabi’

(7) One, of the months of the year (A.H.) one (and) ninety and nine hundred (Rabi’ I A. H. 991=March 1583).

The scribe Zahir Muḥammad is untraceable. But it was he who wrote the Galna inscription of Haibat Khān mentioned above.²

Murtadā Nizām Shāh II

IX. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 1013

The only epigraph in this group whose date falls in the reign of Murtadā II, is fixed on the southern end of the western wall of the tomb locally known as Wazir’s tomb in the village, very near the Dargāh of Pir Polād.² The inscriptive slab, measuring 47 by 53 cm., contains five Persian couplets, carved in relief in as many lines in Nasta’līq characters. The quality of the poetry is of a fairly high order and perhaps the best in the present study. As a matter of fact, it can compare quite favourably with similar specimens. It is evident that the composer of these verses Mughfīqi was one of the talented Persian poets who had flocked to the court of the Nizām Shāhī and other rulers of the Deccan. Then again, the calligraphy of the record is excellent.

The Nasta’līq style of this epigraph can rank among the best specimens of that style, whether on paper or on stone. It is a pity that the calligrapher has not disclosed his name.

The text purports that Āqā Sulaimān, ‘the like of whom in manliness and fortitude, none in the world remembers to have known’ was killed by an enemy, and the great Khān Mahālādār Khān constructed a tomb over his grave in A. H. 1013 (1604-05). The date is afforded by a chronogram.

I have failed to trace any reference to Āqā Sulaimān, the deceased, in the historical works available to me. But he appears to have been a man of distinction, not only because the text

---

¹ _Elaps_, 1957 and 1958, p. 15.
showers high praises upon him, but also because a great Nizām Şāhī nobleman t/lought fit to construct his tomb.

About Mahālār Khān, the difficulty is of another nature. There were both the father and son who enjoyed this title in the court of the Nizām Şāhī kings. Mahālār Khān, the father, is stated to have been a grandee of Circassian origin and held high position. Unfortunately, the date of his death is not known. Therefore, it is difficult to say which of the two, father or son, took part in the skirmishes between the Mughal army and Malik 'Ambar's forces reported in contemporary chronicles in the events of the year 1615-16. The son is reported to have succeeded to the title of his father on his death, but unfortunately, neither the name of the king nor the date of the death is quoted. In the middle of 1634, he entered the services of the Mughal emperor and was granted sīf in Bihar. In about February 1636, he was again sent to Deccan along with Sayyid Khān-i-Zamān against 'Ādil Şāh of Bijapur.

In any case, if the chronogram has been correctly understood, as it has most probably been, the date of the construction i.e. 1604-05, should indicate that Mahālār referred to therein is the father and not the son. For, he had more occasion to be at Galna than his son and must have been in charge of the region about this time.

The writing of the epigraph is slightly damaged due to the weathering of the stone. But the text is quite legible. It has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate XIV (a)

(1) چو آنا سلیمان کسی در چهان بیعاد و جرات ندارد بیاد
(2) چو دوآ میانہ باخر رسید ز غم معاند ز پا در فناد
(3) بناکر دب تریش گنبدی سر سروان خان عامل نزاد
(4) سبهر مروت مجدادر خان که چون او خلف ام گناب نزاد
(5) چو از مشقی خواست تاریخ گفت که آنا سلیمان بجنت وساد

TRANSLATION

(1) Nobody in the world remembers anyone like Aqā Sulaimān in manliness and fortitude.

(2) Since the period of his life came to an end, he fell off his feet from a blow of the enemy.

3 For details, see 'Abdu'll-Ḥamīd, op. cit., part 11, pp. 14, 140; Shāh Nawāz Khān, op. cit., pp. 419-21.
4 The conjunction کہ in the second hemistick of the last couplet is not taken by me to be a part of the chronogram. If it is, the date would be A. H. 1038 (1628-29).
(3-4) Over his grave, the chief among the chiefs, the Khān of noble lineage, the sky of generosity, Maḥālār Khān, like whom the mother-earth did not beget, constructed a tomb.

(5) When Mughfīql was asked for its date, he said, 'May Āqā Sulaimān attain paradise!'

The chronogram constituting the benedictory phrase works out to A.H. 1013 (1604-05). I do not think that the conjunction ki forms part of the chronogram, as has been stated in the preceding lines.

Burhān Nizām Shāh III

X. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1030

The last inscription of the present study belongs to the reign of Burhān III. The three slabs bearing this record measure 64 by 23 cm. each and are fixed on the north, south and west faces of the pillar of the left outer arch of the only mosque in the Fort. Each of the slab is inscribed with two Persian couplets, and the text starts from that on the northern face and continues on the western and southern faces. Thus comprising six couplets in all, which are composed by one Abu'l-Fadl, the text records in a chronogram that the mosque was built in A.H. 1030 (1620-21) on the site of a ruined mosque by Jamshīd who also repaired a reservoir which too was lying desolate nearby.

The builder Jamshīd Khān is stated in the text to have received the fort (of Galna) from Malik 'Ambar, the vākīl of Burhān Nizām Shāh (i.e. III). From the style of the text, the appointment appears to have taken place not long before the date of the record. In other words, Jamshīd Khān may have come to Galna not long before 1620.

This epigraph is a valuable document. It is one more record of Burhān III, of whom only six records were known so far. It also provides one more name in the incomplete list of the governors of the Galna fort and neighbourhood. It is also remarkable for its calligraphy which is a fine specimen of Nasta'īq style.

I have read the text as under:

TEXT

Plate XV

(a) North face.

(1) بنا خداوند بیت الحرام که اقبال داده به برخان نظام

(2) وکیل شهنشاه کشور کمکِ ملک عتبره بود باعدل و دلی


Plate XV

Record of Burhān III, dated A.H. 1030, from Galna (p. 58)

Scale: 1/8
West face.

(1) بضم شيد ملك ال از سر اعتبار وطن تلمه داد آن سر نامدار
     (2) بنا ساخت مسجد ز بپر ثواب برين جای مسجد كه بودیم خراب

(c) South face.

(1) زکای برك ه بدر فضاي خراب
     (2) دلعل ز ابولفضل تاريخ باد

TRANSLATION

(a) (1) In the name of the Lord of the sacred house (i.e. Ka'ba), who has bestowed good fortune on Burhān Niẓām (III).

    (2) the prime-minister (vaqil) of the victorious emperor, was the just and wise Malik ‘Ambar.

(b) (1) Out of confidence, that illustrious chief (i.e. Malik ‘Ambar), gave the fort (of Galna) in fief (waṣṭan) to the Jamshīd of the kingdom.

    (2) He constructed a mosque, for seeking reward, on this (very) site of a mosque which was desolate.

(c) (1) In the neighbourhood was a ruined reservoir which he reconstructed, and it became full of water.

    (2) Let this prayer of Abu’l-Faḍl be its date, that ‘may Jamshīd be forgiven by God’!

The date afforded by the chronogram is A. H. 1030 (1620-21).

Malik ‘Ambar, the Niẓām Shāhī minister, is too well-known to need any mention here. But not much is known about Jamshīd, who was appointed the governor of the Galna fort by him. Now we know that one ‘Abdu’l-Lāṭif entitled Jamshīd Khān was a relation of Malik ‘Ambar, who ultimately went over to the Mughals on the 19th September 1629 and received the rank of 1000, 1500 horse.1 In all probability, he is identical with Jamshīd of our record. The particular mention of ‘Ambar’s having granted the fort to Jamshīd in whom the former had full confidence, is quite significant. It can be reasonably interpreted to mean that he was a near relation of ‘Ambar. If the above identification is correct, it may mean that Jamshīd Khān had continued in the command of the Galna fort until his crossing over to the Mughals in 1629. We may further hazard a guess that about this time when ‘Ambar’s son Fath Khān was imprisoned by Burhān III, Jamshīd Khān might have been ousted, and the Galna fort occupied by Mahmūd Khān, whose being in command of the fort in 1632 has already been mentioned above (p. 44).

1 ‘Abdu’l-Ḥamīd, op. cit., part i, pp. 269, 299.
Likewise, the composer Abūl-Faḍl may be identical with Qāḍī Abūl-Faḍl who, later on, in 1632, carried out the negotiations on behalf of Maḥmūd Khān with the Mughal general Khān-i-Zamān, resulting in Maḥmūd Khān’s surrender of the fort. Abūl-Faḍl appears to have been a local man in the state service and probably continued in the same capacity at Gāmna during the Mughal occupation as well.

Incidentally, the ruined mosque, completely rebuilt by Jāmshīd, is very likely to have been the one for which Dastūr Khān had endowed an inn in 1489-90."

---

¹ 'Abdu'l-Ḥamīd, op. cit., Part I, p. 443.
² EIM, 1929-30, pp. 56.
TWO EPITAPHS FROM HYDERABAD CITY

BY M. F. KHAN

Epigraphical Assistant

It is our sad experience that the scholars interested in historical research are not making sufficient use of the epigraphical material, particularly on the Arabic and Persian side, which is being brought to light from time to time. It is understandable that they cannot embark upon any large-scale exploration and search of these epigraphs themselves. But what is rather inexplicable is why they cannot utilize the published material on these. Even the Gazetteer Revision Units in most of the States do not care to utilise the epigraphical publications, which could otherwise provide them with important and, what is more, authentic, information on the matters of India's past.

