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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 13th 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.

K.V. RAMESH
DIRECTOR (EPIGRAPHY)
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A UNIQUE INSCRIPTION OF SULTAN AHMAD OF MALWA FROM PIRANPUR NEAR CHANDERI

BY PROFESSOR S. A. RAHIM

LECTURER, NAGPUR MAHAVIDYALAYA, NAGPUR

Despite the fact that there exists a number of historical works dealing with the history of the Mālwa Sultanate, written both at its capital Māndū and a little later elsewhere, there are considerable gaps in our knowledge of this dynasty. While none of the contemporary records in the former category has seen the light of the day, with the exception of an abridged edition of the Maʿāṣīr-i-Maḥmūd Shāhī of Ali Kirmānī, also known as Shihāb-ʾi-Ḥakīm,1 almost all the important works in the other category are available in print as well as in translation. A few years back, however, in 1965 to be exact, a political and cultural history of Mālwa by Dr. U. N. Day of the Delhi University, originally being the subject for his Degree of the Doctor of Philosophy, was published.2 But unfortunately Dr. Day, while utilising the historical works on the subject, failed to consult the latest epigraphical material3 which, as the readers of this series are aware, contains a large number of the inscriptions of the Mālwa Sultanṣ who have come to light,4 and which furnish in some cases, new information about, and in other, supplement our knowledge of, the history of the period. We shall restrict ourselves to give only one instance here. A Jain record of 1424 at Deogarh in Jhansi District of Uttar Pradesh, gives the name of the reigning king as Shah Alambhak of Māndū, which according to Dr. Day stands for Shah Alap Khan.5 But this is not correct. The title Shah Alam can be easily recognised in the phrase ‘Shah Alambhak,’ and is not the corruption or variant of Shah Alp Khān, but it was the title which the latter alias Hoghang Shāh Ghori appears to have adopted. This is also clear from the title ‘Alam Sāḥi’ used for Hoghang Shāh in the Kāvyā Maṇohar of Maheshwar Kavi as is noted by Dr. Day himself.6 Dr. Day would have immediately recognised this fact, if he were aware of

---

1 This abridgement made by Dr. Nāruʾ-Ḥasan of the Delhi University was published in 1968 by the Indo-Persian Society, Delhi.
2 U. N. Day, Medieval Malwa (Delhi, 1965).
3 He did consult the epigraphs noticed in the Annual Reports of the Archaeological Department of Gwalior State (ABADG) and also those published in the Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica (EIM), up to its 1939-40 issue.
6 Ibid., p. 424, f.n.1.
the fact that his Māndū inscription clearly mentions Aḥp Kīān as having been entitled Shāh-i
Ālām. Incidentally, the same king finds mention as ‘Shāh Alīm’ in a Sanskrit record dated
V. S. 1483 (1428 A. D.), from Naderi in Guna district, also noted by Dr. Day, who could not
still connect him with Hṣaṅg Shāh, probably because he accepted the wrong identification
of Shāh Alīm with the ‘Sayyid king of Delhi’ given in the source, despite the clear date.

The inscription under study is one more such instance which, being as it is a unique record
of a rival king in the Mālpāt territories during the last days of the Sultanate, underscores the
need of extensive search of epigraphs on one hand and proper utilisation of their evidence, on
the other. The present inscription may be termed as an outstanding discovery of recent times,
as it represents the unique inscription of a son of the ruling Khalji family of Mālpāt, who had,
as will be seen presently, succeeded his father in wielding independent authority at Chanderi,
which is hardly a couple of kilometres from the finds pot of this record. The narrative in most
of the historical records generally referred to by scholars of history about the father’s having
declared his independent rule at Chanderi under the name Sūltān Muḥammad Shāh and
about his son Sūltān Ahmad Shāh is not very clear, particularly in regard to dates as also the extent
of his rule. It is surprising that some of our historians, particularly, Dr. Day, should have
totally ignored the son, though the earliest authority does mention the fact as we shall soon see. Our
inscription also, giving as it does a specific date, can be said to fill a lacunae in the history of
Mālpāt of the first quarter of the sixteenth century.

The tablet bearing this interesting inscription is fixed into the left side of a step-well locally
called Gachaw-Bāori, situated to the north-west of the village of Pirānpur, situated about four
kilometres east of Chanderi. An impression thereof was taken along with those of other epigraphs
from the place when I visited it in January 1962, but the impression being unsatisfactory, sufficient
details could not be made out at that time. In a subsequent visit in November 1966, a fresh
impression was prepared and efforts were also made to read it on the stone. But due not less to the
somewhat indifferent and unusual way of execution than to the damaged nature of the epigraph,
the text has not come out in the impression as well as it should. Nevertheless, it is definitely far
better than the earlier one and as a result, the epigraph could be deciphered. I am happy to say,
almost completely and correctly. I must, however, admit that in a couple of places, more
particularly in the last line, I am not certain about the reading of a couple of words.

The square tablet, measuring 50 cm. a side, contains a text of twelve lines, which but for
the first and the last two lines, are in verse. The first line comprises, instead of the Basmala,
another religious formulae, offering praise to Šallah and salutation to His Prophet, and the last two give
particulars of the scribe, the mason, etc.

---

1 Epigraphia Indica Arabic and Persian Supplement (ELAPS), 1964, p. 51. Dr. Day perhaps was misled by
the incomplete and faulty reading of this epigraph which was first published in E/M, 1909-10, p. 24; its revised
reading in ibid., 1911-12, p. 10, was even more confusing though the portion indicating Shāh-i-Ālām as the title
of the king was correctly read. The correct name and date of the king were clearly indicated in ARIE, 1962-63
No. D, 50.
2 ABADG, for V.S. 1981, No. 24.
3 It must be noted that even a modern writer as the compiler of the Gwālior State Gazetteer, has noted the
fact that Dābur after conquering Chanderi made over the fort to its legitimate sovereign Ahmad Khān, son of
Shāhīr Khān. But his statement that the latter’s alias was Muḥammad II and that he was a son of Muḥammad II are
5 For another epigraph from Pirānpur, belonging to Gḥayba‘u’l-Dīn Khalji’s time, see ibid., 1961-62, No. D,
63. It was published in ELAPS, 1964, p. 75, pl. XXIII b.
A UNIQUE INSCRIPTION OF SULTĀN ĀHMAD OF MĀLWĀ

The tablet having been exposed to inclemencies of weather, the writing is considerably damaged; the calligraphy too, though not poor, is not fine either, and the engraving is indifferent. And though, the text has even then been almost fully deciphered, the poor quality of verse and the faulty syntax and grammar have rendered the meaning in a couple of places not perfectly clear.

The first three couplets of the metrical text which is contained in lines 2-9 refer to the construction of the step-well and eulogise, in poetical strain, the fine quality of its water. The fourth couplet contains in the first hemistich, the name of the reigning 'Sultān of the land, Āhmād son of Muḥammad' and in the second refers to the Khāliji kings at the 'Mānḍū fort', but the connection between these two parts is not easy to establish due to the medio-re text and manner of engraving. What is probably meant is that the king belonged to the stock of the Khāliji kings who ruled at Mānḍū. The next verse mentions Bhārati Chand (ra), the official Majmūdār at the village and Maliku’š-Sharq Faḍlā. The sixth verse quotes the date to the exact day, viz. 1st Dhul-Qa’dā 926 (13th October 1520). In the seventh verse occurs the poetic name Mañhtiqi, who is stated to have composed the metrical text comprising seven verses, 'each verse of which is an ocean full of lustrous pearls'—an utterly absurd claim, for the quality of the verse as stated earlier is just mediocre. The next verse, composed in a separate metre, is imprecatory.

The first of the last two lines of the epigraph which are in prose, records the name of the scribe Muḥammad Sha’bān Afghān, who was, we are told, an old retainer of Khān-i-‘Azām Afḍāl Khānī. The last line could not be satisfactorily deciphered. According to my reading, it states that this well meant for public use was constructed at the instance of B(P?)ayāg Dās unbeliever, by the mason attached to him, namely Rāmḍās, son of Lakhman.

The style of writing of the epigraph is Naskh which is basically of a tolerably good quality. But it is the way in which the letters have been executed that imparts a somewhat untidy appearance to the writing. It seems that the letters were originally intended to be brought out in relief, as is indicated by their outlines marked out on the stone, but for some reason or the other, the portion of the slab surrounding these was not chiselled off.1 In some parts, particularly in lines 9, 10 and 11, some of the letters look as if they have been incised on stone.

The text of the epigraph has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate I(b)

(1) نحده و نصل
(2) مسیس و شهر ای منت خداً فضل سبیان
مرتب گشت این بالین بکرم نام یزدانی
(3) بعید چشمه کوثر بیاپس سلسیل آبی
مزاج شیر وز شکر مصبی شهد هم دانی
(4) انوشد گرکسی آبی بخواند و صف صد بایی
بکوید نیست این آبی مکر در چشمه کنعانی

1 There is at least one more similarly engraved record at Chandesi, which was set up four years later, in the time of Ībrāhīm Lodi (EIAPS, 1955 and 1956, pl. XXI c).
(5) بعهد حضرت سلطان بر احمد بن محمد کان شهنشاه خلیج از آن تصویر سلطان
(6) بوضع (؟) این بهارته پسندست مجموعدار این درکه
پمک الشرک (؟) این فولاد صنایعی است علونی
(7) مهی ذی القعده در غرب دشت را بیست و شش دیگر
بنهماد عام ربط آمده بیوم یومها ثانی
(8) مشتیم هفت بیست را مسلم گفت در مهدی
که در هر بیت درنالی است بر لولوی عمانی
(9) هر که درین بائین نظر پیدا ند
چشم شود کور شکم درد کند
(10) کاتب الحروف عبد العبد الفقیر عبد شبیان افغانی متعلق قدم خان اعظم الفضل خانی
(11) بنرمانیت پیاگداس (؟) کافر تمبیر این بائین موقوف راداس لکهمن معمار متعلق پیاگداس (؟)
در ماه ذی القعده سنه ...

TRANSLATION

(1) We praise Him and send salutations (on His Prophet).

(2) Thanks and gratefulness are due for the bounty of God and Divine excellence (that) this step-well was constructed through the grace (lit. generosity) of the name of God.

(3) In its well is the fountain of Kauthar, at its steps, its water is like the Salsabil, its composition is milk and sugar—you may even know it to be pure honey.

(4) If anybody drinks its water, he would recite hundred chapters in its praise (lit. description) (and) would say, ‘This (sort of) water is not to be found anywhere except perhaps in the fountain of Canaan.’

(5) (This took place) in the reign of His Majesty the king of the land, ʿAhmad son of Muḥammad, who is (descended †) from Khaljī emperors reigning at Māndū Fort.

(6) At this place (†) Bhāratī Chand is the Majmūʿdār from this court, (who) is attached to (7) Malikuʿsh-Sharq Faqīlā, the world-conquerer.

(7) The month was Dhu’l-Qaʿda, on the first day, (and) the year was twenty and six above nine hundred, on the day which was Monday (1 Dhu’l-Qaʿda 926=13 October 1520).

1 Name of a stream in Paradise.
2 Name of another stream in Paradise.
3 ‘Uwān according to F. Steinwas, A comprehensive Persian English Dictionary (London, 1957), p. 866, is a prefacing or writing a title page to a book.’
SUR RECORD FROM BIHAR

(a) Inscription of Muḥammad Sūr, dated A. H. 962, from Bihārsharif (p. 10)

MĀLWA SULTANATE RECORD FROM MADHYA PRADESH

(b) Epigraph of Sultān Ahmād from Pirānpur (p. 3)
(8) Mas'riqi composed seven complete couplets in its praise, in each of which there is an ocean full of the Oman pearls.

(9) Whoever casts an evil eye on this step-well, may his eye be blind and his stomach ache.

(10) The writer of these words is the poor and insignificant creature Muḥammad Sha'bān Afgānī, an old retainer of Khān-i-Aʿzām Afḍal Khān.

(11) At the instance of Bayāqūdās (i.e. Prayāq Dās) unbeliever, the construction of this step-well endowed for public (at the hand of ?) Rāmdās (son of) Lakhman (attached to ?) Bayāqūdās (Prayāq Dās) unbeliever, in the month of Dhu'l-Qa'da, year (?). . . .

It may not be without significance that this epigraph is also one of the many records of the time of the Mālāwīa kings found in Gūnā district particularly at Chanderi and its neighbourhood, which commemorate the setting up of step-wells. It also supplies new information about the local history of Chanderi as obtained in and about A.H. 926. It happens to be the only source to have preserved the name of a Hindu official of the revenue-collection department, namely Bhāratī Chand, who was the Majmūdār at the place. The record also provides, for the first time, the name of a new Mālāwīa noble, whose name even would have passed into oblivion but for our record. The Maliku'sh-Sharq's designation or his connection with Chanderi or the court is not specified in the text, but it can be safely assumed that he held a high post at the court, presumably that of a minister, or he may have held his jāgīr in the region. It is therefore surprising that he should be untraceable in historical works. The epigraph also gives the name of the scribe—designer of the text, a piece of information not always met with in epigraphs. He is Muḥammad (son of) Sha'bān, who describes himself as an Afgān and also as an old retainer of Khān-i-Aʿzām Afḍal Khān. The latter is evidently identical with a nobleman of Mālāwīa, Maulānā Irāmū'd-Dīn entitled Afḍal Khān who was concerned in the fāṭimidal wars between Sultān Muḥammad and his brother Sultān Muḥammad. He changed sides a couple of times receiving once the highest title of Majlis-i-Kārīm from, and was ultimately beheaded by, the former at the instigation of Medīnī Rāī in about A.H. 918. The similarity of the names of Afḍal Khān and Faḍlā which are derived from the same root, may suggest the possibility of their being the father and the son. The text is stated to have been composed by the pseudo-poet Mas'riqi, to trace whom in the historical or other works would be futile. Lastly, the names of the person at whose request the step-well was constructed and of the mason, very probably, attached to him, are also given. If the reading is correct, the former in particular is mentioned with the sobriquet 'unbeliever' generally used for a Hindu, while, it will have been noted that no such sobriquet is used for Bhāratī Chand.

But the major importance of this epigraph is that it not only confirms but throws new light on the existence of a sovereign principality, however nominal or short-lived, which was set up by the brother of 'Alīu'd-Dīn Muḥammad II of Mālāwī (1511-1531), son of Nāṣir Shāh Khaljī. The latter had, before he died in December 1510, appointed his son Muḥammad as his successor, his eldest son and heir-apparent Shihābu'd-Dīn having rebelled. The death of Nāṣir Shāh was a signal for further trouble which Muḥammad Shāh had to face. He had not yet settled down on the throne when news came in about July 1511 that some of the nobles had decided to raise to the throne another brother of his, Sāṭīb Khān by name. The latter helped by these nobles succeeded a few days later, in besieging the palace of Muḥammad Shāh who was compelled to escape from the fort and flee towards Ujjain, or Sārangpur, according to some. The nobles raised Sāṭīb Khān to the

thrones under the title of Sultan Muhammad. But his luck did not last long and he had to take to his heels, and having tried his luck in Gujarat and Berar, he came to Chandeli in about A.H. 919 (1513 A.D.) when Sikandar Lodi of Delhi was prevailed upon to send military help to him. After a few more vicissitudes, he is stated to have been raised to throne once again at Chandeli in A.H. 918 or A.H. 919. But ultimately he is believed to have been ousted from Chandeli by Sultan Mahmud and compelled to go over to the army of Sikandar Lodi. After this nothing is known about him, but he seems to have succeeded in regaining Chandeli and ruled there until after the death of Sikandar Lodi in A.H. 923. Incidentally, Nizamuddin Ahmad and Firuzhta give his name as Sarih Khan, the former also using the regal title Mahmud for him. On the other hand, the Gujarati historians call him Sultan Muhammad. That, whatever his original name, his royal name was Muhammad as given by the Gujarati historians is proved beyond any doubt by the present inscription which also calls him Muhammad.

Sultan Muhammad is believed by almost all authorities to have ultimately crossed over to the Lodi kingdom in A.H. 920. Dr. Day who also subscribes to this view does not give any further information about the rival king at Chandeli after A.H. 920. Nor do we find any mention whatsoever of this Sultan Muhammad alias Sarih Khan’s son in Dr. Day’s work—the latest on the history of Malwa—leave alone of his having set up independent authority, however nominal, at Chandeli. As a matter of fact, Dr. Day’s account, for which he mainly relies on Nizamuddin Ahmad, fails to throw any light on the political status of the Chandeli region on which the Delhi rulers had always set their covetous eyes. As long as the Malwa Sultanate was strong enough, Chandeli was left undisturbed, but once it developed weakness, the Lodis tried to wean it from the Malwa authority. Sultan Mahmud ruled over the Malwa kingdom right upto his death in A.H. 937 (1530-31 A.D.), with the exception of the period of a few months when he left Malwa in October-November, 1517, to be restored to the throne by the Gujarati Sultan in February of the following year. But once the Gujarati forces withdrew, the nobles and governors in outlying provinces became independent, and only a fragment of the large kingdom was left to Sultan Mahmud by the end of A.H. 925 (1519 A.D.) according to Dr. Day. Dr. Day also places the occupation of Chandeli by Medini Rai at about this time, but he has not quoted any authority for this timing; this occupation, as we shall soon see, took place not in A.H. 925 (1519 A.D.) but after some time. Nor is the duration of this occupation clear from Dr. Day’s narrative. He also seems to make Medini Rai in charge of Chandeli right from A.H. 925 (1519 A.D.) down to his death and fall of Chandeli some years later. Now, according to the indisputable contemporary evidence of our epigraph, Sultan Ahmad was master of Chandeli in A.H. 926 (1519-20 A.D.), and therefore, Medini Rai could not have been lord there in that year.

1 The events of about this period are almost identically described except for slight difference in dates by Nizamuddin Ahmad, Firuzhta, Sikandar, Ha’ji Dabir and others. For a resume of this, see Day, op. cit., pp. 271-279, 281-284.

2 Sikandar, Mir’at-i-Sikandari (Baroda, 1962), pp. 174, 175, 176, 179; Ha’ji Dabir, Zafar-ul-Walid bi-Massafar wa-Ali (London, 1910), pp. 97, 98, 100, 212, 213, etc.

3 Dr. Day follows Nizamuddin Ahmad, when he says that Sarih Khan ‘went to the army of Sikandar Lodi on the other side of the border of Malwa’ (op. cit., p. 284).

4 For details, see Day, op. cit., pp. 290-97.

5 Ibid., p. 303.

6 Ibid., p. 312. In the Gwalior State Gazetteer too, Rana Sangha is stated to have seized it in 1520 and made it over to Medini Rai who held it until Babur captured it on 27 September 1527 (Luard, op. cit., pp. 210-11). Apart from the inscription under study, the Lodi record of A.H. 930 (1524 A.D.) from Chandeli (EIAPS, 1944 and 1956 pp. 122-23) also shows that Rana Sangha could not have taken it before 1524.
In short, one looks in vain in Dr. Day's otherwise laudable work, for any worthwhile information about Chandari's political status by the end of the first quarter of the sixteenth century. Naturally Dr. Day could not be expected to be aware of the evidence furnished by the inscription under study, which was brought to light after his work was published. But there are at least two references in historical works that have escaped Dr. Day's notice, which could have been utilised to present a somewhat clearer picture on the subject. One of these is to be found in Niẓāmu'd-Dīn Aḥmad's work itself which has been the main source for Dr. Day's narration of the later Mālwa Sultāns, but it seems to have escaped Dr. Day's notice, as the particular statement occurs in the account of Ibrāhīm Lodi. The other reference, which gives more details, is from about a contemporary source, to wit, the Memoirs of the Mughal emperor Bābur whose statement throws fresh light on the history of Chandari, and as such, deserves to be quoted below first in full:

"Formerly Chandari will have belonged to the Sultāns of Mandāū (Mandū). When Sh. Nāsiru'd-Dīn passed away, one of his sons Sh. Māljūd who is now holding Mandū, took possession of it and its neighbouring parts, and another son called Muḥammad Shāh laid hands on Chandari and put it under Sh. Sikandar (Lūdī)'s protection, who, in his turn, took Muḥammad Shāh's side and sent him large forces. Muḥammad Shāh survived Sh. Sikandar and died in Sh. Ibrāhīm's time, leaving a very young son called Aḥmad Shāh whom Sh. Ibrāhīm drove out and replaced by a man of his own. At the time Rānā Sangā led out an army against Sh. Ibrāhīm and Ibrāhīm's beasts turned against him at Dūlpūr, Chandari fell into the Rānā's hands and by him was given to Medīnī [Mindī] Rāo the greatly-trusted pagan who was now in it with 4 or 5,000 other pagans."

Bābur took Chandari from Medīnī Rāi in A.H. 935 and gave it, again, to Aḥmad Shāh, according to his own statement. Abūl-Faḍl and Firishta also have referred to the restoration of Chandari to Aḥmad Shāh by Bābur.

The above account of Bābur clears up the picture to a large extent, and the exact chronology which lacks can be supplied from epigraphical and historical works. Firstly, the epigraph under study indicates that the history of Chandari as given by Bābur is fairly correct. Aḥmad Shāh was at least ruler of Chandari in A.H. 926, the date of the record. From the other reference in Niẓāmu'd-Dīn Aḥmad's work to which attention has been drawn, Bābur's statement regarding Muḥammad Shāh having survived Sikandar Lodi stands corroborated. According to this, immediately after his accession, Ibrāhīm Lodi lost no time in strengthening various parts of the kingdom and he sent Shaikhzāda Manjūh to guard the Chandari fort and act as a Peshwā (Chief Minister) of Muḥammad Shāh.

From the above, it would transpire that Muḥammad Shāh was succeeded by his son Aḥmad Shāh some time between A.H. 924 and A.H. 926. The latter seems to have been supplanted,
not very long after, by Miyān Ḥusain Farmūlī, who was given the fief of Chanderi by Ibrāhīm Lodī. But exactly at what date this deposition took place, and how long Miyān Ḥusain enjoyed his new fief, is nowhere mentioned, though the latter’s extermination by the aḥzādas of Chanderi, at the instigation and instance of the Lodī monarch has been described in details by some historians. As Miyān Ḥusain’s death is reported to have taken place a little before the death of the Bihār governor Daryā Khān Nubānī, this event must have taken place some time in A.H. 927 or 928 (1521-22 A.D.).

In what year did Rānā Sāṅgā take Chanderi from Ibrāhīm Lodī is also nowhere mentioned, nor has the fixing of the date been attempted by any scholar including Prof. A. B. Pānde, who has worked on the history of the Lodīs. That it could not have been before 9 Ramadān 930 (11 July 1524) is clear from an epigraph of Ibrāhīm Lodī from Chanderi which names Sharaful-Mulk as the Muqta of the Chanderi jāgir. This Sharaful-Mulk must have succeeded to part, if not whole, of the Chanderi jāgir of Miyān Ḥusain Farmūlī in whose clandestine removal, he had taken an active part at the instigation of Ibrāhīm Lodī himself.

It follows, therefore, that Medīnī Rāī must have been set up as Rāja of Chanderi only after July 1524 and Aḥmad Shāh was again made king of Chanderi by Bihārīn in A.H. 934 (1527-28 A.D.) as stated above. We are totally in dark about what happened to Sultān Aḥmad Shāh thereafter.

In any case, the inscription under study is extremely valuable as a historical document and due notice should be taken thereof.

Before I close, I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Z. A. Desai, editor of this journal, who not only asked me to select this epigraph for study but also helped me in various ways in the preparation of the article.

---

3. The Gwalior State Gazetteer places the event in 1520 which is manifestly wrong as has been shown above (p. 6, supra, fn. 7).
4. EJAPS, 1935 and 1936, pp. 122-23. The inscription was noticed as early as in about 1929 in the ARADO, for the year V.S. 1986, no. 13, where its date is wrongly read as A.H. 902, though it is stated to have been set up in the time of Ibrāhīm Lodī (who came to throne in A.H. 920).
A UNIQUE INSCRIPTION OF MUHAMMAD SHAH SUR OF BIHAR

By Dr. Z. A. Desai

This interesting inscription was first identified and brought to light by my esteemed friend Professor S. H. Askari of Patnä, the great historian and scholar, who is known to have virtually dedicated himself to historical studies. It is no exaggeration to say that almost all the new Arabic and Persian inscriptions of the province of Bihar found in recent times including those that have been published in this series, owe their discovery entirely due to the indefatigable energy and untiring zeal of the learned professor. It has indeed been a privilege to have been accompanied by him, more than once, in the course of my visits to the province to collect Arabic and Persian inscriptions. These epigraphs have shed considerable new light on the history of Bihar, particularly of the pre-Mughal period and it is no exaggeration to say that epigraphical evidence alone has been forthcoming to give a list of succession of the Tughluqian governors of the province, about which our information was almost nil. Professor Askari had published three learned articles, based on the evidence of inscriptions and literary works like the biographies of saints and their Malfuz (Daily Talk), one each dealing with the Turko-Afghan Period, Lodí Period and Early Mughal period.

The inscription under study was noticed by Professor Askari in the above-mentioned first article, where the Roman transcript of its text as deciphered by him was also given. Initially, its impression was prepared for my office in 1954, but the writing being somewhat damaged and the letters having been executed in a somewhat cursive hand and also placed one upon another, the text could not be satisfactorily read. As a result, the king's titles were stated to read Shamsud-Din. In January 1956, when I visited Bihârsharif in the company of Professor Askari, I took the opportunity to examine it on stone, and had a somewhat better impression thereof obtained. It is from this impression that the epigraph is being edited here.

The tablet bearing the inscription is fixed above the mihrâb in the western wall of a building called Imâmbâra situated in the Ma[halla Aziz Ghaç of Bihârsharif, a sub-divisional headquarters in Patnâ district. The building was used at that time and, may be, is used even now, to run a small restaurant called Munshi Hotel.

1 Some ideas of this can be had from the studies on the inscriptions of the Tughluq and the Sultans of Bengal, from Bihar, which appeared in the various issues of the Epigraphia Indica Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), as detailed in the foot note 2, below.

2 The first and the third of these articles were published in the 1954 and 1957 issues of the Current Studies, Magazine of the Patna College, Patna, where Professor Askari headed the Department of History with great distinction. The second was published in the Journal of the Bihar Research Society, Patna, vol. XII, part 3 (1965). It is unfortunate that these articles, published as they were in a college magazine having a limited circulation and that too among students of various subjects and calibre, did not attract sufficient notice.


4 Ibid., Bihârsharif is famous in Indo-Muslim history as the provincial capital in the pre-Mughal period. A number of inscriptions of the Mamlûk, Tughluq, Shârîf and Lodí kings have been found here. These have been listed in the ARIE and almost all of them also published in the various issues of the Epigraphia Indo-Ma[l]econics and EIAPS. For references to these, see EIAPS, 1961, p. 25, f.n. 2. Independent articles on the inscriptions of the Tughluqs and of the Sultans of Bengal from Bihar have appeared in ibid., pp. 25-44 (where more references will be found) and ibid., 1968, pp. 11-16. Some Shârîf, Lodí and Sûr epigraphs were published in ibid., 1962, pp. 44-55; ibid., 1967, pp. 25-32; and ibid., 1966, pp. 25-37. A few Mughal epigraphs were published in ibid., 1966, pp. 35-42 and ibid., 1968, pp. 4-14.
The epigraph comprises a three-line text, of which the first line is devoted to Basmala and the remaining two contain the historical record in Persian, which refers itself to the reign of Nāṣru’d-Dunyā wa’d-Dīn Abū’l-Muẓaffar Muḥammad Shāh Sūltān and assigns the construction of a mosque to Aḥmad (son of) Tāhir, son of Diyā in 1554-55.

The epigraphical tablet measures 30 by 25 cm., and the style of writing is Naskh of quite an ordinary type which is somewhat on crudiish side in certain parts. However, an attempt seems to have been made to achieve a certain impressiveness by the parallel arrangement of vertical strokes of some letters and the slanting strokes of parts of other letters particularly in the first line, and the effect could have been quite picturesque if the calligraphy were of a high order.

The reading of a few words in the middle of the second line of the text which could not be deciphered satisfactorily is tentative. These words except one, are not indistinct, but their correct reading could not be established, as they are quite unfamiliar. It would not be surprising if they have been wrongly inscribed in place of some other words.

**TEXT**

Plate I(a)

لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله
(1)

نصر(?)
الدینا و الی胞ین ایض انور خلیفه شاه سلطان
(2)

پایه مسجد بندلا: درگاه فکر خرکیا احمد(?) بن طاهر بن ضیا فی اینی سنین و تسمیا
(3)

**TRANSLATION**

(1) There is no god but Allāh, Muḥammad is the Prophet of Allāh.

(2) (In the reign of) Nāṣru’d-Dunyā wa’d-Dīn Abū’l-Muẓaffar Muḥammad Shāh Sūltān,

(3) the builder of the mosque is the servant of the court.......................

Aḥmad son of (?) Tāhir, son of Diyā in (the year A.H.) two and sixty and nine hundred (A.H. 962-1554-55 A.D.).

Professor 'Askari's eye-reading of this epigraph, despite the fact that it was made under unfavourable conditions, is correct to a fairly good extent. The above reading differs from that of his in two or three places: He reads in line 2 Zafar ‘d-Dunyā (which looks more like Nāṣru’d-Dunyā) and Mirnagar Harkhā and Bunyā instead of Fakir Kh(or H)arkhā and Diyā respectively in line 3. It will be seen from the illustration that the words are almost quite clear in the

---

1 According to the tentative reading given in the text, this phrase reads like Fakir Kh(or H)arkhā. It could have been originally intended for some invocatory phrase.

2 'Askari, 'A Review of Bihar during the Turko-Afghan per od', *Current Studies, Patna*, 1954, p. 22.
A UNIQUE INSRIPTION OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH SŪR OF BIHĀR

impression. But it is difficult to explain what they stand for. Likewise, the reading of the name of the builder is also not certain. It has been tentatively read as Ahmad, son of Tahir, son of Diya. The name of Tahir son of Diya is quite clear. About the builder, nothing is known from available historical records, but the text mentions him as the servant of the court, that is an official.

But the main importance of the record lies in that it is a unique record of the king mentioned therein. There were, as Professor Askari has rightly pointed out, two sovereign rulers bearing this name, to wit, Sultan Muḥammad Shāh Sūr surnamed Ādil who ruled first at Delhi and later at Chunar (1553-57) and the other, Muḥammad Khān Sūr, governor of Bengal including North Bihar (1553-55). The latter who is mentioned in some historical works as Gauriya,1 was the viceroy of Bengal which then included parts of North Bihar also, and having refused to acknowledge the former, independently ruled as king of Bengal from 1553. He was ultimately killed at the hands of Himī in December 1555 in a battle fought at Chhapparghat, near Kāpī.2 His death was avenged by his son and successor to the throne Ghīyāth-ud-Dīn Bahādur Shāh, who killed Muḥammad Ādil in the battle fought in the vicinity of Surajgarh, near Monghyr, in about April 1557.3

Now, as Professor Askari has rightly observed, the title of both of them are different from that found in our inscription.4 As to the titles of Muḥammad Ādil, his coins have Muḥārisu’ d-Dunyā wasd-Dīn,5 while none of his three inscriptions found so far, contains any title.6 On the other hand, no inscription of Muḥammad Shāh Sūr of Gaur was known so far. But his coins issued from Arākān mint in A.H. 962 have clearly Shamsu’d-Dunyā wasd-Dīn.7 The inscription in the study bears the date A.H. 962 and also contains the name Muḥammad Shāh, and in addition its findspot, Bihār Sharif, is more likely to be at this date under the Afghān ruler of Gaur than Muḥammad Ādil, who being deprived of the Delhi throne had come down to Chunar. But in that case the title used in the inscription, to wit, Nāṣru’d-Dunyā, would be different from the title used in his coins. There is also one possibility namely that the word Nāṣr in the title may have been so engraved instead of Shams. The style of writing being somewhat confusing, this would not be wholly impossible.

1 ‘Abdul-Qādir Badayūnī, Mānas ‘Abbāsī-Tusnāyī, vol. I (Calcutta, 1868), p. 432. Firdawīs, Tūrī Al-Firdawī (Nawebshere, 1864), vol. I, p. 235; Nizāmu’d-Dīn Ahmad, Tubugāt-i-Akbarī (Lucknow, 1876), p. 241. It is rather surprising that Dr. S.M. Imāmu’d-Dīn in his introduction to Tūrīh-i-Kān-Abān-va-Makhrun-i-Afghān, vol. I (Dacca, 1960), p. 402, should write the sobriquet as Kurish. The correct sobriquet Gauriya is used by these historians to distinguish him from other nobles bearing his name, as he was ruler of Gaur in Bengāl.

2 R. G. Majumdar, ed. History of Bengal, vol. II (Dacca, 1948), p. 179. None of the Persian historians give the exact date of the battle, but from the statement of Firdawīs, op. cit., p. 235, it would appear that the battle was fought after the reoccupation of Delhi and Agra by Humāyūn, which took place in Rajab 962 (May-June 1555) and just before the death of the latter which took place in Rabī’ 963 (January-February 1556). The date of the battle, therefore, given in Majumdar, op. cit., appears to be correct, but R. R. Diwākār, ed. Bihār Through the Ages (Calcutta, 1959), p. 484, the date given is 1554.


4 Askari, op. cit.


6 Two of these are from Jathālā (JLAIS, 1953 and 1954, pp. 37-38). The third is from Kaitkālā (ARBE, 1967-68, No. D, 265). Generally speaking, historical works do not give his regal title and wherever it is given, it is incorrectly given. For example, Badayūnī, op. cit., gives Jalāl-ud-Dīn.

7 Wright, op. cit.
A glance at the illustration will show that the word Naṣr could have been originally intended to be Shams. And even otherwise, the cases where the titles on coins and inscriptions differ are not entirely unknown. Therefore, I am inclined to assign this epigraph to Muhammad Shāh Sūr who governed Bengal for about two years after declaring his independence in A.H. 960.

2 In any case, there is no doubt that the word is not Ẓafar as taken by Professor ʿAskari.
AN EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPIGRAPH FROM GUJARAT

BY DR. Z. A. DESAI

The town of Pāṭan in Mehsānā district in North Gujarāt is wellknown, under the name of Anhilwārā or Nahrwāla, to students of Indian history as the capital of Gujarāt ever since its foundation till its place was taken by Ahmadābād in 1412. Now shorn alike of its historical importance, antiquarian character and former splendour, it is reduced to the position of a tāluka headquarters. It is approachable both by rail and road from Ahmadābād, which is about one hundred kilometres on the south-east.

Very few Islamic monuments have survived at Pāṭan, which was the capital of the Muslim governors for about a century. Whatever few have come down to us probably date from the Sultanate and post-Sultanate periods, and these too comprise in almost all cases the mausolea of celebrated saints like Shaikh Farīd, Makhdūm Ḥusāmuddīn Multānī and the like, situated on the outskirts of the present town. Fortunately, however, a large number of Muslim epigraphs ranging from the Ṛaipūt period down to the present times, have been preserved in various monuments, comprising mostly mosques, in which the town abounds. These epigraphs have been listed in the Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy from time to time, and some of them have been edited in the previous issues of this series as well. The Khalji and the early Tughluq records of the place—the available Tughluq records do not date prior to the reign of Firuz Tughluq—have totally disappeared, except two fragmentary epigraphs, which have been proved to have formed part of a record of the time of Ḍhī‘ al-Muḍawwar. It may be recalled that this record also mentions Ani Khān that is to say, Malik Sanjar, a brother-in-law of that monarch, who was the governor of the province for about a decade. In one of my subsequent visits to Pāṭan, to be exact in January 1965, I discovered one more inscription of the time of the Khalji monarch, which seems to have been caused to be set up by a man of official status, but surprisingly enough it omits to mention the name of the king. It is proposed to study this inscription in this short article.

This is quite an elegant inscription carved in relief on a slab of white marble which is built up into the inner face of the city-wall to the immediate west of the Moti Shāh Darwāza. This part of the city-wall forms the southern wall of a shop, which belongs to the adjacent mosque on the west. The mosque in question is a modern structure. The text of the epigraph comprises one line of writing in Persian recording the construction of a mosque in 1315 by Malik ul-Umar Tughluq Shāh. Whether the epigraph

1 For reference to the history and description of the town, see Epigraphia Indica Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1961, p. 15, f.n. 4.
3 Epigraphia Indo-Muslimica (EI), 1939-40, pp. 3-4 (pl, I b); EIAPS, 1961, p. 16 (pl, III a); ibid., 1962, pp. 3-4 (pl, I b), 7 (pl, II c), 8 (pl, III a), 9 (pl, IVb), 10 (pl, IVa), 11 (pl, IVb), 12 (pl, IVa), 13 (pl, IVb), 14 (pl, IVb), 15 (pl, Vb), 16 (pl, VIII b), 17 (pl, IX a), 18 (pl, IX b), 19 (pl, IX a), 20 (pl, IX b), 21 (pl, IX a), 22 (pl, IX b), 23 (pl, IX a), 24 (pl, IX b), 25 (pl, IX a), 26 (pl, IX b), 27 (pl, IX a), 28 (pl, IX b), 29 (pl, IX a), 30 (pl, IX b), 31 (pl, IX a), 32 (pl, IX b), 33 (pl, IX a), 34 (pl, IX b), 35 (pl, IX a).
4 Recently a fragmentary inscription of Ghiyāshu'd-Dīn Tughluq Shāh has been discovered (ARIE, 1973-74, No. D, 77).
6 Here only those inscriptions are taken into account which specifically refer to the ruling monarch.
7 For the detailed notice of this epigraph, please see EIAPS, 1962, pp. 1-3.
has anything to do with the present mosque cannot be said for certain, but the possibility that there might have been an old mosque on the same site and the epigraph might have belonged to it cannot be ruled out.

The style of writing is Naskh of no distinctive merit in itself, but the letters which are engraved in relief have been symmetrically and neatly placed and the effect produced on the whole thereby is extremely pleasing to the eye.

The text is engraved on the entire surface of the slab which measures 1.67 m. by 20 cms. and has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate II(a)

امر بنى هذا المسجد ملك الأثما ملجماء الفقرا اختيار الدولة والدين على عبد الخاموش
إمام الله تعالى في الغر مين جماد الأول سنة خمس عشر و سبعا

TRANSLATION

This mosque was ordered to be built by Maliku'l-Umarā (lit. prince among the nobles), the refuge of the needy, Ikhtiyarū'd-Daulat wa'd-Dīn 'Ali (son of) Muḥammad (son of) Khāmūsh, may Allah perpetuate his glories, on the first of Jumāda'l-Ulā (of the) year (A.H.) fifteen and seven hundred (1 Jumāda I 715-3 August 1315).

The importance of the epigraph lies, apart from being one of the very few records of the Khalif period that have survived in Gujrat, in preserving the name of a noble of first rank, Maliku'l-Umarā 'Ali. Though the latter is not designated by any official authority in the text, the titles Maliku'l-Umarā Ikhtiyarū'd-Daulat wa'd-Dīn used along with his name and his description as helper of the needy, can be safely taken to indicate that he enjoyed high official status. As such, the epigraph is quite valuable as a source of regional history.

At the same time, the Maliku'l-Umarā does not appear to have been in the lime-light of political activity. Otherwise, his name at least would have found mention in contemporary records. For want of any information whatsoever, it is difficult to establish his full identity beyond what is known from the present record, namely that he was an official of high status stationed or at least having a temporary or permanent domicile at Pašan at the time of the date of the record. No doubt we do come across a short account of Sayyid Khāmūsh, an uncle of the author of the celebrated hagiographical work Siyara'l-Auliya. But as he is stated to have died in A.H. 732, at a comparatively young age, he would be too late a person to be a grandfather of Maliku'l-Umarā 'Ali. However, there is the possibility of the former's having belonged to this family if not being the son of the latter—the naming of grandchildren after the name of grandparents has been a common practice.

It has been alluded to above that the name of the ruling monarch has been omitted in the text. This is by no means a solitary instance, as students of Indo-Islamic inscriptions know, and as such it may not have any particular significance. On the other hand, one may be tempted to take into account the situation obtaining at Delhi at about this time when, according to historical works, 'Ālū'd-Dīn's last days were marked by the influence wielded over him by Mālik

1 Amir Khudr, Siyara'l-Auliya (Delhi, 1879), pp. 219-20.
Nāgaur, who was instrumental in having Alp Khan the governor of Gujarāt to be recalled to Delhi by the king, to be put to death a little later in the beginning of 1316.\(^1\) Seen against this background, the absence of the king’s name may have been due to the fact that the state of affairs at the capital was not clear, and the authorities at various levels in Gujarāt could not make up their mind, and hence took recourse to the safer way of keeping quiet on this point. It would not be unlikely that this course was adopted by the Malikul-Umarā of the record under study, who, it may be remembered, did not stand to lose anything by doing so, as this epigraph did not constitute, strictly speaking, an official document.

The need for preservation of this important historical document of the early fourteenth century is imperative, and it is hoped that it will not be allowed to be destroyed or lost in the course of the demolition of the city-wall by the Municipality of the town, which was in various stages of completion, at the time of my visit.

INSCRIPTIONS OF THE KHANZADAS OF NAGAUR

BY DR. Z. A. DESAI

Very little attention has been paid by our historians to the history of the small but powerful dynasty of the Khānzādas of Nāgaur, which ruled over part of central Rājasthān from Nāgaur for a period of slightly less than a century and a half. It is a measure of its greatness that it retained its sovereignty against heavy odds—the kingdom was surrounded on all sides by powerful neighbours who were all the while ready to attack and if possible annex it to their own territories. For example, there were the Rājpūt chiefs of Mewār and Mārwār on one side and on the other, there were the Sultāns of Mālwa. There were also the Sultāns of Gujarāt, who, however, in the beginning at least as it would seem, acted more in times of need like protectors than otherwise, which is not surprising since the founders of the principality of Nāgaur and the kingdom of Gujarāt were scions of the same family.

The reason for this lack of interest may be partly, if not wholly, due to paucity of material. None of the well-known historical works, contemporary or otherwise, dealing with the history of the period, contain any information about, leave alone devote a separate chapter to, the history of the dynasty. The historians of Gujarāt also do not supply any detailed information about this house whose found was a brother of the founder of the Gujarāt Sultanate. As it is, even a full list of the rulers, not to speak of the dates of their rule, is not to be found. Secondly, until very recently, very few epigraphs of the Khānzāda chiefs were found; these too, to be exact, numbering seven in all, were found at Dījwānā in Nāgaur district and Nārinā in Jaipur district of Rājasthān, but none of them at Nāgaur itself. At the same time, the apathy of scholars to the regional history or to that of minor dynasties must also share some responsibility for this, as no systematic search for the sources (including epigraphical) for the history of the Nāgaur principality seems to have been made. Only during the past decade, the Archaeological Survey of India has discovered some more lithic records of these rulers.

This is not to say that the matter did not receive any attention at all. As a matter of fact, the first to make a somewhat systematic effort in this direction more than thirty-five years ago, was Dr. M. ‘Abdu’llāh Chaghtāi.1 His fairly detailed article on the history of Nāgaur from its earliest conquest by the Muslims also included the history of the Khānzādas. This account, though not very exhaustive, was based on the available material in historical works and a few known epigraphs referred to above, some of which—those from Dījwānā—were found by him. Even then, to him must go the credit of providing for the first time, a compact though brief account of the dynasty, having fortunately been able to lay his hands on a Persian manuscript entitled Aurād-i-Qādiriya, preserved in the sanctuary of Ḥaḍrat Ḥamidu’d-Din Su’ālī, popularly called Sultān’-Ṭārīkīn and Sāifi Sāḥib. It was mainly on the basis of the information contained in this manuscript that he was able to reconstruct a fairly complete genealogy of the Khānzādas. In 1958-59, Dr. K. C. Jain attempted a brief history of Nāgaur town from the earliest times to Akbar’s period, as a part of his project of the history of important towns of Rājasthān.2

Dr. Jain who does not seem to have consulted Dr. Chaghtái's article, provides some interesting information gleaned from the colophons of a few Jaina manuscripts stated therein to have been written in the time of Khânsâda chiefs.1 A few years later, in 1966 to be exact, Dr. B. S. Mâthur of the Udaipur University read a paper on the history of Nágaur at the Mysore Session of the Indian History Congress. As the paper is not readily available to me, it is difficult to say for certain if Dr. Mâthur has been able to throw fresh light on the subject since Dr. Chaghtái and Dr. Jain wrote. But a passing reference may be made to the fact that as would appear from the published summary of his paper, he also subscribes to the generally accepted view that Nágaur remained part of the Delhi Sultanate till the fall of the Tughluq dynasty, after which a triangular contest arose between the states of Gujarât, Mewâr and Mârwâr for its possession, that it had often to change hand, that it was only during the reign of Sultân Sikandar Lodî that Nágaur became once again a part of the Delhi Sultanate.2 This does not appear to be a true statement of facts, as Nágaur had at no time become part of any of the three kingdoms mentioned above, nor did it become a part of the Delhi Sultanate under Sikandar Lodî.3

For this reason, we greatly feel, at times, the lack of zeal on the part of research scholars and historians to look for new material, epigraphical as well as written. In one of my visits to Nágaur, for example, I was told about some old documents and papers that were in possession of the descendants of the Khânsâdas, the last of whom is reported to have migrated to Pakistân in 1948 or so.

While for obvious reasons, the scope of the present study does not permit us to explore any new, or interpret the available material pertaining to this dynasty, it will be our endeavour here to place before the scholars and historians alike, with necessary comments, the new epigraphical material that has come to light in recent years through the Archaeological Survey of India. It is genuinely felt that the detailed examination of this material attempted in the following lines will add to our knowledge of the history of the period, particularly of Râjasthân.

The most important aspect of this study is that as many as twelve of the sixteen inscriptions studied therein are from Nágaur itself.4 Three decades earlier, Dr. Chaghtái had bemoaned the fact that no inscription of the Khânsâda dynasty had come to light from Nágaur itself. No wonder, therefore, that his study of Nágaur epigraphs does not contain a single epigraph of this dynasty.5 But these twelve epigraphs show that not all such remnants had been completely destroyed by Râna Kumbhâ when he came there to dismantle the bastions of the Nágaur Fort.

---

1 Jain, op. cit., p. 135.
3 Among others, Dr. A. B. Pânje (The First Afghan Empire in India, Calcutta, 1958, pp. 147-149) also subscribes to this erroneous view. The basis of this assertion is the account of the historians of the Mughal period (Nâmu'd-Din Abûn, Tabâghî-i-Dakhûrî, Lucknow, 1875, p. 168) that in about A. H. 910, the Nágaur chief Muhammad Khân, being threatened by an attack by Sikandar Lodî, agreed to pay tribute and have the latter's name introduced on the coinage and in the sermon. This statement even if factual, cannot be interpreted to mean annexation as Dr. Pânje and others state. Also, apart from the Aurâd-i-Qâdiriya (Chaghtái, op. cit., p. 176), an epigraph set up as late as in A. H. 933 mentions Frûs Khân as the reigning chief (Inscription No. 16, infra).
4 It is worthwhile to point out that these may not be the only extant Khânsâda records of the town. An exhaustive survey of the inner and outer faces of both the city-wall (or what may now have remained of it) and the lower and upper wall of the citadel is bound to produce a few more records. I myself, in one of my visits, was shown an epigraphical tablet, which was built up in the outer wall at a great height; from its calligraphy, it definitely seems to be a Khânsâda record. All my efforts to secure its impression failed due to its inaccessibility and for want of a ladder of sufficient height.
5 Epigraphia Indo-Muslimica (EIM), 1949-50, pp. 55-58; Chaghtái, op. cit., p. 179.
But it is a great pity too, that, as in the case of the Khalîf inscriptions of Chitorgarh, of which we had the occasion to speak in a previous issue, at least as many as nine of these twelve epigraphs are not in situ: in other words, the buildings on which they were fixed to commemorate their erection, have ironically enough, disappeared. Then again, the epigraphical tablets are fragmentary, and in most cases, badly damaged and are used as stone masonry in the walls of the citadel as well as the city-wall of the town. The buildings on which they were originally set up comprised, as is clear from their texts, a few tombs, which in all probability enshrined the remains of the members of the Khânzâda family, a few mosques and a step-wall, and these are reported to have been demolished by Mahârâja Bâkht Singh of Jodhpur—there are a number of carved muqarnas, blind niches, etc., found built up in these walls. Mr. H. B. W. Garrick, the Assistant Archaeological Surveyor, has noted in about 1883-84, the accounts rife at Nâgaour that 'Aurangzeb himself never destroyed more temples than did Bâkht Singh mosques, and this may—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'. As this aspect has been referred to by me in some details on an earlier occasion, when some of the epigraphs found in the city-wall and the citadel have also been mentioned, it need not detain us here any further.

This wanton damage has deprived the posterity of the most authentic source for the local history, on one hand, and of the specimens of architecture that some of these buildings can be reasonably taken to have comprised, on the other. And this is all the more regrettable in view of the fact, that, as pointed out earlier, historical works contain little information on both these aspects. It was therefore a matter of some satisfaction to have come across these epigraphs which even in their present fragmentary and damaged state, furnish important and new historical information, particularly in regard to the chronology of this dynasty.

As stated above, so far only seven epigraphs of these chiefs have come to light; three each from Dîjwânâ in Nâgaour district and Nârânâ in Jaipur district and one from Bâl Khâtû in Nâgaour district. Of these seven, again, four—one from Dîjwânâ and three from Nârânâ—belong to the reign of Mujâhid Khân and bear the dates A.H. 840 and A.H. 848, and the remaining three are dated A.H. 886, A.H. 889 and A.H. 896 in the reign of Frûz Khân, a grandson of Mujâhid Khân.

The present group represents at least three new rulers. It contains three early epigraphs, dated A.H. 831, A.H. 822 and A.H. 838. Two of these are unfortunately fragmentary, one of them being beyond any doubt the unique record of Frûz Khân, son of Shams Khân Dândânî the founder of the dynasty; from their surviving text, I am inclined to think that they were in all probability meant for the Tomb of Shams Khân Dândânî. The third record was caused to be set up by a royal, but not ruling personage, namely Hâtìm Khâtûn, spouse of the last-mentioned. This is quite interesting considering the fact that even in the whole range of Indo-Islamic history, particulars about, and in many cases, even the names of, most of the intimate members of the royal family are un known.

The next king to be represented in these records is Mujâhid Khân. His two epigraphs are dated A.H. 844 and 865. The later of the two inscriptions is extremely important not only in that

---

1 Epigraphia Indica Arabic and Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1939 and 1960, p. 70.
3 EIAPS, 1967, pp. 3-4. A few more inscriptions, since found, have been included in the present article.
5 Ibid., 1949-50, pp. 21, 22; Chaghâlâ, op. cit., p. 173.
it provides epigraphic evidence of a later date for his reign, but also in having a bearing on the question of the place from where he had ruled, as will be discussed in its proper place. Mujahid Khan's grandson Firuz Khan II claims as many as five epigraphs, three from Nagaur and two from Bara Khatsu, which range in their dates between A.H. 880 and A.H. 900. His three known epigraphs, as has been seen above, being dated A.H. 886, A.H. 889 and A.H. 896, these new epigraphs studied here provide earlier and later dates. Again, the epigraph, dated A.H. 900, shows that Firuz Khan was reigning in that year, thus extending his reign by at least one year, from A.H. 899 mentioned in Dr. Chaghta'i's Genealogy to A.H. 900. Then again, the Bara Khatsu inscriptions of this king, both pertaining to one and the same monument, furnish the name of two high local officials.

The two other new kings to be represented for the first time in epigraphs are Muhammad Khan and Firuz Khan III. To the reign of the former belong five records and to that of the latter one. Of these, the inscription of Firuz Khan is extremely important, besides being unique. For, while dates of inscriptions of Muhammad Khan fall within the dates of his reign as given in Dr. Chaghta'i's Genealogy, the inscription of Firuz Khan, dated A.H. 933, throws new light on the dates of the later rulers. According to Dr. Chaghta'i's Genealogy, Muhammad Khan was succeeded by his son Firuz Khan who ruled from A.H. 915 to A.H. 922 and he by his son Muhammed Khan II who reigned from A.H. 922 till his death in A.H. 933. Now according to our inscription, Firuz Khan was reigning in A.H. 933. This would mean, firstly, that Firuz Khan of our record, who would be Firuz Khan IV, had succeeded the last-mentioned Muhammad Khan II in A.H. 933 and may have ruled beyond that date, at the most up to the time of Babur who claims Nagaur as part of his kingdom. Unfortunately, in the case of the later inscriptions—those of Muhammad Khan and Firuz Khan III—the genealogy is not given, and therefore, their parentage cannot be authenticated. And while it has been found that the information from the Aurd-i-Qadiriyia, which formed the basis of Dr. Chaghta'i's Genealogy, appears to be in the main correct as far as the names of the rulers of this house are concerned, the same, however, cannot be said of their dates. On the other hand, the evidence of inscriptions as far as the names and dates are concerned is unimpeachable, but then the difficulty is that we do not have at present all epigraphs of all the rulers, or even those bearing all the dates of the represented rulers. After a careful consideration of the said Genealogy and the available dates of the inscriptions, I am inclined to feel that while the line of rulers as given in the Genealogy is correct, the dates of the rulers are not—we have seen above in the case of Firuz Khan II that his date can be extended at least by one year. In other words, there is no Firuz Khan IV and the inscription of A.H. 933 should be taken to refer to Firuz Khan III, son of Muhammad Khan I, only. In other words, Firuz Khan, son of Muhammad Khan I who ruled until or at least in A.H. 933, was succeeded by his son Muhammad Khan II, in that or in one of the following years. This is fortunately corroborated by the statement of the colophon of a Jaina manuscript which refers to Muhammad Khan as ruling over Nagaur in V.S. 1585, Falgun Vadi 6 (12th March 1528). This would be Muhammad Khan II who may have succeeded (his father) Firuz Khan III in or after A.H. 933 and before 20th Jumada II 934, the date of the transcript of the Jaina manuscript and ruled until the extinction of the dynasty at the hands of Babur or so.

If the above presumption is correct, the dates given in the said Genealogy will have to be revised. But, this can only be done when some new material comes to light. However, a word

---

1 That is to say it provides a later authentic date. According to the Genealogy reconstructed by Dr. Chaghta'i, Mujahid Khan had a long rule from A.H. 829 to A.H. 872.
2 Annette Susannah Beveridge, Babur-Nama (Memories of Babur), New Delhi, 1970, p. 521.
3 Babur's claim over Nagaur has been referred to above.
or two may be said about fixing of A.H. 915 as the date of the end of Muḥammad Khān I's reign in the Genealogy. This has perhaps been done on the basis of the statement of the Mughal and Afghān historians that in that year Muḥammad Khān offered to acknowledge the sovereignty of Sikandar Lodi. In view of lack of any definite evidence on the death or dismissal of the said chief, it is equally possible that he continued to govern his principality beyond that date.

Then, at least five of these epigraphs furnish for the first time the names of persons of note, including members of the ruling family: Ḥātim Ḥāṭūn, spouse of the founder of the dynasty, who has been already referred to; a wife of Miyaṅ 'Alī brother of Muḥammad Khān; Malikzāda Fathu'llah, son of Khānzāda Ahmad Khān (the latter may have been a brother of one of the chiefs); Khānzāda Ḥasan son of Fīrūz Khān II; Maliku'l-Umārā Lādīa Khalāṣ, the Senior and the Junior; Dadā (son of) Kīlā Ṣalāhkhān; and one whose name reads something like Adā Jānbū. One inscription, dated A.H. 880, mentions a 'son of' Alā son of Sherdil Khān', who may be identical either with Malik Hizinbā, son of 'Alā son of Sherdil Khān mentioned as the agent of Dīdwānā in a later epigraph, dated A.H. 896 or with a brother of his.

Six of these epigraphs record the construction of mosques, three of tombs-cum-mosques, two of tombs, and one each of a step-well and a Khānqāh. The remaining one epigraph being badly damaged, its exact purport cannot be made out. Majority of these epigraphs are not in situ. The buildings—tomb and mosques—on which they must have originally appeared do not exist; these might have possessed some architectural character.

A word or two may also be said about the calligraphy of these records. This is usually of a fairly high order particularly in the case of the inscriptions caused to be set up by the Khānzāda chiefs or members of their family, at Nāgaur. The style of writing is Naskh or Thuluth of a pleasing variety, recalling to mind the calligraphy, in varying degrees of quality, of the epigraphs of Bihār, Bengāl and Gujarāt. The writing is particularly remarkable for its bold and pleasing execution and the arrangement of the elongated shafts and rounded curves of its letters is also quite happy. In some cases, the execution of letters has a pronounced angular flourish and the calligraphy of a few letters, such as 'ain and the final ā (as in Allāh) is quite artistic recalling to mind similar features in the late Tughluq and very early Sultanate inscriptions of Gujarāt.

Last but not the least, coming to the area covered by these epigraphs, twelve of the total sixteen records studied here are, as stated above, from Nāgaur, while of the rest, two come from Barī Kħāṭū and one each from Narāīn in Jaipur district, and Kumārī, which is about twenty-five kilometres to the south-west of Nāgaur. These and one more findspot of the Khānzāda records, viz., Dīdwānā, may be reasonably taken to indicate the extent of the authority of this dynasty. Narāīn in Jaipur district, situated to the south of Sāmbhar, may well indicate the easternmost borders of this kingdom.

With these introductory remarks, we may commence the study of these inscriptions in chronological order.

**Fīrūz Khān I**

Fīrūz Khān I was the son of Shams Khān, the founder of the line. Very little is known about the life and exploits of Shams Khān except that he was a brother of Zafar Khān, later on Musafīr Shāh I of Gujarāt, who had granted him the governorship of Nāgaur vice Jalāl Khokhar. He seems to have become independent soon after his brother's death, for we are told that he finds mention as the ruling chief in V.S. 1466 (1411 A.D./A.H. 814) in a Jaina work.1 The date of Fīrūz's

---

1 Jain, op. cit., p. 135.
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acccession to the throne is not mentioned in any historical work. According to Dr. Chaghtāi's Genealogy, he succeeded his father on his death in A.H. 829 and reigned until A.H. 857. But his father had died in about A.H. 822 if not earlier, as is clearly shown by a recently discovered unique epigraph mentioning him, which is included in this study (Inscription No. II). He only finds mention in historical works in the events of confrontation between the Sultāns of Gujarāt and Mālwa. He is stated to have died in A.H. 857, after reigning for about three decades and a half.

I. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 821, FROM NĀGAUR

The fragmentary tablet bearing this inscription is built up into the outer-face of that part of the southern outer wall of the citadel, which is nearer to the Gāndhi Chawk of the town and has in front a row of shops, facing the Station Road. Measuring in its present state 75 by 33 c.m., it contains a one-line record, from whose surviving text, one can easily see that considerable part thereof is lost. It records the construction of a mausoleum in 1418, but when, is not clear from the extant text. The record also furnishes important information about the martyrdom attained by somebody whose name is lost but who is referred to as ‘the chosen one of God’. It ends with a request to the visitor of the tomb for a prayer for the deceased. The language of the epigraph is Persian and the style of writing is Thuluth, having a slight tendency towards Tughrā. The vertical shafts of the letters have been elongated and effort has been made to ensure visual artistic effect.

Its text has been deciphered as under:-

TEXT

Plate II(b)

[...] فل اثرلا ای؟ فلک خرداد تبیش بنامکرد این محیون تا هر که دوین متن برد آن بیرونی دها حق را بدعاه ایمان و بیانه یاد کند فی النسخ خاص(9)

وهمشان سه احیى و عشیر و ثامنایه

TRANSLATION

...subdued it (and) ultimately attained the joy of martyrdom. This auspicious mausoleum was constructed, so that whoever comes to this place may remember that chosen one of God with the prayer for (his) Faith and with (the recitation of) Fītīḥa. Dated the fifth (1) of Ramāḍān, year (A.H.) one and twenty and eight hundred (5 Ramadān 821-6 October 1418).

1 Chaghtāi, op. cit., p. 178.
2 Sikandar, op. cit., p. 82; Niṣāmu’d-Din Ahmad, op. cit., p. 453; Fītīḥa, op. cit., p. 192. Of all the historians, only Ḥāli Dābir, al-Fasār al-Walid bi-Mugaffar wa Alīkh, Vol I (London, 1910), p. 11, gives the actual date.
4 Fītīḥa is the opening chapter of the Qur’ān which is recited to invoke blessings.
Though fragmentary, the epigraph is extremely important. That it is not in situ is quite obvious. It is also clear that it was originally meant for a mausoleum—maqbara of the text. From the fact that the mausoleum is called auspicious, it can be reasonably inferred that it was erected over the remains of an eminent person, very probably a royal personage. The epigraph also furnishes an important piece of information that the person for whom it was built died a martyr’s death, evidently—as is clear from the context—in a battle.

It is a pity that the record being fragmentary, the identity of the martyr cannot be determined beyond doubt. Could it be that, the person referred to as having fallen a martyr is none other than Shams Khan Dandani himself? Unfortunately, the historical works do not help us in this regard. Nâgaur finds mention in historical works in the account of the events of A.H. 819 when Sultan Ahmad I of Gujarât is supposed to have marched to Nâgaur and ravaged the country,¹ but according to some, he retreated on learning the intention of Khîdr Khan, the Sayyid king of Delhi, to come to its rescue.² If so, it should mean that something serious had taken place at Nâgaur about this time, and it was probably to rectify matters that Ahmad Shâh had gone there. Or it may be that Ahmad Shâh’s Nâgaur expedition was accentuated by his desire to take revenge on Shams Khan, his grand-uncle who had not only, allegedly, administered poison to Ahmad Shâh’s father, but had also given refuge to the GujarÂt Sultan’s uncle and his own nephew Firuz Khan.³ It is also possible that Khîdr Khan’s proposed march to Nâgaur was not in the nature of intervention against the Gujarât Sultan but otherwise; the latter might have moved to thwart the designs of Khîdr Khan over Nâgaur at this crucial period, when Shams Khan had died. And it was probably at this time that Shams Khan’s son and successor Firuz Khan ascended the throne with the help of his nephew, the Gujarât Sultan.

The above surmise that the person referred to in our inscription may be Shams Khan is also indirectly indicated by another epigraph to be studied next, in which he is mentioned as already dead in A.H. 822 (1419 A.D.). Then again, the Nâgaur chief whom Sultan Hoshang of Mâlwâ tried to woo against his Gujarât rival and who warned the latter about it in about A.H. 821 was Firuz Khan son of Shams Khan Dandani,⁴ showing that the last-mentioned had died in or before A.H. 821.

If the above surmise is correct, the epigraph must have been set up on the mausoleum of Shams Khan, and would thus be an extremely valuable record, deserving preservation.

In any case, the date of the death of Shams Khan Dandani given in the Genealogy referred to above as A.H. 829 is thus manifestly proved wrong, both by the epigraphical and the historical evidence.

---
¹ Tûrîk (or Tubaqat)-i-Muhammad Shâh (Ms.), f. 111.
² Yâhya Suhîndî, Tûrîk-i-Mubârak Shâhî (Calcutta, 1931), p. 186. Friâhta, op. cit., p. 185 and Nîsâmû’d-Din Ahmad, op. cit., p. 461, have apparently derived their information from the Delhi historian Yâhya. The retreat of the powerful Sultan Ahmad of Gujarât against Khîdr Khan is rather hard to believe. Significantly, the Gujarât historian Sîkandar does not mention Nâgaur expedition at all.
³ Sîkandar, Mirât-i-Sîkandar (Baroda, 1962), p. 91.
⁴ According to Sîkandar (ibid., p. 46), he was Shams Khan, but there seems to have been copyist’s error in transcribing the name. Both Nîsâmû’d-Din Ahmad, op. cit., p. 461 and Friâhta, op. cit., p. 185, have Firuz Khan son of Shams Khan. Dr. S. C. Misra, The Rise of Muslim Power in Gujarât (Bombay, 1963), pp. 172, 176 also takes him to be Shams Khan, but he quotes all the three authorities for this, which is inexplicable.
INSCRIPTIONS OF THE KHANZADAS OF NAGOUR

II. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 822, FROM THE SAME PLACE

This is another fragmentary record, which seems to have originally belonged to a Khanzada monument. The tablet on which it is engraved in one line is built up into the northern upper wall of the Nagour Fort. This part of the wall contains at least half a dozen inscribed slabs, of varying sizes, most of which are fragmentary. Some of them bear Quranic texts while at least two, including the one under study, are historical records.

Unfortunately, the epigraphical tablet is badly damaged. Apart from the lost portion towards the right, it has broken or cracked in the middle and the two parts have been cemented together. The writing is considerably damaged, but except for the places where letters have peeled off, the text has been more or less completely read. Luckily, enough text has survived to furnish valuable information. The extant text records the construction of an 'illuminated mausoleum' in 1419 and contains the name of Khan-i-A'zam, Fruz Khan Ghazi.

The language of the inscription is Persian and its style of writing is bold Nasir which is quite akin to that in the previous record except that the curves of the letters here are somewhat flattish. The epigraphical tablet measures 110 by 45 cms.

The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate II (c)

الخان الأعظم فروز خان ابن شمس خان غازى طاب الله ترا بني عمارة هذه المقبرة

[اله]نورة ....... (ال) برجمة الله مورخا في التاريخ الثالث من سبع آلاف سنة اثني [3]

عشرون وثمانية

TRANSLATION

.............. Khazn 'l-A'zam Fruz Khan son of Shams Khan Ghazi, may Allah render his grave pleasant, constructed was this illuminated mausoleum....... came (I) into the mercy of Allah. Dated the third of Rabii'u-l-Awwal, year (A.H.) twenty two and eight hundred (3 Rabii'I 822-30 March 1419).

The importance of this epigraph cannot be overstressed. It clearly shows that by the year A.H. 822 (1419 A.D.), Shams Khan Dandani was already dead. He could, therefore, not have ruled until A.H. 829 as worked out by Dr. Chaghtai. Also, it may be taken to corroborate indirectly some of the surmises recorded above, about a few events connected with Nagour at about this period.

2 The other historical record, also fragmentary, belongs to the reign of Muhammad bin Sam and is dated A.H. 594 (1196 A.D.). It has been published in EIAPS, 1968, p. 3 (pl. 1 a).
3 The religious records also appear to be early. While one of them containing only the phrase wa aglan executed against floral background in Thuluth of the same type as in the epigraphs on the Qur'ân Minâr at Delhi, can be safely dated to the early thirteenth century, the rest also are assignable on palaeographical grounds to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is a matter of regret that due to certain inevitable circumstances, their rubbings could not be prepared.

chaghtai, op. cit., p. 176.
It is not clear from the incomplete text as to in what capacity Firūd Khān has been mentioned here. But very likely the inscription refers to his reign, and the missing text must have contained words to that effect.

It is a pity that this inscription and the one just studied above have come down to us in fragments. Their complete texts would have shed further light on the history of this kingdom which still awaits the painstaking research of a diligent plodder.

Before we pass on to the next epigraph, mention may be made of a building at Nāgaur, which popular belief marks as the last resting-place of Shams Khān. The Kāla-Gumbad, as it is locally known, is situated inside the Dargah of Barī Pir Sāhib, situated to the immediate north of the Shamsīl Mosque, which also is attributed to this Shams Khān.¹ The Shamsīl Tank on the western bank of which the said mosque is situated is also known after him. The Kāla-Gumbad is perhaps the only architectural relic of the time of the Khānsādas to have survived.

III. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 838, FROM NĀGAUR

This well-preserved epigraph is perhaps the only complete record among those occurring on the various parts of the upper and lower walls of the Nāgaur Fort, which have come to our notice. The epigraphical tablet measuring 96 by 50 cm. is built up into that part of the outer face of the southern upper wall, which is situated to the west of the Water-Tower.² The text runs into two lines of Persian and purports that a well was constructed in 1430 by Ḥātim Khātūn, wife of Shams Khān the deceased, for obtaining the pleasure of God. It further expresses a hope that the Muslims might derive benefit from it and remember the builder with a prayer for her Faith.

The epigraph is also remarkable for its beautiful calligraphy, which recalls to mind similarly executed Tughluqian epigraphs of Bihār and Gujarāt inscriptions of Zafar Khān, but its style of writing is not that excellent and flawless.

The text has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate III (b)

(1) باکرود این چاه را بتوافق ایش تلخ اعجای اعتبد حامخاتون فوم شمسخان طاب
ارهای راه رازه

(2) خداً عز و جل تا مسلمانان نفع گیرند و بدعا ایمان یاد آورند فی الغرہ من رمضان
سنة ثمان و ثلاثین و ثامنماه

TRANSLATION

(1) This well was constructed with the grace of Allāh, may He be exalted, by the weakest of creatures, Ḥātim Khātūn, wife of Shams Khān, may his grave be rendered pleasant, for the pleasure of

¹Chaghātāi. op. cit., p. 172, has rightly held erroneous the statement of Mr. Garrick (op. cit., p. 64), that shams Khān, the founder of the Khānate, was an official of Ilutmish.

(a) Epigraph, dated A. H. 844, from Narāinā (p. 27)
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(2) God, may He be honoured and glorified, so that the Muslims derive benefit and remember (the builder) with a prayer for (her) Faith. On the first of Ramadān, year (A.H.) eight and thirty and eight hundred (1 Ramadān 838=31 March 1435).

The importance of the inscription lies in the fact that it has preserved the name of an important member of the Khānzāda family, namely the wife of the founder of the line. This is all the more important when we remember that this type of information is not commonly available even from historical works. Also interesting is the statement in the text that the well was constructed for the benefit of the Muslims. It is difficult to say if the well is the same as the Water-Tower referred to above. If so, the tablet may be in situ, which would indicate that the Fort may represent in the main the original citadel forming the residence of Khānzādas. But if the tablet is not in situ, it must have been brought from some step-well in or around the town. The reference in the text to the Muslims being the intended beneficiaries, may perhaps be correctly interpreted as the restriction of its use to Muslims only. If so, we would have an indirect corroboration of the strong caste and community prejudices for which Rājasthān in particular is quite well-known. It may be pointed out that we have at Mākrān in the same district an inscription of the time of the Mughal emperor Shāh Jahān, which prohibits people of low caste from drawing water from a well in the Bāori-Mahalla.1 In this context, the fact that the land around Nāgar district is a waterless and sandy tract, should not be lost sight of.

It may also be noted here that the name of the ruling chief is omitted in the text. Whether this could be taken to signify beyond doubt any political reason, it is difficult to say since this practice is not so uncommon in the Muslim records of India.2

Mujāhid Khān

Firūz Khān I, as seen above, died in A.H. 857 (1453 A.D.), after having ruled for three decades and a half. We have not come across any epigraph of his between A.H. 822 and A.H. 857. On the other hand, as pointed out earlier, in epigraphs dated A.H. 840, A.H. 844, A.H. 848 and A.H. 865, his brother Mujāhid Khān is mentioned as the reigning chief. Of these, the first three dates which fall in the reign of Firūz Khān occur in his records from Dīdwānā and Nārānā, which fact has been reasonably interpreted to indicate that Mujāhid Khān had already carved out a separate principality for himself, during his brother’s life-time, probably with his capital at Dīdwānā, and had occupied Nāgar on the latter's death in or immediately after A.H. 857.

A little digression here in attempting to guess the probable time by which Mujāhid Khān established his authority independently of his brother, it is hoped, will not be out of place. What perhaps is a clue to this may be found in one of the Nārānā inscriptions which says that Mujāhid Khān occupied and became master of Dīdwānā, Sāmbhar and Nārānā after the tumult and turmoil caused by Rānā Mokal. Now in some Sanskrit epigraphs, Rānā Mokal is eulogised as the van quisher of Firūz Khān (and not Shams Khān)3 which would place this defeat after the death of Shams Khān Dandānī which took place some time before 30th March 1419, if not in A.H. 819 (1416-17) or so as has been suggested in the preceding lines. But since Mokal did not ascend the throne until 1421, this event must have taken place thereafter. Dr. Chaghtāi’s Genealogy gives A.H. 829 (1425-26 A.D.) as Shams Khān’s date of death (which is manifestly wrong) and as both

---

2 See, for example, the Gujarāt inscription included in this number (p. 14, infra).
3 According to Dr. Chaghtāi, op. cit., p. 175, Shams Khān fought a battle with Rānā Mokal in A.H. 814 (1411 A.D.), but this is not correct, as Rānā Mokal did not come to the throne till 1421.
Firuz Khan I’s and Mujahid Khan’s initial years of reign. Unfortunately, nowhere, not even in the Râipûrt annals or epigraphs, the exact date of Mokal’s victory over Firuz Khan is given. As the first mention of this victory appears to have been made in the Chitorgarh inscription dated V.S. 1485 (1429 A.D.), and Sringi Rishi inscription dated a few months later, the victory must have been obtained before that date, in which case, it is doubtful if Mujahid Khan had already established his authority in 1425-26 as worked out by Dr. Châghtâi.

It occurs to me that the opportunity to set up his independent authority must have been availed of by Mujahid Khan on the death of the Râna in 1433. It may be recalled that sometime during that year, Sultan Ahmad I of Gujarât had marched towards Nâgaur, but returned without reaching there but after plundering the Râna’s country. It is very likely that Ahmad Shâh went to Nâgaur to the Khânzâda chief’s help against the Râna but returned on hearing of the murder of the latter.

When on Firuz Khan’s death, Mujahid Khan occupied Nâgaur, the former’s son Shâhâ Khan sought at first the help of Râna Kumbhâ of Mewâr and subsequently of Sultan Qutb-ud-Din Ahmad II of Gujarât to secure his father’s kingdom, but he ultimately failed to do so and Mujahid Khan became the undisputed master of the kingdom.

According to Dr. Châghtâi, who quotes local information, Mujahid Khan ruled up to A.H. 872 (1467-68 A.D.). This may well be correct or at least nearer to truth as in a Sanskrit inscription of Dwâwânâ dated V.S. 1520 (A.H. 868/1463 A.D.)—i.e., about three years after the Nâgaur record of A.H. 865 (Inscription No. V, ininfra), Mujahid Khan is mentioned as the ruler.

IV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 844, FROM NARAÎNÂ

This inscription pertaining to the reign of Mujahid Khan is from Naraînâ situated in the Sambhar Tahsil of Jaipur district. Along with Sambhar, it seems to have fallen within the jurisdiction of the Nâgaur kingdom. It was one of the three places, the other two being Dwâwânâ and Sambhar, that were, after probably being lost to Râna Mokal of Mewâr, reconquered by Mujahid Khan, as mentioned in one of the inscriptions to be found there.

The present epigraph is engraved on a squarish tablet measuring 60 by 55 cms. which is fixed into the south wall of the courtyard, near the main entrance of the Jami’ Mosque of the town. There are at least three inscriptions on the mosque proper, and these were published in a previous issue of this series from impressions prepared by Mr. B. L. Dhâmâ, an officer of the Archaeological Survey of India. It is surprising how the present record escaped Mr. Dhâmâ’s notice, unless it

1 This date as in the case of practically all other dates in the Genealogy seems to have been taken from the Aurâd-â-Qâdâriyya.
2 Epigraphia Indica, vol. II, p. 410. It may be noted that the dates of this record are stated to be irregular.
4 Sikandar, op. cit., p. 40; Nâsûmâ’-Din Ahmad, op. cit., p. 444; Firasha, op. cit., p. 190.
5 For details, see Sikandar, op. cit.; Nâsûmâ’-Din Ahmad, op. cit.; Firisha, op. cit. Also Châghtâi, op. cit., pp. 77-78.
6 AIE, 1908-09, No. B. 147. Râna Kumbhâ’s occupation of Nâgaur, even if proved historically, would appear to be only temporary. In any case, the parasamâtis mentioning the Râna’s exploits in this region, for details of which see H. B. Sardâ, Mahârâna Kumbhâ (Ajmer, 1917), pp. 55, 56, 63, etc., appear to be highly exaggerating in their contents.
7 EIM, 1923-24, p. 15.
8 AIE, 1935-36, No. D, 140.
9 EIM, 1923-24, pp. 18-19.
be that it was brought to its present place afterwards. There is one more tablet fixed into the platform of a grave in the courtyard of the mosque; it is a fragmentary epitaph.1

Since the epigraphical tablet has been adversely affected by inclemencies of weather and neglect, the writing is badly damaged. The letters have completely disappeared towards the end, and even in other parts, the writing is somewhat illegible in a few places, particularly in lines 1 and 2, with the result that the object of construction which it seems to mention, cannot be determined except that it was situated somewhere outside the fort (bišār). It refers itself to the reign of Mujāhid Khān, who is described as the best of kings. The date is given in words, and can more or less be clearly deciphered to be A.H. 844 (1440-41 A.D.). It may be pointed out that the two groups of the records of Mujāhid Khān from Narainā—the one on the Gauri Shankar Tank and the other on the Jami’ Mosque—are dated A.H. 840 and 848.2

The style of writing of the record is Nusha of a fairly good type. Its calligraphy is superior to the one in the Tank inscriptions under reference, dated A.H. 840, but not as artistic and well designed as the three Jami’ Mosque epigraphs.3

The record comprises five couplets in Persian. The inscriptions of the Khānzādas are as a rule in prose and this is perhaps their third metrical record which is known to us.4

The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate III(a)

| 1 | (1) بناء شد در تا زمان امان | (1) was constructed at this time. security. |
| 2 | (2) خارج حصار | outside the fort. in the time of Mujāhid Khān, on of Shams Khān. |
| 3 | (3) کافر ز نوه غمین گشتہ بیار | (3) The infidels, on all sides, have become depressed, due to fear (of the Khān), and the heart of the believers have gladdened (lit. blossomed forth) due to prosperity. |
| 4 | (4) خیبر الفرون فربد مضتی | (4) The chosen one (i.e. Prophet Muhammad) has said, “My age is the best of ages”. This age, verily, is better than that of the other kings. |
| 5 | (5) خاصل چهل جا | (5) (It was the year A.H.) eight hundred (and) fourtyfour (A.H. 844-1440-41 A.D.). |

This epigraph, as seen above, provides one more date of the reign of Mujāhid Khān.

---

1 ARIE, 1955-56, No. D, 141.
2 EIM, 1923-24, pp. 15, 16, 19.
3 See ibid., plate VII and Dr. G. Yazdānī’s remarks in ibid., p. 18.
4 The other two are: one of the two Tank records mentioned above, and the epigraph of Firūz Khān II’s time at Nāgaur (Inscription No. VI, infra).
The fifth inscription of this group and the second of Mujahid Khān, is from Nāgaūr. The tablet, measuring 75 by 30 cms., on which it is inscribed, is fragmentary, but fortunately, as far as it can be judged from its text, not much of its text is missing. The tablet which must have originally belonged to a mosque, as is evident from its purport, is now built up into the western upper wall of the Nāgaūr Fort, by the side of two more inscribed tablets, dated in the years of the fourteenth century. The record under study mentions the construction of a mosque in 1461 during the time of Mujahid Khān. The name of the builder which was contained in the second line is lost. The epigraph comprising two lines of Persian is executed in Nashā of a fairly good type, which indicates a mature and experienced hand.

The text has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate IV (a)

(1) ...... [زما] ؟[ن ملیس عالی مفاهیم خان یدیم اهتمال می‌دانیم بناکرد این عمارت مسجد بتوفیق الله]
(2) ...... [و یاک از برای رضاء خدا [ئی] (؟) این آن‌که من شهر رمضان سنگ خم‌های و ستیج و تمام‌الیه]

TRANSLATION

(1) ................. time of (? Majlis-i-Āl Mujahid Khān, may Allāh perpetuate his glories, the edifice of this mosque was built by the grace of Allāh,
(2) .................and Pure, for the sake of the pleasure of God. On the second of the month of Ramaḍān, year (A.H.) five and sixty and eight hundred (2 Ramaḍān 865-11 June 1461).

This, as stated above, is a new and the latest Persain inscription of Mujahid Khān. Also, it is the only record of his to be found at Nāgaūr itself.

It has been stated above that Mujahid Khān’s records from Diḍwānā and Narainā, respectively in the north-eastern and south-eastern parts of the Nāgaūr kingdom, set up when his brother Frūz Khān was alive and ruling at Nāgaūr, indicate that the former ruled over this part of the kingdom independently, while Frūz Khān ruled over the remaining part from the capital Nāgaūr. Dr. Chaghtāi has also followed this reasoning in the reconstruction of the Genealogy. In the absence of Frūz Khān’s inscriptions, after the one of A.H. 822, it may be argued that Mujahid Khān had succeeded him as exclusive chief of the whole principality some time before A.H. 840, his earliest inscription from Narainā. But this argument, based on the negative evidence of inscriptions, does not hold good before the clear statement in historical works that Frūz Khān ruled over Nāgaūr till he died in A.H. 857. Therefore, until fresh material comes to light, we have to accept that Frūz Khān had succeeded his father and Mujahid Khān either being

3 Reference has already been made in the preceding lines to his Sanskrit inscription dated two or three years later (p. 26; supra).
4 It would not be quite correct to say that this fact is known from history as stated in *EIM*, 1940–50, p. 21, the fact is based on epigraphs only.
5 Chaghtāi, op. cit., pp. 176–177.
6 A systematic search in the region may yet bring to light new epigraphs of the early Khānzadās.
dissatisfied or for some other reason managed to set up his authority in the eastern part of the kingdom, as vouchsafed by his epigraphs, and became master of the whole kingdom on the death of his brother in A.H. 857 as seen above. The presence of his inscription dated A.H. 865—the one under study—would also point to that fact. There is little chance of the tablet not belonging to Nāgaur or its neighbourhood—its present position, along with other epigraphical tablets, shows that it formed part of a mosque at Nāgaur itself.

Firūz Khān II

According to Dr. Chaghtāi’s Genealogy, Mujāhid Khān died in A.H. 872 and his son Šalāh Khān—erroneously called Šalābat Khān by Dr. Chaghtāi—came to power and ruled for three years. His existence is known only from the inscriptions of his son Firūz Khān II, which quote his full genealogy; Dr. Chaghtāi’s information about the duration of his reign seems to have been derived from the Aurād-i-Qādiriya.

Firūz Khān II also does not find mention in historical works. But he is already known to the readers of this series from his two inscriptions found at Dīwānā. The present study contains five more records of his, of which three are from Nāgaur and two from Bari Khātu. Dr. Chaghtāi makes him rule from A.H. 875 to A.H. 899, but one of the inscriptions in our study (p. 36, infra) extends his reign at least by one year. Firūz Khān II is also referred to in a Jain work as reigning in 1484 A.D.

VI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 880, FROM NĀGAUR

This epigraph is to be found on the mosque locally called Akhādewālī-Masjid, situated in Maḥalla Chūpirgarān, at the back of the Shāmei Mosque. The mosque is of modest dimensions and has no architectural pretensions: its building appears to be old but has undergone extensive repairs. It comprises a single prayer-hall divided into three aisles, each two bays deep, having an opening of broad and slightly pointed arches. Its roof is flat. There is only one miḥrāb in the west wall, above which the tablet bearing the inscription under study is fixed.

This is another of the very few metrical epigraphs of the Khānzdās—the second in the present group—that have come down to us. It comprises six Persian couplets, running into as many lines, on an area measuring 30 by 75 cms. The epigraph purports that the mosque was constructed by a son of ‘Alā‘ and grandson of Sherdilkhan in 1475, during the time of Firūz Khān, son of Šalāh Khān. It further states that the text was inscribed by Samā‘, son of Hasan, who hailed from the town of Sarasati. The name of the composer is not given, but that does not matter either, as he does not appear to be a man of any poetical talent or training. The quality of the verses is mediocre, and the composer has flouted the rules of the grammar, prosody and syntax, obscuring the meaning of the record. For example, the sense intended to be conveyed in the last couplet cannot be exactly made out.

An interesting aspect of the inscription is that it is incised on stone instead of being cut into relief as is the case with all the other records of the Khānzdās. The only other record executed in this style at Nāgaur is the record of the Ghūrīn, monarch Muḥammad bin Sām. The style of writing of our record is Naskh of no particular merit.

1 Chaghtāi, op. cit., pp. 176, 179.
2 EI/M, 1949-50, pp. 21-22.
3 Chaghtāi, op. cit., pp. 176, 179.
4 Jain, op. cit.
6 EIAPs, 1968, pl. I a.
The text has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate IV (b)

1) در زمان سرور فیروز خان بن صلاح خان اعظم کامران
(2) کرد این مسجد بنای آن عون حق بن علاء شیرو دل خانیست کان
(3) از برای خسپه نه یک کرد مسجدی را تا تاند جاودان
(4) هیصد و هشتاد ساله تاریخ بود هفدهم از ماه شعبان بود آن
(5) بند علی بن حسن بود از خبط سرسبین بنان
(6) روز یکشنبه بنال عالم یست شد مرتب این جنين مسجد بخوان

TRANSLATION

(1) In the time of the chief, Firuz Khan, son of Salab Khan, the greatest successful Khan,
(2) one who is the son of 'Ala (son of!) Sherdilkhani constructed this mosque with the help of God.
(3) He built a mosque for the sake of God so that he may be immortal.
(4) The date was year (A.H.) eight hundred and eighty, and it was seventeenth of the month of Sha'ban (17 Sha'ban 880-16 December 1475).
(5) Know that the humble creature, the scribe Samia' son of Hasan, is from the town (khatta) of Sarasati.
(6) On Sunday, the construction took place (in the) world and such a mosque was completed.

Read ye.

It will be noted that the name of Firuz Khan I's father is clearly inscribed as Salab Khan. It has been hitherto read as Salabat Khan, also by Dr. Chaghta'i who had before him the manuscript of the Aurd-i-Qadiriyya and had also published the Diwana and Bari Khatsu inscriptions of this chief. But there is no doubt that the reading of this name in this epigraph as also in a few more included in the present study is clearly Salab Khan.

It is somewhat unusual that the builder's name is not specified in the epigraph. He is simply called 'bin 'Ala-[i-] Sherdilkhani which would mean— if we treat the hamza after 'Ala as being governed by the idafati-ibnai (the kasa denoting the son-and-father relationship) as it almost certainly is—son of Sherdilkhani. Now we know from one epigraph that one son of this 'Ala, named Malik Hizib, was the Commissary (Gunaghta) of the same Firuz Khan in Diwanah in A.H. 896 (1491 A.D.). If both are identical, the epigraph would provide an earlier

---

1 This is perhaps 'Ala-i-Sherdilkhani which means 'Ala son of Sherdilkhani.
2 In the plates of the two Diwana inscriptions (ElM, 1949-50, pls. X1 and XII A), the name can be clearly read as Salab Khan. But Dr. Chaghta'i may perhaps have been misled by the manuscript of the Aurd.
date, by about 16 years, for Malik Hizibr. But in that case, whether Hizibr had held any office at Nāgaur, the findspot of the epigraph under study, is not indicated in the record, though it can be presumed so without much fear of contradiction. The other alternative is that he may be another son of ʿAlā. Thirdly, if the idāfat between ʿAlā and Shurūkhānī is not an idāfat-i-ibnī (as it almost certainly appears to be), the name of the son would be Shurūkhīnī, in which case the name borne by the grandson and the grand-father would be common. This is not unusual. But nothing definite can be said about this view of the hopeless quality of the verses. As it is, I am inclined to take it as a case of idāfat-i-ibnī. In any case, nothing is known about the personages from the available historical records.

Likewise, nothing is known about Samāʾ the scribe. Sarasatī, to which he is stated in the text to belong, is modern Sirsā, a district headquarters in Haryāṇā State. As in the text, there is nothing in the calligraphy of the record that might do credit to the scribe.1

VII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 885, FROM NĀGaur

The credit of discovering this epigraph goes to Shri N. M. Ghanam, Technical Assistant, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Baroda, who had come across it in the course of his exploration work in Jodhpur district. It is engraved on a tablet, measuring 70 by 30 cms., which is lying loose in the building locally called Kālā Gumbad, situated within the premises of the Bāre Pir Shāhīb-ki-Dargāh. This Gumbad which has been referred to above (p. 24, supra) is separated from the Shamsī Tank on the south south-east by the compound wall and is popularly attributed to Shams Khān Dandānī, the founder of the line.

The impression of this record, prepared by Shri. Ghanam was received along with those of a few more epigraphs from the Nāgaur district in October, 1966.2 But partly because the writing is damaged and the calligraphy is quite intricate, and partly because the inked rubbing was not quite satisfactory, the epigraph could not be completely and correctly deciphered. As a result, the date and the name of the Khānṣāda chiefs were left unread and the object of construction was tentatively deciphered to be a mosque.3 Subsequently, Shri W. H. Siddiq, then Senior Epigraphical Assistant in our office who was deputed to tour Rajasthān in about October 1962 was specifically asked to have a fresh rubbing prepared, but though the rubbing was better, the text still defied decipherment. Then, when I visited Nāgaur in December 1966, not only did I have its fresh rubbings prepared very carefully, but also sent considerable time in deciphering the text on the stone and was, fortunately, able, after sustained and concentrated efforts, to decipher the whole of the text.4

The epigraph consists of a single line of Persian prose and records the construction of a Khānqāh in 1480-81 during the reign of Firuz Khān son of Sulāḥ Khān. The script employed is Nasḵ which is remarkable for the sharp and pointed outline of its letters, whose elongated strokes have been so designed as to form a row of arches, creating a highly artistic effect.

1. It is just possible—the language of the record being much below standard—that by the term khāb which literally means 'one who writes' is intended the writer i.e. the composer.
3. All the epigraphs were listed in ibid., 1961-62, Nos. D, 239-263.
The text has been read as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate V (a)*

لا شد اين خاتم دار عهد دولت بندي خان أعلم و خاتم معظم مجلس عال فروز خان

بن صالح خان يديم الله معاليه لت (؟) سنه خمس و ثمانين و ثمانية

**TRANSLATION**

This Khānqāh was constructed in the reign of His Highness the great Khān and magnificent Khāqān Majlis-i-‘Ali Frūz Khān son of Salāh Khān, may Allāh perpetuate his glories, in the year (A.H.) five and eighty and eight hundred (A.H. 885-1480-81 A.D.).

A reference has already been made in the preceding lines about the correct name of Frūz Khān's father (p. 30 supra). In this as well as the following three inscriptions, his name is clearly inscribed as Salāh Khān.

The text is silent regarding the builder of the Khānqāh, who would on the face of it appear to be some one else than the chief. Nor does it provide any clue to its identity—to what saint or saintly establishment it was attached. And there is unfortunately no authentic history of the original provenance of the epigraphical tablet. If it happens to have originated in the same premises where it is found i.e. the Bārī Frūz-i-Dargāh—the Dargāh built in memory of the famous divine Shaikh ‘Abdu'l-Qādir Jīlānī, the founder of the Qādīrī order—it would mean that the Khānqāh was built for the use of the followers of the Qādīrī order. One thing is certain that the epigraph has nothing to do with the Kālī Gumbad or the mausoleum of Shams Khān Dandānī.

**VIII-IX. INSCRIPTIONS, DATED A.H. 886, FROM BĀRĪ KHAṬU**

These two extremely interesting records are found inscribed on two tablets fixed on two different parts of a mosque called Khānzdān-kh-Masjid situated in the Fort on the top of the hill at Bārī Khāṭu in the Jāel Tahsil of Nāgaur district. The credit of noticing them for the first time goes to Dr. M. A. Chāghtāi. He published, however, only one of these and his reading comprising only the name and genealogy of the chief, the year and the portion referring to the Muqta of the Mu'āmala of Khattū is incomplete. They were also noticed in 1958 by Mr. K. V. Saundaranājan of the Archaeological Survey of India, Baroda, on receipt of their photographs from whom, I deputed Mr. I. A. Omeri, then Epigraphical Assistant, to prepare their inked rubbings. It is from these impressions that both the epigraphs are edited here.

On plan, the mosque consists of a single prayer-hall, built entirely in trabeate style, overlooking a courtyard. The main miḥrāb, unlike in other cases, is cut open into the western wall. The building is simple in execution and does not contain any decorative features of importance. Nevertheless, as a building of the fifteenth century in Rājasthān, it is not without antiquarian interest.

---

1. I am not very sure about the reading of this word. The sign below the letter ت of تثمانين on the stone has been taken to indicate this word.


(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 885, from Nāgaur (p. 32)

(b) Record, dated A.H. 886, from Bārī Khāṭu (p. 33)
One of the two epigraphs appears above the central mihrāb and slightly to its left.¹ The epigraphical tablet measures 106 by 45 cms. and is inscribed with a six-line text in Persian prose.² The text purports that the mosque was constructed in 1482 during the reign of Majlis-i-‘Alī Firūz Khān, son of Salāḥ Khān, during the deputyship of Maliku’l-Umarā Ikhtiyārū’d-Daulat wa’d-Dīn Lādla Khālāṣ, the former chief of the Royal Stables and the Muqṭa’ of the district of Khattū by Maliku’l-Umarā Tāju’d-Daulat wa’d-Dīn Malik Lādla Khālāṣ, the Muqṭa’ of the Fort of the said district.

The text is executed in ordinary Naskh with a slight tendency to cursiveness and has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate V(b)

(1) بنا شه این مسجد در عهد دولت بنگی خان خوانین تکیتہ روی زمان
(2) آراسته روب العالمین پرورنده اهل ایمان بر[با]ندا زنده اهل کفر و طغیان شیر ممدان
(3) میب امان و ایمان بنگی مجلس (sic.) عالی فیروز خان بن صلاح خان
بن شمسخان وئهی الملك
(4) و بناءا بفضل الله و حسن توفیق نویدت ملک الامراء اختیار الدویلة و الادین بهلو
زمان لادله خلاص
(5) آخورتک خاص تمیم(؟) و مقطع معامله کهتو یدیدن علیوه کار کردن ملک الامراء
تاج الدویلة و الادین
(6) ملک لادله خلاص مقطع قلم معامله [؟]ذکر دام تمکینه فی التاريخ الثانی و
العشروان [؟] شهر دیز الحجه سنت و ثمانین و نیمماهی

TRANSLATION

(1) This mosque was constructed in the reign of His Highness the Khān of the Khāns, the signet on the surface of the earth,

(2) one who is decorated (with chiefship) by the Nourisher of the worlds, the cherisher of the men of Faith, the overthrower of men of Infidelity and rebellion, the lion of the arena (of manliness),

(3) the means of peace and security, His Highness Majlis-i-‘Alī Firūz Khān son of Salāḥ Khān son of Mujāhid Khān son of Shams Khān (son of)³ Wajhū’l-Mulk.

(4) And it was built, by the bounty of Allāh and (His) best grace, during the period of Maliku’l-Umarā Ikhtiyārū’d-Daulat wa’d-Dīn, the champion of the time, Lādla Khālāṣ.

² In fact both these epigraphs happen to be the longest Khānzāda records that have come down to us.
³ An idāfah-i-ībah has to be read between these two names.
(5) the former keeper of the Royal Stables and the (present) Muqta\' of the district (Mu\'amala) of Khattū, may Allāh perpetuate his grandeur. The work was carried out by Maliku\'-Umātā Tāju\'d-Daulat wa\'d-Dīn.

(6) Malik Lādla Khaḷīṣ, Muqta\' of the Fort of the said district (Mu\'amala), may his prowess endure for ever. On the date, the 22nd of the month of Dhul\'-Hijja, year (A.H.) six and eighty and eight hundred (22 Dhul\'-Hijja 886–11 February 1482).

The tablet bearing the second inscription of the same mosque, measures 62 by 35 cms. and is fixed on the facade of the prayer-hall, above and to the right of the entrance. The record is identical in purport, and, to a great extent, even in words, with the previous one except for the omission of the name of the Muqta\' of the district and of the titles of the Muqta\' of the Fort. In this epigraph, it may be particularly noted, the latter has been unambiguously mentioned as the builder of the mosque.

The epigraph consists of four lines of writing in Persian prose. The style of writing is Naskh of a quality which is inferior to that in the other record. It has greater cursiveness also, no particular regard having been shown for notches of letters or ligatures.

The text has been read as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate VI(a)*

(1) يناباكرد اين مسجد را بفضل الله و حسن توفيقه ملك لإله خلاص مقطع قلبه

(2) كهنو نصره الله عين آفاق

(3) درعیب بنگل خان خواننتکنیه روزی زیرین آراسته رابع العالمين بروندیه اهل ایمان

(4) براندازنده اهل کفر و طفیان شیر میدان بسی امن و امان بنگل مجلس علی

(5) فيروز خان

(6) [نیسن] صالحان بن ماجده خان بن شمسخان وجبید الملك في التاريخ الثانی و

**TRANSLATION**

(1) This mosque was built, by the bounty of Allāh and His grace by Malik Lādla Khaḷīṣ, Muqta\' of the Fort of Khattū, may Allāh assist him against calamities.

(2) during the reign of His Highness the Khān of the Khāns, the signet on the surface of the earth, one who is decorated (with chiefship) by the Nourisher of the worlds, the cherisher of the men of Faith,

(3) the over thrower of the men of Infidelity and rebellion, the lion of the arena (of manliness), the means of peace and security, His Highness, Majlis-i-Āl Fīrūz Khān,

---

1 This is how the place-name is spelt by Muslim historians also. Its local pronunciation is Khaṭtā.

2 The word in the text is kār kord which literally means 'the work was done by'. If kārkord is taken as a single word it would mean 'carrier or agency of'. But as the second inscription makes him the builder, the word kār kord has been taken here as a verb.

(a) Epigraph, dated A.H. 886, from Bara Khātu (p. 34)

(b) Record, dated A.H. 900, from Nāgaur (p. 36)
INSRIPTIONS OF THE KHÂNZÂDÂS OF NÂGAUR

(4) son of Šâlah Khân son of Mujâhid Khân son of Shams Khân (son of) Wajîhu’l-Mulk, on the 22nd of the month of Dhu’l-Ḥijja, year (A.H.) six and eighty and eight hundred (22 Dhu’l-Ḥijja 886-81 February 1842).

From the above, it is quite clear that it was Mahku’l-Unârâ Tâjû’d-Daulat wa’d-Din Malik Lâdlâ Khalâs, the Muqta’ of the Fort of the district who built the mosque.

These epigraphs are, thus, quite important. But for these, the names of two nobles of first rank of the Khânzâdâs would have remained unknown. As a matter of fact, we know precious little about the history of this dynasty and are absolutely in dark about its officials. Therefore, the importance of the epigraphs from which for the first time we have come to know of these two officials cannot be overstressed. From the appendage of titles and the high rank the two nobles enjoyed, as stated in the epigraphs, they appear to have held prominent position in the government, and it is a reasonable surmise that they might have belonged to the ruling family.

Attention may be drawn to the peculiarity in the names of these two grandees, both of whom are mentioned as Malik Lâdlâ Khalâs. I fail to grasp the exact connotation of the name Lâdlâ, except perhaps that it be the Hindi word Lâdlâ meaning ‘the fondled or darling’. But it is almost certain that the term Lâdlâ Khalâs does not appear to be a case of having the idâfat-i-ibnî. That is to say, it cannot be taken to mean ‘Malik Lâdlâ son of Khalâs’, for the persons each mentioned as Malik Lâdlâ Khalâs are definitely two different persons, as the titles and the posts held by them show. The only plausible explanation of this would be that these were either two entirely different persons, or that Lâdlâ Khalâs was the family name by which the persons were known and they were distinguished from each other by their titles. The second alternative appears to me to be more likely.

But these epigraphs are also important from another point of view. They happen to be the only Khânzâda records found so far at Bâr Khâtu—a place about sixty kilometres to the east-south-east of Nâgaur—where, as the readers of this series are aware, the epigraphs of the successive dynasties of the Manûlûks, the Khâlîs and the Tughluqs have been found. It has been noted that out of the forty-three epigraphs found so far in the town, there is not a single record, other than the two under study, set up after A.H. 802 and before A.H. 968. Could this be interpreted to mean that Bâr Khâtu was added to the Nâgaur territories in the reign of Fârûq Khân II—on a little earlier, in the reign of his grand-father Mujâhid Khân, as has been noted by Dr. Chaghtâi? On the other hand, Bâr Khâtu being situated hardly at a distance of about 40 kilometres to the south-west of Diwânâ and about 60 kilometres to the east of Nâgaur, it appears unlikely that it should have come into the Khânzâda possession so late. The only plausible explanation may be that under the early Khânzâdâs, Khâtu had lost its importance, which it regained under Fârûq Khân II.

In any case, the records clearly indicate that under this chief, Bâr Khâtu was the headquarters of a separate district with a Fort, whose importance can be judged by the fact that it was governed by two officials of high standing.

It may also be recalled that these are the only Khânzâda records which have such an array of high-sounding titles used for the chief. Also, as in the case of the Narainâ record of his grand-father Mujâhid Khân, referred to above, the records under study quote the full genealogy of the chief right up to the progenitor of the ruling families of Gujarât and Nâgaur, namely Wajîhu’l-Mulk, a Tughluqian grandee.