The result is that though some very interesting inscriptions have come to light in recent years, few scholars seem to know about it even. The two epitaphs from Hyderabad, which are the subject matter of this article, are two of the many such historical records. These epitaphs were discovered as long back as in 1922-23 and published immediately thereafter,¹ but have more or less failed to attract the attention of the scholars, so far as my knowledge goes.

The credit of discovering these two epitaphs goes to the late Mr. S. A. A. Bilgrämi, then Assistant Secretary to H. E. H. the Nizâm's Government, Judicial, Police and General Departments, who held temporary charge as the Director of Archaeology of the Hyderabad State during 1922-24, when Dr. Ghulâm Yâzānî was on a study-tour abroad. During his tenure, Mr. Bilgrämi, it seems, had made it a point to 'hunt for fresh inscriptions, in the ruined cemeteries of forgotten ages' in Hyderabad,² and was, one must acknowledge, responsible for bringing to light some interesting unpublished inscriptions from that city:³ It was during one of these excursions made to unearth the past that the graves of an eminent Qātāb Shâhî nobleman, Khairât Khân and his son were discovered by him by chance in the Riffâ'î graveyard, near the Gowlipûra gate of the city, while he was engaged in finding out the grave of Sayyid Mu'azzafar.⁴

Mr. Bilgrämi published the texts of both the epitaphs which unfortunately do not reveal anything much about their subject, beyond recording their names and dates of death. He also added a valuable note on the career of Khairât Khân, prepared on the basis of some unpublished works and published inscriptions which were set up by Khairât Khân.⁵ But Mr. Bilgrämi could not decipher the date-figure correctly, with the result that the year of the death—same in both the cases—was advanced by more than a decade than was actually the case. Moreover, he has not illustrated these records which are remarkable for their beautiful calligraphy. It was, therefore, deemed necessary in the interest of historical research to correct the date and republish these epigraphs with their facsimiles.

¹ S. A. A. Bilgrämi, Landmarks of the Deccan (Hyderabad, 1927), pp. 58-59. Mr. Bilgrämi's work was first published in Urdu under the title Ma'âthir-i-Dukan.
² Ibid., introduction.
³ Ibid., p. 148.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 59-60.
Each of the two slabs is also inscribed on the reverse with religious texts. Since as such, these inscriptions on the reverse do not contain any historical information, they are not included in this article. Incidentally, they are of the same highly artistic execution.¹

The epitaphs are reported to have been engraved on the headstones of two graves contained in a large tomb built on an elevated platform inside the necropolis of the Rifā'is within the Gowlipūra gate of the city. The grave in the adjoining smaller tomb is said to contain the remains of the wife of Khairāt Khān, but it does not contain any inscription.²

The smaller of the two graves, situated in the centre of the tomb, belongs to Khairāt Khān's son who had predeceased his father, also buried by his side, about six months. The arch-shaped tablet fixed at its head measures 30 by 50 cm. and is inscribed on both sides in elegant Thulth script, which is of high order. Unfortunately, the scribe who must have been a calligraphist of great merit, has not mentioned his name, which is a pity. The excellent calligraphy, which can easily match with the best specimens to be found not only at Hyderabad but elsewhere as well, is sufficient to show that its artist was a high-ranking calligrapher of his time.

The obverse of the slab contains a five-line text, the major portion of which is devoted to the Shiite durūd.³ The obituary proper, which is engraved in a thinner hand, but of almost the same artistic quality, occurs in the second part of the last line, and records that the death of Bābā 'Abdu'llāh, son of Khairāt Khān, took place on the 5th Rabī' II 1055 (21st May 1645). Mr. Bilgrāmī read the year as A. H. 1066, which is wrong.⁴

The language of the religious text is Arabic, while that of the obituary, Persian. The text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

_Plate XVI (a)_

(1) اللهم صل على النبي
(2) و الوجیه و البنیول و السبطین و السجاد
(3) و البقر و الصادق و الکنام
(4) و الرنا و اللیتة و اللیتة و الکرک
(5) و المهدی عليه السلام وفات مغفوری بایا عبد الله بن خیراتخان پنجم مأمون

**TRANSLATION**

(1-5) Shiite durūd.⁵

(5) The death of pardoned Bābā 'Abdu'llāh, son of Khairāt Khān, (occurred on) the 5th of the month of Rabī‘u’th-Thānī (A. H.) 1055 (21st May 1645).

---

² Bilgrāmī, op. cit., p. 59.
³ *ARIE*, 1904-05, No. D. 4. The reverse contains the Quranic chapter XCVII inscribed in the same hand (ibid., No. 5).
⁴ Bilgrāmī, op. cit., p. 59.
⁵ For a translation of the most popular version of the Shiite durūd, please see *Epigraphia Indo-Muslimica* (EIM), 1915-16, p. 26.
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It will be observed from the illustration that the first two digits of the year-figure are thus engraved on the stone: ع ٦. These were mistakenly read by Mr. Bilgrami as 66, while they correctly stand for the numeral 55. ع is nothing but a way of writing the figure ٦ in vertical position with the upper portion towards right and the two ends, otherwise joined, remaining open and apart.¹ Mr. Bilgrami, while rejecting the reading, by Dr. Yazdani, of this figure in the epitaph of Muhammad Quṭb Shāh,² stated that in Persia, the numeral 6, and in Egypt and Turkey, the numeral ٦, were written that way.³ I am afraid, Mr. Bilgrami was misinformed. The figure ع represents 6 in Persia, but is never written there as ع. And even ع is nothing but the usual ع written with an upward slant towards right. That Mr. Bilgrami was wrong in interpreting the figure as 6 is borne out by the very fact that in the above-mentioned epitaph of Muhammad Quṭb Shāh, the figure is corrected as ٦ by him but almost the same figure, with joined ends no doubt, in another part of the same epitaph, is taken even by him to be ٦ in the figure of the year of death, viz. A. H. 1035. And he has tried to reconcile the two dates A. H. 1035 and 1036 by stating that one was that of the death and the other of fixing up of the slab.⁴ This is far-fetched.

The figure in question, with and without joined ends, is used to indicate the numeral ٦ in quite a few inscriptions.⁵ That it cannot but be taken to stand for ٦ is conclusively proved by at least two epigraphs: in one of them, the figures ع and ٦ are used to indicate Monday 25th and Tuesday 26th of Dhu’l-Hijja respectively.⁶ This shows that the figure in question stood for 6 only. But the most conclusive proof of my contention is afforded by an inscription from Raichur, in which the second digit of the numerical value 50, according to the ABjad system of the letter ٦ is indicated by the same figure, not in one, but in three places where it occurs.⁷

In short, the figure represents only ٦ and not 6 and therefore the year in which ‘Abdu’llâh and his father expired was A. H. 1055 and not A. H. 1066.⁸

The headstone on the grave of Khairât Khân is also arch-shaped and measures 85 cm. from apex to bottom and is 42 cm. wide. It contains five lines of writing, which, except for the obituary note occurring in the second half of the last line, contain a Quranic chapter. The reverse of this tablet is also inscribed, as in the case of the previous epitaph, with religious text, which however, comprises in this case Shiite durūd.⁹ In other words, in the other epitaph, the obverse had Shiite durūd, and the reverse, a Quranic chapter and in this one, it is vice versa.

The obituary, which is in Persian, places the death of Khairât Khân on the 18th Ramadân 1055 (28th October 1645). Unfortunately, no other details are given in this otherwise interesting epigraph of an eminent Quṭb Shāhi official.

¹ The same mistake was committed by Mr. Bilgrami in his decipherment of the date of another inscription of Hyderabad discovered by him, as was pointed out in Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1966, pp. 32-33.
² NIM, 1915-16, pl. VIII b.
³ Bilgrami, op. cit., p. 139, n.1.
⁴ Ibid., p. 149.
⁵ NIM, 1921-22, pl. X b ; ibid., 1925-26, pl. XI a; ibid., 1932-34 (Supplement), plas. XXIV b, XXXIII a & b, XXXIV a; ibid., 1937-38, plas. VI a, XIX b; ibid., 1949-50, plas. XIV c, XVI a; EIAPS, 1959 and 1960, pl. XVIII; ibid., 1963, plas. XX, XXIII; etc.
⁷ EIAPS, 1963, pl. XXIIIc.
⁸ This and the preceding two paragraphs are by the Editor.
The text has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate XVI (b)

1) İn the name of Alläh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

(2-5) Qur’ân, chapter XCVII.

(5) The death of the pardoned Khairât Khân (occurred on) the 18th of the month of Ramadân (A. H.) 1055 (28 October 1645).

In this epitaph too, the year A. H. 1055 was wrongly read as A. H. 1066 by Mr. Bilgrâmi.¹

From the above epitaphs, it is clear that the father expired hardly within six months of the death of his son. Unfortunately, it is not possible from the text to determine the age of ‘Abdu’llâh. That he was quite young when he died, is indicated by the size of his grave and also by the term of endearment ‘Bâbâ’ used for him in the text.