1 See L. I. 3. on p. 33, supra.
3 Chaghtâi, op. cit., p. 179.
X.—INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 900, FROM NĀGAUR

This is another interesting epigraph of the time of Fīrūz Khān II. It is engraved in one line on a tablet, measuring 85 by 34 cms., which is fixed above the central mihrāb of the small unpretentious mosque situated in the compound of the Baṣe Piṅ Śāhīb-kī-Dargāh referred to above. The rubbing of this inscription also was prepared in 1959 by Shri N. M. Ghanam, of the Western Circle of the Archaeological Survey of India, Baroda. But the epigraph seems to have been noticed and its impression prepared by Dr. Chaqṭā, much earlier; he had sent the photograph of its rubbing along with those of a few more to the Director General of Archaeology in India, New Delhi, to be included perhaps as an addenda to his article on the inscriptions from the Jodhpur State. While in the available records, the note on these inscriptions, if it was sent, is not available, it did not find place in the said article, nor does it appear to have been published by him elsewhere.

Both the rubbings of Dr. Chaqṭā and Mr. Ghanam were not as distinct as one would like to have. Also, a few unfamiliar words could not be deciphered at the time of listing the epigraph in our annual report for 1961-62. Consequently I took opportunity of my visit to Nāgaur in 1966 to devote some time to decipher the writing on the stone itself and also have its fresh impression made. It is from this impression that the epigraph is being published here.

It will be seen from the plate that the writing is almost perfectly well preserved, the letters are clearly engraved and the style of writing is quite bold. Nevertheless, due to the crowded writing in the typical style of the Khānzdādā inscriptions, in which one letter is written upon another and a word or a letter thereof is at times interposed between those of the other word, the decipherment has been rendered difficult. Added to this was the somewhat unfamiliar name of the builder. And though it is a matter of satisfaction that practically the whole of the epigraph has been, it is hoped, correctly, read, there is one word written cursively which has still remained unintelligible.

The epigraph consists of one line in Persian prose and purport to that the mosque was built in 1495, during the reign of the chief Fīrūz Khān, by one Dadā, son of Kfla Šalāk Khān.

The calligraphy of the record is quite remarkable. The style of writing is Naṣik of the same type as in the early fifteenth century inscriptions of Zafar Khān of Gujarāt, so much so as to make one feel that the inspiration, if not the calligrapher himself, must have come from there. The well-shaped letters have been placed below the artistic arrangement of tall arch-shaped railings formed by their elongated shafts, the whole producing quite a pleasing effect.

The text of the epigraph has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate VI(6)

بنایش این مسجد اثر در عهد دولت خان اعظم و خاقان معظم فیروز خان[ان] بتوفيق
رحمانی ددا کیلا صلاححلاءی بشراث الثانی و العشر من شهر الربیع قدره سنة تسمیعیة

---

2 *BIM*, 1949-50, pp. 18-33.
4 *The reading of this word is not certain. Could it be *شلبه*?*
This illuminated mosque was built in the reign of the great Khân and magnificent Khâqân, Firûz Khân, through the grace of the Merciful (i.e. God), (by) Dadâ (son of) Kîlî Şâlah Khânî, for the king (?), on the 12th of the month of Rajab, may its dignity increase, year (A.H.) nine hundred (12 Rajab 900–8 April 1495).

The primary importance of this epigraph lies as pointed out in the introductory lines, in extending the reign of Firûz Khân II by one year from the last known date of his reign A.H. 899, as recorded in Dr. Chaqthâi's Genealogy. It is also quite important in another respect. Like the Barâ Khâju record studied above, this epigraph also furnishes the name of a person of some note who flourished at this time. Though the name of the person is quite unfamiliar and to establish his or her identity is difficult, a look at the reproduction of the epigraph will show that there should be little doubt about Dadâ Kîlî Şâlah Khânî being the correct reading of the name of the builder. But whether this constitutes the son and the father's name or is the name of one person is a debatable point. Dadâ means also a wet-nurse, and if that be the meaning intended here, it would mean that the builder was Kîlî, the Dadâ, attached to Şâlah Khân, father of Firûz Khân. Now, when in Nâgaur, I was informed by Mr. Raḥmatu'llâh Raunâq Uthmânî of the Pirzâda family of the town, who is much interested in the history of the reign and possesses valuable information on the subject, that he had quite some time back seen a document of the time of Aurangzeb, then in possession of the descendants of the Khânzâdas, in which mention is made of a Dâ's Tomb along with the Tomb of Shâhanshâh Khân (i.e. Kâlâ Gumbad, which is to the immediate east of the mosque containing the inscription under study). Mr. Uthmânî being unaware of the mention of Dadâ in the epigraph under study, his account as to the mention of the Dâ's Tomb in the document cannot be dismissed as an after-thought. There is also one more Tomb in the vicinity of the said Kâlâ Gumbad, which could be the Dâ's Tomb in question. The proximity of the mosque to these buildings lends weight to the identification of Kîlî as the nurse of Şâlah Khân.

In the alternative, Dadâ may be the name of the builder, and Kîlî that of his father. From the appellation Şâlah Khânî attached to his name, he appears to have been a favourite noble or servant of Şâlah Khân.

In any case, the epigraph has preserved unto us the name of a leading person of the period, and as such its importance is considerable.

Muḥammad Khân

In the Genealogy of Dr. Chaqthâi, Muḥammad Khân is shown as having succeeded his father Firûz Khân II in A.H. 899 and ruled up to A.H. 915. That he did not succeed Firûz Khân until A.H. 900 is evident from the record just studied. We have been able to discover so far five records of Muḥammad Khân, the earliest of which is dated A.H. 909 and the latest A.H. 913. In the colophon of Jain works, Muḥammad Khân is also spoken of ruling in V. S. 1561 (1504 A.D./A.H. 910) and V. S. 1576 (1519 A.D./A.H. 925-26).}

1 Chaqthâi, op. Cit., p. 176.
3 According to Mr. Uthmânî, the officials mentioned in these documents were Qâḏl Dost Muḥammad and Ḥâji Sulṭân, the Muḥassîb. The descendants of the Khânzâdas mentioned therein were Pâlid(?i) Khân, Raḥmat Khân and İzûfar Khân.
2 According to Mr. Uthmânî, the last of the Khânzâda family of Nâgaur was Ramâdân Khân whose sons were Faḍyâd Khân and 'Abdul-Ghâfi, who migrated to Pâkistân in 1948. There is no member of this family, according to him, now living at Nâgaur.

Jain, op. Cit.
The year A.H. 915 is shown in the Genealogy as the final year of his reign. In this year, Muhammad Khan is stated to have offered allegiance to Sikandar Lodhi, as has been referred to above (p. 17, supra). Dr. Chaghtai’s information may have been based on the Aurad whose dates, are however, not always correct. Until, therefore, some fresh information comes forth, the question of the terminal year of his reign should be considered open.

XI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 909, FROM NAGAUR

This is again quite an interesting epigraph in which one more member of the ruling family finds mention. It was brought to my notice by Mr. Raunaq Ummāni, who has been instrumental in saving quite a few epigraphical tablets built up in the city-wall, then under demolition by the Nāgaur Municipal authorities, from being lost or damaged. He got some tablets removed to the Kanhere Jalāhān-ki-Masjid, situated near the Dargāh of Ahmād ‘Ali Bāpjī, within the Delhi Gate, towards its north-west.¹

The one bearing the inscription under study is one of them.² It measures 50 by 38 cms. and contains a one-line text, which assigns the construction of a cathedral mosque to the wife of Khānzāda Miyān ‘Ali in 1503-4, during the reign of Muhammad Khān.

The language of the record is Persian. The style of writing is Naḵka of the same variety as in the previous epigraph. The letters are remarkable for their well-shaped outline and bold execution. But here, the elongated shafts of the letters have been arranged in a somewhat novel way. Raised to the same level, they have been decreased in size in the descending order from right to left, and the artistic effect produced by this is accentuated by the motif of banner-heads that marks the tips of these shafts.

The text of the record is quoted below:

TEXT

Plate VII(a)

بنا این مسجد کلّان مکوّنہ خانزادہ مینان علی بن توقیف رحمن در عهد خان اعظم محمد

خان سنه تسمعہ تسمعاہ

TRANSLATION

This large (i.e. cathedral) mosque (was) built (by) the wife of Khānzāda Miyān ‘Ali through the grace of the Compassionate (Allah) during the reign of the great Khan Muhammad Khān (in the) year (A.H.) nine and nine hundred (A.H. 909-1503-04 A.D.).

This is the second inscription from Nāgaur in which a female member of the ruling family is mentioned. But unlike in the case of the other record (p. 24, supra), her name is not given. She is merely introduced as the wife of Khānzāda Miyān ‘Ali Khān. Fortunately, the identity of the latter is known from historical works. According to these, he was a brother of Muhammad Khān and had entered into a conspiracy in about A.H. 915, with another brother of his, Abā Bakr, to kill their royal brother. But ultimately, both were compelled to seek asylum at the court of Sikandar Lodhi, then camping at Dholpur, and Muhammad Khān, anticipating a reprisal by the latter, appeased him by sending letters of allegiance and presents to him and showing his readiness to have his name read in sermons and minted on coins. ‘Ali Khān was appointed by the

¹ For these see ARIE, 1965-66, No. 3, 352-55.
² Ibid., No. D, 352.
Lodi king to the sarkār of Sui Saber, which was later on taken from him by way of punishment and given to his brother Abā Bakr. Beyond this, nothing is known about him. This event may have occurred in about A.H. 916 or so.

The inscription under study belongs to a period when Miyan ‘Ali was still at Nāgaur. The mosque built by his wife must have been destroyed along with other monuments of the town by Rāja Bakht Singh, as referred to in the introductory lines; if not even earlier by Rāna Kumbhā.

XII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 911, FROM THE SAME PLACE

The tablet bearing this epigraph was found built upside down in the outer face of the lower part of the city-wall when I had its rubbing prepared in 1906. It was also shown to me by Mr. Raunaq Uthmānī. This portion of the city-wall stood to the west of the opening therein, off the Niyyariyon-kā-Maḥalla, and facing the famous Dargāh of Sūfi Ṣāhibīn towards north-west. It is not known if the city-wall still stands or has since been pulled down.

The epigraphical tablet having been exposed to varied climatic conditions for centuries, the writing which was originally in the same bold relief as is characteristic of the Khānṣāda records of Nāgaur, is badly damaged, particularly in the bottom portion which lay exposed; the writing in the top portion of the tablet which was buried in the ground is in a slightly better state of preservation. Fortunately, however, the text could be read almost completely after a few concentrated efforts.

The epigraph consists of one line of writing in Persian occupying a space of about 80 by 40 cms. The tablet seems to have originally belonged to a tomb, as the inscription records the construction of the mausoleum of Manṣūrī Fathu’llāh son of Khānṣāda Ahmad Khān, and of the mosque, which was evidently attached to it, in 1505–06, during the reign of Muhammad Khān. The text, as in the case of other Khānṣāda records, is incomplete in that there is no verb in the entence, but the purport is more or less understood. The name of the builder is not given.

Fortunately, we are in a position to identify with some amount of certainty the tomb on which the slab might have been originally set up. Mr. Raunaq Uthmānī who was, it may be remembered, in the dark about the purport of the record, had earlier pointed out to me a ruined tomb locally attributed to Fathu’llāh Shāh, situated not far from the location of the tablet, a little to the north of the city-wall and east of the Dargāh of Ṣūfi Ṣāhibīn. Only the traces of the plinth and a marble sarcophagus now remain of what appears to have originally been a tomb of some architectural merit. From these, it appears to have been an octagonal tomb like the one at Kumāri, about twenty-five kilometres to the south-west of Nāgaur, which has fortunately survived the hand of the vandal.

The style of writing is NasīKA of the same high quality which characterises the Khānṣāda records. Apart from the finely chiselled outline of its letters, the elongated shafts have been arranged to form arch-heads, the apex of each of which is marked by a small cross or trifoil, investing it with a picturesque effect. The highly artistic arrangement in which the four curves representing the letter sān have been placed across these shafts on the left side, and the two distinguishing marks of the letter kāf on their right side, must have invested the whole with a picturesque effect when in original condition; this is somewhat marred by the disfiguring of the letters caused by neglect and weather.

1 The name of this place is transcribed in different manuscripts in different ways. See S.A.A. Rizwi, Utar Taimūrkā’s Bhārat (Alligarh, 1958). p. 224, f.n. 1.
2 Niẓāmu’d-Din Ahmad, op. cit., pp. 168–69.
The text of the record has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

Plate VII(b)

بنا إين مسجد وكتب فتح الله ملكزاده بن خانزاده أحمد خان در عهد خان أعظم مجد خان بتوافق رمضان سنة أحد عشر و تسعمايه.

**TRANSLATION**

This mosque and the tomb of Fathu'llah Malizada son of Khannuda Ahmed Khan (was) built in the time of the great Khan Muhammad Khan through the grace of the Compassionate (Allah in the) year (A.H.) eleven and nine hundred (A.H. 911-1305-06 A.D.).

From this epigraph, the names of two more members of the Khânzâda family are known. Also, the epigraph indirectly confirms the local tradition pertaining to the tomb of Fathu'llah Shâh who appears to be none other than the Malizada.

**XIII. ANOTHER INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 911, FROM NAGAUR**

One of the few old buildings to survive at Nâgaur is the small and somewhat dilapidated mosque called Ek Minâr-ki-Masjid, situated in the Pahânon-ka-Mahlâla. The mosque is so called because one of its two minarets has fallen. Built of stone, it is a structure of modest dimensions built in trabeate system. On plan it consists of a single prayer-hall, overlooking an enclosed court, which is divided into five aisles and two bays by pillars supporting a flat roof. The prayer-hall is decorated with a prominent parapet, mounted with arch-shaped merlons, which seem to have been carved with simple geometrical designs. An equally prominent cornice shaded the open facade, but most of its slabs have fallen. The lone small but shapely minar rises above the roof at the southern end of the facade, and its tapering design, octagonal and round in sections, and rounded up at the top, is quite pleasing. It recalls to mind its slightly earlier late Tuglukian counterpart at Delhi, but is more remarkable for its symmetry and shape. The mosque, when fresh from construction and its second minaret and other parts intact must have presented a fairly impressive appearance. It is an interesting specimen, after the Shamsi Mosque and the surviving towers of the 'Idgâh, of the mosque architecture of the Khânzâdas or rather of Nâgaur.

The tablet bearing the epigraph measures 65 by 34 cms. and is fixed above the central mîhrâb between it and the roof. It has been considerably affected by weather and wear and tear of time, with the result that the letters, engraved in fine relief, have flaked off, particularly towards the end, but this has not proved a handicap in its decipherment, except for a word, which ironically enough is perfectly well preserved and otherwise clear. The text comprises, as in the case of the majority of the Khannuda records, a single line of writing in Persian, and records the construction of a mosque in 1505-06 during the reign of Muhammed Khan. The name of the builder of the mosque was perhaps contained in the word which has defied persistent attempts at decipherment; having tentatively read it as Phûlkalâ, I take it to be the name of the builder.

The calligraphy of this epigraph is also of a high order. The style of writing is Nasîrî of the same type as in the other records and the letters, cut into bold relief, are particularly remarkable for their sharp outline. Another innovation made in its design, if one may say so, is the arrange-

---

MUHAMMAD KHAN

PLATE VII

(a) Inscription, dated A.H. 939, from Nāgaṛ (p. 38)

Scale: 2

(b) Record, dated A.H. 911, same place (p. 40)

Scale: 14
next of the elongated shafts, which do not cover the whole slab as is the case in similar records studied before, but have been placed a little apart from one another in groups of five, four and three, commencing from right. But this does not produce the desired artistic effect.

The text of the record has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate VIII (a)*

بانا ابن مسجد پھولکلا(؟) در عهد خاتونعظم جنگ خان پٹوئی رحمان سنہ احیاء عشر و تسعماہ

**TRANSLATION**

This mosque (was) built by (?) Phulkâla (?) in the reign of the great Khân Muḥammad Khân, by the grace of the Compassionate (in) the year (A.H.) eleven and nine hundred (A.H. 911=1505-06 A.D.).

**XIV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 912, FROM KUMÁRI**

Kumári is a small village situated in the Nágaur district at a distance of about twenty-five kilometres to the south-west of the district headquarters. On the outskirt of the village, there are a few tombs including that of Bālā Pir consisting of an ordinary platform with two graves. To the west north-west of this, at a distance of about 150 to 200 metres lies a square platform, about 2.25 metres high, in the middle of which stands an octagonal tomb, locally called Ḥasan Shahid’s Tomb, which is roofed by a single dome decorated with stripes and crowned by a lotus finial as in the Mughal domes. Perforated stone-screens fill the arched sides of the Tomb which is not devoid of architectural merit. Traces of blue enamel tile-work may still be seen at places. The Tomb is also interesting as being one of the few monuments of the Khánzâda period that have come down to us.

This platform is extended on its left by a platform slightly raised by about 15 cms. which is bound on the west by a single wall to serve, evidently, as the Qanâti Mosque for the Tomb. In the middle of this wall is a stone mîhrâb above which is placed the tablet bearing the epigraph under study.

This epigraph also was first found by Mr. N. M. Ghanam in 1959. It was noticed in our annual report on the basis of the impression taken by him. But the impression being unsatisfactory, the writing being somewhat crowded and the letters being small and also executed in a slightly cursive hand, the text could not be read correctly then, and consequently, it was stated to seem to record the construction of a mosque and the Tomb of Firûz Khân and the raising of a garden; its date was doubtfully read as A.H. 902 (1496-97 A.D.).

The reference to Firûz Khân’s Tomb was extremely interesting, and if the reading of the inscriptions was correct, it would indeed have been a great discovery in itself. As such, it was necessary to be certain about the reading of the record beyond any reasonable doubt. Consequently, while in Nágaur in 1966, I visited Kumári in the company of Mr. Ghanam and Mr. Raunq Uthmân. Apart from having its fresh estampage prepared, I also finalised the reading of the epigraph, according to which it was definitely proved that the tomb did not contain the remains of Firûz Khân. At the same time, this fact did not detract from the importance of the record, as the Tomb, according to the final reading, was erected over the remains of a member of the Khánzâda family, or to be exact a daughter-in-law of Firûz Khân II as will be presently seen.

---

The epigraph which as usual consists of one line of writing in Persian states that the construction of the Tomb of the wife of the late Khânzâda Miyân Hâsan son of Fîruz Khân and the mosque attached thereto took place in 1506-07, during the time of Muhammad Khân.

The style of writing is Nasḵ but unlike in the case of the other Khânzâda records, the letters are somewhat small and cursive and the writing appears a little crowded. But for this, the epigraph conforms to the general calligraphical style. The artistic device of elongated shafts of letters and the curves of the letters sūn and the marks of the letters kāf placed across these, has been resorted to here also.

The epigraphical tablet measures 60 by 24 cms., and the text has been deciphered as follows:—

TEXT

Plate VIII (b)

۰۰۰۰۰۰

The construction of this mosque and the Tomb of the wife of the late Khân, son of Fîruz Khân, whose name is Khânzâda Miyân Hâsan (took place) by the grace of the Compassionate, during the reign of the great Khân Muhammad Khân in the year (A.H.) twelve and nine hundred (A.H. 912-1506-07 A.D.).

Needless to say, nothing is known from historical works about Khânzâda Miyân Hâsan or his wife, and but for this epigraph, they would have remained totally unknown. The record also supplies the information that Miyân Hâsan was the son of Fîruz Khân by whom evidently Fîruz Khân II is meant. That is to say, he was the brother of the reigning chief Muhammad Khân. He had probably predeceased his wife; according to the epigraph, he was no more when her tomb was constructed.

XV. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 913, FROM NĀGAUR

The tablet containing the last record of Muhammad Khân, a badly damaged one, is built up into the inner face of the part of the parkotā (upper wall) of the Nāgaur Fort, which overlooks the Horse-Stables and Rānawās (Ladies' Quarters).1 It being directly exposed to the inclemencies of weather, the writing thereon has been adversely affected, and the letters cut out in alto relievo have been almost completely levelled out, as can be better visualised from the illustration (pl. No. IX b).

A complete reading of the epigraph, therefore, is out of question. However, it is no mean satisfaction that a sizable portion of the record sufficient to yield the purport including the date has been deciphered to a fairly correct extent.

The inscription comprises, as usual, one line of writing in Persian, recording the construction of a mosque in 1507 during the reign of Muhammad Khân. The name of the builder does not appear to be there; he could be the chief himself.

(a) Epigraph, dated A. H. 911, from Nāgaur (p. 41)
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(b) Inscription, dated A. H. 912, from Kumāri (p. 42)
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Plate IX.

(a) Epigraph of Muḥammad Khān, dated A. H. 913, same place (p. 43)
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Fīrūz Khān III

(b) Record, dated A. H. 933, from Nāgaur (p. 44)
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INScriptions of the Khânzâdas of Nâgaur

The style of writing is Nâsîh. Whatever of the calligraphy has survived, is sufficient to proclaim its fine quality. Though small, the letters appear to have had the same sharpness of outline and artistic flourishes as their other counterparts at Nâgaur. The smallness of the letters, of the size of hardly one fourth of the total height of the slab, has been pleasantly contrasted with their elongated shafts raised right to the top.

The epigraphical tablet measures 60 by 33 cms. The text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

Plate IX (b)

بنیاد گرد این مسجد بتوینق رحمان در عهد دولت بنگر خان اعظم و خاقان (؟) معلم
[محمد خان...ف التاریخ نلم صفر المظفر (؟) من سنا سال عشر و تسعینه]

**TRANSLATION**

This mosque was built by the grace of the Compassionate, in the reign of His Highness the great Khân and the magnificent Khâqân [Muhammad Khân].........On the third of the victorious (month of) Šafar of the year (A.H.) thirteen and nine hundred (3 Šafar 913=14 June 1507).

A point that most easily strike to the discerning scholars is that this is the only of Muhammad Khân’s five records studied here which uses the set of two titles that are almost invariably used in Firûz Khân II’s epigraphs. On the other hand, four of his epigraphs merely use the title ‘great Khân’. Since the name of Muhammad Khân is not legible in the damaged record, a doubt may arise if it belongs to his reign. But there should not be any such doubt on this score, as the date A.H. 913 is quite clearly legible on the stone as well as in the rubbing.

**Firûz Khân III**

The existence of this ruler was first made known by Dr. Chaqtaï in the Genealogy, where he is shown as having ruled from A.H. 915 to A.H. 922 in which year he is stated to have been succeeded by his son Muhammad Khân. The latter is shown therein to have ruled till A.H. 933. Presumably this information was obtained from the Aurad-i-Qâdiriyya. But from this solitary record of his, it appears that Firûz Khân was ruling in A.H. 933. The implications of this evidence as also the probable date of accession of his successor Muhammad Khân II have been discussed in some detail in the introductory lines (p. 19, supra) and need not be repeated here.

**XVI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 933, FROM NâGAUR**

The last of the sixteen epigraphs of this study comes from Nâgaur. It pertains to the reign of Firûz Khân III. The loose tablet, measuring 65 by 31 cms., on which it is inscribed, is now preserved into the Dargâh of Ḥâdat Râyîd Ixmân Nûr, is which situated outside the town to the south-east of the Delhi Gate.1 The tablet, according to Mr. Rasul Uthmânî, who brought it to my notice, was recovered from the demolished part of the city-wall. From the text it appears that the epigraph originally belonged to a tomb.

The inscription consists of a single line of writing in Persian. The tablet is slightly fragmentary, having lost a little portion on the right, but this has not affected materially the text except for a letter or two. It records the construction of a tomb and a mosque, evidently attached thereto, by a certain person, whose name is not clearly decipherable but reads something like Adâ Jânûb or Adâ Chânûbû. The construction took place in 1527 during the reign of Firûz Khân.

---

The style of writing of this epigraph is Naskh of the usual variety with elongated shafts of letters. The writing is quite crowded and words have been placed one upon the other in horizontal as well as somewhat diagonal positions. Attention in particular may be drawn to the way in which the letters nun have been designed almost flattish like bā and placed across the elongated shafts of letters.

The text of the record has been deciphered as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate IX (a)*

بنا كرد اين مسجد و حضيره (sic.) اداجانيو (اداجانيو) در عهد خان اعظم فيروز خان
صلبحات تعالى بترقيق رحمان يخريخ لهم ماه ذي القعدة سنة ثلاث ثلاثين و تسعة [ليه]

**TRANSLATION**

This mosque and the tomb were built by Adā Jânbū (or Adā Chānbū) in the reign of the great Khân Firūz Khār, may Allāh preserve him, by the grace of the Compassionate, on the date, ninth of the month of Dhul-Qa'da (of the) year (A.H.) three and thirty and nine hundred (9 Dhul-Qa'da 938–10 August 1527).

The importance of the record is evident. Incidentally, this is the only one-line Khânzâda record in which the sentence is complete in all respects. Thus, Adā Jânbū or Adā Chānbū, is shown in the text as the builder of the Tomb-cum-mosque complex. But the question would arise, whose tomb was constructed by him (or her)? In the few Tomb-records studied in the preceding lines, the names of the persons whose tombs were built have been mentioned. Could it be that it was Adā Jânbū or Adā Chānbū who was buried in the tomb? If the verb *bīnā kard* was used without an object, this would have been the interpretation. It may also be that the said person may have built the tomb for himself (or herself) while alive. But no definite conclusion can be reached on this point.

Likewise, I am not sure if I have correctly read the name of that person. The writing is quite clear, and there is absolutely no confusion in that regard. All the letters of the word are clear and legible, but due perhaps to the unusualness of the name, I am unable to decipher it correctly. It is possible that some of the readers may be able to hit upon the correct form of this name.

Before conclusion, I would like to mention once again the assistance and help I received in copying some of these inscriptions from the staff of H. H. the Mahārāja of Jodhpur who owns the Nāgaur Fort, and who has kindly permitted me to publish these records. I must also mention with admiration the indefatigable energy and interminable interest which Mr. Raunaq Uthmānī has for the history of the Nāgaur region; he was kind enough to accompany me in both of my visits to various places bearing inscriptions, and some of the records studied here might have escaped our notice but for his untiring zeal. Shri N. M. Ghanam also deserves our thanks for having traced some new inscriptions either on his own or through the information supplied by Mr. Raunaq Uthmānī and also for having accompanied me in one of my visits to Nāgaur.

Lastly, I genuinely regret that a couple of spotted epigraphs from the Nāgaur Fort could not be copied for want of proper equipment. I have a feeling that an extensive search may still uncover new epigraphs from the Fort or the remaining portion of the city-wall, if it is still intact.

* Bā could be taken as a suffix used as a term of respect for ladies, like Bibi.
SOME MORE DIRECTION-STONES OF THE NIZĀM SHĀHĪ DYNASTY

BY DR. A. A. KADIRI

Senior Epigraphical Assistant

I propose to study in this article a few interesting inscriptions of the Nizām Shāhī kings of Ahmadnagar, dealing with a single but an unusual aspect of history, namely that of communications. As is well known, contemporary chronicles contain scanty information about the administrative and public welfare institutions. Other sources of such important information in which at the most we can get stray references are literature, epigraphs, deeds and endowments, royal orders and the like.

In the whole domain of Indo-Muslim epigraphy, so far, no records have been found which served the purpose of direction-stones or direction-signs of our days, except those set up in the Ahmadnagar kingdom. As the readers of this series are aware, a few such bilingual direction notices in the official language (Persian) and the local language (Marāṭhī) were found some time back at Antur and Kalamb. Unfortunately, no systematic effort to locate more such epigraphs was made since then. In the past decade, however, some eight more records of similar nature have been found at various places, some of which are situated on the borders of the Nizām Shāhī dominions, to wit, Betul district in Central India and Kolābā district on the Western coast. These valuable records indicate the direction of roads leading to various places from the places of their installation.

Communication is the most vital link in the life of any nation or kingdom. No state could afford to neglect this important means of keeping its trade and commerce, functioning of its various departments, both civil and military, and administration of the kingdom, in order. It is but natural that the Muslim kings also must have taken adequate steps— as in the case of Sher Shāh Sūr—to ensure proper maintenance of the roads and their safety. But no details thereof have come down to us, except that in Deccan, we are told that measures to ensure the safety of roads were taken first by Muhammad Shah I Bahrani (1358-75). Similar information in respect of other kings is not forthcoming from historical works. But fortunately, from a fragmentary record found at Cheul in Kolābā district, which incidentally appears to be the earliest of such direction records (and is included in this study), it is known for the first time that Burhān Nizām Shāh II (1591-95) immediately after his accession, issued a farmān directing that at every place in his dominions, where there was a confluence of roads, a sign-post should be set up to avoid confusion and inconvenience to the travelling public. This farmān affords a concrete proof of the said king's zeal for the welfare of the travelling public. As these epigraphs were intended for the benefit and use of the general public at large, it is but natural that their texts were also ordered to be inscribed in the official language Persian and the local language Marāṭhī.

---

1. Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica (EIM), 1919-20, p. 15; pl. (IX a).
2. Epigraphia Indica Arabic & Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1955 and 1956, p. 115 (pl. XXIX c); Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission (PIHRC), vol. XI (1928), p. 92, where its gist was published. The record is now in the Central Museum, Nagpur.
As referred to above, so far only two such records, one each in the vicinity of the Antur Fort in Aurangabad district and from Kalamb in Yeotmal district of Maharastra, have been published. Both were set up in the time of Burhan II. According to the Persian version of the Antur record whose Marathi counterpart is not published, the road leads on the east towards Nagpur and Jalna, on the south towards Daulatabad and Ahmadnagar, on the west towards Mahun and Chalisgaon and on the north towards Antur and Burhanpur. The Persian writing on the Kalamb pillar seems to have been scrapped up and is hence almost illegible. Its Marathi version states that the road to right leads to Salvation and that on the left to Nanchangao.

Of the eight records studied in the following lines, seven are of Burhan II and one of Burhan III (1610-30). The earliest of these is from Cheul in Kolaba district of Maharastra. Apart from alluding to the forman regarding setting up direction-stones as referred to above, it refers to the confluence of roads to Ashtam, Nagmakan, Pen and Revand. The next is found at Bar, a district headquarters of Maharastra. It points out to the road leading from the town of Bir to the city of Ahmadnagar. The third record is from Nimbait in the Nasik district of Maharastra. It is inscribed on four sides of a pillar and points out to the roads on each direction—from Nimgao to Daulatabad on the south and Galm on the east; the stone having considerably weathered, the names of places on the north and west sides are illegible. The fourth record is from Somaripe in Betul district of Madhya Pradesh. It also refers to the forman and indicates the directions towards Ellicchpur and Chand. The fifth record was found in the same neighbourhood, at Ravanburi. It points to Jiwap on one side, to Bhimgar on the other, to Asir on the third, to Pratapgarh on the fourth and to Saiya on the fifth. The sixth record is from Mehek in Buldana district of Maharastra. As in the Kolaba record referred to above, the Persian version is lost and the Marathi text only contains the name of the king and the date. The seventh record is from Paunar, in Wardha district of Maharastra. It is fragmentary and contains only the Marathi text, the surviving portion of which is almost similar to that of the Mehek record, but seems to have contained some additional information. The eighth record, the only one to be set up in the time of Burhan Nizam Shah III, was found near Dive-Agra, to the right of the road towards Borlai Panchayatan (about 2 kilometres away) in Kolaba district. It marks pargana Borlai on the east, the sea on the west, pargana Shrawardhan on the south and the district of Danda on the north. The Marathi version also refers to a ferry at Dighi on way to Danda.

It will be noted that in these records, as in the case of two other records of similar nature referred to above, the date is given in words preceded by the words Shuhr-i-Sana. Now this term was commonly used in Islamic countries and also in India, when only the year is given but not the exact month and date. At the same time, in India, particularly in the Deccan, the term was also used to denote the Solar variation of the Hijra year which was commenced from A.H. 744 or 745, and was called Shuhr San—corrupted into Sur San of Maharastra.

Now in the text of the six inscriptions studied here (Inscription Nos. 2-7), the year 1000 is preceded by the term Shuhr-i-Sana, but in the seventh (Inscription No. 1), the same year is clearly specified as of Hijra era. If in these six epigraphs which were set up in the reign of Burhan Nizam Shah, the Shuhr era were meant, their dates—Shuhr 1000 or A.H. 1008—would not fit in with the dates of the reign of either Burhan II (A.H. 999-1003) or Burhan III (A.H. 1018-40). Necessarily therefore, the date has to be taken in the Hijra era i.e. A.H. 1000, which,

1 PIHC, p. 32, has Deoli instead of Salvation.
2 For details, see M. Nizam, Bijapur Inscriptions, Archaeological Survey of India Memoirs, No. 49 (Delhi, 1936), pp. 96-102.
3 For this, see p. 59-60, infra.
it may be noted, is the date of the seventh record of the same king (Inscription No. 1). Moreover, as these epigraphs were set up in pursuance of the royal order issued immediately after the accession of Burhān Nizām Shāh, both according to Inscription No. 1 where the Hijra year 1000 is clearly given and also according to Inscription Nos. 2-7, where the year 1000 preceded by the term Shuhūr-i-Sans is given, and since of the three Burhāns, the accession of Burhān II took place a few months before A.H. 1000, it is also indicated that Burhān II is meant. In other words, the term Shuhūr has to be taken to mean 'in the months of' and the date has to be taken to belong to the Hijra era.

But the date in the eighth epigraph (Inscription No. VIII) presents some difficulty. There the year is 1010, preceded by the word Shuhūr-i-Sans, and the king's name is Burhān. Here Burhān II cannot be meant, since the date of the epigraph whether taken as A.H. 1010 or Shuhūr 1010 (A.H. 1018) would not fit in with the dates of his reign. Therefore, the king has to be Burhān III, and the date will have to be taken as Shuhūr 1010 (A.H. 1018) and not as A.H. 1010, when Murtuza II was ruling and Burhān II was dead for six or seven years. It may appear somewhat confusing that in the case of the six epigraphs, the term Shuhūr has to be taken in the ordinary sense and in the case of the seventh, as denoting the Shuhūr era, but this has to be so in view of the explicit mention of the king and the year 1010 clearly given in the text.

The historical importance of these epigraphs is considerable. They provide through their findspots an idea of the boundaries of the Nizām Shāhī kingdom even in the days when it was threatened by Mughal expansionist designs. That the Nizām Shāhī sovereignity was acknowledged on the western coast of India is clearly shown by the Cheul and Dīvā-Agar records, and therefore, there is no truth in the statement of the local records that the governors of Dāndū-Rājpūrti, which lies between Cheul and Dīvā-Agar, were Mughal officers.¹

Secondly, Somāripeṭ and Kherālī-Rāwanbārī near Betul are also proved to have been included in the Ahmadnagar kingdom, thus corroborating the statement of the Ahmadnagar historian, Sayyid 'Alī Taḥtātābā that during Mīrāz 'Afsa Koka's governorship of Mālwā (c. 1593-56), Hāndūrā, situated to the north-west of these places, was the border between Mālwā and Nizām Shāhī kingdom.² Towards Bīdar, the town of Bir, and on the east north-east, Mēhkar, Kōlamb, and Pānum̲ār were under the authority of these kings.³

But still greater importance of these records lies in their providing an idea of the network of roads in the various parts of the kingdom and the towns of some consequence at that time. The towns where these records were put up must have been famous for something or other. Some of them are now reduced to small unimportant villages, but in the old days, they commanded sufficient importance. It would be interesting to reconstruct, on the basis of the information contained in these epigraphs and casual references to the army's marches in the area, the important routes that were commonly taken by the travellers.

The epigraphs are also important in another respect: they have faithfully recorded how these place-names were spelt in those days. For example, Ellichpur—which has been now changed to Achalpur—must have been pronounced as Ellichpur as recorded in the text of the Somāripeṭ inscription.

¹ Mahārāshtra State Gazetteers, Kolaba Districts (MSG, Kolaba), Bombay, 1964, p. 80.
² 'Alī Taḥtātābā, Burhān-i-Ma'ālik (Hyderabad, 1936), p. 549; Dr. Rādha Shyām, The Kingdom of Ahmadnagar (Delhi, 1969), pp. 179-80, 209, 270 (where Hāndūrā is misspelt as Hindya).
Būhān Niẓām Shāh II

INSCRIPTION NO. 1

The earliest inscription of the set is reported to have been found almost eight decades ago in the field belonging to one Vishnu Joshi, at Cheul in Albāq Tāluka of Kolābā district. Its inked rubbing seems to have been taken by an officer of the Archaeological Survey, Western Circle, Poona, in about 1893-94, but was very probably transferred in 1903 to the Office of the Government Epigraphist for India, Octacemund (now Chief Epigraphist, Mysore) and thence transferred to the office of the Superintending Epigraphist for Persian and Arabic Inscriptions, Nagpur, in 1958. The impression being quite worn out, it was intended to have its fresh impressions prepared when we visited Cheul in 1959, but attempts to locate the tablet proved unsuccessful. It is therefore from the old impression that the record had to be edited here.

Cheul, now reduced to a village of little importance, was the most important port-town in the Niẓām Shāhī kingdom and was also the headquarters of the province of that name. It was through it that the foreign trade of the kingdom was transacted. Therefore, it is but natural that the order directing sign-posts on stone to be put up in various parts of the kingdom, immediately after the accession of Būhān II, was first implemented here.

The inscritional slab seems to have been considerably damaged due to inclemencies of weather at the time when its rubbing was taken; letters have peeled off in quite a few places. The text occupying a space of about 55 by 80 cms. consists of ten lines of writing in Persian carved in relief in Nastālīq characters. It is unfortunate that the damage to the slab as also the worn out condition of the impression has rendered part of the text illegible. The readable portion of its text imparts the information that in the year when Būhān Niẓām Shāh ascended the throne, a faramān was issued to the effect that at every place in the dominions where many routes met, a sign-post indicating the directions should be set up so that the travellers may not experience any difficulty. It then lays down the directions to the towns of Ashāf, Nāgothānā, Pen and two more places which could not be deciphered. It also mentions a mountain temple, the route to which lay to the south. The epigraph was set up in 1591-92.

The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate X(b)

( ) باغ علی‌ن اکست کده در سال جلوس نواب کمیاب(?)
(2) جمجمه سلیمان بوی نوعان نظام‌شاه خلاد ملکه و سلطانه فرامن واجب
(3) الادعمن صادر شد که هر مکانی از محلات منسوبه که اختلاف طریق
(4) باین علی‌نی نصب ناپلئون تا مرید دین را ایجاد نماید لذا
(5) مسافرین که از دروازه کرکه(?) صوند ناپلید که اگر متوسطه

1 ĀRIA, 1959-60, No. D, 149. For the history and description of the town of Cheul, see MSG, Kolaba, pp. 715-55.
2 Rādhe Shyaṃ, op. cit., p. 377.
3 For the strategic and commercial importance of Cheul, see MSG, Kolaba, pp. 720-25; Rādhe Shyaṃ, op. cit., pp. 332-56.
(a) Record dated A.H. 1000, from B.H. (p. 56).
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(1) The reason (for setting up) of this sign (-post) is that in the year of accession of the successful Nawwāb,

(2) the possessor of Jamshīd's dignity (and) having Solomon's army, Burhān Nizām Shāh, may his kingdom and sovereignty be perpetuated, a royal decree (fārmān) commanding

(3) obedience was issued that at every place in the royal (lit. guarded) dominions where there is diversity of roads,

(4) a sign-post should be set up so that the travellers may not encounter any difficulty. Therefore,

(5) the travellers who…….from the Korle (i) Gate, should go………, and if they intend to

(6) go to Ashtam, they should turn their face towards the sun and proceed; and if they want to go to………

(7) they ought to turn their face towards north-east and take up the familiar (lit. famous) route;

(8) and if they proceed towards south, the route (leads to) the mountain temple; and if [they wish] to go to Nāgotāna (modern Nāgoṭhanā)………

(9) and if the intention is to go to the town (qagla) of Pen………..

(10) ………………… is Regdanda (modern Revdānā). And this was (inscribed) in (the year) one thousand of the Hijra era (A.H. 1000-1591-92 A.D.).

Inscription No. 2

The second direction-notice of Burhān II's reign was found inscribed on a pillar locally called Rankhamā, which is fixed in the ground by the side of the road near the Collector's office at Bir, a district headquarters in Mahārāshtra.1 Occupying a total space of 73 by 60 cms., the text is bilingual comprising one line in Persian and three lines in Marāṭhī.2 Bir has a number of inscriptions and old monuments. Dr. G. Yazdi who had made an extensive survey of these, had published their texts also.3 It is surprising how the epigraph under study, the only Nizām Shāh record to be found at Bir, escaped his notice.

1 For the antiquities and inscriptions of Bir, see Annual Report of the Archaeological Department of H. E. H. Nizam's Dominions for the year 1920-21, pp. 4-14.
The record is dated 1591-92 in the reign of Burāhān Niṣām Shāh II and indicates that the road leads from the town (qasba) of Bir to the city of Ahmadnagar. Both the Persian portion and the Marāṭhī versions are carved in relief. The style of writing of the former is somewhat crude Naskh, which is partly responsible for the difficulty in the decipherment of the text. It will be noted that the Nāgari version is almost the same as the Persian version except for two Marāṭhī words used in place of their Persian equivalents in line 4.

Though the contents of the record were known, albeit not completely, the exact object of the pillar has been a matter of conjecture so far. Traditionally, it is believed to be a Rankhamb and was described as such recently in a Marāṭhī journal by Shri N. S. Pohnerkar.1 Dr. V. B. Kolte, former Vice-Chancellor of the Nāgpur University, who referred to it in one of his articles and quoted its contents almost completely, except the city-name Ahmadnagar (to which the road led), endorsed the view expressed by Mr. Pohnerkar. But there is no basis for such assumption or assertion. From the text, it is quite clear that it has nothing to do with a Rankhamb but was set up as a direction-stone like many others.

The text has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate X (a)*

(i) *Persian version.*

(1) در زمان حضرت بهرائ نظام شاه شهر سه اف قصب بی راه احمدنگر

(ii) *Marāṭhī version.*

दर जमाने हुसरत बुसहान निज़ा
म स्या स्वर तान अलफ कसावा बी
ढ मार्ग स्वाहर अहमदानगर

**TRANSLATION**

(i) (1) In the reign of His Majesty Burāhān Niṣām Shāh (in the) months of the year one thousand (A.H. 1000-1591-92 A.D.), the route from the town (qasba) of Bir to the city of Ahmadnagar.

(ii) (2-4) As in line No. 1.

It will be noted that the name of the city Ahmadnagar has been inscribed as Ahmādānagar. This is not an uncommon spelling being found in inscriptions as well as on coins.2

**INSCRIPTION NO. 3**

The third sign-post of Burāhān II, a stone-pillar, was found buried in the local graveyard at Nimbāt, in Nāṣik district.3 Its inked rubbings prepared by an officer of the Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Poona, some time in 1936-37, were preserved in the old records.

---

1 *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, dated the 29th November 1970.
2 *EJAPS*, 1962, p. 74, fn. 3.
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These being somewhat worn out, I had fresh ones prepared when I visited the place in 1961, and it is from these that the epigraph is being edited here. It is not known if the record is published or noticed anywhere. It is inscribed on all the four sides with bilingual text on each side. But the writing on two sides is badly damaged, rendering its decipherment uncertain as well as incomplete.

The readable portion of the text yields the information that the road towards south leads to Daulatabad from Nimāg and that towards the east side to Gaṅā, also through Nimāq. The places to which the roads going towards north and west led are not clearly legible. The pillar is stated to have been set up in 1591-92.

The text occupies a total space of about 40 by 50 cms., 40 by 55 cms., 37 by 50 cms. and 40 by 35 cms. respectively on the south, east, north and west sides. The style of writing of the Persian text is Naskh of somewhat crudish type, which coupled with the fact that the writing is badly affected has rendered its complete decipherment difficult. The language of the record is mediocre—containing words from the local dialect and the spellings are also wrong in a number of places.

The epigraph has been read as under:

TEXT

(a) South side.  

(i) Persian version:

Plate XI (b)

(1) 

(2) 

(3) 

(4) 

(5) 

(ii) Marathi version:

Plate XI (a)

(1) मार्ग नीतिगावां वहन दील  

(2) ताबादेस जातो

(b) East side.

(i) Persian version:

(1) 

(2) 

(3) 

(4) 

(5)  

75202

(ii) Marathi version:

(1) मार्ग नीतिगावा वहन गाथ्याया  

(2) स जातो
(c) North side.  

(i) Persian version:

(1) الله محمد علي
(2)
(3) داه
(4) در زمان حضرت برهمان نظامشاه
(5)

(ii) Marāṭhi version:

(1) मार्ग नीवगावा वहन वेढी
(2) गावास जातो

(d) West side.  

Plate XIII (b)

(i) Persian version:

(1) رسول الله محمد علي
(2) لا اله الا الله
(3) داه
(4) در زمان حضرت برهمان نظامشاه

(ii) Marāṭhi version:

(1-2) Obliterated.

TRANSLATION

(a) (i)

(1) Allāh, Muḥammad, 'All."  
(2) ..............................................................
(3) In the reign of His Majesty Burhān Nīgām Shāh
(4) [in the] months of the year one thousand (A.H. 1000-1591-92 A.D.). The road above the village Regāvī....... is the route to Daulatābād.

(ii)

(1-2) The route from Nivagāon (i.e. Nimgaon) goes to Daulatābād.

(b) (i)

(1) Allāh, Muḥammad, 'All.  
(2-3) In the reign of His Majesty Burhān Nīgām Shāh
(4-5) [in the] months of the year one thousand (A.H. 1000-1591-92 A.D.) in the direction of Q [K]inwat, from the foot of the village Nimgām the route leads to Gālnā hill.

(ii)

(1-2) The route from Nivagāon leads to Gālnā.
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(c) (i)
(1) Allāh, Muḥammad, 'Alī.
(2-3) ..........................road (leads to)........................
(4) In the reign of His Majesty Burhān Niżām Shāh
(5) ..........................[leads to]........................gām(?).
(ii)
(1-2) The route from Nivagāon leads to Belegāun (?).

(d) (i)
(1-2) There is no God but Allāh, [Muḥammad] is the prophet of Allāh. Allāh, Muḥammad, 'Alī.

(3) ..........................road........................Nimbāti
(4) in the reign of his Majesty Burhān Niżām Shāh.
(ii)
(1-2) ...........................................

INSCRIPTION NO. 4

This direction-stone was found at Somāripet, a village close to Kherlā, towards its southwest, in Betul district of Madhya Pradesh. The slab measuring 80 by 140 cms. is fixed up into the ground in the village and contains ten lines of writing of which six are in Persian and four in Marāṭhī. The Persian text refers to the reign of Burhān Niżām Shāh (II), bears the date 1591-92 and states that the road on one side goes to Ellichpūr and that on the other side leads to Chāндā. In the text reference is also made to the royal order in pursuance of which the sign-post was set up. The Marāṭhī portion only mentions the name of the king, the date and the route to Ellichpūr.

The epigraph was first noticed in the Districts Gazetteer, but due to its incomplete and incorrect reading the name of the Ahmadnagar monarch was taken to be that of a Muhammadan governor under the king of Mālwā. From the reading quoted below, the epigraph is proved beyond any doubt to contain a Niżām Shāḥī record.

The Persian and Marāṭhī texts are carved in relief in Naṣaʿīg and Nāgārī characters, whose only merit is their boldness. This is an extremely important record. Like the Kherlā-Rāwanbarī record to be studied next, it was found not only in what can be reasonably called the northeasternmost limit of the Niżām Shāḥī kingdom but in the heart of the Kherlā kingdom, which figures prominently in the events of the Bahmanī rule, and fills up a gap in its history intervening the Mālwā and the Mughal rules. It also corroborates as stated in the introductory lines, the statement of the Niżām Shāḥī historian ʿAbī Tabātābā, that during Mirzā ʿAzīz Koka’s governorship of Mālwā (c. 1593-95), Hāndiā, now in Hoshangābād district, formed the border between the province of Mālwā and the kingdom of Deccān. It is also proved from these two epigraphs from Betul district (which borders on Berār) that the Niżām Shāḥī occupation of Berār had also included the region up to Betul and possibly Hāndiā.

---

Note: The writing in this part has totally peeled off.

2 ARIE, 1966-67, No. D. 48 and No. B. 17C.

3 Apparently the fourth line of the Marāṭhī text is buried in the ground.


Tabātābā, op. cit., p. 64; Rāđhe Shyām, op. cit., pp. 179–80, 293, 279.
The text has been read as follows:

TEXT

Plate XII (5)

(i) Persian version:

(1) در زمان حضرت
(2) برخی نظام شاه
(3) شهور سلطان
(4) بر حکم فرامن سلطان
(5) صادر شد که یک جانب
(6) راه ایلخ پور دیگر راه چانده

(ii) Marathi version:

(1) दर जमाने हजरती बु
(2) रहान निजाम स्वाहा शुभ
(3) तफ येक बाट अझिल्पुर
(4) ................................

TRANSLATION

(i)

(1) In the reign of His Majesty
(2) Burhān Niząd Shāh
(3) [in] the months of the year one thousand
(4-5) in pursuance of the royal formān which was issued (it is notified that) on one side, the
(6) road leads to Ilichpūr (i.e. Ellichpūr) (and) the other road is to Chāndā.

(ii)

(1-2) In the reign of Hajrat Burhān Nījad Shāh (i.e. Shāh), months of the year one thousand
(3) One route leads to Alachhpūr (i.e. Ellichpūr).
(4) ................................

The towns mentioned in the record viz. Ellichpūr and Chāndā are well-known. The epigraph
shows that this part of the country was connected even in those days to Ellichpur, the capital
of Berār (now in Amrāoti district of Mahārāṣṭra) on the south-west and to far off Chāndā, now
a district headquarters in Mahārāṣṭra, beyond Nāgpur on the south-east, on the trunk line to
Madras,
The next epigraph of Burhān Nizām Shāh II in this group is also bilingual and appears on a slab fixed in at Rāwanbāri situated very close to Kherlā in Betul district. The tablet is lying loose by the side of a cart track at a distance of about a kilometre from Rāwanbāri,1 and measures 80 cms. by 1.40 m. It contains a text of seven lines in Persian followed by three in Marāṭhī carved in relief. The Persian text, as in the case of the Somāripeṭ record, is engraved in bold Nasta’liq letters, otherwise of no distinctive merit, and while referring to its being set up in the reign of Burhān Nizām Shāh (II) in the months of the year (A.H.) 1000 (1591-92 A.D.), purports to indicate the road in one direction to Jiwāpūr, in another to Bhawargāh, in the third to Asir, in the fourth to Pratāpgarh and in the fifth to Sāliyā. The Marāṭhī portion as in the case of the Somāripeṭ record merely refers to the reign of the king and quotes the date.

In the Betul District Gazetteer, reference has been made to two stone pillars on which the distances are marked, which are signed by Burhān Shāh, Goṇḍ Rāja of Deogarh, and are of comparatively recent origin.2 It is difficult to say for certain if the two inscriptions under study are intended, but the purport given including the name of the king strongly points to that being the case. If so, the present study will make it clear that these records have nothing to do with the Goṇḍ king but were set up by Burhān Nizām Shāh II of Ahmadnagar.

The text has been read as under:

\text{Plate XIII(a)}

(i) Persian version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>در زمان حضرت برہان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>نظام شاه شهور سنه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>الف يک جانب داَر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>جیور(٤)بورو و دیگر راه بھور گروه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>سیوم راه اسیر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>جھادم راه پرتاب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>گروه پنجم داَر سالیا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Marāṭhī version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>दर जमाने हजारती</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>बुरहाल निजाम स्या</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>सू ॥ अठफ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
1 ARIE, 1966-67, Nos. D, 47 and B, 175.
2 CPDG, Betul District, p. 246.
(i) In the reign of His Majesty Burhān
(2) Niẓām Shāh (in the) months of the year
(3) one thousand (A. H. 1000=1591-92 A. D.). On one side is the road to
(4) Jīwāpūr and on the other is the road to Bha(n)wargāh.
(5) On the third (side) is the road to Asīr.
(6) On the fourth (side) is the road to Pratāp-
(7) garh and on the fifth (side) is the road to Sāliyā.

(ii) In the reign of His Majesty
(2) Burhān Niẓām Syāḥ (i. e. Shāh)
(3) (in the) months of the year one thousand (A. H. 1000=1591-92 A. D.).

Both the Somāripeṭ and Rāwanbāri records are situated within a couple of kilometres from
each other and also within a radius of about a kilometre from Kherlā which was conquered by
Firūz Bahmanī but was restored to its ruler. Afterwards it was taken by Ḥosḥang Shāh of
Mālāw. It is believed to have continued as part of that kingdom till 1560, when Mālāw was
taken by Akbar. But that this is not correct, is shown by this as well as the previous record.
These records clearly show that sometime before 1591, the date when these were set up, the region
had been occupied by the Niẓām Shāh kings of Ahmadnagar and formed part of their kingdom.
In other words, as stated above, these records fill a gap in our knowledge of the history of the
region.

One of the places mentioned in the text is Asīr. The celebrated Asīrgarh is situated at a
distance of about 160 kilometres to the west south-west. There is one more Asīrgarh in Betul
district itself which is situated about 65 kilometres to the north-east of the district headquarters.
This is perhaps likely to be the place mentioned in the epigraph. Of the rest, Bhaωargāh is
very probably Bhanωargāh of the maps: Situated at a distance of about eleven kilometres
due west of the Bharatpur Railway Station, on the Betul-Itarsi section of the Central Railway,
it lies north north-west of Rāwanbāri. Sāliyā of the record is perhaps Sāλaiyā of the maps.
There are three places bearing this name. Of these Salaiya situated in 22° 05' and 78° 05' at a
distance of about thirty kilometres north-west of Bordahi Khās Railway Station on the Amla-
Parasia section of the Central Railway, is likely to be the one mentioned in the record. The
other two places bearing the name are further up, at a distance of more than 80 kilometres towards
north and north-east respectively, of this Salaiya, which is nearer to and to the north north-east
of the findspot of the record. Salaiya is a market place also. As to Pratāpgarh, two places
bearing this name could be traced on maps: one is situated in 22° 25', 79° 35' (about 160 kilo-
metres to the east north-east of Betul) and another 23° 15', 78° 35' (about 155 kilometres to the
north north-east of Betul). One of these places has to be identical with Pratāpgarh of our record.
The remaining place Jīwāpur could not be located on the maps available to me.

1 Sherwānī, op. cit., pp. 156-57. For a somewhat coherent history of the region, see CPDG, Betul District,
pp. 25-38.
2 CPDG, Betul District, p. 233.
3 It is shown in Half Inch Sheet No. 55 J/SW of the Survey of India Maps.
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INSCRIPTION NO. 6

This epigraph is also bilingual. It is from Mehar in the Buldānapā district of Mahārāṣṭra. The slab is reported to have been found by Mr. R. A. Thengade, Lecturer in History, Arts and Commerce College, Mehar, who sent its inked rubbing, prepared perhaps by him, to Dr. V. B. Kolte, then Vice-Chancellor of the Nagpur University. The latter, who referred to it in his article referred to above, was kind enough to give it to me at my request, for which I am extremely grateful. It is not known if the record is published anywhere else.

Mehkar, the headquarters of a Tāluka, is a place of some antiquity. It was the headquarters of a sarkār in the time of Akbar. Unfortunately, the portion containing the Persian text has broken off and only the Marāṭhī version has survived. The latter consists of five lines of writing carved in relief in Nāgarī characters occupying a space of about 30 by 50 cms. As in the other records, this version mentions only the name of the king and the date A. H. 1000 (1591-92 A. D.), and the information on directions which was evidently contained in the Persian version is not available.

The Marāṭhī text reads as under:

TEXT

Plate XIV(b)

(1) दर जमाने
(2) उहसरती बु
(3) रहान निजाम
(4) स्या सूहुर स
(5) न श्राढफ

TRANSLATION

(1-3) In the reign of His Majesty Burhān Nisām
(4-5) Syā (i.e. Shāh), in the months of the year one thousand (A. H. 1000-1591-92 A. D.).

The epigraph shows that Mehar was a town of sufficient importance in Berār during the Nisām Shāhī period.

INSCRIPTION NO. 7

The seventh direction-stone of the time of Burhān II was found at Pāunār in Wardhäuser district of Mahārāṣṭra. Pāunār situated at a distance of about 8 kilometres to the north-east of the district headquarters, is the first station on the railway line towards Nagpur. It is an old village.

2 Maharashtra Times, Bombay, dated 29th November 1970.
3 For the history and description of the town, see CPDG, Buldana District (Calcutta, 1919), pp. 448-60.
and has a history behind it. Now, shorn of its earlier importance, it has the traces of the old fort, one of the gateways of which, a large imposing structure of stone, was standing at least in the closing years of the last century. Upon the gateway was an inscription in Nāgarī characters according to H. Cousens, and following him the District Gazetteer, but its contents were left undescribed.

The gateway is now no more, but the epigraphical tablet is the same as one now fixed into the compound wall of the house of Mr. Vīṭṭhal Chinnāji Bangre—As was gathered by Mr. S. A. Rahim, then Epigraphical Assistant, who had visited the place to copy the record.

As in the case of the Mehkar record, here too the Persian text is cut off and lost, with the result that the places to which the roads from Paunār led cannot be determined. The text in Nāgarī characters has survived the hand of neglect or vandal, but it merely states that the slab was set up in 1591-92, during the reign of Sūltān Burhān Nīshām Shāh. The Persian text, now lost, evidently contained the purport proper of the epigraph. It is a pity that the Persian texts of all the three Nīshām Shāhī direction-stones found so far in the Berār region, including the one from Kālamb referred to above, are either damaged beyond recognition, as in the case of the last mentioned or lost as in the case of this and the previous epigraph. It may be more than a coincidence. While it is difficult to say if these have been purposely destroyed, the fact remains that the information sought to be conveyed has been lost to us for ever.

It may be noted that the language of the Nāgarī record is Persian. It reads as under:

**TEXT**

Plate XIV(6)

(1) दर जमाले
(2) हवस्ती सुध
(3) तान बुरहान मि
(4) जाम स्प्या सु
(5) हुर सन अठ
(6) फ़ काइम सु [व्
(7) मार्ग ||

**TRANSLATION**

(1-7) In the reign of Hājrati Sūltān Burhān Nīshām Sīā (i.e. Shāh), in the months of the year one thousand (A. H. 1000-1591-92 A. D.), this was set up. The road..................

---

1. For the history and description of Paunār, see CPDG, Wardha District (Allahabad, 1904), pp. 262-23.
4. *ARIE*, 1966-67, No. B, 201. There is only one Arabic-Persian record at Paunār. It contains only religious text and is assignable to 16th-17th century on palaeographical grounds (*ibid.*, No. I, 182).
5. This phrase was commonly used in Marāṭhi records.
This is the only epigraph of Burhān III in the present group and also its last. On enquiry I had informed Dr. V. B. Kolte about the Marāṭhī version of this epigraph, the impression of which was prepared at his instance by an officer of the Department of Archaeology, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay. The slab is fixed on the side of a road to Borlai Panchayatan, from Dive-Agar, in Shrivardhan Taluka of Kolābā district of Maharashtra, at a distance of about a kilometre from either place. Dr. Kolte who published a reading of its Marāṭhī portion in his article referred to above, was kind enough to make its rubbing available to me. It is from that impression that the Persian text of the epigraph is being published here for the first time.

This is also a bilingual inscription occupying a total writing space of 40 cms. by 1.20 m. and runs into twenty-four lines of which the first eight are in Persian and the remaining sixteen in Marāṭhī, all carved in relief. The Persian text is engraved in Naḵḵ characters of a fairly good type but the letters have lost their prominence of relief and have peeled off at a few places due to weathering of the slab.

The Persian part of the epigraph records that in the reign of the just king Burhān Niẓām Shāh in the Shuhūr year 1010 (A. H. 1018-1609 A. D.), this road-direction stone was set up at pargana Div and that the road to the east leads to pargana Borlai; on west to the sea, on the south to pargana Shrivardhan and on the north to māja[mala] Dāndā. The Marāṭhī text supplies an additional piece of information, namely that there is a ferry at Dīghī on the route to Dāndā.

This epigraph is a very valuable document not only because it adds one more to the seven records known so far, of Burhān Niẓām Shāh III, whose very existence in the Niẓām Shāhī dynasty is primarily established on the basis of his inscriptions, but also because according to me, it is the earliest of his epigraphs hitherto discovered. As explained in the introductory lines, the date of the record is to be taken as Shuhūr 1010 i.e. A. H. 1018 (1609 A. D.), while his earliest known record is dated A. H. 1019. Dr. Yazdānī who was the first to establish his identity fixed the year of his accession as A. H. 1019 (1610 A. D.) on the authority of an inscription from the Antur Fort and also on the basis that the Bāsātīn’s Salātam—a 19th century work—continues to mention Murtaḍā Niẓām Shāh II till the year A. H. 1020 (1611 A. D.). But this does not appear to be a very sound basis. The events of the last days of Murtaḍā II may perhaps be recounted here. From the time that Murtaḍā II had intrigued with some nobles to dispose off Malik ‘Ambar in A. H. 1016 (1607 A. D.), the latter wanted to depose Murtaḍā II, but desisted on the intervention of Ibrāhīm II ‘Ādil Shāh, and marched, with the king, to Junnār. According to the Bāsātīn, in Shuhūr 1009 (A. H. 1017-1608 A. D.), Murtaḍā II shifted his capital from Junnār to Daulatābād. In 1609, when Malik ‘Ambar became free from all troubles, he turned his atten-

---

1 In Dr. Kolte’s reading, the 22nd line is not given. Since listed in ARJE, 1970-71, No. D 116 and No B 103.
2 EJM, 1919-20, p. 12 (pl. VIII), p. 14 (pl. VII a and b); ibid., 1933-34 (Supplement), p. 22 (pls. XIIa and XIIIa); ibid., 1949-50, p. 6 (pl. IIIa); ETAPS, 1967, pp. 58-59 (pl. XV).
3 EJM, 1919-20, p. 12.
5 Frigh, op. cit., vol. II, p. 166; Zubairī, Bāsātīn’s Salātam (Hyderabad), p. 270; Rādhe Shyām, Life and Times of Malik ‘Ambar (Delhi, 1968), p. 82.
6 Zubairī, op. cit., p. 270. According to Dr. Rādhe Shyām, loc. cit., p. 82, Malik ‘Ambar brought him from Junnār to Daulatābād to keep him nearer to himself.
tion towards Murtadā II, to settle the score. Now according to our record, dated Shuhūr 1010 (A.H. 1018-1609 A.D.), Burhān III was the king, which shows that 'Ambar must have ultimately succeeded in doing away with Murtadā II in 1609 itself.

This assumption is corroborated by other contemporary evidence too: The Mughal emperor Jahāngīr despatched Prince Pārwān on the Deccan assignment on the 14th Rajab 1018 (October 1609). But before the latter reached Burhān pur, Jahāngīr received the news that 'Ambar had killed Murtadā II. Assuming that the journey from Āgra to Burhān pur took one or even two months, Murtadā II must have been dead by the end of December 1609, if not earlier.

In view of the above, as well as of the epigraph under study, it would appear that Burhān III had ascended the throne in A.H. 1018 and not in A.H. 1019 as assumed by Dr. Yazdānī and others.

Apart from this, the record under study helps us in dispelling the doubts about the Nīsām Shāhī sovereignty over the Konkan region. It has been asserted that though Malik 'Ambar is stated to have recovered most of the territory from the Mughals soon after the fall of Ahmadnagar in 1600, local records seem to show that till 1618, the governors of Dāndā-Rājpuri were Mughal officers. But from the present record, it is clear that at least until 1609, this area was under the Nīsām Shāhī rule.

The text of the epigraph has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate XV

(i) Persian version.

1) در زبان پادشاه عدلت پناه خلقت
2) دستگاه پرچم نظماشم خدالله
3) ملکه و [ساطع] اله و زاد عدله و
4) [همله] شهباز سنه عشرا و پرگنه
5) دیو نشان راهها نبت کرده شد
6) راه مشرق پرگنه بور لیه و جانب مغرب
7) دریا شور و جانب جنوب بپرگنه شربور
8) دهن جانب [شمال] معامله دندان

---

1 Rādhe Shyām, loc. cit.
2 Tāzuk-i-Jahāngīrī (Aligarh, 1864), p. 75.
5 MSU. Kolaba District, op. cit., p. 80.
6 This should have been جنوب to correspond with the Marāthī text.
BURHAN NIZAM SHAH III

Epigraph, dated Shuhur 1010,
from Borla Panchayatan (p. 60)

PLATE XV

Scale: 16
(ii) Mārāṭhi version.

(1) दर जमाने पालस्या ज
(2) म च्या आदाध [ल]
(3) पर्ना विछापत दर्दत
(4) गाह बुरहान निजा
(5) म स्या बुद्धदहुँ मु
(6) चक्कु व सुत्रातानुहूँ
(7) जाद अदाधुँ व अह
(8) स्यानो हुहर सन अठ
(9) फाह आशार पराणे
(10) दिव निशात वाटा पुरब
(11) दिसे पराणे बौरलाए दक्षे
(12) शो शीर्धीस पण्डा
(13) मे दृशिया उत्रे परग
(14) शो दण्ड बार्थी दिवीस
(15) तरी स्त्री मार्ग
(16) [५] जे ई. १११

TRANSLATION

(i)

(1-2) In the reign of the king, the asylum of justice, the possessor of the dignity of caliphate, Burhān Nizām Shāh, may Allāh perpetuate

(3) his kingdom and sovereignty and increase his justice and

(4) benevolence! (in) the Shuhūr year one thousand

and ten (Shuhūr 1010-1609 A. D.), in the pargana of

(5) Div, the sign-post of roads was set up.

(6) The road to the east (leads to) pargana Borlai and on the west

(7) is the sea and on the south is the pargana Shīlīwar-

(8) dhan (aud) on the north is the district (mu‘āmalat) Dānḏā.

(ii)

(1-13) As in lines 1-8 above.¹

¹ Lines 9-21 constitute the Nāgāri transcript of the Persian version.
There is a ferry on the route to Dandā at Dīghi Road.

Dive-Āgar—Āgar Panchāitan of the Survey maps is now reduced to a small village, situated about two kilometres to the west of Borlai, which is mentioned in the text as a pargana. Shriwardhan is a Tāluka headquarters situated towards south, while Dandā mentioned as a district towards north, known as Dandā-Rājpuri in earlier times, is now reduced to a small village situated on the other side of the Rājpuri Creek. Dandā was approached as stated in the Mārāthi text by the ferry at Dighi which can also be seen on the maps.

1 Sheet No. 47 B & F.
SOME MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM GUJARAT

BY DR. Z. A. DESAI

A considerable number of Arabic and Persian inscriptions from Gujarát belonging to different periods of its history have been brought to light in recent years by the Archaeological Survey of India,¹ and quite a few of them have been studied in the past numbers of this Series, such as for example, seventeen epigraphs of the Pre-Muslim or Raiput period,² twenty four of the Pre-Sultanate or Khalji and Tughlaq period³ and fifty of the Sultanate period.⁴ Here it is proposed to study fifteen records, belonging to the time of Akbar and Jahangir, out of a total of about sixty records of the post-Sultanate or the Mughal period.⁵ A few of these do not make an explicit mention of the reigning monarch, but being important in one way or the other, they have also been included.