Khairât Khân seems to have held high position in the Quṭb Shâhî court. But very little is known about him. Almost all the available information relating to him from a contemporary work, Ḥadîqatu’s-Salâhîn of Nizâmû’l-Dîn Aḥmad Shîrâzî, which was then not published, was given by Mr. Bilgrâmi in his account.²

According to this work, Khairât Khân was the sar sawâbat and one of the most trusted servants of ‘Abdu’llâh Quṭb Shâh. He went to Iran in 1627, as the Quṭb Shâhî envoy to the court of Shâh ‘Abbâs. On his way to Iran, he was summoned from Surat, the port of embarkation, to Agra by the Mughal emperor Shâh Jahân who also gave him a letter for the Iranian sovereign. But by the time he reached the Iranian port Bandar-i-Abbâs, Shâh ‘Abbâs had died and was succeeded by Shâh Ṣafî. Khairât Khân went to Isfahan, presented the letters of ‘Abdu’llâh Quṭb Shâh as well as of Shâh Jahân and was very well received. He started for India in 1633 and reached Hyderabad, after delivering the reply of Shâh Jahân’s letter to him, in 1634. He was received with much

¹ Bilgrâmi, op. cit., p. 58.
² Bilgrâmi, op. cit., pp. 59-60. According to Dr. Yazdânî (EIM, 1913-14, p. 55), Khairât Khân’s embassy to Iran is also mentioned in the Târîkh-i-Rugâ’û’l-Dîn Khânî. 
favour by his master, who conferred upon him the post of a minister. In 1637, he accompanied the grand mother of the Golconda monarch upto Masulipatam on the eastern coast, whence she sailed for Jeddah on Pilgrimage.

Mr. Bilgrámi has also given the above particulars, with some details of dates. From the notes which Dr. Z. A. Desai, the editor of this journal took from this manuscript and which he was kind enough to place at my disposal, it appears that Mr. Bilgrámi has omitted to mention that Khairát Khán originally belonged to the Uymaq tribe and that his kinsmen were living in a village in Iran. The name of this village is unfortunately not mentioned in the above manuscript, but the author states that Sháh Šafi gave the very village in in‘am to Khairát Khán because of that fact only. Another point which Mr. Bilgrámi has not taken note of is that Nigámu’d-Dín Aḥmad Shírāzi mentions Khairát Khán as a ‘man of great wealth and generosity’ and also as ‘one who had rendered great services’.

Khairát Khán also finds mention in a few epigraphs, of which two, earlier published by Dr. Yazdání, have also been noticed by Mr. Bilgrámi. According to these, he had constructed several shops and a well and a garden in 1640 and a granary in 1642.

A third inscription, in Telugu and Persian, recording his name has been recently found at Pangal in the Mahbubnagar district of Andhra Pradesh. Providing a much earlier date in Khairát Khán’s career, it states he had constructed a watch-tower at the top of the Bálă-Qal’a and a well in the potter’s street inside the fort at Pangal in 1620, during the reign of Muḥammad Quṭb Sháh. It may also indicate that Khairát Khán was stationed at Pangal in the early period of his career or had his fief there.

[After these lines were written, it was found that the Hadīqatu’s-Salāfīn, edited by the late Mr. Bilgrámi has been printed at Hyderabad in 1961. It seems to have been released for sale long after that date.—Editor.]

---

1 Hadīqatu’s-Salāfīn, Ms. in the Sālār Jang Museum Library, ff. 77 and 80.
2 ETM, 1913-14, pp. 55, 57; Bilgrámi, op. cit., p. 69.
4 This paragraph is by the Editor.
SIX MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM VIDARBHA

By S. A. Rahim

Epigraphical Assistant

As a part of my study of the Mughal inscriptions from the Vidarbha region of Maharashtra, I propose to publish here six more epigraphs, which were copied in November 1964, in the course of my official tour. Of these, three are from Ellichpur in Amraoti district and one each from Amner in Amraoti, Ashti in Wardha and Karanja in Akola districts. According to the king-wise break-up, four records are dated in the reign of Aurangzeb and two in that of Shāh 'Alam II.

I. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1082, FROM ASHTI

The earliest of these in chronological order is from Ashti, situated in 21°12' N. and 78°11' E. in the Arvi taluka of Wardha district. Ashti, now reduced to a small village, was an important place in the Mughal period, and formed a pargana in the jāgīr of Muḥammad Khān Niyāzī in the time of Akbar. The inscribed tombs of Muḥammad Khān and his son Ahmad Khān in the village are among the chief objects of sufficient antiquarian interest in the whole district.

The inscription is engraved on the slabs of the walls forming the south-east corner of the mosque, locally called Lodi-Masjid, which is situated in a field, outside the village. Its four-line text in Persian, including one verse, neatly executed in ordinary Nastaʿlīq script, occupies a space of 1-6 m. by 31 cm. on both the sides of the corner. It records that the mosque was constructed in A.H. 1082 (1671-72) during the reign of Aurangzeb by Mahmūd, son of Daulat, an Afghān of the Lodī clan. The composition of the text leaves much to be desired.

The mosque seems to have acquired its present name, most probably because the clan-name 'Lodi' occurring in the fourth line just below the word 'Masjid' was taken by some body as a part of the phrase 'Binā Masjid'. It could as well be due to the fact that it was built by a Lodi Afghān. But the first reason seems to be more probable.

The text of the epigraph is quoted below:—

TEXT

Plate XVII (b)

(1) در زمان با امان اورنگ زیب بادشاہ کبیر پنا

1 Epigraphia Indica, Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1963, pp. 51-60; ibid., 1966, pp. 43-54.
4 For a brief description of the tombs and its inscriptions as well as history of the Niyāzī chiefs, see M. A. Suboor. 'A Short Note on the Ashti and Burhanpur Inscriptions', Bulletins of the Nagpur Museum, No. 1 (Allahabad, 1920), pp. 1-7.
SIX MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM VIDARBHA

67

(2) بیت:
الف و هشتاد و دو ز هجرت بود
کین (3) بناء مسجد عمود بن دولت نمود
عرف افغان
لوذی

TRANSLATION

(1) In the peaceful reign of Aurangzeb Badshah, the shelter of the world.
(2-3) Verse: It was one thousand and eighty and two from the Migration (of the Prophet), when this mosque was constructed by Mahmud, son of Daulat, alias Afghan
(4) Lod. No information is available about Mahmud, Afghan of Lod clan.

II. EPIGRAPH, DATED A.H. 1100, FROM AMNER

This interesting epigraph is engraved on a slab, measuring 57 by 57 cm. which is fixed on the outer side of the eastern wall of the tomb of La'li Khan, a large domed building in stucco with small spires at each corner, at Amner in Morsi faluka of the Amraoti district. It was first noticed in the district gazetteer, where a faulty rendering in English was also given. Subsequently, Raza Bahadur Hiralaal too noticed it in his List, but his brief notice, though certainly an improvement, also from a sufferers mistake or two.

The text consists of eight lines of writing of which the first is devoted to the religious text comprising Bismillah, the First Creed and the names of the first four caliphs. The next six contain a couplet each in Persian, and the last line records the dates. The quality of the Persian verses is unfortunately not only mediocre, but is also somewhat ambiguous, with the result that their purport is not absolutely clear. But it seems to state that La'li Khan, a servant of Raja Kishan Singh, laid down his life in the service of emperor Aurang Shahu Alamgir, i.e. Aurangzeb, on the 4th Ramadhan. The year of La'li Khan's death in the battle is given as A.H. 1100, regnal year 34, which is irregular in the sense that 4th Ramadhan of A.H. 1100 was the fourth day of the regnal year 33. But since the chronogram in words contained in line 7 yields A.H. 1100, we may safely presume that 34 is either the composer's or engraver's mistake for 33. La'li Khan must have thus died on the 4th Ramadhan A.H. 1100 (12th June 1689).

The text further records that though La'li Khan attained martyrdom at a place called Badhnur, he was buried at Amner. It assigns the construction of his tomb as well as a mosque, a tank and a flourishing garden to one Husain. The date of the construction of the tomb is given as regnal year 36, which, if not a mistake of calculation (as in the case of La'li Khan's date of death as stated

1 ARIE, 1964-65, No. D. 121. The tomb was briefly described in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1926-27, pp. 39-40, where the gist of the inscription is incorrectly given.
3 Hiralaal, Descriptive Lists of Inscriptions in the C. P. & Berar (Nagpur, 1916), p. 130, No. 178
above) for 35—regnal year 35 started on the 1st Ramaḍān 1102 or 19th May 1691—would mean that the tomb and other edifices mentioned in the text were built in the year Ramaḍān 1103-Sha‘bān 1104 (May 1692-April 1693). But I am inclined to think that the regnal year 36 is a mistake for 35, and the construction took place some time during May 1691-April 1692.

The style of writing of the main text is tolerably good Nasta’liq which is remarkable for its neat execution; the religious text in the first line is inscribed in mediocre Naskh.

The epigraph reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XVII(a)*

1. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله حضرت إيا بكر عم عثمان علي
2. اعز بني خدمت أورننك شه عالم كبير لعلخان باز ازين دير كهن كرد عبود
3. بود جون روز ماركز ز جهان رمضان ليكن إرها لطيف بايرندن بحور
4. قالن الشهيدن ينياك ك منير مسجد و حوض دغر باخ جو خلد معمور
5. جاودان دار خدا يا تو چنين روشن غريب تايد از تربت پاکس یدوكان قبلا نور
6. لعلخان يافت شهادت بكاني بدنور
7. عمارت متبره سنة 113 مرتب شد سنة 110 جارس والا سنة 111 هجري

**TRANSLATION**

1. In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful. There is no god but Allāh (and) Muḥammad is the apostle of Allāh. Ḥaḍrat Abā Bakr, ‘Umar, Ḫūṭmān (and) ‘Abī

2. (2) For rendering service to Aurang Shāh-i-‘Alamgīr, with great efforts, the subordinate of Bāja Kishān Singh (namely),

3. (3) La’l Khān, passed away from this old world, as the auspicious day was 4th Ramaḍān.

4. (4) Though his body was interred into the earth of Amner, his benign soul was entrusted to the Houris (of Paradise).

5. (5) Husaín with sincerity of heart and soul, constructed the tomb, a mosque and a tank (ba’ūd) and also a garden like flourishing Paradise.

6. (6) Oh God! may this extraordinary tomb last for ever, and may the dome of light from his holy grave shine in both the worlds!

† This is probably the engraver’s mistake for ‘بدو كون’ meaning ‘in both the worlds’
MUQHAL INSCRIPTIONS

(Plates XVII-XIX)

(a) Epigraph, dated A.H. 1100, from Amner (p. 68)

Scale: \[\frac{1}{184.1}\]

(b) Aurangzeb’s inscription, dated A.H. 1082, from Ashti (p. 66)

Scale: \[\frac{1}{18}\]
(7) When I sought its date from the Angel of the Unseen, he replied that La'î Khân attained martyrdom at the place of Badhnûr.

(8) The building of the tomb was completed in the (regnal) year 36. (He died in) the exalted regnal year 34, A.H. 1100.

It has been stated above that regnal year 33 and not 34, A.H. 1100, is the correct date of death of La'î Khân. He therefore died on 4th Ramaḍān 1100 (12th June 1689). Likewise, it stands more to reason to suppose that the tomb was also built in regnal year 35 (1691-92) and not 36 (1692-93).

From the above text and translation, it will be seen that it was not Rāja Kishan Singh who built the tomb as stated in the district gazetteer,¹ nor is Ḥusain mentioned as the Rājâ's servant, as stated by Hirālî.²

About the three personages mentioned in the text, only Rāja Kishan Singh seems to be known to history. He may be identical with Rāja Kishan Singh who succeeded Râm Singh as the zamindâr of Chanda in October 1683.³ There were also Kunwar Kishan Singh and Kishan Singh Hâdî, both of Aurangzeb's time, but they had died earlier.⁴ Though the possibility of La'î Khân's being the subordinate of either of the two cannot be ruled out, the odds of Rāja Kishan Singh of Chanda being the person referred to in the epigraph, appear to be heavy, as he was living and also close to the findspot of the inscription.

About La'î Khân, no information is available. That his body was brought to Amner for burial from the place of his death in the battle, shows that Amner was his fief or more probably his place of residence. Amner, as we know, was in bygone days a place of considerable importance, and the Amner tract was included in the fief of Ismâ'îl Khân, son of Muḥammad Khân Niyāzî, whose inscription, dated A.H. 1055 (1645-46), now in the Central Museum, Nagpur, was stated by the members of the Niyâzî family to have originally belonged to Amner.⁵ It is not unlikely that La'î Khân might have belonged to the Niyâzî stock.

Ḥusain, the builder of the edifices mentioned above, is also quite unknown, but the possibility of his being a relative of La'î Khân cannot be ruled out.

As regards the locale or the battle in which La'î Khân laid down his life, no clue is available. He is stated to have died at Badhnûr, which should mean that Badhnûr was the place where some engagement took place resulting in the death of La'î Khân. There are quite a few places bearing this name in Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, etc., as also in other parts in the south, e.g. Badhnor in Merwara region of Rajasthan, one each in Bijapur and Gulbarga districts of Mysore and three in the adjoining districts of Betul and Chhindwara in Madhya Pradesh. Of those, each of the three places in Madhya Pradesh are within a distance of not more than 100 kilometres from Amner. There is Gori-Bidnur in the Tumkur district of Mysore, which was simply called Bidnur in those days. And the queen of this Bidnur was engaged, in the year previous to the one in which La'î Khân died, in hostilities against Aurangzeb's men.⁶ But this Bidnur is rather too far to have been the place whence La'î Khân's dead body could be conveniently brought to Amner. I feel that it

¹ Fitzgerald and Nelson, op. cit., p. 351.
² Hirâlî op. cit.
³ Musta'id Khân, Ma'âqir-i-'Alamgîrî (Calcutta, 1871), pp. 239, 250.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 161, 217.
⁵ Suboor, op. cit., p. 5.
⁶ Musta'id Khân, op. cit., pp. 328-29.
must be one of the places near Betul-Chhindwara, which border on Wardha district, that must be the place of the battle.

III. INSCRIPTION, DATED REGNAL YEAR 41, FROM ELLICHPUR

The third inscription belongs to Ellichpur, head-quarters of the tāluka of the same name in Amraoti district. Ellichpur has been historically quite important in Berar region, and finds mention in the events of the Muslim rule of the early fourteenth century. It was the capital of Berar, after Gawilgarh, in the time of the 'Imād Shāhī dynasty and succeeding governors and rulers. But unfortunately, no early record, dated prior to A.H. 991 (1583-84), has been traced there.¹

The tablet bearing the record under notice is fixed over the main entrance of the Jāmi’ mosque of the town.² Measuring 1.2 m. by 82 cm., it contains seven Persian couplets, preceded by Bismillāh and followed by the name of the scribe, which are executed in Thulth of a fairly high order in six lines. The poetry of the text is also fairly impressive.

The epigraph states that the ancient Jāmi’ mosque of Ellichpur, which was the pride of the town, but was lying unrepaird for centuries, was reconstructed along with its reservoir (baug) and well by the great Khān ‘Ali Mardān Khān, through the efforts of Shāh Muḥammad Baig, in the 41st regnal year of Aurangzeb’s reign corresponding to A.H. 1108 (1697). The Hijrā date is also afforded by a chronogram. The scribe has signed his name as Muḥammad Hāshim ‘Ali Mardān Khānī.

I have read the text as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XVIII(b)*

(١) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم و يه آلتی

آتکه حکم نافذ تاج از سر قیصر بود

(٢) در زنان دولت خاقان عالمگیر شاه

جامس دین حاکم دنیا عل مربان خان

(٣) کرگل نعل سمندش مه کلیز از رخ زدود

مسجد جامع که ایلچهور بود از وی بیست

(۴) مرت از مرو دهند دون انتاده بود

شد باندیک فراستی آنینه دار قصر جود

(۵) همانت این خان گردند قدش مهند آن

شام محمد بیگ سامی بود در این کار خیر

(۶) نیش چون خیر بود این کار دیگر

تکه عذب الینیه زمزم از چاهی شنود

(۷) موج حوت جان فراتش آتروه طاعت ست

¹ *ARIE*, 1960-69, No. D, 62. For the history of Ellichpur as well as Berar, of which it was the premier city, see Fitzgerald and Nelson, op. cit., pp. 33-100.

TRANSLATION

(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful. And in Him I have trust.

(2) In the time of the reign of the king Ālamgīr Shāh, whose absolute order removed the crown from the head of Caesar,

(there was) ‘Ali Mardān Khān, the champion of religion and the commander of the world,

(3) by the dust of the shoe of whose horse, the moon wiped the spots from its face.

The Jāmī‘ mosque, on account of which Ilīchpūr (Ellichpur) was (like) Paradise, had remained desolate and without any repairs, on account of the passage of the mean Time.

(4) The magnanimity of the (said) Khān of sky-like status repaired it, and within a short period, it became the mirror of the Jūd (lit. of munificence) palace.

(It was) Shāh Muḥammadh Bāid (who) strive for this charitable work.

(5) As his intention was sincere, the work was accomplished more beautifully.

The wave of its life-refreshing reservoir is the water of the face of (i.e. adds lustre to) devotion. The Zamzam\(^1\) learnt the point of sweet description from its well.

(6) When I asked the date of its construction from the old man of Wisdom, he replied, ‘One who has seen the Ka‘ba has repaired this mosque’. (A. H.) 110[8]. Written by Muḥammadh Hāshīm ‘Ali Mardān Khānī, (regnal year) 41 (1697).

Mîr Husain, entitled ‘Ali Mardān Khān, who extensively repaired and renovated the old Jāmī‘ mosque of Ellichpur, which is locally believed to have been first constructed in the time of Muḥammadh bin Tughluq Shāh,\(^2\) was an eminent official of Aurangzeb. He is mentioned in historical works as ‘Ali Mardān Khān Ha’idarbādī, since before entering the service of Aurangzeb in the 30th regnal year, he was one of the eminent noblemen of the last Qutb Shāhī ruler, Sulṭān Abu’l-Ḥasan. He received from Aurangzeb the title of ‘Ali Mardān Khān with a rank of 6000. He died some time during the 49th regnal year (started 17th December 1704). He is stated to have been appointed to the governorship of Berār some time in A.H. 1105 (1693) subsequent to his release from the Marāshī captivity of two years. Before his death, he also acted as the deputy of Muḥammadh Bīdār Bākhīt at Burhanpur.\(^3\)

The present inscription supplies the additional information that as late as in A.H. 1108 (1697), ‘Ali Mardān Khān was in Berār. This is important, as the exact date of his appointment as governor to, or transfer from, Berār is not recorded anywhere. The epigraph also furnishes one more piece of information: In case the first phrase of the second hemistich of the last couplet, which

---

\(^1\) Hagar’s well in Ka‘ba at Mecca.
\(^2\) Fitzgerald and Nelson, op. cit., p. 397.
\(^3\) Shāh Nawāz Khān, op. cit. vol. II (Calcutta, 1890), pp. 824-25. Musta’īd Khān, op. cit., p. 364, mentions only his release from captivity.
evidently refers to ‘Ali Mardān Khān, is correctly translated, as it most probably has been, it would mean that he had, some time in the past, performed pilgrimage to the Ka’ba.