The findspots of these inscriptions make an interesting study in itself. They belong to places situated almost in all the parts of the present boundaries of Gujarát—Kaḍi and Pāṭan in northern, Māngrol in western, Baroda, Cambay and Sarkhej in central, and Vehrā in southern Gujarát. Again, Pāṭan has the largest number, totalling 7, Cambay and Māngrol coming next with 2 each and the remaining places having 1 each. This is not without interest, corroborating as it does the statement of Professor M. S. Commissariat that as under the Sultanate, also during the Mughal imperial rule, the towns to the north and north-east of Ahmadabād, in the region now represented by the newly created districts of Mēhsānā, Bānās Kānṭhā and Śābar Kānṭhā, play a part in Gujarāt history not less prominent than the perhaps better known towns to the south of the capital.⁶

That these epigraphs constitute an important source for the history of Gujarāt under the early Mughals is too obvious to be emphasised here; they supply, as will be clear from their study in the following lines, important information even in the political field. They indicate, on the other hand, a somewhat larger area of building activities than is generally known. The largest number of these, or to be exact, seven, pertain to the construction or repairs of mosques (along with a tomb in one case). Among other non-secular buildings, the erection of tombs is mentioned in two, while one fragmentary record, now set up at a place other than to which perhaps it originally belonged, is an epitaph. On the secular side, two epigraphs refer to the foundation of a suburb, and one each to the construction of a market-place, a step-well and a fort-gate.

Also, these epigraphs provide new names in the list of local officials and noblemen, supply some new information about their personal and political career, particularly in the matter of dates and contain interesting information about some of the saints, their associates or descendants and the like, which is not to be had from available sources. For example, two of the inscriptions under study name trustees of two famous saintly establishments of Gujarāt—one at Pāṭan and the other at Sarkhej. The inscription set up to commemorate the construction of a market-place

¹ These are listed, as and when found, in the Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy (ARIE).
³ Ibid., 1962, pp. 1-46.
⁴ Ibid., 1963, pp. 5-50; ibid., 1953 and 1954, pp. 49-77.
⁵ A study of eight inscriptions of Shāh Jahan, originally included in this article had to be omitted for want of space. Incidentally, of the post-Shāh Jahan epigraphs, those of Aurangzeb form the largest number.
corresponding perhaps to the agricultural marketing yard of the present days—indicates the efforts on the part of the administration to ensure an equitable dealing to the producer;\(^1\) this incidentally must have also ensured the proper and correct payment of the sales or purchase-levies to the state.

The language of these inscriptions in most cases is Persian. Arabic is employed only in five of them, which pertain to the reign of Akbar. The rest, including five more epigraphs of the time of that monarch are in Persian, mostly in verse. Palaeographically, there is nothing very remarkable about these inscriptions, except that among the scripts represented here, viz. Naskh, Thuluth and Nasta‘liq, we have some specimens of calligraphy of a fairly high order.

The impressions of these epigraphs were obtained, except otherwise stated, in the course of my official tours as well as that of some of my colleagues, to various parts of Gujarat.

Akbar

I. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 982, FROM PĀṬAN (N. G.)

The inked rubbing of this inscription was received in 1961-62 from the then Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Baroda. It seems to have been originally prepared by an officer of the Archaeological Department of the erstwhile Baroda State of which the region (roughly comprising the present Mehsana district) in which Pāṭan, the findspot of the inscription is now situated, formed part.\(^2\)

The loose slab bearing this epigraph was some time back reported to have been lying in the mosque attached to the Tomb of Maulānā Ya’qūb, situated about four hundred metres to the north-west of the famous Sahastralinga Tank outside the town.\(^3\) My efforts to trace it in 1969 proved futile, and on inquiry, I was told that the epigraphical tablet did lie for some time in the mosque but had disappeared a few years back.

Occupying a writing space of about 65 by 24 cms., the three-line Arabic text is executed in Naskh style which is somewhat akin to the style of writing employed in the late Tughluq and early Sultanate records of Gujarat. The writing is affected by weather, and as a result, the letters having lost their prominence of relief, the text is not clearly intelligible in one or two places; particularly the word indicating the nisṭa of the person mentioned therein does not admit of correct decipherment.

The epigraph, apart from quoting the famous Quranic verse occurring in mosque inscriptions records the construction of a mosque and a mausoleum ‘for its master or occupant Sultān Dost Muḥammad Sultān a’n-Najrāvi(?), in 1574, during the reign of emperor Akbar. The text being somewhat ambiguous, it is not possible to say for certain whose mausoleum was constructed, particularly since the tablet was not in situ and it is not known to what building it originally belonged. But very likely, the text seems to indicate that the mausoleum belonged to Dost Muḥammad Sultān who, it may be pointed out, is mentioned as deceased. The text could also

---

\(^1\) That it was so is explicitly stated in an inscription of Shah Jahan’s time omitted from the present study, recording the construction of a gazebo, i.e. a market (ARIE, 1964-65, No. D, 66).


\(^3\) ARIE, 1961-62, No. D, 38. The inscription on the mosque itself is studied in the following lines.
be interpreted to mean that Dost Muhammad Sultân constructed the mosque and the mausoleum of his master or the master of the mosque, but in that case the omission of the name of the latter cannot be explained satisfactorily.

The importance of the record lies in the fact that it is the earliest record of Akbar found so far in Gujarât, which was first conquered by that emperor in 1573. Also, from the tenor of the text, the occupant of the tomb, Dost Muhammad Sultân, who could not be traced in available records, appears to have been a man of consequence, or perhaps a local official.

The text has been deciphered as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XVI (a)*

(1)بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم و ان المسجد قد فلا تدعو مع الله احدًا
(2) فني هذا المسجد لصاحبه دوست محمد سلطان التجراف (؟) تغداه
(3) في عهد السلطان الأعظم المظفر جلال الدين محمد أكبر بانشاد غاذي تاريخه (؟) الثاني

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the name of Allah the Beneficent, the Merciful. 'And verily, the mosques are for Allah only; hence invoke not any one else with Allah'.

(2) This mosque and this dome (i.e. mausoleum) for its occupant (lit. master) Dost Muhammad Sultân an-Najrâvi (?), may Allah cover him with His Forgiveness, were built.

(3) In the reign of the greatest king, the victorious, Jalâlu’d-Dîn Muhammad Akbar Bâdshâh Ghâzi. Its date is second of Rabî’u’l-Awwal year (A. H.) 982 (2 Rabî’ I 982–22 June 1574).

**II. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 985, FROM THE SAME PLACE**

This neatly executed record also comes from Pâtan. The tablet on which it is inscribed, measuring about 125 by 65 cms., was found on the central mihrâb of the Baûrî or Jâmi’ Mosque of Maḥalla Mukhâtwâdâ, by Dr. A. A. Kâdiri, Senior Epigraphical Assistant. More than one third part of the slab is carved with three ornamental ogee-shaped pointed arches, the middle of which is inscribed with the First Creed. The text proper runs into five lines and is composed in Arabic of a somewhat florid and literary style, unlike in the case of most of the epigraphs. The style of writing is Nashâ of quite a pleasant type. Even as the letters are written quite closely and are moreover slightly weather-beaten, the calligraphical effect is picturesque which speaks of the skill of its designer, whose name is unfortunately not mentioned. Incidentally, there appears to have crept in a couple of orthographical mistakes in the execution of the text.

The inscription records the construction of a mosque in 1577, by Saiûba Bâni, wife of Khwâja Khalîlu’llâh. The latter is stated in the text to have descended from Ḥadrat ‘Abdu’llâh bin Jarîr

1 Qur’a’n, Chapter LXXII, verse 18.
2 *ARIE*, 1960-61, No. D. 64.
3 In view of the fact that a large number of Pâtan inscriptions are not in situ, it is difficult to say if it is the same mosque on which the epigraph now occurs that was constructed.
a’l-Lāghi al-Bajaltī, who is described as one of the closest Companions of the Holy Prophet. The Khwāja is further mentioned in the text to have been, at the time of the construction of the mosque, the governor of Pāṭan. The array of titles used for emperor Akbar is worth notice. Such titles, which occur in the early Delhi Sultanate inscriptions, are found in quite a few epigraphs of Akbar pertaining to the early part of his reign.¹

The epigraph has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XVI (b)*

(a) **Under the middle arch.**

لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(b) **Below the above.**

(1) يسمع الله الرحمن الرحيم ونبا تقبل منا التك التي السبع العلم قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من بني مسجدنا بني الله له بنيا في الجنة قد بنيت هذه البيعة المسمى في عصر السلطان الأعظم والشاه الأكرم ملك رقاب ام (الامام) طاعة

(2) سلطان الهند و العجم صاحب التاج و العلم تقب الله تعالى على العالم الذي قيل في حقه عدل ساعة منه يعمل الثقلين يوزا جلال الدين محمد أكبر بأداء الغازى خالد الله ملكه العفيفة الصالحة الكريمة المجانية فاطمة النوران ذي (ق) طاعة

(3) انت سليمان في ضيوف الله السفيرة بناء هذا البلع إلى ثواب الله الجلي والرائجه إلى عفو الله الملك الصالح بانو منفوج خالد الله وهو من أولاد من هو احباح الصحابة للرسول العربي عبد الله بن جرير الشهير البعل

(4) في الخامس عشر من شهر ربيع الأول سنة خمس وثمانين وسبع من الهجرية و كان خالد الله المشاهير الهادى ها حاكما و عاملا من العظمة على في هذه البلدة المشهورة به فنحضا الله تعالى

(5) عن الفتى في السنة المذكورة المحمد بن بكره يتم البالغات (2) و بعدها جمل

هذا العمل من البابيات الصالحات كما قال الله عزوجل و البابيات الصالحات خير عند ربنا تموابا و غير إملا

**TRANSLATION**

(a) **First Creed.**

¹Cf. *El.APS*, 1909, pp. 54, 63, 67, 68, etc.
MUGHAL INScriptions FROM GUJARAT

AKBAR

(a) Inscription, dated A. H. 982, from Pātān (p. 65)

(b) Record, dated A. H. 983, same place (p. 66)
(b) (1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful. ‘O Our Lord, accept (this) of us; verily, Thou art the Hearer, the Knower’. The Prophet, may Allāh’s salutations and blessings be upon him, has said, ‘He who builds a mosque for Allāh, Allāh builds for him a house in Paradise’. This auspicious edifice was built in the reign of the greatest Sultan and the most noble king, lord of the necks of nations,

(2) the monarch of Arabia and ‘Ajam, master of the crown and the banner, the shadow of the Exalted Allāh on the earth, in respect of whom it has been said that justice done (by such a king) for a short while is equivalent to the (good) action of both the worlds (namely) Jalālūd-Dīn Muḥammad Akbar Bádshāh al-Ghāzi, may Allāh perpetuate his kingdom, by the chaste, the pious, the noble and the benevolent lady, the Fāṭima, among the women (of the world) who is in the servitude of

(3) Allāh, the Mary of the age aspiring for the pleasure of Allāh, one who intends to seek, by the construction of this edifice, merit from the Manifest Allāh, and the hopeful of the pardon of the Great Allāh, Šāliḥa Bānū, wife of Khwāja Khallīlūl-Allāh who is descended from one of the most beloved Companions of the Arabian Prophet, ‘Abdu’llāh son of Jarir a’l-Līshī a’l-Bajallī,

(4) on the 15th of the month of Rabī ‘u’l-Awwal, of the year five and eighty and nine hundred from the Migration (15 Rabī’I 985–2 June 1577). And the aforementioned Khwāja Khallīlūl-Allāh was the governor and the ‘Āmil (i.e. Agent) appointed from the exalted court for this town, better known as Patan, may the Exalted Allāh protect it

(5) from mischief, in the said year. Praise be to Allāh that through his grace this merit (!) was achieved and with His bounty this action became one of the enduring charitable deeds, as the Exalted and Glorified Allāh has said, ‘And the ever-abiding, the good works, are better with your Lord in reward and better in expectation’.

This epigraph is one of the very few records pertaining to women. Also, it furnishes an interesting piece of information about the pedigree of the builder’s husband, and supplies material for local history, disclosing as it does, one important link in the chain of local officials. The name of Khwāja Khallīlūl-Allāh is not met with in the annals of the period, not even in the Mīrū’d-i-Aḥmadī, which is somewhat surprising, for Patan even after it ceased to be the capital of Gujarāt in the Sultanate period, continued to be an important place, to which generally, men of sufficient prominence were appointed. Khwāja Khallīlūl-Allāh who thus appears to have been one of the notable men of his time, held Patan at least in 1577, the date of the record.

According to the text, the Khwāja’s ancestor ‘Abdu’llāh bin Jarir al-Līshī al-Bajallī had the distinction of being a companion of the Holy Prophet. Now the doyen of Traditionists Imām Abū Ismā’īl Muḥammad Bukhārī (d. A.H. 256) mentions Jarir son of ‘Abdu’llāh al-Bajallī among the Companions of the Prophet and devotes a small section to him. Subsequent writers, like ‘Abdu’l-Karīm Sam‘ānī (d. A.H. 562) and Haṣṣa Saftī al-Dīn al-A王者荣耀 (tenth century A.H.), also call him Jarir bin ‘Abdu’llāh. But our epigraph calls him ‘Abdu’llāh son of Jarir. It is

---

1 Qur’ān, Chapter II, verse 127.
2 Daughter of Prophet Muhammad.
3 Qur’ān, Chapter XVII, part of verse 46.
6 Haṣṣa Saftī al-Dīn al-A王者荣耀, Tadbiru’l-Šahābī, Kansūl asābīr-Biyāh (Cairo, A.H. 1301), p. 61. I was able to consult these works through the kindness of Maulāna Sayyid Aḥmad of the Madrasa Madinatul-‘Ulūm, Nagpur, to whom I am extremely grateful.
difficult to say which of the text is corrupt, though the possibility that Abdullāh had also a son named Jarīr who was, like his father, a companion of the Prophet cannot be ruled out. But Sam'ānī's account indicates that the one mentioned by him is Khalīlullāh's ancestor, as his account corroborates the statement of the epigraph that he was one of the loving companions of the Prophet.1

III. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1006, FROM THE SAME PLACE

This inscription is from the tomb of one of the most celebrated exponents of the science of Tradition—Hadith literature—that India has produced, namely Shaikh Muḥammad son of Tāhir of Pātān. It is engraved horizontally in four lines on a tablet measuring 83 by 25 cms. The tablet is fixed over the doorway of the Shaikh's Tomb situated in a large enclosure, on the outskirts of Pātān, just without the Khaṇ Sarovar Gāte.2 The record which is in Persian verse is incomplete, and it appears that some part of the tablet, on the left side, which contained the remaining portion of the text, is now missing.3

The metrical record is composed by Radī and states that the construction of the tomb of Shaikh Muhammad Tāhir who rendered yeomen services to the cause of the Hadith literature took place in 1597-98 and that the Shaikh had expired on the 6th December 1578. As part of the text is missing, the person who constructed the mausoleum cannot be made out. The style of writing is Nāshī of a fairly good type, but the overall effect is not equally pleasing as the alignment and arrangement are not quite perfect. The quality of verse is mediocre.

Shaikh Jamālūd-Din Muḥammad, entitled Maliku'l-Muhaddithīn (lit. Prince among the Traditionists), was celebrated throughout the Islamic world as an eminent Traditionist. Originally born of Bohrā parents, he was a great zealot for orthodoxy in religion. Born in A.H. 911 (1508 A.D.), he went to Hijāz at the age of thirty, after completing his education in India, and pursued higher studies particularly in the science of Tradition under great savants like Shaikh ʿAlī Muttaqī and others. On his return to India, he zealously took up the cause of introducing religious reforms in his community and was killed on his way to Delhi to see emperor Akbar to seek his promised intervention and help in the matter. He also made great efforts for the spread of education, and being a man of substantial means, even helped deserving students with board, lodge and incidental expenses. He compiled a number of books on the science of Tradition, the most important of which, the voluminous Majma'utu Bilādīl-Anwa, purporting to be an exhaustive dictionary of both the Hadith and the Qur'ān, has been judged by competent critics to have 'almost eclipsed all the previous works of its kind'.4

The text of the inscription runs as follows:

TEXT

Plate XVII (c)

(1) روضة رباني خير خير
(2) تاكس إعلام طغاة شرير

1 Sam'ānī, op. cit.
3 As far as it can be judged, about one third of the slab is missing.
4 M. G. Zubairi Aqmad, The Contribution of India to Arabic Literature (Allahabad, about 1946), pp. 43-44, 52, 153, 254, 403, where a complete list of the Shaikh's works as well as references to books containing his account will be found. To the latter may be added, ʿĀṣim Abul-Ḥayy, Tād 'Iyyām in Urdu (Lucknow, 1926), pp. 55-56 and Nizāmān Muḥaddith in Arabic, part IV (Hyderabad, 1954), pp. 298-301. His biography entitled Tażā'īr Abul-Ḥayyān Muḥammad bin Tāhir by 'Abdu'l-Wahhāb has been published by 'udwānāl-Muṣannīn (Delhi, in 1946), but I have not seen it.
(1) The good and divine mausoleum of the learned, the revealer of the secrets of the Bringer of good news and the Warner (i.e. Prophet Muhammad),
the upholder of the standards of the Tradition of the Guide, the humbler of the banners of the mischievous rebels,

he whom Divine Decree

(2) with pleasure be drank the cup (of death) (and) left for the sightseeing of the great (i.e. the other) world.

On the sixth of Shawwāl he was honoured with rank and position in the kingdom of eternity like the resplendent full moon.

He is Shaikh Muhammad, son of Tahir, the maim.

(3) "And he is a Martyr, a Martyr, a Martyr"—(A.H.) 986 (6 Shawwāl 986-6 December 1578)—in this regard there is no denying the fact.

For the auspicious date of (construction of) this mausoleum, take (the words) 'the gate of Divine pleasure' (A.H.) 1006 (1597-98) from the garden of Paradise.
(4) O Ṛḍi, if you sincerely pay attention (i.e. desire), the obliging Munificent (Allāh) will certainly help.

The dates for the two events as described above are given both in figures as well as in chronograms.

IV. FRAGMENTARY EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 991, FROM BAROḍĀ

The arch-shaped tablet measuring 53 cms. from apex to bottom and 35 cms. in width, on both sides of which this fragmentary but interesting epitaph is engraved in relief, was found by me in 1959 at the head of a grave in the courtyard of the Jāmi’ Mosque of the famous city of Baroḍā.¹

The chief importance of the record lies in the fact that it has now been proved to be the epitaph of the famous Muḥājir nobleman and official Nawwāb Quṭb-ud-Dīn Muḥammad Khān, youngest brother of emperor Akbar’s foster-father Shamsu’d-Dīn Ataga Khān, who was governor of Baroḍā and Brouch and was murdered by the orders of Sulṭān Muẓaffar III of Gujarāt in 1583.² There should be little doubt that the tablet is not in situ, for it must have been originally set up at the head of the grave of the Nawwāb who lies buried at Baroḍā itself in a grandiose mausoleum, situated at Danteshwar on the road leading to the Makarpurā palace of the Mahārājā of Baroḍā. The mausoleum, locally called Hajira—corruption of Haṣira—is a massive brick structure octagonal on plan, built on an elevated platform, and is perhaps the only impressive extant Muslim monument of the city.³ It would be interesting to know when and why was the tablet detached from the Nawwāb’s grave and how did it come to be fixed at the present place.

As the tablet is built up into the ground, it is difficult to ascertain if there was some inscribed portion thereof at the bottom, and if so it is missing or is underground. It is possible that the slab had already broken when it was brought and fixed up in the ground in the Jāmi’ Mosque. In its present state, at least one fourth of the tablet is missing.

As stated above, the record is inscribed on both the sides, the text on each side comprising a Quranic verse between the bordered arch and a two-verse Persian Fragment in the two vertical borders. Like the Quranic texts, the two Fragments are incomplete, but their meaning is quite clear; each purports to give a chronogram for the martyrdom of the Nawwāb. In one of them, the full name Quṭb-ud-Dīn Muḥammad has survived, while in the other, the title Nawwāb and the word Quṭb (lit pivot) are extant. These as well as the date of martyrdom, which according to the two chronograms, was A.H. 991 (1583 A.D.) leaves no room whatsoever for doubt that the epitaph relates to none other than Nawwāb Quṭb-ud-Dīn Muḥammad Khān. It will be noted that it was this very year in which the last Gujarāt Sulṭān Muẓaffar III was able to regain, albeit temporarily, his throne.⁴

The calligraphy of the record is of a very high order, the text having been written in different scripts. The religious text is inscribed partly in plain Naṣīḥ and partly in plain Tughrā or Tughrā-i-Maḥūs, while the versified historical text is executed in pleasing Naṣṭāliq.

³ Commissariat, op. cit., pp. 21-22 and plate facing page 36.
⁴ Ibid., p. 19.
The text on the obverse of the slab reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XVIII (b)*

(a) *In the border.*

(i) *At the apex:*

(ب) 

(ii) *Right and left sides:*

اَلْقَ파 قَطْبُ دِينِ مُحَمَّدٍ خَان

[بُشْهَادَتِ وَسَيِّدِ كَرِمٍ وَقِيمٍ]

(b) *In the middle.*

(i) *Within the arch:*

لاَ إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ مُحَمَّدٍ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ

(ii) *Below it:*

(1) بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

(2) شَهِدَ اللَّهُ أَنِّي لَأَلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ الْحَقُّ الْعَارِضُ الْحَكِيمُ

(3) فَإِنْ أَنتُمْ رَأَيْتُوْنَهُ كَثِيرًا لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ الْعَزِيزُ الْحَكِيمُ

**TRANSLATION**

(a) i. Allâh.

ii. By the Divine decree, QuÔb-i-Din (i.e. QuÔbû’-Dûn) MuÔhammad Khân, that...

ii. *By the Divine decree, QuÔbû’-Dûn Muhammad Khân,*

(b) i. There is no god except Allâh. MuÔhammad is the Prophet of Allâh.

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

(2) ‘Allâh bears witness that there is no god but He, and (so do) the angels and those possessed of knowledge, being maintainer of justice; there is no god, but He, the Mighty, the Wise.

(3) [Surely, the true religion with Allâh is Islâm and those to whom the book had been given did not show opposition but after knowledge had come to them out of envy among themselves].

It appears that one more inscribed panel after this which probably contained the remaining *Qur'anic text* (supplied in the translation) is missing.

QurÔan, Chapter III verses 17 and part of 18.
The text on the reverse reads as under:—

TEXT

Plate XVIII(a)

(a) In the border.

(i) At the apex:

(ii) Right and left sides:

(b) In the middle.

(i) Within the arch:

(ii) Below it:

TRANSLATION

(a) i. Allah.

ii. When sedition encompassed everything (like an ocean), the Nawwâb became immersed in

"Call me 'the Qiyâf (pole-star) of the sphere of martyrdom'."

(b) i. And He is the Witness and the Witnessed.

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

(2) He is Allah besides whom there is no god, the Knower of

(3) [the Unseen and the Seen. He is the Beneficent, the Merciful].

V. INSCRIPTION, ALSO DATED A.H. 991, FROM KÂĐI

This epigraph, which pertains to the time of another famous Mughal official who was viceroy of Gujarât for some time, namely Shihâb Khân, surprisingly omits any reference to the Mughal

---

1. One more inscribed panel after this which must have contained the remaining part of the Qur'ânic text (supplied in the translation) is missing.

2. Qur'da, Chapter LIX, verse 22.
emperor. The inscriptive tablet is of white marble and measures 85 by 45 cms. It was originally set up on the Jamʿi Mosque of the town of Kādī in Mōsānā district, but seems to have been detached when the mosque was rebuilt in 1957; it was still lying loose when I had its impression taken in 1964.¹

Kādī now divested of any importance seems to have been an important strategic place in old days, particularly during the Muslim period. Unfortunately, all its early monuments have since disappeared, except the small but imposing citadel built by Nawwāb Murtaḍā Khān Bukhārī in A.H. 1018, that is to say in the time of emporor Jahāngīr according to its inscription.² The earliest Muslim epigraphical record in the town noted so far is of the time of Fīrūz Tughluq.³

The epigraph, which consists of four Persian verses, states that a mosque was built in the ḫwiṭṣ of Kārī (i.e. Kādī) in 1583-84.⁴ in the time of the great Khān Shihāb Khān. The year of construction is given both in figure as well as in a chronogram. There is no indication in the text about the name of the builder. As to Shihāb Khān, he is none other than Shihābū' d-Dīn Aḥmad Khān, a noble of great abilities and reputation who replaced Wazīr Khān as the viceroy of the province towards the end of 1577 and continued in the post till 1583. The month of the year not being specified, it is not known in what part of that year the construction took place, but it may be of interest to know that it was to Kādī, the findspot of the inscription under study, where Shihāb Khān had repaired, on his recall as viceroy and en route to the royal court, towards the end of A.H. 991 and it was at this place that he was prevailed upon by the new viceroy, I'īmād Khān to assist him against Sultān Muḥammad III who had already entered Aḥmadābād. Shihāb Khān, a capable administrator and a revenue expert, has gone down in the history of Gujarāt as one of its best Mughal viceroys. He is stated to have constructed or repaired and strengthened in all about eighty forts at different strategic places in the province. He died at Ujjain in 1590.⁵

The text is executed in a fair Nastaʾīq and reads as under:—

TEXT

Plate XVII (c)

(1) در عهد خان مکرم صاحب آئین شاہ منیر
(2) تعمیر یاقت مستقل از خطہ کری
(3) کرم کہ کرم کہ کرم کے قداری سال اور
(4) ز اہاد اور آگر نشمی پنج بیک

سلہ 1991

TRANSLATION

(1) In the time of the munificent Khān, Shihāb Khān, by whom the affairs of the community and the religion were properly conducted,

² Ibid., No. D, 33. It was published in G. Yatround and R. C. Gyanī, Muslim Inscriptions in Baroda State (Baroda, 1944), pp. 8-10. Also see Commissariat, op. cit., pp. 46-47.
⁴ For the connotation of this term, please see EIAPS, 1968, p. 10.
⁵ Only first three days of the year 1584 fell in A. H. 991 which ended on 2nd January, 1584.
⁶ For an account of his career, see Shih Nawār Khān, op. cit., vol. II (Calcutta, 1890), pp. 867-70; Blochmann, op. cit., pp. 332-33; Commissariat, op. cit., pp. 11-15, 17-19.
(2) A mosque was constructed in the khitā of Ka’rī (which), like Ka’ba, has become the place of prostration for the high and the low.

(3) When I pondered to find out the date of its construction, my pen became musk-coloured by (writing) this firm text:

(4) *If your do not take into account its first digits except 1, Wisdom says (that the words) the Jāmi’ Mosque was completed (will afford the date).

(5) Year (A.H.) 991 (1583-84 A.D.).

The date, as will be seen above, is afforded by the chronogram contained in the last couplet, yielding A.H. 991, which is also inscribed in figure. The ingenuity of the chronogram, whose composer has chosen to remain anonymous, lies in the fact that the date will be worked out only if its letters having the numerical values represented by the first digits other than 1, i.e. 2 to 9, are omitted in reckoning.

VI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 994, FROM CAMBAY

Cambay, the findspot of the inscription under study, was the capital of the erstwhile State of the same name and is, now, a Taluka headquarters in the Kairā district. It was a flourishing commercial emporium and a world-mart in the 14th century and also the Sultanate and the post-Sultanate periods.

The inscriptive tablet measuring 122 by 35 cms. is reported to have been fixed on the Three Gates of the town, which like its more famous counterpart in Ahmadābād, opens out into the business thoroughfare. The record is quite interesting in that it refers to the construction of a ‘beautiful and wonderfully planned’ market-place (sāq) which was completed in 1583-86 in the reign of emperor Akbar. It is difficult to say if the original market exists or not. Very probably, it does not. From its brief description contained in the text it seems to have comprised a number of shops. Also of interest is the reference, by implication, in the text, to the custom of decorating the market with silk and brocade evidently to attract the customers. Though not specifically mentioned so in the text, the market seems to have been constructed by the government. The year of construction is given both in the figure as well as by a chronogram.

The text of the epigraph comprises three Persian verses of a fairly high order which are inscribed vertically on the slab in Nasta’liq characters of a fairly pleasing type and read as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XVII (b)*

(a) Right vertical panels.

[Characters from the slab]

---

1 See foot-note 5, on p. 73.
3 ARIE, 1964-55, No. C, 43. Its inked rubbing was received from the office of the Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Baroda.
4 This market must have been on the pattern of the Iranān Bazār of Tehrān, Isfahān, etc.
(b) Middle vertical panels.

چہ مرغوب قلوب آمد چہ حاجہ یار عطر پیاراندے و دیا

(c) Left vertical panels.

شمار تاریخ اس مکان زمین زد عمراتها عجب و سوق زیبا

TRANSLATION

(a) (1) In the time of the king Akbar, was completed
    (2) a heart-ravishing market of marvellous plan.

(b) (1) Since it has (already) captivated (the) heart (of everybody), what is the need
    (2) of adorning it with silk and brocade?

(c) (1) Wisdom wrote down the date of its completion (in the words):
    (2) Wonderful buildings and a beautiful market (A.H.) 994 (1585-86 A.D.).

VII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 996, FROM PĀTAN

This is one of the few inscriptions which give some more detailed purport than is generally met with in the Arabic and Persian inscriptions of India. The epigraphical tablet measuring 95 by 40 cms. is fixed over the central mihrāb of the mosque situated in the compound of the saint Makhdūm Husām-ud-Dīn Mūlānī (d. A.H. 738), one of the eminent disciples of the celebrated Ḥaḍrat Nizām-ud-Dīn Auliya of Delhi, and contains eight lines of closely written text in Arabic which furnishes the information that the renovation of the mosque— for that is evidently intended by the words 'this place' in the text, which begins with the famous religious formula usually occurring in mosque inscriptions—inside the enclosure of the Dargah of the pious Shaikh and holy Imām, namely Husām-ud-Dīn, who expired in A.H. 736 (1336 A.D.)—was carried out in 1588 by the orders of the able and brave Sayyid and the magnificent chief, Sayyid Qasim son of Sayyid Mahmūd, under the supervision of Manjila, son of Jalāl Bahlīm. The last-mentioned is spoken of in the text as an old retainer or attendant of the Sayyid. Reference is also made in the text to the fact that the saint was a spiritual successor of the celebrated Ḥaḍrat Nizām-ud-Dīn Auliya of Delhi. It further states that the work was undertaken at the suggestion of Ḥāfiz Shaikh Kabir Muhammad son of Isḥāq, the hereditary trustee of the place, the latter having been advised in a dream by the Makhdūm (i.e. the saint) to have it renovated. The Arabic text is stated to have been composed by ‘Abdul-Lāṭif son of Abul-Qasim an-Nāgauri (i.e. of Nāgaur) al-Ansārī, and inscribed by ‘Abdul-Qādir son of ‘Abdul-Lāṭif. That the scribe and the composer are not son and father, as may otherwise be suggested.


2 The mosque was originally built, according to the inscription now appearing over its left mihrāb, in 1495 during the reign of Sulṭān Mahmūd I of Gujarāt (ibid., No. C, 91 and EIAPS, 1958, p. 35, pl. Xa).


4 The epitaph of Sayyid Mahmūd may still be seen at Majhera in Muzaffarnagar district of Uttar Pradesh (see ARIE, 1952-53, No. D, 392).
by the name 'Abdu'l-Laṣṭīf, is clear from another inscription from Pāṭan studied in the following lines (p. 82, infra), where his full name is given as 'Abdu'l-Qādir son of 'Abdu'l-Laṣṭīf al-Yamani.

The inscription thus provides quite useful information, particularly in regard to the hereditary trustee and attendant of the shrine of the saint; this is all the more important as this type of information is not generally available from any source other than the Pedigree-Trees (ahjārā) which are generally frowned upon as unreliable by historians. That these Pedigree-Trees are not unreliable is proved by the present epigraph also.¹ In the Family-Tree supplied by the present Sajjāda of the saint, Mr. Shujā'ud-Dīn Fārūqī, M.A., B.T., who is seventeenth in line from the saint, the names of Muḥammad Iḥṣāq and Kabiru'd-Dīn occur as the fifth and sixth descendants. Our epigraph, while corroborating the Tree, however, gives the correct names as Kabir Muḥammad and Iḥṣāq respectively.

As to Sayyid Qāsim, who belonged to the Bārha Sayyid family, that came into greater prominence some time later, he took a leading part in the conquest of Gujarāt by Akbar and also during the early critical years of Muḥgal rule in the province.² Our record also speaks of an old retainer of his, Manjīla son of Jalāl, whose clan-name was Bahīm. Nothing is known about him as also about the composer of the text and the one who inscribed it. The composer appears to have been well-versed in Arabic language, but the same cannot be said about the calligraphical skill of the scribe. The calligraphy is of no particular merit, the style of writing being Nasīḥ.