About the scribe Muḥammad Ḥāshim, nothing is known. He must have been a professional calligrapher apparently of no mean merit, and the appellation ‘Ali Mardān Khān shows that he was in regular employ of the governor. About Shāh Muḥammad Baig also, nothing could be traced. He may have been a local official.

IV. INSCRIPTION, DATED REGNAL YEAR 42, FROM KARANJA

The fourth inscription of this article which constitutes the last record of Aurangzeb, comes from Karanja in Murtazapur tālukā of Akola district. Engraved on a tablet measuring 86 by 22 cm., fixed on the right side of the Pūhā gate of the town, it forms the third record of the time of Rustam Khān, the jāgīrdār, and Qādir Ḍughirul-lāh, the faujdār, of Karanjan Bibi, the other two dated in the 42nd (as in the case of the one under study) and 43rd regnal years of Aurangzeb having been published in an earlier issue of this Journal. The text consists of four lines of writing in Persian partly in prose and partly in verse. It states that Rustam Khān became the master through the kindness of Shāh ‘Alamgīr, which can only be taken to mean that he became the fief-holder, particularly since in his other two records from the place referred to above, he is termed as jāgīrdār of the place. It further states that the gate of the qaṣba of Karanjan Bibi—called Makka Gate in the text—was built in the 42nd regnal year (March 1696-February 1699), during the time of Baghirul-lāh, the faujdār.

The text of this epigraph has the same purport as that appearing on the Dārwā gate of the town, also built in the 42nd regnal year. The calligraphy of both the records is likewise similar, which means that both were inscribed by the same person, whose name is not given in either of the two.

The style of writing is fairly good Nasta’līq. Some letters in the last line, being damaged, could not be read. The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate XVIII(a)

(1) الله أكبر

(2) ز لطف شاه عالم گیار شد مخدوم رستم خان - دروازه مکه

(3) قصبه کرتنچه چه در عمل قاضی بشير امکان فوجدار جلوس سیمک مانوس

(4) سنه ۴۲ هجری دو ترتیب شد

TRANSLATION

(1) Allah is great!

3 Ibid., p. 55.
(a) Record of Aurangzeb, dated regnal year 42, from Karanja (p. 72)

Scale: 16

(b) Inscription of the same king, dated A.H. 1108, from Ellichpur (p. 70)

Scale: 13
(2) Through the kindness of Shāh 'Alamgīr, Rustam Khān became the lord (i.e. sīaf-holder). The Makkā gate
(3-4) of the qasba Kāranja-Bībī was completed in the time of Qādī Bashīru'llāh, the faujdār, (in the) auspicious regnal year fortytwo, 42 (A.H. 1109–3 March 1698-20 February 1699) May the end be good!

As stated above, both Rustam Khān and Bashīru'llāh find mention in two inscriptions from Kāranja. The former is mentioned therein as the jāigirdār of the place, which fact also is more or less conveyed in the present epigraph, by the word makhdūm (lord) used for him. It is difficult to say if our Rustam Khān is identical with Sayyid Rustam Khān Dakhanlī, Frūz Jang’s deputy in Berar sometime after the 33rd regnal year of Aurangzeb, who held Balapūr and other places in his sīaf. About Bashīru’llāh, it is only from these three epigraphs that we know of his tenure as faujdār of the place, at least during the regnal years 42-43.

V-VI. INSCRIPTIONS, DATED A.H. 1180, FROM ELILCHPUR

The fifth and sixth inscriptions, with which the present study concludes, are again from Ellichepur. They were engraved in the reign of the Mughal emperor Shāh ‘Alam II (1759-1806) and as such, are important in showing that the Mughal emperor, despite his dwindling authority, was still acknowledged as, if nothing more, a titular head by Nawwāb Niẓāmu’d-Daula Bahādur Aṣaf Jāh II of Hyderabad, who was the virtual master of the Berar province.

The tablets of these two records flank the Hīrāpur gate of the town. Both the epigraphs contain the same purport, which runs to the effect that in the reign of Shāh ‘Alam, Nawwāb Amīr Niẓāmu’d-Daula Bahādur Aṣaf Jāh instructed Nawwāb Ismā’īl Khān Bahādur, the governor (nāzīm) of the province (qāba) of Berar, to strengthen the fort of Hīchpūr (Ellichpur) and reconstruct the Hīrāpur gate, and accordingly, the work was carried out by Khūshkhabar Khān in the year A.H. 1180 (1766-67).

The tablet, fixed on the right side of the gate, measures 50 by 70 cm. and is inscribed with a nine-line Persian text in prose and verse. Its purport is more detailed than that of the other record, in that it mentions the construction of the gate and also its name and gives the name and titles of the Aṣaf Jāhī chief and his Berar governor.

The style of writing is pleasing Nasta’liq. The letters are damaged by the weathering of the stone, but that has not affected the decipherment of the text which is quoted below:

TEXT

Plate XIX(a)

1 بعهد شاه عالم [باد] الشاه حسب [1] لحكم
2 تواب نظام الدو [اله] بهادر اصفهاج
3 باسليل خان بهادرز ناظم صوبه براود
4 از سر نو بنیا [د] ی؟ [دوروا]ن هیراولو [رود]

1 This is in verse and forms one hemistich.
2 Shāh Nawāz Khān, op. cit., vol. II. p. 504.
TRANSLATION

(1) In the reign of Shāh ‘Ālam Bāḏgāh. By order.
(2) Nawwāb Nizāmu’d-Daula Bahādur Āṣaf Jāh ordered
(3) Ismā’īl Kān Bahādur, the governor (mā’ām) of the province (gūba) of Berār,
(4) to construct afresh the Hirāpur Gate.
(5) (Consequently), in the charge of Khūshkhābar Kān,
(6) it received the beauty of strengthening, in the year
(7) one thousand and one hundred and eighty from the Migration of the Prophet (A.H. 1180-
1766-76 A.D.).
(8) (Verse :) When I asked the date of its construction,
(9) the Angel of the Unseen, replied, ’It is auspicious (and) fortunate’.

The chronogram contained in the last line works out to A.H. 1180, also given in figure.

The second inscription of the Hirāpur Gate and the last of the study is fixed on its left side. It
is engraved on a tablet measuring 96 by 70 cm. and consists of three couples in Persian followed
by the date-figure. Its purport is the same as in its above-mentioned counterpart, but here the Āṣaf
Jāh chief and its Berar governor are only mentioned by the titles Āṣaf Jāh and Nawwāb Ismā’īl
Kān respectively, and it only states that the former had ordered the ’strengthening of the fort’
and does not make any reference to the gate. The date is also contained in the chronogram occuring in the last hemistic.

The style of writing of this record is also beautiful Nasta’liq. Its text reads as under:—

TEXT

Plate XIX(b)

(1) در زمان [ن] شاه عالم خسرو گیتی ستان
(2) امر آصف جاه انجج چون یسایم شد عیان

1 ARIE, 1964-65, No. D, 104. Its text is also quoted on page 47 in an Urdu work on the life of the patron-
saint of Ellichpur, entitled Tādhkira-i-Bāhmānī by M. Maḥtāb Khan of Ellichpur. It was printed at Banaras and
published by the author in 1958.
(3) بهر ایسحق به نور انتظام قلمه می‌رود
(4) کرد فرمینصرف نواب اسمبلخان
(5) عزم تجویز چوئ لنظم خوشنخور خانان تعود
(6) رونق شهروی شده تاریخ این عالمیکان
(7) سنه 1180

TRANSLATION

(1) During the time of Shāh ‘Ālam, the world-conquering monarch,
(2) when the order of Āqaf Jāh, the bravest, was made obvious to the governor (nāzīm)
(3) for strengthening the fort of Illichpur (Ellicipur) which is full of light,
(4) Nawwāb Ismā’īl Khān thought of its compliance.
(5) When the governor (nāzīm) conveyed his decision on the proposal to Khūshkhabar Khān,
(6) (it was carried out and) the ‘splendour of the city’ became the date of this exalted edifice.
(7) Year (A.H.) 1180 (1766-67).

About the personages mentioned in the record, Āqaf Jāh II does not need any introduction. The Berar governor on his behalf, Ismā’īl Khān Bahādur, the Panni Afghān, is also quite well-known. He came into conflict with the governor of the neighbouring province Zafaru’d-Daula, who suspected that he was harbouring the rebels of Nirmal. Zafaru’d-Daula, without waiting for the permission of the minister Ruknu’d-Daula to march against him which he had asked for, went and besieged him in Ellicipur in June 1773, but through the intervention of the minister, a truce was made. In 1775, the Āqaf Jāh appointed his eldest son as the governor of Berar in place of Ismā’īl Khān, confining him to the fiefship of Balapur, but he refused to obey. Zafaru’d-Daula was sent to Ellicipur and closely followed by Āqaf Jāh himself. Ultimately, in the middle of May 1775, Ismā’īl Khān fell in an engagement.1 It may be mentioned that he finds mention as governor in some more inscriptions from Ellicipur which omit to mention the sovereignty of the Mughal emperor.2

Khushkhabar Khān, through whom the reconstruction was carried out, is not mentioned in historical works. But according to the inscription of the Mālipūra gate of Ellicipur, which was also constructed, under his supervision, by Ismā’īl Khān under orders of Āqaf Jāh II in A.H. 1184 (1770-71), he was the ‘ūmil of the pargana of Ellicipur.3 Incidentally, the inscription under reference is the earliest of the Āqaf Jāh records at Ellicipur which omit the name of Shāh ‘Ālam II.