The text has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate XIX (b)

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم قال الله تعالى لنا يعمر مساجد الله من آمن بآله و اليوم الآخر

الله و قال عليه السلام من يئذ من الله تعالى بنيت في الجنة صدق رسول الله

(2) قد جحد في ها هذه البقعة بويعة له في الروضة العذيمة للشيخ البتاى والأمام البتاى الذي

قيل في تاريخ وصالخ صاحب الكشف حسام الدين وهو خليفة سلطان الشهاب نظام

(3) الجملة و الدين الجشتي قدس الله تعالى ارواحهم بأمر السيد الأكرم الشهيج و الامير

المعظم الرفع الطالب بأعمال البر ذات واجب الوجود

(4) سيد قاسم بن سيد مجود مع الله المسلمين بطول سنة اتهجا لذراعه تعالى و باستعمال

من له في أمر الدولة ولاية كاملة و من عضرة المخدر له في هذا الأمر اشارة

(5) بهاءة و عليه اثار العناية و التعطف منه ظاهرة إلا و هو الشيخ الحافظ خادم هذئ

الروضة ايا عن جد بالصد و الاستحقاق الشيخ الأوحد الشيخ كبير محمد بن إسحاق و باهتم

¹ It will be recalled that in a similar case, the correctness of two steps in the Pedigree-Tree of the present Sajjāda of Qādir Hamidu'd-Dīn Nāgauri was established by a couple of epigraphs at Nāgaur (cf. EIAPS, 1961, p.35 and f.n.1).
² For details of his career, please see Shah Nawāz Khān, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 377-78, 400-10; 'All Muḥammad Khān, op. cit., part I (Baroda, 1928), pp. 154, 175, 176; Blochmann, op. cit., p. 461, No. 105, etc.
(a) Inscription, dated A. H. 1009, from Cambay (p. 84)

(b) Epigraph, dated A. H. 996, from Pāṭan (p. 76)
(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful. The exalted Allāh says, 'Only he shall visit the mosques of Allāh, who believes in Allāh and in the Final Day (i.e. the day of Judgement)—(to the end of) the verse '. And (the Prophet), may (Allāh's) peace be upon him, has said, 'He who builds for Allāh, a mosque, Allāh builds for him a house in Paradise '. Verily, the Prophet of Allāh has spoken the truth.

(2) Renovated was, in all its spaciousness, the structure of this edifice situated in the eminent Mausoleum of the excellent Shaikh and the pious Imām, for the date of whose death it is said (i.e. is obtained from the words) 'Master of inspiration, Husamud-Din' who was the spiritual successor of Sultānul-Muqālik Nizām-

(3) u'l-Milat wa'd-Din al-Qishy, may the Exalted Allāh sanctify their souls, by the order of the brave and munificent Sayyid and the lofty and magnificent nobleman, one who seeks through good deeds the Essence of the Self-Existent Lord,

(4) (namely), Sayyid Qāsim son of Malmud, may Allāh benefit the Muslims through his long life. (This he did) for the sake of obtaining the pleasure of the Exalted Allāh, at the suggestion of one who wields perfect authority in the matter of guardianship (of the shrine) and who had received a clear indication from the presence of the Master (i.e. the saint) in this matter

(5) and who enjoys manifest traces of kindness and favours from him, (namely) the Shaikh who is Ḥāfez (i.e. one who knows the Qur'ān by heart), the hereditary attendant of this Shrine by his own exertion and right, the unique Shaikh Kabir Muḥammad son of Iṣḥāq, and under the superintendence

(6) of one who is the most trustworthy and moderate among men, and old retainer of the generous Sayyid, namely Manjula son of Jalāl Bahārīn, may Allāh accept (this good deed) from all of them. The author of this

(7) text is the one who is dependant upon the Protecting and Omnipotent (Allāh), 'Abdu'l-Laṭīf, son of Abīl-Qāsim son of 'Abdul-Laṭīf an-Nāgaurī, al-Ansārī, may Allāh forgive him and his forefathers, all of them. On the second of the auspicious month of Ramadān, year (A.H.) six and ninety and nine hundred (2 Ramadān 996=16 July 1533).

(8) This was written by the weak creature 'Abdu'l-Qādir son of 'Abdu'l-Laṭīf.

---

1 The name of the father is written in very minute hand below these words.
2 Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verse 18. Incidentally, it is somewhat unusual that the Qur'anic verse be not fully inscribed but it has been indicated to be taken as granted through the words al-dyn, i.e. ( till the end of the verse—an equivalent of etc., etc.)
This epigraph, recording the construction of a mosque by the same Sayyid Qāsim Bārha, is from the mosque situated in the enclosure of the Dargāh of Maulānā Ya'qūb, popularly known as Maulānā Maḥbul, referred to above.¹ The tablet on which it is inscribed measures 1.30 m. by 30 cms. and is fixed above the central miḥrāb.²

The record consists of five lines of writing in Arabic execute in fairly good Naskh characters, the calligraphy resembling, to quite some extent, that of the inscription dated A.H. 982 studied above (No. I). It states that the blessed mosque in the Dargāh of the great saint and pole-star, namely Ya'qūb, was built in 1590, by Sayyid Qāsim, son of Sayyid Maḥmūd al-Husainī, a resident of Bārha. The inscription also furnishes this information about the saint that he was an attendant (Khālim) i.e. a disciple of Shaikh Zainu’l-Dīn, a spiritual successor of Shaikh Burhānu’l-Dīn who was in his turn the spiritual successor of Haḍrat Nizāmu’l-Dīn Chishti.

**TEXT**

*Plate XX (b)*

¹ For an account of the saint, see Faḍl Aḥmad, op. cit., pp. 121-22; 'Ali Muḥammad Khān, op. cit., Supplementary, p. 114.
² *ARIE*, 1954-55, No. C, 102. The mosque has on its northern mīhrāb another epigraph which comprises religious text (Qur’an, Chapter LXXII, verse 18), executed in beautiful Ta’lli characters *ibid.*, No. C. 103.)
(1) In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful. The Exalted Allāh has said, 'Only he shall visit the mosques of Allāh who believes in Allāh and in the Final Day (i.e. the Day of Judgement) - (to the end of) the verse'. And (the Prophet), may peace be upon him, has said, 'He who builds for Allāh, a mosque, Allāh builds for him a house in Paradise'. Verily, this auspicious mosque in the enclosed (lit. guarded) resting place

(2) of the Quṭb (lit. pole-star), who is learned in divinity, the Ghaouth (lit. rescuer)⁵ and the divine gnostic, the date of whose death can be extracted from what the Chosen (Prophet), may Allāh's salutations and peace and also those of the Creation be on him, entitled him in the incident of His Holiness Shaikh Ḥakkāk, the (chief of) the Prophet's Sanctuary at Madīnah—

(3) may on its residents be (Allāh's) blessings—may his honoured secret be sanctified (by saying), 'What? Are you asking about Ya'qūb? He is liked and loved by me',⁶ and who (i.e. Ya’qūb), may his honoured secret be sanctified, was the servant (Khādīm) of Shaikh Zainūl-Ḥaq wa’d-Dīn, the spiritual successor (Khālīfa) of

(4) Shaikh Burhānūl-Ḥaq wa’d-Dīn, the spiritual successor of Sulṭānūl-(Matā’al, the beloved of Allāh, Shaikh Nizāmūl-Millah wa’d-Dīn al-Ǧīḥṣī, was built by the most munificent and brave Sayyid

(5) and the most magnificent and pious Sayyid, spreader of justice and bounty, provider of munificence and gift, the seekor, through his good actions, of the Essence of his Nourisher and his Protecting Creator, Abūl-Maṣūm, the (lit. Father of virtues) Sayyid Qāsim, son of the loving and the lovable Sayyid Maḥmūd al-Husaini, inhabitant of Bārha, may the favours of the Truth, (i.e. God), worthy of worship, be showed upon him, in the year (A.H.) nine and ninety and nine hundred, in the month of Muṭarram (Muṭarram 999=October-November 1590 A.D.)

(6) Allāh, accept (this).

The importance of this epigraph is considerable. It furnishes some new and also supplementary information about the saint as well as the builder, who are otherwise quite well known. For example, about Sayyid Qāsim, it provides an important piece of information that he was a Ḥusainī Sayyid;⁷ it also calls him Abūl-Maṣūm, which must have been his kunya, and it specifically states that he was an inhabitant or resident (ṣākīn) of Bārha. The etymology of this word which has more or less come to signify the clean-name is uncertain and a satisfactory meaning or connotation of the term has yet to be found.⁸ Though unfortunately our epigraph does not provide any explicit answer to this controversial question, it does provide valuable indication which restricts the sphere of etymological derivations to only one, viz. that the term Bārha has nothing to do with bāḥīr meaning outside or bārāh imān i.e. the twelve Imāns of the Shi’as, or ʿabd meaning pious,⁹ but it has a geographical connotation. Of course, whether

---

1 Qur'an, Chapter IX, verse 18. Also see foot-note on page 77, supra.
2 In Ṣufi hagiography, a Quṭb occupies the first place and a sūṭh the second.
3 This phrase—alvese variation of the hemistich from an'Arabic Qaṣida—purporting to be the words used by the Prophet about Maulānā Ya’qūb, as well be explained presently, constitutes the chronogram for the date of his death.
4 The claim of Sayyid Maḥmūd to be a Sayyid-i.e. descendant of the Holy Prophet was not accepted beyond any doubt in his own life time, as is evident from the incident related by emperor Jahāngīr (Jahangīr, Tūrāk-i-Jahāngīrī, Aligarh, 1864, p. 266). Cf. Blochmann, op. cit., p. 425.
6 Blochmann, op. cit., pp. 425, 429, where the etymology has been discussed at some length,
the term represents a village or a region, it is not clear beyond doubt, but very likely the term as used in the epigraph might be taken to indicate a village rather than region.3

Secondly, the inscription helps to clear up some confusion that seems to prevail about the identity of Maulānā Yāqūb. Perhaps, the earliest account of the saint is contained in the Taḥkīrāt-i-Husāmiyya composed in Persian in A.H. 855, hardly fifty-five years after his death by one Ḥusām son of Ṣādiq whose main object was to make available to the Indian admirers and disciples of the saint a Persian translation of the Qaṣida-i-Hakīkīyya which Shaikh Ḥakkāk of Madina had composed in Arabic, describing the extent of Prophet’s love for Maulānā Yāqūb as communicated to him by the Prophet himself— as will be elucidated presently.

Among the hagiological works available to me, the earliest reference to him and a somewhat detailed account of his to be found is in Muḥammad Ghaṭūth’s hitherto unpublished Gulūr-i-Abrār composed about two decades after the date of the epigraph under study. According to this account, the saint entitled Tajū’d-Dīn died in A.H. 789,3 which is evidently wrong as our epigraph and other sources place his death in A.H. 800. His brief account in the Mu’ūṭāt-i-Aḥmadi seems to have been taken from an earlier work on the subject.3 But unfortunately, in the Baroda edition of that work, there is confusion about the year of the saint’s death, stated to be A.H. 890 in words, while the chronogram quoted yields A.H. 800.4 A somewhat fuller account of the saint is contained in a modern work on the saints of Deccan, where the details including the date of the death (given in figure as well as by quoting the same chronogram as given in the Miḥī’at-i-Aḥmadi) are factually correct.5 Our epigraph, which quotes an altogether different chronogram, now establishes beyond doubt that the saint had expired in A.H. 800, which fits in with the fact, mentioned in the inscription as well as the last mentioned two works, that he was a disciple of the fourteenth century saint, Shaikh Zaīnu’d-Dīn of Daulatbād.

It will be observed that while seeking to give the chronographic phrase for the saint’s death, the text makes a reference to what the Prophet himself conveyed to Shaikh Ḥakkāk, a constant attendant of the shrine at Madina, about his feeling for Maulānā Yāqūb; this communication— Ya’qūb, huwa mahbūb wa ma’ṣūrī (i.e. What? Are you asking about Ya’qūb?) He is liked and loved by me—forms the chronogram, yielding A.H. 800. This episode in the life of the saint wherein he was recommended to Shaikh Ḥakkāk by the Prophet himself, forms the subject of an Arabic Qaṣida composed by the said Shaikh and may be briefly described here: Maulānā Yāqūb in the course of his travel to the holy cities met at Zabīd, Shaikh Ismā’īl al-Jabrāti,

1 Blochmann’s following comments are still true to day: A more exhaustive History of the Sādāt-i-Tāhā, based upon the Muhammadan Historians of India—now so accessible—and complete from inscriptions remains and other documents still in possession of the clan, would be a most welcome contribution to Indian History— (Blochmann, op. cit., p. 431, f. n. 2).
2 Fāḍl Ahmad, op. cit., p. 121. In another place, Ghaṭūth mentions Sayyid Tajū’d-Dīn Qāchiri who expired in A.H. 1007 when Pāṭan was held in jāghir by Sayyid Qāsim (ibid., p. 442). He is evidently a different person. It is apparent that Ghaṭūth who was almost a contemporary of Sayyid Qāsim did not take pains to trace particulars and his account of the saint’s life, may have been inspired by the epigraph under study.
4 The Bombay lithographic edition has A.H. 800 in words also.
5 ‘Abdul’-Jabbār Khaṭā, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 119-20. A more recent account of the saint gleaned from the above as well as two more works including one manuscript (Maḥāqān-i-Auliyyā) is contained in Sayyid Yārā Sāhib, Taḥkīrāt-i-Dāzmāt i-Hāllāt-i-Auliyyā-i-kirām (Pāṭan, N. G., 1928), part 2, pp. 23-26. A Gujarāti pamphlet containing the biography of the saint and description of his tomb etc., compiled by Muḥammad Waḥīd Sāždār of Pāṭan, has been published in 1939 by the Siraṭ Committee of Pāṭan. It contains an illustration of the epigraph under study and its yurport in Gujarāti, but unfortunately the rendering, particularly of the chronogram referred to above is incorrect.
who having been impressed by the former’s sanctity, gave a recommendatory note to Shaikh Ḥakkāk who was his disciple. Now the latter was so much steeped in the love for the Prophet that he would never do anything that was not approved by the Prophet, and so when Maulānā Yūsūb reached Madina and met him, Shaikh Ḥakkāk without immediately responding to his greetings went into contemplation and received the call of the Prophet that: if he were asking his opinion about Yūsūb, he should know that he was his beloved.¹ As a result of this mention of endearment by the Prophet, the saint was popularly known as Maulānā Maḥbūb.

Before passing on to the study of the next epigraph, I feel it necessary to state that the contents of the inscription in certain parts—lines 2-3—containing a reference to Shaikh Ḥakkāk of Madina and to the Prophet were not wholly intelligible to me despite the complete decipherment of the text. I had occasion to mention the difficulty in the course of my visit to Pāṭan in July 1969 to my esteemed friends Sayyid Faysāl Ḥussain Qādiri, Mr. Shujā’u’d-Dīn Fārūqī and Sayyid Ruknū’d-Dīn. It was then that not only this episode in the life of the saint was related to me, but a manuscript of the Tadhkira-i-Ḥusāmiyya in possession of one Mr. Barkatū ʿAllāh was also made available to me for a cursory perusal. Subsequently, Mr. Fārūqī also sent to me a copy made by him of the Persian translation, by Ḥusām, of the Qasida-i-Ḥakkākiyya. I am thankful to all these gentlemen for their help and their interest in the matter.

IX. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 1008, ALSO FROM PĀṬAN

This is another important inscription which furnishes new information about a member of the family of Sayyid Qāsim—a son—who is not mentioned in historical works and who seems to have been associated with Pāṭan in official capacity, most probably as governor or holder of a jāgīr. The epigraphical tablet measuring 85 by 30 cms. is fixed above the central miḥrāb of the mosque situated in the enclosure of the Dargah of another celebrated saint of Pāṭan, Sayyid Ḥusain, popularly called Khing-sawār (lit. horse- rider),¹ which is situated at a little distance to the west of the above-mentioned Sahastralinga Tank.²

The six-line text in Arabic records the fact that the reconstruction of the mosque as well as the Tomb—though not so specifically stated, these evidently refer to the Tomb of Sayyid Ḥusain and the mosque attached to it—was carried out by the great and brave Sayyid and just and bountiful Amīr, Sayyid.³ Ali son of Sayyid Qāsim and grandson of Sayyid Maḥmūd in 1599-1600. The date for the work has been given both in words as well as in a chronogram stated to have been composed by a scholar whose name has not been disclosed. At the end of the text occurs the name ‘Abdūl-Qādir son of ‘Abdūl-Latīf Yamauni, preceded by the phrase ‘I am entirely dependant upon His covert favours’. This is evidently that of the scribe, and he must be identical with the scribe of the inscription in the mosque of Mahdūm Ḥusāmū’d-Dīn Multānī (No. VII, supra); in view of his niḥa Yamauni, he must be different from the father of the composer of the epigraph under reference, namely ‘Abdūl-Latīf Nāgaurī, as pointed out above (p. 75, supra). The calligraphy is Nasḵī of no particular merit. From the niḥa, he appears to have been of Arabian descent, which would not be surprising, as the town of Pāṭan has been the home of many Arab settlers, mostly traders, and there are still a few families there which have business relations with Arabia.

¹ The actual hemistich from the Qasida is: `a Yaʿqūbū, ḥuwa maḥbūbū.”
² For an account of the saint, please see Fadl Abuṣrā, op. cit., pp. 116-117; Ali Muḥammad Khān, op. cit., Supplement, p. 113; ‘Abdūl-Jabbar Khān, op. cit., part 1, pp. 283-84; Sayyid Pyārā Sahib, op. cit., part 2, pp. 20-22.
³ ARIE, 1964-55, No. C, 97. Over the left miḥrāb of the mosque occurs another inscription comprising a Quranic text (Chapter LXXII, verse 18), executed in Kufi and Thulūḥ of a very high order (ibid., No. C, 98.)
The language of the epigraph, as in the case of the other inscriptions from Patan, of sufficient literary merit, and as compared to majority of the Arabic inscriptions of India, flawless; the benedictory phrases used for the renovator may be noted in particular.

The text reads as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XX (a)*

(1) In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. ‘Our Lord! accept from us; surely, Thou art the Hearing, the Knowing’. Undertaken was the renovation of this noble place

(2) and the eminent dome, (the renovator) being desirous of the pleasure of His Generous Lord and intending to seek His all-embracing merit and bounty, the greatest, the noblest and the bravest: Sayyid, and the most just and excellent Amir,

(3) one who is supported by the help of Allah, the Loving and the Master, (namely) Sayyid ‘Ali son of Sayyid Qasim son of Sayyid Mahmud, may the shadows of his chiefship (siyadat) remain spread

(4) till the Promised Day (i.e. Day of Judgement), may the ropes of the tent of his government be tied with the pegs of eternity, may the palace of his high station remain secure from demolition and damage.

---

1 *Qur'an*, Chapter II, part of verse 127.
2 Reference to his being a Sayyid.
(6) Another epigraph, dated A.H. 996, same place (p. 78).

(6) Record, dated A.H. 1068, from Bulan (p. 82).
SOME MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM GUJARAT

(a) and may the pillars of the hall of his grandeur remain safe from the striking of the malign-
nant eye (lit. Eye of Perfection), in the year eight of the Migration of the Chosen (Prophet) (A.H. 1008-1600 A.D.), may Allāh's blessings be upon him and his progeny and his pious Companions.

(6) And praise be to Allāh, the First and the Last. As to its date, one of the accomplished
men has said, 'One who enters it becomes safe and honoured.' And, I am utterly dependent
upon His covert favours, 'Abdu'l-Qādirson of 'Abdu'l-Laṭif al-Yamanī, may his sins be
pardoned.

H. Blochmann, in his extremely exhaustive and also very valuable notes on the A'in-i-
Akbarī could trace, from historical works, only two sons of the Sayyid viz. Sayyid Ādam and
Sayyid Sulaimān. And now the epigraph under study discloses for the first time the existence
of at least one more son, named Sayyid 'Ali. With the help of the epigraph it is now possible
to identify almost with certainty Sayyid 'Ali Bārha mentioned by emperor Jahāngīr in his
Memoirs. The emperor speaks of having granted an increase in rank to Sayyid 'Ali Bārha on
or about the 30th March 1615 and again an elephant on or about the 5th June 1615. Unfortu-
unately, Jahāngīr does not give any details about him or the post he held.

Equally important is the information contained in the record about 'Ali's implied official
status. The high-sounding titles used for him and the long array of eloquently worded phrases
invoking perpetuity for his life, authority and grandeur, and also the doubtful that he held some post
of considerable authority; very likely, he had succeeded his father in the thānādārī of Pātān,
when the latter died in A.H. 1007.

X. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1009, FROM CAMBAY

The tablet bearing this inscription, when its rubbing was taken in 1959, was lying in the
Stores office of the Public Works Department—and presumably it still lies there—at Cambay. Measuring 38 by 25 cms., it contains a six-line text in Persian prose and verse, executed in
what may be basically described as NasīKh, but having flourishes traceable to Ta'liq variety of
the Arabic alphabet. The letters are small and very closely written, and the tablet seems to
have been exposed to inclemencies of nature and neglect for considerable time. As a result,
the writing has been affected, and the task of decipherment was rendered somewhat difficult.
Fortunately, however, the text has been completely deciphered, except for one or two words
purporting perhaps to be the honorific titles of the builder.

The exact findspot of the epigraph is not known, but as it refers to the construction of a step-
well, it must have originally belonged to one in or around Cambay, at the most within the juris-
diction of the Public Works Department, Cambay Sub-division. The record states that Mirzā
Khān, son of Nawwāb Mirzā Abu'l-Qāsim, constructed a large step-well as an act of merit and
endowed it for the use of the general public in 1601, during the reign of Jalālu'd-Dīn Abu'l-Fath
Akbar.

---

1 The original Arabic comprising the chronogram for the date of reconstruction is a variation of a famous
Quranic text (Chapter III, part of verse 96).
2 Blochmann, op. cit., p. 427.
3 Jahāngīr, op. cit., pp. 133, 145.
5 ARIS, 1959-60, No. D, 104. It has been removed, it is now ascertain[ed], to the local College Museum.
The epigraph has been deciphered to read as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate XIX (a)*

(1) در زمان سلطان السلاطين جلال الملك و الدنيا و الدين أبو الفتح جلال الدين

أمير باذشة

(2) غازى بتوفيق رفاه و تأيید پزدیان تعمیر نمود و بنی ساخت....و لاء(؟).....آصف

خان(؟)...ميرزا خان خلف نواب

(3) تامدارى خورشید استیارى میرزا ابو القاسم این، سیل دا خالصا مخلصا لوجه الله

تعالی الكریم و ارتقاء لرضاشعه

(4) العیم و وقف کرداورا برای یک فس امام از خواص و عوامی، غیره شهر ذى الحجة

الحرم ستة سبع

(5) و الغفت من الهجرة البنیة عليه الف الف صلواته لله و الف الف تجیة

این برکه که همست آبیز از آب حیات(؟) چیزی که عیان بود، چه حاجت به مفات

هرکس که از وجرعه آیی نوشید

مانند غذای پزدی فارغ امانات

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the time of the sovereignty of the Sultan of the Sultans, Jalâlu’l-Millat wa’d-Dunyâ wa’d-Din Jalâlu’d-Din Akbar Badshâh-i-

(2-3) Ghâzi (and) through the Divine guidance and heavenly support.............. Mîrzâ Khân, son of the illustrious Nâwâb of sun-like reputation, Mîrzâ Abû’l-Qâsim, laid the foundation and constructed this step-well (sâbîl), purely and solely for the sake of the Exalted and the Generous Allâh and for seeking His pleasures

(4) (which are) all-embracing, and he endowed it for the use of the general public, whether high or low, on the first day of the month of the Holy Dhu’l-Hijja in the year nine.

(5) and one thousand from the Migration of the Prophet, may thousand-thousand salutations of Allâh and thousand-thousand blessings be upon him (1 Dhu’l-Hijja 1009-24 May 1601).¹

Verse: This reservoir whose water is from (the Fountain of) the Water of life—

(6) a thing which is apparent, where the need of describing it—

whosoever drank a mouthful of water therefrom, became immune to death like the Prophet Khîdr.

¹ In *AIE*, 1959-60, No. D. 104, the date was inadvertently printed as 11 Dhu’l-Hijja 1009 (3 June 1601).
It is difficult to identify the builder. While no person of the name of Mirzā Khān who flourished at about this time—excepting of course Mirzā Khān, the famous Khān-i-Khānān, who is altogether a different person—is met with in well-known historical works, we come across a number of noblemen with the name of Abū'l-Qāsim, who enjoyed high status and authority under Akbar and Jahāngīr. These are Abū'l-Qāsim Tabrīzī who held the office of the Diwān of Gujarāt in A. H. 991; Nawwāb Abū'l-Qāsim Namkin, who expired in A. H. 1057; Mirzā Abū'l-Qāsim Nishāpūrī, about whom not much is known; Abū'l-Qāsim, brother of Āṣaf Khān, etc. But the available details of the career of these gentlemen are too meagre to provide a clue for the satisfactory identification of the builder. The only reasonable guess is that Nawwāb Abū'l-Qāsim, father of the builder, is very likely identical with Abū'l-Qāsim Tabrīzī who was the Diwān of Gujarāt for some time under Akbar.

Jahāngīr

XI. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1020, FROM SARKHEJ

The loose tablet bearing this inscription is reported to have existed some years back in the premises of the Dargāh of the celebrated saint Ḥaḍrat Shaikh Aḥmad Khāṭṭū (3 A.H. 849) at Sarkhej, a small village, situated just on the outskirts of the city of Ahmadābād. The tablet is not traceable and inquiries made by me on the spot regarding its present whereabouts and original findspot have met with no result. Fortunately, an inked rubbing of the epigraph was taken in May 1941 by the Western Circle of the Archaeological Survey of India, then situated at Poona, and it is from that rubbing that the inscription is edited here for the first time. There is no doubt that the epigraph originally belonged to a mosque at or near Sarkhej, since it is clearly so stated in the text.

The record consists of three Persian couplets, arranged in as many lines and states that Mr Abū'l-Qāsim of noble lineage who discharged the duties of the trusteeship of the Dargāh most satisfactorily, built a wonderful mosque on the road to Sarkhej in 1611-12. The date is contained in an ingenious chronogram which, as in the case of the one contained in the Kadi inscription studied above (p. 73, supra), requires the deduction of the first digits from the values yielded by each letter of the chronogrammatic phrase.

The chief importance of this inscription, apart from its beautiful calligraphy, lies in the fact that it furnishes an important piece of information about the trusteeship of the Dargāh and its incumbent; this is particularly valuable since in written records, we do not usually come across this type of information. As to Mr Abū'l-Qāsim who held the trusteeship, it is not possible to make any satisfactory identification; it is difficult to say if he is identical with any of the persons so named, mentioned in the study of the previous epigraph though it is not unlikely.

The text occupies a writing space of 45 by 25 cm. The style of writing is Nastaʿlīq of quite a pleasing type, but curiously enough there are two mistakes in the written text as will be observed from the reading quoted below:

TEXT

Plate XXI (a)

\(\text{که یعقوب} \text{نور (نور) تعلیت و داد}

\(1 \) ARIK, 1963-64, No. D. 84. For an account of the saint, please see 'Ali Muhammad khān, op. cit., Supplement, pp. 33-34; Commissariat op. cit., vol. I (Bombay, 1938), pp. 131-32; etc.

\(2 \) However, I understand from other sources that the tablet is kept in one of the rooms in the enclosure.
(3) مسجد(ی) ساخت در ره سرکیج گفت بیت العتبه ای احاد
(3) سال تاریخی از خرد جسم

TRANSLATION

(1) Mir Abu'l-Qasim of noble lineage who, to tell the truth, added lustre (1) to trusteeship,
(2) constructed a mosque on the road to Sarkej (Sarkhej), the like of which the world does not remember.
(3) I sought the year of its date from Wisdom (who) said, "It is to be found from the phrase 'the Ancient House' without the first digits".

The Arabic equivalent of the phrase 'the Ancient House' has two letters, the numerical value of each of which according to the Abjad system is represented by first digits. These are 2 and 1, the total of which is to be deducted from the total numerical value 1023 of the said phrase to obtain the date A.H. 1020 (1611-12 A.D.).

XII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A. H. 1026, FROM PĀTAN

This epigraph is from the Tomb of Qâdi Ahmad Jûda (or Jodh) situated on the outskirts of the town of Pātan, just without the city-wall between the Moti Shâh and Khân Sarowar Gates. The marble slab on which it is engraved measures 22 by 34 cms. and is built up into the eastern wall of the Tomb, which is a modern structure.

The credit of bringing this epigraph to light—apart from a mere reference to it in the Mir'at-ti-Ahmadi—goes to the late Professor M. S. Commissariat who published a translation thereof in his valuable work. His rendering is substantially correct except for the name of the builder as will be pointed out at the proper place.

Qâdi Ahmad was greatly respected in his time for piety. He is much better remembered in connection with the foundation of the city of Ahmadabad—to which reference is also made in the text; as is wellknown, he is stated to have been one of the four Aḥmads who laid the actual foundation of the city, each representing one direction. Qâdi Ahmad is stated to have died in 1437, almost two centuries before the inscription under study.

The epigraph is in Persian verse, but the quality of verse is mediocre. On the other hand, the Nasta'liq style of its calligraphy is fairly good. The text which runs into five couplets assigns the construction of the Mausoleum of Qâdi Ahmad Jûda (or Jodh) which 'provided Pātan with the light of sanctity' to one of his grandsons, Farid (and not Humaid as given by Professor Commissariat) son of Faqih, the work having commenced in August-September 1616 and completed in June-July 1617. It also furnishes the information that the saint was a spiritual successor of

---

1 This usually denotes Ka'bba.
2 In ARIE, 1963-64, No. D, 84, through oversight, the year A.H. 1029 (1619-20 A.D.) was given.
6 For details, see Sikandar, Mir'at-i-Sikandari (Baroda, 1961), p. 34; 'Ali Muḥammad Khān, op. cit., Supplement, p. 2.
7 For an account of the saint, see 'Ali Muḥammad Khān, op. cit., p. 118; Pyārī Sāhib, op. cit., part 1, P. 34.
Shaikh Ahmad Khattu who lies buried at Sarkhej and who was also one of the four Ahmads at whose hands the foundation of the city of Ahmadabad was laid.

The letters of the text, even originally inscribed in bas-relief, have further flattened, but the text is quite legible, as will be seen from the reading that follows:--

**TEXT**

Plate XXII (b)

(1) چو شیخ احمد کہن تو خلافت یتعلق
علاه ترومود از لطف و عنایت

(2) بخدوی قاضی احمد جوده مرتاق
یک平整یا پرمنا نور ولایت

(3) ز حار مسیح باشد احمد آباد
یک ایقان یودند صاحب هدایت

(4) که کرب این مقبره از سر بدايت
چه روحیه پر برجب شد نپایت

سنہ 1026

**TRANSLATION**

(1) When Shaikh Ahmad Khattu bestowed, through kindness and favour, the Robe of Succession

(2) upon His Holiness (Mahdūn) the pious (lit. ascetic) Qādi Ahmad Jūlha (or Jodh), see there is in his resting-place, light of saintliness.

(3) The city of Ahmadabad was founded with (the help of) four Ahmads: he, the master of guidance, was one.

(4) His grandson is Farid son of Faqih, who started afresh the construction of this mausoleum.

(5) Know it to have started (in) the month of Sha'bān, year (A.H.) 1025 (Sha'bān 1025 = August-September 1616). What a tomb! Wonderful! Its completion was in Rajab, year (A.H.) 1026 (Rajab 1026 = June-July 1617).

The epigraph is thus quite important. The information about Qādi Ahmad's participation in the foundation of Ahmadabad may have been borrowed from the Mir'ūt-i-Sikandari which was composed a few years before the date of this epigraph.1 In any case, it must have been the current belief, though it may be of interest to recall that in the verses of the contemporary Hulwi Shirāzī, describing the foundation of the city, which have been quoted in the Mir'ūt, no mention to this fact occurs.2 Then, the inscription has at least preserved the name of a descendant of the saint who flourished about two centuries after his death. But even far more important to my mind is the light the inscription throws on the correct sobriquet or surname of the saint which is commonly believed to have been ḥudūd (جوہد) meaning 'generosity'.3 There is no unanimity in historical works about the correct spelling of this name. It should be noted that of the two earliest available historical works on Gujarāt history in print, the Mir'ūt-i-Sikandari merely gives the

1 Mir'ūt-i-Sikandari is generally believed to have been composed in A. H. 1020.
2 Sikandar, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-36.
3 *cf. Pyārā Shāhīb, op. cit.*, part 1, p. 2.
name as Shaikh Ahmad; it does not call him Qadi Ahmad nor does it say anything about his being buried at Patan or Nahrwala as it was called in those days. In the other, the Tari'^a-i-Salatin-i-Gujarat, composed at about the same time or a little earlier, the name Qadi Ahmad occurs, though it also does not make any mention of Patan or Nahrwala. In none of these two works, the sobriquet of the saint occurs. The only historical work in which the sobriquet occurs is the Mir'd-i-Ahmad, a late eighteenth century work, the two editions of which transcribe the name variously as 'Jayyid', 'Jahid', 'lajihd' and 'bijihd'. In our epigraph, the surname is transcribed clearly as 'Jahida' (or 'Jodh') which must represent the correct spelling, as the epigraph was caused to be set up by a descendant of the saint. The saint thus was called 'Jahida' or 'Jodh', a surname (Yodh) which has to-date survived in Gujarati, and therefore, the popular epithet 'Jahid' by which he is generally called should be taken as a misnomer. The famous Qadiri Sayyid families of Patan as well as of Rakhshash in Ahmadabad claim descent from the Qadid.

XIII. INSCRIPTION, DATED A.H. 1029, FROM VASRAVI

Vasravi is now a small and out of the way agricultural village in the Mangrol Taluka of Surat district, situated at a distance of about five kilometres to the south south-east of the Taluka headquarters. That it was a place of importance in the past is established beyond doubt from the epigraph under study, and also from two earlier Nagari inscriptions, found there, which are unfortunately fragmentary: One of these is dateable on paleographic grounds to the thirteenth century, and the other, dated 1498, refers itself to the reign of Sultan Mahmud of Gujarat.

The present epigraphical tablet, measuring 21 by 55 cm. is, built into the facade, to the right of the door of the Dargah of a saint locally known as Hadrat Ganji-Ahmad, and is evidently not in situ. It contains a brief text running into nine lines of writing in Persian, recording the construction of the gate of the fort of Basarhi (modern Vasravi) in 1623. The epigraph also provides important information that the work was completed when the jagir was held by Shah Jahan and the governor was Shah Baig. The epigraph thus shows that Vasravi had already a fort in Jahangir's time, which also establishes its strategic importance.