---

2 ARIE, 1964-65, No. D, 105, 109, 110. For other inscriptions mentioning him and also for epitaphs of his descendants, see ibid., 1959-60, No. D, 66, 67, 73-83, etc.
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| Ajmer, in Rajasthan | 1, 3, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 23 |
| Akār, in Nasik district of Maharashtra | 51 |
| Akbār, Muḥtār emperor | 21, 25, 26, 66 |
| Ākhurīk-i-maṣūra, a post | 3, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17 |
| Akola, a district in Maharashtra | 65, 72 |
| ‘Alam, Miṣḥān Shāhī | 31, 32 |
| ‘Alam Shāh, see ‘Alau’Dīn ‘Alam Shāh | |
| ‘Alamgīr, Shāh, Muḥtār emperor | 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73 |
| ‘Alau’Dīn, Khalji, Delhi Sultān | 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13 (f.n. 5), 15, (f.n. 2), 17, 23, 24 |
| ‘Alau’Dīn ‘Alam Shāh, Sayyid king, tomb of, at Budaun | 33, 34 |
| ‘Alau’d-Dīn, ‘Alam Shāh, in Delhi | 3, 4 |
| Al-Fakhrī, see also Fakhrī | 3 |
| ‘Ali, Ḥaḍrat, fourth caliph | 50, 52, 56, 68 |
| ‘Ali, Mongol invader | 14 |
| Aligarh, inscription from | 39, 40 (f.n. 1), 2 |
| ‘Ali Mardān-Khānī, title of Mir Husain | 70, 71, 72 |
| ‘Ali, Mardān-Khānī, epithet of Muḥammad Hāshim (s.v.) | 70, 71, 72 |
| ‘Ali, Tāj’ud-Dīn, Khalji governor | 3, 10 |
| ‘Amar, Malik, Niẓām Shāhī minister | 44, 57, 59 |
| Amber, near Jaipur in Rajasthan | 21 |
| ‘Amīr a post | 75 |
| Amir Khusraw, see Khusraw | |
| Amiru’il-Umara, a post | 27 |
| Amner, in Amrooti district of Maharashtra | 66, 67, 69 |
| Amrooti, in Maharashtra | 66, 67, 70 |
| Amroha, in Moradabad district of Uttar Pradesh | 39 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amthua, in Gaya district of Bihar, inscription from</td>
<td>27, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh, State of</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antur, fort, in Aurangabad district</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āqā Sulaimān, tomb of, at GaHa</td>
<td>44, 56, 57, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsalān Khān, Mamlūk governor of Bayana</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvi, in Wardha district of Mahārashtra</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āṣaf Jāh, Nawwāb Nīzāmu’d-Daula Bahādur, Nīzām of Hyderabad</td>
<td>73, 74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āṣaf Jāhi, a dynasty</td>
<td>73, 74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aghrafi, Malik, Bahmani governor</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashī, in Wardha district</td>
<td>66 (f (n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’ṣa’ Sa’idī, see Sa’īdī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ātābāk, name of a Khaliqi noble so transcribed</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ātābe, variant of Nānāk (s.v.)</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auḥādi, chiefs of Bayana</td>
<td>1 (f (n. 2), 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auḥādi Khān, founder of the Auḥādi dynasty</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurang Shāh, Alamgīr, emperor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurangzeb, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>67, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āyām Humāyūn, Ahmad Khān, see Ahmad Khān</td>
<td>68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bābā ‘Abdu’llah, see ‘Abdu’llah, Bābā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bābā Badr, see Badr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bābak, name of a Khaliqi noble so transcribed</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bābur, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>21 (f (n. 6), 25 (f (n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badānur, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>67, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badr, Bābā, dargah of, at Nāgur</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baglana, fort, in Nasik district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahā’ud-Dīn Ṭughrīl, Malik, see Ṭughrīl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahmani, a dynasty</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahā’m Shāh, Ghurānīd king</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bākht Singh, Mahārāja, of Jodhpur</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balapur, in Akola district of Mahārashtra</td>
<td>73, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balban, Ghīyāsh’ud-Dīn, Sulṭān of Delhi</td>
<td>2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balban, ‘Izzul’Dīn</td>
<td>5, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bānāk or Bānākā, variant of Nānāk (s.v.)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandar-ī-‘Abbās, port in Iran</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bari Khatu, in Nagaur district of Rajasthan, inscriptions from</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghīrul’lāh, Qāḍī, funjdar</td>
<td>72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barānī, clan-name</td>
<td>33, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayana, in Bharatpur district of Rajasthan, inscriptions from</td>
<td>1 (f (n. 2), 2, 3, 7, 20, 21, 24 (f (n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayyū, Malik, governor of Bihar</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāzīd Nāhānī, Shaikh, Ḥādhr Khāli, a builder</td>
<td>28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal, Sulṭān of</td>
<td>25 (f (n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betar, a region in Mahārashtra</td>
<td>70 (f (n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetūl, district in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>69, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharatpur, erstwhile state and district in Rajasthan</td>
<td>1, 2, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhārij, Rāthor, Rājas, of Baglana</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidnur, see Gori-Bidnur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar, state</td>
<td>11, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 (f (n. 2), 27 (f (n. 2), 28, 30, 31, 32, 37, 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar Sharif, in Patna district of Bihar</td>
<td>26, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijaisamandīgarh fort, at Bayana, inscriptions from</td>
<td>24 (f (n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijapur district, in Mysore</td>
<td>67, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīkāner, district in Rajasthan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budaun, Uttar Pradesh, inscriptions from</td>
<td>23, 32 (f (n. 2), 34, (f (n. 2), 35, 36, 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha, Shaikh, entitled Jujhār Khān</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budh, Khwāja, Chāyanda, a saint</td>
<td>28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhlōl Shāh, Lodī king</td>
<td>32, 34 (f (n. 2), 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhān, Nīzām Shāh I, Ahmadnagar ruler</td>
<td>43, 51, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——, Nīzām Shāh III</td>
<td>44, 45, 58, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhanpur, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>66 (f (n. 4), 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāhānīgīr, a post</td>
<td>36, 37 (f (n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaran, in Bihar</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaksu, variant for Chatsu (s.v.)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanda, a district in Mahārashtra</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatsu, in Jaipur district, inscriptions from</td>
<td>2, 20, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chausa, in Shahabad district of Bihar</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāyanda, Budh, see Budh, Chāyanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chānī Khān, tomb of, at Budaun</td>
<td>35, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhindwara, a district, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>69, 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D

Dādū, Malik Miyān, Chāhāshīyir of Sikandar Lodi ................................................. 36, 37
Dāru'-Karāmāt, a tomb at Nagaur so called ................................................................. 18, 19
Daryā Khān, son of Mubārak Khān, Nūbānī, Lodi governor ........................................ 26, 27 (f. n. 2), 31, 32
Daryā Khān Zangi, Hūd, Nūbānī Khāt Khāli, mentioned in an inscription .............. 31, 32
Dastūr Khān, governor of Galna ...................................................................................... 43, 60
Dā'ud, Malik, governor of Jalor under Tughluq .............................................................. 23
Dā'ud Abdu'l, Mirān, a scribe ......................................................................................... 28, 29
Daulat, Lodi, Afgān, father of Mabhūd .......................................................................... 66, 67
Daulatabad, in Aurangabad district of Maharashtra ...................................................... 14,
17 (f. n. 5), 43
Daulat Khān, believed to be a builder ........................................................................... 35
Deccan, a region ................................................................................................................ 12 (f. n. 1), 14, 28, 33, 44, 46 (f. n. 3), 55, 56, 57
Delhi, Sultān of .................................................................................................................. 1, 5, 9, 10, 13, 23, 26 (f. n. 3)
Didwana, in Nagaur district ............................................................................................ 1
Dūdū, mother of Jālāl Khān Nūbānī ............................................................................... 28
E

Elīshpur, in Amroātī district ............................................................................................... 66,
70 (f. n. 1), 71, 73, 74 (f. n. 1), 75
Etah, district, in Uttar Pradesh ...................................................................................... 33

F

Faḍlullāh Gosā'in, Shāh, a saint, dargāh of, at Bihār Sharif ........................................... 26
Fakhīr, father of Sirāj and grand-father of Mu'ayyad ................................................... 12, 13
Fakhīrī, name so read ....................................................................................................... 3
Farid, name of Shāh Shāh Sūr .......................................................................................... 25
Faridu'd-Dunyā wa'd-Dīn Abū'l-Mugaffar Ahdī, khan and titles of Shāh Shāh (s. v.) .... 33, 39
Faridūn, Iranīan king .......................................................................................................... 27
Fatḥ Khān, son of Malik 'Ambar (s. v.) ........................................................................ 44, 59
Fatḥullāh, Miyān, builder ................................................................................................ 41
Fatḥullāh, Khwājāghī, Mughal official ........................................................................... 44

G

Galna, fort in Nasīk district .................................................................................................. 43 (f. n. 1), 2, 9, 44, 46, 47, 48,
49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60
Gaur, in Malda district of West Bengal ............................................................................ 27
Gawīgarh, in Amroātī district .......................................................................................... 70
Gaya, a district, in Bihar ..................................................................................................... 27
Ghālíkh Khān, Nīzm Shāhī official ................................................................................... 48 (f. n. 1)
Ghānam, Mr. N. G. ............................................................................................................ 1, 6
Ghāzi Malik, title of Tughluq .......................................................................................... 17
Ghaznavīd, a dynasty .......................................................................................................... 5
Ghiyāshu'd-Dīn, title of Balbān (s. v.) ............................................................................ 2, 5, 9
Ghiyāshu'd-Dīn, title of Tughluq Shāh (s. v.) .................................................................. 2, 6, 8, 9, 14
Ghiyāshu'd-Dunyā wa'd-Dīn Abū'l-Mugaffar, khan, and titles of Tughluq Shāh (s. v.) .... 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14
Ghulām Khān, mosque of, at Mandor ........................................................................... 23
Gori-Bidnār, in Tumkur district of Mysore .................................................................... 69
Goleconda, near Hyderabad ............................................................................................. 65
Gosā'in, Shāh, Faḍlullāh see Faḍlullāh ........................................................................... 27 (f. n. 4)
Gujarat, region .................................................................................................................. 5, 11
Gulbarga, in Mysore State .............................................................................................. 69
Gurg 'Ali Shāh, tomb of, at Chatu .................................................................................. 21

H

Haḍrat-i-'Ali Sher Khān, son of Hasan Sūr, see also Sher Shāh ....................................................................................................................... 28, 29
Hāfiz Mu'nu'd-Dīn, of Nagaur ....................................................................................... 7
Haḥżār Khān, name Juḥār Khān so transcribed ................................................................ 42
Haibat Khān, Nīzm Shāhī official ................................................................................... 44, 49, 50
51, 56
Hājī Khān, builder ............................................................................................................ 26
Hājī Khān Tarīn, Lodi official .......................................................................................... 27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haqimi, a composer</td>
<td>47, 48 (f. n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamidud-Din Suwalli Safi, Nagauri,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadrat, a saint</td>
<td>18 (f. n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamza, Malik Karim ud-Din, Mamluk</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan Suhr, father of Hadrat-i-Ali</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sher Khan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijaz Khan, name Juhjur Khan so</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcribed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hila, in Patna district, inscriptions from</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindon, in Sawai Madhopur district of Rajasthan</td>
<td>1, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humayun, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>25 (f. n. 3), 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husein, a builder</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husein Chishti, Khwaja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husein Farnali, Mian, sief-holder of Saran under Lodis</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husein Nesam, Ahmadnagar ruler</td>
<td>43 (f. n. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husein Shah, Sharqi, Jaunpur ruler</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughi Shtrazi, composer and scribe</td>
<td>45, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad, in Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>61, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Brahim Shah, Lodhi king</td>
<td>27, 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahimi Shah, Prince</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikat Khan, see Akat Khan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadiyur Khan Karrani, grandfather of Daud Milk</td>
<td>36, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilchpur, see Elichpur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilmi, Mir Murtaq, a poet and sief-holder of Budaun</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utumysh, Shamsu'd-Din, Mamluk king</td>
<td>2, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imad Shahi, a dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imadud-Din-Mulk, father of Malik-i-Sharq</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imadud-Din-Mulk, Malik-i-Sharq</td>
<td>32, 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imam, title used for Sher Shah</td>
<td>38, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imam Khwaja Budh Chayanda, see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqti</td>
<td>3, 10, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>64 (f. n. 2), 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishkur, Afgan clan</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iskandar, variant for Sikandar (s. v.)</td>
<td>27, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodhi king</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam Shah, Sur king</td>
<td>38 (f. n. 2), 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam'ul, a builder</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam'ul Khani, Niyazi, Mughal nobleman</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam'ul Khani Panji, Afghan, Aga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahangir governor of Ellihpur</td>
<td>73, 74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Issu'd-Din Balhan, Malik, see Balhan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jael, in Nagaur district</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahangir, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>25, 31 (f. n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahur Khan, name Juhjur Khan so</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcribed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaipur, erstwhile state and district in Rajasthan, inscriptions from</td>
<td>1, 2, 20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalal Khan Nubani, official under Lodis and Suras</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalalud-Din, Khaliqi king</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalor, district in Rajasthan, inscriptions from</td>
<td>1, 7, 8, 11, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana, in Patna district of Bihar, inscription from</td>
<td>29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunpur, district, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>27 (f. n. 2), 34, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeddah, a city in Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhajjar Khan, name Juhjur Khan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so transcribed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhjur Khan, variant for Juhjur Khan (s. v.)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodhpur, erstwhile state and district, in Rajasthan</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhjur Khan, title of Shahk Budhian, son of Sa'dulah</td>
<td>41, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumman, supervisor of construction</td>
<td>35, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumman, Madari, Shih, a saint</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachhwaahas, a Rajput clan</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafur, Malik, Khaliqi general</td>
<td>15 (f. n. 1), 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaman, in Bharatpur district, inscriptions from</td>
<td>1, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandahar, in Nander district</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara-Manikpur, in Allahabad district of Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanja, in Akola district, inscriptions from</td>
<td>66, 72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanja-Bibi, Karanja so called</td>
<td>72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karimu'd-Din, father of Zainul-Abidin</td>
<td>39, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Karimuddin Hamza, Malik, see Hamza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korkard, meaning of the term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karrani, an Afghan clan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khairat Khan, Qutb Shahi nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khalfu'l-Malik, sobriquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khaliqi, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khan-i-Azam Shahbaz Khan, see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shahbaz Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khan-i-Jahang, father of Ahmad Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khan-i-Zamun, Sayyid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khansuda of Nagaur, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khatu, see Bari Khatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khaldr, Khwaja, Prophet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khaldr Khalli, sie of Bazid Nuhani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khusraw, Amir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwaja Buda, a saint, see Buda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwaja Fatihullah, see Fatihullah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwaja Husain Chishti, see Hussain Chishti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwaja Jahar, prime minister of Firuz Tughluq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwaja Khdr, see Khdr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwaja Mahmud Gawan, see Mahmud Gawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwaja Muinuddin Chishti, see Muinuddin Chishti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khushshhakher Khan, son of an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khusraw Khan, predecessor of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tughluq Shah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khilj Singh, Raja of Chanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khilj Singh Haidar, Raja of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mughal mubaddar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khilji Khan, Mamluk governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koil, name of Aligarh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kol, variant for Koil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladun, in Nagaur district, inscriptions from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lad Khan, Mughal official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodhi, a dynasty and clan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madhvi Pradesh, State of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maghul, father of Malik Dadu, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chahangir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahaldar, a post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahaldir Khan, the son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahaldir Khan, the son, the father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nasir Shahi official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maharaja Bakht Singh, see Bakht Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maharaja of Jodhpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maharastra, State of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahabubnagar, in Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahmud, son of Damlat Afghan, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahmud Gawan, Khwaja, Bahmani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahmud Khan, Nasir Shahi official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahmud Qattal, Haqrat, a saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahmud Shah Tughluq, Delhi Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahfil, a supervisor of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majlis-i-'Ali, a title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makan, Miyat, Majlis-i-'Ali Zafar Khan, Lodhi official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makh, variant for Makan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makhudam Husain Nagauri, a saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f. n. 5), 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makkhan, variant for Makkhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Ahmad, Nasiru'l-Mulk Bahri,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik 'Ambar, see 'Ambar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Ashraf, see Ashraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Bahru'd-Din Tughrul, see Tughrul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Bayyu, see Bayyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Dadud, see Dadud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik 'Izzu'd-Din Balban, see Balban, 'Izzu'd-Din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Kaftur, see Kaftur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Karimuddin Hamza, see Hamza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Mamluk, Shahbaz Khan, see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mamluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Mujir Abul Rajah, see Mujir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Muizzafar, see Muizzafar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malik Nili, title of Kaftur Hazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinari, Khalji official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Nānak, see Nānak</td>
<td>12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Nāvak, see Nāvak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Qirān, see Qirān</td>
<td>12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Saifuddin Qutubuddin, title of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Nānak</td>
<td>12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——, title of Malik Qirān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Tughluq, see Tughluq Malik</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Wajih, see Wajih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malikul-Umara, title of Firuz, son of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——, title of Nānak Sultan (s.v.)</td>
<td>12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik ul-Sharg, a title</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——, title of 'Imad ul-Mulk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malwa, a region</td>
<td>27 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamluk, a dynasty</td>
<td>1, 5, 13, 40 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamluk, administrative unit</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manā Husaini, Sayyid, father of</td>
<td>49, 50, 52, 54, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismā'il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandoor, in Delduar district</td>
<td>2, 20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mānik, variant for Nānak</td>
<td>15, 16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mānik, Malik, Shāhbāz Khān</td>
<td>28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardānahah, Ruknuddin, a builder</td>
<td>37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma'sūm, Mir Muhammad, inscription of</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marūd Khān, Banita, a Sār noble</td>
<td>38, 39, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masulipatam, in Kistna district of</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt, Banita so read</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca, Hagar's well at, in Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>71 (f.n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meide, in Nagaur district</td>
<td>3, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawara, a region</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawat, a region</td>
<td>27 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir 'Ali, a Nizām Shāh official</td>
<td>44, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir Husaini, entitled 'Ali Mardān Khān,</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an official</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir Muhammad Ma'sūm, see Ma'sūm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir Murtaqā Ilmi, see Ilmi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrān Dā'ud Abdāl, see Dā'ud Abdāl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirān Sayyid Jumman Madārī, see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumman, Madārī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyān Dādā, Malik, see Dādā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyān Fathu'llah, see Fathu'llah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyān Husain Farmūlī, see Husain Farmūlī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyān Makan, Malīsī-'Āli, Zafar Khān,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see Makan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyān Shaikh 'Alam, see 'Alam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongol, invasion</td>
<td>13, 14, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moradabad, a district in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morsi, in Amravati district</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu'ayyad, son of Sirāj, muḥarrir</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubārak Khān Nūhānī, Lodi governor</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubārak Shāh, Abu'l-Muṣaffar Qutbuddin,</td>
<td>2, 7, 8, 10, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi, Sultan of Delhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughal, a dynasty</td>
<td>17, 21, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——, 25, 27, 31 (f.n. 1), 40 (f.n. 2), 44 (f.n. 3), 57, 59, 60, 64, 66, 73, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, the Prophet</td>
<td>30, 31, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——, 38, 39, 41, 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, a builder</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of Malikul-Umara</td>
<td>3, 8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firuz, a governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Bahāmid, Ghanavid</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Bidār Bakhtī, Mughal prince</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad bin Sām, Sultan of Delhi</td>
<td>2 (f.n. 6), 6, 6, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad bin Tughluq Shāh, Sultan of Delhi</td>
<td>2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Hāshim 'Ali Mardān Khān, a scrip</td>
<td>70, 71, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Khān, so-called Mughal official</td>
<td>44 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Khān, Niyāzī, Jagirdār of Ashti</td>
<td>66, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Ma'sūm, Mir, see Ma'sūm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Qutb Shāh, Goleconda ruler</td>
<td>63, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, name of 'Alīuddin</td>
<td>3, 4, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalji, a prince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, Shāh III, Bahmani king</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, Sipahsālār, son of Firuz</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥarrir a post</td>
<td>3, 12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——, 19, 19 (f.n. 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murūd-d-Dīn Chiṣhti, Khwāja, the famous saint</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mujir, Abū Rajā, Malik, Tughluq official</td>
<td>20, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mujiruddin, see Mujir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulher, fort, in Nasik district</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulūk Tālāb, local name of Firuz Sighar</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muqtī', a post</td>
<td>8, 10, 12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murād, name of a place and a bastion</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaqā Ilmi, see Ilmi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaqā I, Nizām Shāh, Ahmadnagar king</td>
<td>44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaqā II, Nizām Shāh, Ahmadnagar king</td>
<td>44, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustazapur, in Akola district</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughulī, a composer</td>
<td>56, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughaffar, Malik, Tughluq official</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Murassar Shâh, Sultan of Gujarat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|------|---------------------------------
|      | Mysore, State of               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nâ'îb, Malik, title of Kâfir Hasâr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | Nûnâk Sultânî, Malik'u-Umarâ, Sâif'd-
<p>|      | Da'ulat wa'd-Dîn, Khâlî &amp; Tughluq |
|      | official                         |
| 13, 14, 3 | &amp; f.n. 1,2, 15 | &amp; f.n. 6 |
|      | Nûnâk, Thakkur, of Daulatabad    |
| 17 f.n. 5 |             |
|    | Nânder, district, in Maharastra  |
| 51   |             |
|    | Narwar, in Sheopuri district of Madhya Pradesh |
| 28   |             |
|    | Nasik, district in Maharashtra |
| 43,44 |             |
|    | Nûsîr-i-Âmirî'l-Mu'mînîn, title of Delhi Sultân |
| 3,11 |             |
|    | Navranglal Bhat                  |
| 6    |             |
|    | Navzandas, a post                |
| 13   |             |
|    | Nawwâb Ismâ'îl Khan Bahâdur, see Ismâ'îl Khan |
|      | Nawwâb Nîzâmû'd-Daula Bahâdur, see Āsaf Jâh II |
|      | Nâyak, variant for Nûnâk         |
| 15 f.n. 3 |             |
|      | Nâyak, Malik, see Nâyak          |
|      | Nîyâzi, clan-name                |
| 66   | &amp; f.n. 4,             |
|      | Nîrmal, in Adilabad district of Andhra Pradesh |
| 75   |             |
|      | Nîpâm Shâhî, a dynasty          |
| 43, 44, 45 |             |
|      | Nîzâmû'd-Daula Bahâdur, see Āsaf Jâh |
|      | Nîzâmû'l-Mulk Bahri, Malik Ahmad, see Ahmad, Nîzâmû'l-Mulk |
|      | Nûbâî, a clan of the Afghans     |
| 26, 27 |             |
|      | Nûgrat Khân, Mamlûk governor     |
| 24   |             |
|      | Nûgrat Shâh, Sultan of Bengal    |
| 25   |             |
|      | Nûgratû'd-Din Tâbîsî, Mamlûk governor 24 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rustam Khan, jagirdar</td>
<td>72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustam Khan, Dakhani, Sayyid, deputy of Firuz Jang</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'dat Khan, Najam Shahi official</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'du'llah, father of Jujuhar Khan</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'dar-Mulk, Malik, title of Malik Qiran</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'id Baig Badakhshi, Mughal official</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'di, sieva of Hadrat Hamidu'd-Din</td>
<td>18 (f. n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'fa'd-Daulat wa'd-Din, title of Malik Naukat Sultan</td>
<td>3, 12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakti, in Etah district of Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>38 (f. n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salher, a fort, in Nasik district</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samana, sef of, in Panjab</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhal, in Morabadad district of Uttar pradesh</td>
<td>26, 36 (f. n. 3), 37, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhar, in Jaipur district of Rajasthan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saran, a district in Bihar</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarnobat, a post</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'id Khan, the name Mas'ud Khan so read</td>
<td>39 (f. n. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawai Madhopur, a district in Rajasthan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid, a dynasty</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid, poetical name of Sayyid Isma'il, composer of an inscription</td>
<td>50, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Isma'il, a composer and scribe</td>
<td>49, 50, 52, 54, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Jumman Madari, Miran, see Jumman Madari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Manu Husain, see Manu Sayyid Musaffar, Qutb Shahi nobleman</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Rustam Khan Dakhani, see Rustam Khan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah 'Abbasi, king of Iran, embassy to</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Alam II, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>66, 73, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Alagir, see 'Alagir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahbuz Khan Nabhani, Khun-i-A'zam</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Faqu'il-lah Goastain, see Faqu'il-lah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Jumman Madari, see Jumman Madari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsu'd-Din, title of Shah Jujhar Khan</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsu'd-Din, see Shamsu'd-Din</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsu'd-Din, Iltutmish, Mamluk king, see Iltutmish</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsu'd-Din, Shaikh, title of Shaikh Buddhaan Jujhar Khan</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsu'd-Arifin, name of the saint Janahu'd-Din</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharqi, a dynasty</td>
<td>25 (f. n. 1), 34, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheopuri, a district in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sher Khan, Mamluk governor</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sher Khan, later on Sher Shah</td>
<td>25, 27, 28, 29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sher Shah Suri emperor</td>
<td>26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38, 39, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shighali, see Ya'qub Baig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiqdar, a post</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikandar, Lodi king</td>
<td>25, 26, 27, 34 (f. n. 2), 36, 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikandar-i-Thani, title of Alau'd-Din Khalji</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sind, province of, now in Pakistan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siraj, father of Mu'ayyad and son of Fakhr</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwalik, hills</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwana, in Jodhpur district of Rajasthan</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta'bak, NaNak so transcribed</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taju'd-Daula wa'd-Din, Tughluq official</td>
<td>3, 8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taju'd-Din 'Ali, see also 'Ali, Taju'd-Din</td>
<td>3, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatak, Nanaak so transcribed</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telangana, a region</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakkur Nanaak, see Nanaak, Thakkur</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanhodar, a post</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilaat, near Delhi</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 8, 21, 23, 24, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughluq, a dynasty</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughluq Malik Ghazi, later on Ghayya shu'd-Din Tughluq Shagh</td>
<td>2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10 (f n 1), 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughrit, Malik Bahau'd-Din, a nobleman of Muhammad bin Sâm</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumkur, a district in Mysore</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtag, Mongol invader</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh Khân, Khalji governor</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh Khân, Balban, later on Sultan Ghayygu'd-Din Balban</td>
<td>5, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar, second caliph</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttar Pradesh, State of</td>
<td>7, 25, 32, 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ummân, third Caliph</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uymâq, a Turkish tribe</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakil, a post</td>
<td>58, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidarbha, a region</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajih, Malik, Bahmani governor</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardha, a district in Maharashtra</td>
<td>66, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya'qub Baig Shighâli, Mughal official</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafar Khân, Khalji general</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafar Khân, Majlis-i-'Ali, titles of Miyân Makan</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafarabad, in Jaunpur district</td>
<td>37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafar u'd-Daula, Asafshâhi governor</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zâhid, nom-de-plume of Jujhar Klân</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahir Muhammad, a scribe</td>
<td>58, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainu'l-'Abklîn, son of Karimu'd-Din, a builder</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>