It will be recalled that Shah Jahan held the viceroyalty of Gujarat during 1618-22. But what is perhaps intended to be conveyed by the epigraph is that Vasravi (and perhaps the region around—which is quite fertile) was included in the personal fief of prince Shah Jahan. As to Shah Baig, in all probability he is identical with Shah Baig Uzbek, who received the title of Khan in Shah Jahan's first regnal year and rose to occupy high posts including the governorship of provinces like Berar and Aurangabad; he had held the rank of 1000 men, 400 horse in Jahangir's time. We also know of one Shah Baig Khan whose mention occurs in the account of those of Shah Jahan's nobles and retainers who laid down their lives before Shah Jahan's accession; he is stated to have been killed while fighting bravely on the day of the attack on the Buhampur fort.

---

1 Sikanar, op. cit., p. 34.
4 Pyara Sahib, op. cit., part 1, p. 34.
5 Commisariat, op. cit., p. 93.
7 Ibid., No. D, 47. In copying those inscriptions, I received much help from Shri Usmah I. Desai, Police Sub-Inspector, Mangrol and Shri Yousuf Patel, Sarpanch, of Vasravi, to both of whom I am grateful.
But he is already mentioned as Khān when he died while Shāh Baig Uzbek was not yet made a Khān until the accession of Shāh Jahān which should make his identification with the governor of the Vasrāvi area more probable.

The style of writing is ordinary Nasta’liq and the text has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

Plate XXII(a)

(1) الله أكبر
(2) دووژه
(3) قلبه مسراهی
(4) دو جاکیر شاه
(5) جهان و در
(6) عمل بنده درگه
(7) شاه بیک راست
(8) تاریخ ۸ یام[ی] دفا لاخر
(9) سنه ۱۰۲۹

**TRANSLATION**

1. Allāh is great.
2. The gateway
3. of the fort of Basrāhi (modern Vasrāvi),
4. situated in the jāgir of Shāh
5. Jahān and in the
6. governorship of the servant of the court
7. Shāh Baig, was constructed
8. on 2 Jamīdu’l-Ākhar,
9. year (A.H.) 1029 (2 Jumāda II 1029—25 April 1620).

**XIV-XV. INSCRIPTIONS, DATED A.H. 1033, FROM MĀNGROL**

These two interesting inscriptions pertaining to the time of prince Dāwar Baksh’s viceroyalty under Jāhāngīr, bear on an identical subject relating to the population of a suburb, called La’lpūra in Māngrol.¹

Māngrol, now a sub-divisional headquarters in the Junāgadh district, was a town of great importance. It was, in the pre-Sultanate period, the seat of the Sorat province and in recent times, the seat of a small principality, whose chiefs were called Shaikh of Māngrol. A number of inscriptions of the imperial Tughluqs, the Sultāns and the Mughals are to be found there.²

---

One of the two inscriptions under study was fixed into the outer face of the wall of a private house situated opposite the mosque in the Lālpūrā quarter of the town, when its rubbing was taken in 1954.\footnote{\textit{ARIE}, 1954-55, Nos. C, 154.} It was found lying loose by me in the same house when I visited the place in July 1969 in the company of Mr. A. R. Khushītar, a prominent citizen and scholar of the town, who is greatly interested in the history of Māngrol and the neighbourhood. When the epigraph was first noticed in or before 1889, the house belonged to one Sādr Miyān.\footnote{\textit{CIB}, p. 39.} It now belongs to Sayyid Qāsim ‘Alī son of Ibrāhīm who has at the suggestion of Mr. Khushītar kindly agreed to its removal to the mosque for preservation. The other epigraphical tablet which was then lying loose in the same house, had already found its way to the mosque.

The tablet bearing the following record measures 22 by 42 cms., and contains an eight-line text mostly in Persian verse, which is executed in a somewhat crudish Nasta’īlī style. The quality of verse too is rather on the mediocre side. The epigraph records the populating of a suburb proposed to be called Lālpūr evidently after the name of La‘l Baig by whose order it was done in 1624. In the text the suburb is described as ‘the mine of gems’ but what is meant thereby is not clear. Very probably, this description is nothing more than poetic and may have suggested to the composer on account of the name Lālpūr, la‘l meaning a precious stone, ruby. The tablet having considerably weathered, the date of writing cannot be deciphered beyond doubt.

The reading of the epigraph is quoted below:

**TEXT**

\textit{Plate XXII(b)}

\begin{align*}
\text{(1)} & \text{اَللَّهُ اَكْبَرُ} \\
\text{(2)} & \text{تا جَهَان رَا مَدَارِ بِرْغَنْرِ اسْتَ} \\
\text{(3)} & \text{اَيْنَ بَنَا رَا قَرَارَ مَعْتَبَرِ اسْتَ} \\
\text{(4)} & \text{لَعْلَ يِبَّكَ اَمَرِ دِرَانَ فِرْمُود} \\
\text{(5)} & \text{لَعْلَ بُورَ رَا كَكَةٌ مَعْنَىِ گُهَرِ اسْتَ} \\
\text{(6)} & \text{لَعْلَ غَالِبَ چَوْهِ شَیْتَانِ تَأْرَیْخْش} \\
\text{(7)} & \text{43} \\
\text{(8)} & \text{سُرْمَدیَ زَیِنَ حَسَبَ گَلَگَ وَ کَرَامَت} \\
\text{رُوزِ شَهِهٔ بِتَاریخ بیِسْت وَ سَوْیمَ مَدَ رَجَبِ نَوْشَتُهُ شَد}
\end{align*}

**TRANSLATION**

(1) Allāh is great.
(2) As long as the pivot of the world rests on motion.
(3) the stability of this edifice is assured.
(4) La‘l Baig, the noble, issued order
(5) (to populate) Lālpūr which is the mine of gems.
(a) Record, dated A.H. 1029, from Vasrāwi (p. 89)

(b) Inscription, dated A.H. 1026, from Pāyan (p. 87)
Epigraph, dated A.H. 1033, from Mangrol (p. 91)
(6) Since La'l (Baig?) found ghālib (lit. dominant) (A.H.) 1033 (1624 A.D.) as its date,
(7) Sarmad is dumbfounded by this calculation.
(8) (This) was written on Saturday, the 23rd of the month of Rajab (23 Rajab 1033=1 May 1624).

The tablet bearing the other record which is bilingual, measures 35 by 40 cmas., and was lying loose as already stated in the above-mentioned house in 1954 when its rubbing was taken;¹ it is now lying in the mosque. Its six-line text, inscribed in three panels, is badly damaged, and most of the letters have peeled off. It contains the same purport, but it further seeks the cooperation of all and sundry including the officials who might be posted at the place in future to strive for the prosperity of the newly founded suburb and look after it. It also provides the useful information that La'l Baig was the servant of Prince Dāwar Bakhsh, whose name is inscribed in the top corner on the right, in the manner of farmāns and like official records, though it grammatically belongs to the second line of the text. Incidentally, the Corpus reads the portion containing the name of the prince as ‘Prince Hasan Jahangir Akbar’.² The date is given in figures, but these have completely flaked off. The reading quoted in the Corpus has A.H. 1033, which is perhaps derived from the previous record. It, however, appears to be correct, tallying with the date in the Nāgari version and moreover, Prince Dāwar Bakhsh whose retainer La'l Baig professes to be, was viceroy of Gujarat for slightly more than a year from Rajab 1032.

The six-line text in Persian is inscribed in three panels in ordinary or rather crudish Nasta'liq style similar to that in the other epigraph and has been read as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XXIII*

(1)  "Shah Daur Bakhs
dost ishak akbar
(2)  "Lula biyik garam shah[?]"? ,"yatari bismillah jamadi alUl
(3)  "300 [?] dour do shah m az unayat ub i lal pura baad hosh
(4)  "Anja babu wad abadani ahsan pura baad daran kohsh
(5)  "Dorin naaran and jayik tenekand agar tecom baand xada dr
(6)  "Mianst am khanam khe baiydi xadara yz marcand baand xada dr"

**TRANSLATION**

(1) God is Great. Shāh Dāwar Bakhsh.
(2) La'l Baig, the servant of sh[āh].³ On the 20th of the month of Jumādā'ī-Awwal

¹ ARIE, 1954-55, No. C, 165. It was listed in the Bhānmīrar Prachita Shōdhaangrāk at p. 25 (No. 90 of the Catalogue of Inscriptions given at the end), where only the date (V.S. 1647) and the name of the king are quoted.
² CIB, p. 42.
³ As in royal documents, this name should be read along with the text in the second line to which it properly belongs.
⁴ Shāh Dāwar Bakhsh in the first line should be read after this.
(3) in the year (A.H.) [1033] (1624 A.D.) on Monday, through Divine favour, La'ilpurā was populated.

(4) For whatever is needed for the betterment and prosperity of this pūra (suburb), no effort

(5) should be spared and no undue expectations should be entertained (by anybody). If anybody entertains any (undue) expectations, God will

(6) intervene (lit. is in between). Every official who comes (to this place) should look after this for the sake of God.

These two inscriptions are thus quite important. If the present locality, now known as La'ilpurā, in one of the houses of which the two slabs were originally found, was also known by the same name, before their texts were made known in about 1889, it would mean that the suburb was located there. It was originally perhaps populated on the outskirts of the town in Jahāngir's time, but in course of time became part of the expanding town itself. In any case, the epigraph has preserved, in the form of a contemporary document, the history of this quarter. Also, it is only these epigraphs which have preserved the name of La'il Baig, who is otherwise totally unknown. He calls himself a slave of Prince Dāwar Bakhsh and therefore, it is a reasonable guess that his association with Māngrol must have been in official capacity.

The Persian version does not contain the name of the ruling emperor, Jahāngir. But the Sanskrit version refers itself to his reign, quoting his name Salīm Shāh, which is generally found used in such inscriptions. This version consists of 5 lines of closely written letters in a minute hand, and seems to be a little more detailed. But unfortunately, it is too badly damaged to admit of complete decipherment. According to the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore, who was requested to examine it, 'the record appears to belong to the time of Pātasāhī Salīm-Sāhā and to contain the details of date such as Vikrama 1681 and Śaka 1546, Vaiśākha su. 12, Monday (=1624 A.D., April 19). The other details are not possible to make out'.

The Nāgarī version was earlier published by the late Mr. D. B. Diskalkar in 1940.¹ His comments on the epigraph are as follows: 'It opens with the date, Monday (!), the 15th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha in V.S. 1687 or Śaka 1552 and refers to the reign of the emperor Salīm Shāh. It then mentions the name of the viceroy appointed over Saurāśṭra, but unfortunately his name is missing. In the last line are preserved some letters of an imprecatory verse which shows that a grant was made by this inscription.'

He further remarks that the 'Emperor of Delhi at this time was Shah Jahan and not Salīm Shāh which is the other name of Jahāngir. Such a mistake is excusable in this distant part of the country'.² Needless to say, this explanation, even otherwise not warranted by facts, is quite contrary to the usual practice. A mistake about the name of the ruling monarch, particularly under the Muslim rulers, the mention of whose names in public was his exclusive prerogative, was considered inexcusable. But as pointed out earlier, Mr. Diskalkar was misled by the wrong reading of the date due to the damaged nature of the writing. Similarly, the purport of the record as determined by him is also incorrect. The imprecatory verse was intended in this case to ensure protection and proper upkeep of the newly founded suburb and not observance of any grant made therein.

¹ *New Indian Antiquary*, vol. III, No. 9 (December 1940), p. 339. A number of inscriptions from Saurāśṭra were published by him in the series of articles entitled 'Inscriptions of Kathiawād' in the first three volumes of the same journal. These were separately made available under the title *Inscriptions of Kathiawād*.

² Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abā Bakr, brother of Khānṣāda Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khān of Nāgur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdul'Qahān, of the Khānṣāda family of Nāgur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdūl'Laṭif a'īLāhī a'īL-Bajāli, Ḥādrat, Companion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdūl'Laṭif an-Nāgaurī a'īL-Anšārī, father of 'Abdūl'Laṭif AbīL-Qāsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdūl'Laṭif Yananī, father of 'Abdūl'Laṭif Qādir, the scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdūl'Qādir, son of 'Abdūl'Laṭif Yamani, a scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbīL-Qāsim, sīṭa of 'Abdūl'Laṭif, the scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Ismā'īl Muḥammad Bukhārī, Imām, Traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbūL-Faḍl, a historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbūL-Makārim, sīṭa of Sayyid Qāsim Bārha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbūL-Muṣaffar, ānqa of Sultan Muḥammad Shāh of Bihār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbīL-Qāsim, brother of Ḥaḍrat Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbīL-Qāsim Tabrizī, the Dīrān of Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḥlangpur, modern name of Ellichpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādā Chāndū, variant reading for Ādā Jāmbā 43, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādā Jāmbā, a builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āfjāl Khān, see Khān-i-A'gām, a Mālāwī nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āfjāl Khān, title of Mastan Ísmā'īl-dīn, a noble of Mālāwī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āfjān, a clan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aghar Panchāyatan, see Divār-Agar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agra, in Uttar Pradesha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, son of Muḥammad, Sultan of Mālāwī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, son of Tāhir, a builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadābād, in Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad 'All Bāpji, Dārgāh of, at Nāgaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad Jūdha, Qādī, see Qādī Ahmad Jūdha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad Khān, son of Šāhīb Khān, Mālāwī Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad Khaṭṭā, Šāiḥ Khān, see Šaikhs Ahmad Khaṭṭā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadānagar, in Mahārāshṭra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadānagar, Ahmadnagar so spelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, four, builders of Ahmadābād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad Shāh, Sultan of Mālāwī, see Ahmad, son of Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad Shāh, Sultan of Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akbar, Muḥgal emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ālā, son of Sherdil Khānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alachhpūr, variant for Ellichpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ālam Ālpi, Sanskritic form of 'Ālam Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ālam-dīn, Khāji, Delhi Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ālam-dīn, Sultan Mahmūd II, of Malwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allībāq, in Mahārāshṭra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ālim Khān, see Mīrān 'Ālim Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ālim Kirmānī, a historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ālim Tábātabā, a historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allahābād, in Uttar Pradesha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Lāhī, sīṭa of 'Abdūl'Laṭif, son of Jarīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alp Khān, entitled Shāh-i-'Ālam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alp Khān, title of Malik Sānjar, governor of Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amtār, see Malik 'Amīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Āmil, i.e. an Agent, a post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarsoī, in Mahārāshṭra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhilwārā, Pīṭān, known as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anter, in Aurangābād district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabia, a country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arākān, a mixt town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Āṣif Khān, Muḥgal nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtām, i.e., Ashtānī (s.v.), in Khulnā district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asirgarh, near Bhubānpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>———, in Betul district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Aṣkari, Prof. S.H., a historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurangābād, in Mahārāshṭra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurangzeb, Muḥgal emperor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bābur, Muḥgal emperor</td>
<td>2 (f.n. 4), 6 (f.n. 7), 8, 19 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahlīm, clan name</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahmani, a dynasty of Deccan</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baqht Singh, Maharaja, of Jodhpur</td>
<td>18, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bālā Pīr, Tomb of, at Kumārī</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banās Kānthā, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāro Pīr Sāhib, Dargah of, at Nāgaur, inscriptions from</td>
<td>24, 31, 32, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bārha, native place of the Sayyids</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāri Khātū, in Rājasthān, inscriptions from</td>
<td>18-20, 29, 30, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 2), 35, 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barodā, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>31, 32, 36, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64, 70, 73 (f.n. 2), 74 (f.n. 3), 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāsārū, modern Vasrūy, fort of</td>
<td>88, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayāg, a builder</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayāgdās, a builder</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgam, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal, a province</td>
<td>11 (f.n. 1), 12, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berār, a region in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>6, 47 (f.n. 3), 53, 54, 57, 58, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betul, a district in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>45, 46, 47, 53, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhanwargār, mentioned in a record</td>
<td>46, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhārathī Chandu, the Majmu’dar</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhārathī Chandra, same as Bhārathī Chand (š.v.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhawargār, variant of Bhanwargār (š.v.)</td>
<td>55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidar, in Karnātaka</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihār, a region</td>
<td>8 (f.n. 2), 9 (f.n. 4), 11, 29, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihār-harif, in Paṭna district</td>
<td>9 (f.n. 4), 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijāpur</td>
<td>46 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir, a district in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>46, 47, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 1), 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohrā, a community</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blochmann, H., scholar and author</td>
<td>83 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borlā, purana, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>59, 61, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borlā Panchāyatan, in Kolābā district</td>
<td>46, 59, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broach, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buldānā, in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>46, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunyā, wrong reading of Dīyā</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhān II, Nigām Shāh</td>
<td>45-50, 52-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhān III, Nigām Shāh</td>
<td>46, 47, 59-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhānpur, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>46, 60, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhān Shāh, Gōnd Bājā</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhānu’d-Din, Shaikh, see Shaikh Burhānu’d-Din</td>
<td>45, 46, 53, 60, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>2, 6, 8 (f.n. 2), 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 2), 14, 15, 17, 22 (f.n. 2), 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 7), 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 (f.n. 7), 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30 (f.n. 2), 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, 53, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (f.n. 4), 3 (f.n. 1), 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 7), 7, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-47, 48 (f.n. 1), 1, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadi, son of Kīlā Salāh Khānī, builder</td>
<td>20, 36, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadi, wet-nurse</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāli, Tomb of, at Nāgaur</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandī, in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>46, 59, 61, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandī-Rājpuri, in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>47, 60, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dargah of Bār Pīr Sāhib, at Nāgaur, inscription from, also see Bār Pīr Sāhib-Ki-Dargah</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dargah of Maulānā Ya’qūb, at Paṭān, inscription from, also see Maulānā Ya’qūb</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dargah of Sayyid Husain, at Paṭān, inscription from, also see Sayyid Husain</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dargah of Shaikh Ahmad Khatītu, at Sarkhej, inscription from, also see Shaikh Ahmad Khatītu</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryā Khān Nūhānī, governor of Bihār</td>
<td>8 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulatābād, in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>46, 51, 52, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 6), 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāwar Bakhsh, Mughal prince</td>
<td>89, 91, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, Dr. U. N., author</td>
<td>1 (f.n. 5), 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 1), 6 (f.n. 1), 3, 4, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deccan, region</td>
<td>45, 46, 53, 60, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>2, 6, 8 (f.n. 2), 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 2), 14, 15, 17, 22 (f.n. 2), 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n. 4), 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

G

Gachaw-Bàori, at Chandeli, inscription from 3
Gàlnà, in Nàsk district of Mâhârâshtrâ 46, 51, 52
Ganj-i-Âbâd, Hâjrat, saint 88
Gaur, in Bengal 11 (& f. n. 1)
Gauri, sobriquet of Muhâmmâd Khàn of Gaur 11 (& f. n. 1)
Gâwilgär, in Mâhârâshtrâ 47 (f. n. 3)
Ghanam, N. M., official 31, 36, 41, 44
Ghàuth, a gât term 70
Ghàûhi, author of Gulzâr-i-Âbrû 63, 80 (f. n. 2)
Ghiyâhû’d-Dîn Bahâdûr Shâh, king of Bângal 11
Ghiyâhû’d-Dîn Khâlîji, king of Mâlîwâ 2
Ghori, a dynasty 29
Gond Ràja, of Deogarh 58
Gujârât, region 6, 13-17, 20, 22,
24, 25 (f. n. 2), 26,
35, 36, 63-65, 67,
70, 72-73, 76, 85,
87, 88, 91
Gumââhla, i.e. Commissary, post 30
Gûnâ, district in Mâdhya普radesh 2, 5

H

Hâjrat ‘Abdu’llàh bin Jâir, see ‘Abdu’-làh bin Jâir 10
Hâjrat Ganj-i-Âbâd, see Ganj-i-Âbâd 88
Hâjrat Hâmûdû’d-Dîn Suâli, see Hâmûdû’d-Dîn Suâli 40
Hâjrat Nârâmû’d-Dîn Anûiyâ, see Nâmû’d-Dîn Anûiyâ 40
Hâjrat Sâyyíd Imâm Nûr, see Sâyyíd Imâm Nûr 37
Hâjî Sûltân, Mughul official 37 (f. n. 2)
Hâkkâk, Shâhkh, see Shaikh Hâkkâk 29
Hamûdû’d-Dîn Suâli, Hâjrat, Sûltân’t- Târîkhn, Nâgaur sait 47
Hândîâ, in Mâdhya Pâradesh 47 (& f. n. 2), 53
Hârkâh, Khârkâh wrongly read as 10
Hârûnâ, a state 31
Hasan, father of Samâ’, the scribe 29, 30
Hasan Jâhângîr Akbar, Prince Dâwar 91
Hâsân Shahîd, tomb of, at Kâmârî, in Râjâstân 18, 20, 24
Hâjâz i.e. Sândi Arabia 65
Hîmû, famous general 11
Kindây, variant for Hârdjú (e.v.) 47 (f. n. 2)
Hosangâbâd, a district in Mâdhya Pâradesh 53
Hosang Shâh Ghori, Sûltân of Mâlîwâ 1, 2, 22, 56.

E

Ellâhpur, in Mâhârâshtrâ, road to 46, 47, 52, 54

F

Fâdîl, Malik ‘ud-Sharîq, father of Atâd Khan, a Mâlîwâ nobleman 5
Fâqîh, father of Fâdîl (e.v.) 86, 87
Fârîd, son of Fâqîh and descendant of Qâdî Ahmad Sûdha, a saint 86, 87
Fûrûn, issued 45, 46, 48, 49, 54
Fûrûn-khâlîq, in Mâhârâshtrâ, inscription from 47 (f. n. 3)
Fûrûn-khâlîq Shâh, tomb of, at Nâgaur 39, 40
Fûrûn-khâlîq Malikzâde, son of Khânzâda Ahmad Khân, of Nâgaur 40
Pàrsâ, daughter of the Prophet 67
Fûrûn-khâlîq Khân, son of Râmâdân Khân Khânzâda 37 (f. n. 3)
Fîrûz, historian 6 (& f. n. 1), 7 (& f. n. 5, 6, 7)
Fîrûz Râhman, king of Dîsân 56
Fîrûz Khân I, son of Shâh’s Khân Khânzâda, of Nâgaur 17 (f. n. 3), 18, 19,
20, 22, 26, 28
Fîrûz Khân II, Khânzâda, son of Sâlîh Khân 19, 20,
27, 29, 30-37, 41-43
Fîrûz Khân III, son of Muhâmmâd Khân Khânzâda 19, 43, 44
Fîrûz Khân IV, Khânzâda, son of Muhâmmâd Khân 19
Fîrûz Tûghlûq, king of Delhi 13, 73

DELHI GATE, OF NAGAUR 38, 43
DEOGARH, IN UTTAR PRADESH 1
DEOGARH, IN MÂHÂRÂSHTRÂ 55
DEOLI, ROAD LEADING TO 46 (f. n. 1)
DHÂMÂ, B. L., officer 26
DHALPUR, IN RÀJâSTÂN 38
DIDWÀNÀ, IN NAGAUR, INScriptions FROM 16, 18, 20,
25, 26, 28, 29,
30 (& f. n. 2), 35
DIGHI, IN MÂHÂRÂSHTRÂ 46, 59, 62
DIKÂLÂR, D. B., author 92
DIV, PARAGNO OF, SEE ALSO DIV-Agar 59, 61
DIV-Agar, IN Kolâhê district 46, 47, 59, 62
DURRÀ, post 85
YÀ, father of TÀHIR, a builder 10, 11
DOST MUHAMMAD, SULTÀN, a’s-NAJÀVÎ, epitaph of, at PÀÂNA, see ALSO SULTÀN DOST MUHAMMAD 64, 65
DÎLÎPUR, NEAR CHANDERI 7

GACHÀW-BÀORI, AT CHANDERI, INSRIPTION FROM 3
GÀLNÀ, IN NÀSK DISTRICT OF MÂHÂRÂSHTRÀ 46, 51, 52
GANJ-I-ÂBÂD, HÀJÀRAT, SAINT 88
GAUR, IN BENGAL 11 (& F. N. 1)
GAURÌYÀ, SOBRIQUET OF MUHAMMAD KHÀN OF GAUR 11 (& F. N. 1)
GÀWILGÀR, IN MÂHÂRÂSHTRÀ 47 (F. N. 3)
GHANAM, N. M., OFFICIAL 31, 36, 41, 44
GHÂUTH, A GÀT TERM 70
GHÀÛHI, AUTHOR OF GULZÀR-I-ÂBRÛ (80 F. N. 2)
GHÌYÀHÛ’D-DÌN BÀHÀDÛR SHÀH, KING OF BÀNGAL 11
GHÌYÀHÛ’D-DÌN KHALÌJÎ, KING OF MÀLÌWÀ 2
GÌHORI, A DYNASTY 29
GOND RÀJA, OF DEOGARH 58
GUJARÀT, REGION 6, 13-17, 20, 22,
24, 25 (F. N. 2), 26,
35, 36, 63-65, 67,
70, 72-73, 76, 85,
87, 88, 91
GUMÀÂHÌA, I.E. COMISSARY, POST 30
GÛNÀ, DISTRICT IN MÀDHYA PRADESH 2, 5

HÀJÀRAT ‘ABDÛL-LÀH BIN JÀIR, SEE ‘ABDÛL-LÀH BIN JÀIR 10
HÀJÀRAT GANJ-I-ÂBÀD, SEE GANJ-I-ÂBÀD 88
HÀJÀRAT HÀMÛDû’D-DÌN SUÀLÌ, SEE HÀMÛDû’D-DÌN SUÀLÌ 40
HÀJÀRAT NÀRÀMû’D-DÌN ANÛIYÀ, SEE NÀMû’D-DÌN ANÛIYÀ 40
HÀJÀRAT SÀYYÌD IMÀM NûR, SEE SÀYYÌD IMÀM NûR 37
HÀJJÒ SHAÎKH KABIR MUHAMMÀD, SEE SHAÎKH KABIR MUHAMMÀD 40
HÀJÎ SÛLTÀN, MÛGHÛL OFFICIAL 37 (F. N. 2)
HÀKKÀK, SHAÎKH, SEE SHAÎKH HÀKKÀK 40
HÀMûDû’D-DÌN SUÀLÌ, HÀJÀRAT, SÛLTÀN’T-TÀRÎKHÌ, NÀGÀUR SAIT 47
HÀNDÌÀ, IN MÀDHYA PRADESH 47 (& F. N. 2), 53
HÀRKÀH, KHÀRKÀH WRONGLY READ AS 10
HÀRûNÀ, A STATE 31
HÀSSAN, FATHER OF SÀMÀ’, THE SCRIBE 29, 30
HÀSSAN JÀHÀNGÌR AKÀBAR, PRINCE DÀWAR 91
HÀSSAN SHÀHÀD, TOMB OF, AT KÀMÌRÌ, IN RÀJÀSTÀHÌ 18, 20, 24
HIJÀZ I.E. SÀNDI ARÀBIÀ 65
HÌMû, FAMOUS GENERAL 11
KÌNDÌYA, VARIANT FOR HÀRDÌÀ (E.V.) 47 (F. N. 2)
HÔSHANGÀBÀD, A DISTRICT IN MÀDHYA PRADESH 53
HÔSHANG SHAÎKH GHORI, SÛLTÀN OF MÀLÌWÀ 1, 2, 22, 56.
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</table>
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<td>Hušai Ṣīrāzī, poet</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humāyūn, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>11 (fn. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, son of Siddiq, composer</td>
<td>80, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, a</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huṣamuddīn Dawlat waʾd-Dīn, Muhaddis Shaikh, of Fāṭar, a saint</td>
<td>75, 77, 81</td>
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<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm, father of Sayyid Qaṣīn ʿAli, loose slabic the house of, at Māngrol</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrāhīm ʿĀdil Shāh II, of Bijāpur</td>
<td>59</td>
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<td>Ibrāhīm Lodhi, king of Delhi</td>
<td>3 (fn. 1), 7 (fn. 7), 8 (fn. 4)</td>
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<td>Iṣāq, at Nāgaur</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
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<td>Iltūtimāh, Mamlūk king</td>
<td>24 (fn. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imāduddīn, Mauṣūn, entitled Afdal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imām Abū ʿImār Muhammad Buhārī, a Traditionist</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imāmābād, a building at Bihāgharif, from</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imām Nūr, Ḥaḍrat Sayyid, Dargāh of, at Nāgaur</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isfahān, in Iran</td>
<td>74 (fn. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isfahān, father of Ḥāfiz Shaikh Kabir Muhammad</td>
<td>75, 76, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iʿtimād Khān, a vicerey</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<th>Page</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabir Muhammad, Ḥāfiz Shaikh, son of Isāʾiq</td>
<td>76, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabirud-Dīn</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadži, in Gujarāt, inscription from</td>
<td>63, 72, 73, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kair, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairāna, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>11 (fn. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālā Gumbad, Tomb of Shams Khān, at Nāgaur, known as</td>
<td>24, 31, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalāmb, in Maharāṣṭra</td>
<td>45, 46, 47, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāli, a district, in Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalūwa</td>
<td>6 (fn. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari, variant for Kadži</td>
<td>73, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāthiāwād, region in Gujarāt</td>
<td>92 (fn. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufiyā, variant for Kaufiyā (s.v.)</td>
<td>11 (fn. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koufiyā, stream, in Paradise</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khādīm, an attennent</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafta, a spiritual successor</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaliqullah, Khwāja, see Khwaja Khalilullah (s.v.)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaliqi, a dynasty of Delhi</td>
<td>13, 14, 18, 35, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaliqi, a dynasty of Mālāwā</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khān Mahāgh, grandfather of ʿAli, an official</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khān-i-ʿAḡam, title</td>
<td>3, 5, 23, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khān-i-Khānān, title of Mirza Khān</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanqāh, construction of</td>
<td>20, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khānāzāda, chief of Nāgaur</td>
<td>16, 17 (fn. 4), 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (fn. 6), 39, 31, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khānāzāda Ahmad Khān, father of Mālīk-</td>
<td>29, 39, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khānāzāda Hasan, son of Firūz Khān</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Akhundzada Miyan 'Ali, brother of Mubammad Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khansada Miyan Hasan, son of Firuz Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khudin-Mu'aggam, title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khajji, variant of Barhi Khaja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khajji, Mulla of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kheria Rawawari, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khizr Khan, the Sayyid king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khing sawar, the saint Sayyid Husain, popularly called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khita, i.e., a town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khushal, A.R., scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwaja Khallinillah, husband of Saliha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banu, an official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Killa, wet-nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Killa, Salih Khan, father of Dad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kival, in Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolbha, district in Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolte, Dr. V.B., scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konkan, region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolte Gate, at Cheul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kumari, in Rajasthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kumhara, Maharana, see Maharana Kumhara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Ladla Khasa, Malikul-Umarah Khihtiyarrud-Daulat wa'd-Din, official</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladla Khasa, Malikul-Umarah Tajuddaulat wa'd-Din, builder and official</td>
<td>20, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lachman, father of Ramdas, Mason</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lalai Baig, Mughal official</td>
<td>90, 91, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lalpur, a locality, foundation of, see also Lalipur</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lalipur, a locality</td>
<td>90, 91, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lodhi, a dynasty</td>
<td>6 (f.n. 7), 7, 8 (f.n. 2), 9 (f.n. 4), 17, 20, 38, 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Madhya Pradesh, a state</th>
<th>46, 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madina, the holy city</td>
<td>79, 80, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madras, now Tamilnadu, a state</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madrasa Mubaddil-Ullum, of Nagpur</td>
<td>67 (f.n. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maharaja Bakht Singh, see Bakht Singh</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maharaja, of Baroda</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maharana Kumhara</td>
<td>17, 26 (f.n. 6), 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maharashtra, a state</td>
<td>46, 49, 54, 57, 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mabbbuh, Moulana, see Maulana Mabbbuh | 1 |
<p>| Maheshwar Kavi, an author | 1 |
| Mahmud, see 'Ala'ud Din Mahmud II, of Malwa | 6 |
| Mahmud, regal title of Sabil Khan | 6 |
| Mahmud, father of Sayyid Qasim, see Sayyid Mahmud | 6 |
| Mahmud II, father of Mahmud III of Malwa | 2 (f.n. 4) |
| Mahmud III, title of Ahmad Khan of Malwa | 2 (f.n. 4) |
| Mahmud Shaikh, see 'Ala'ud Din Mahmud II of Malwa | 46 |
| Mahaun, road to | 46 |
| Malik 'Ala, title | 28, 32, 33, 34 |
| Malik 'Ala, title, title | 28, 32, 33, 34 |
| Majis-i-Kutum, title | 5 |
| Majis-i-Tamam, post | 3, 4, 5 |
| Mughal Husamuddin Multani, of Fateh, a saint | 13, 75, 81 |
| Makrana, in Jaipur district of Rajasthan | 25 |
| Malik 'Ambar, the famous Deccani general | 59 (f.n. 6), 60 |
| Malik Hazir, son of Alul | 20, 30, 31 |
| Malik Kafur, Khalji general and minister | 15 |
| Malik Ladla Khasa, governor | 34 |
| Malik Sanjar, entitled Alp Khan (e.v.) | 13 |
| Malikul-Mubaddil Ulum, title of Shaikh Muhammad Taher Paanee | 68 |
| Malikul-Umarah, title | 13, 14, 15, 20, 30, 33, 34, 35 |
| Malikul-Shargh, title | 3, 4, 5 |
| Malikul-Shargh Faqih, see Faqih, Malikul-Shargh | 3, 4, 5 |
| Malikzada Fathullah, see Fathullah, Malikzada | 3 |
| Malwa, a province | 1 (f.n. 2), 2 |
| Malwa, Sultan of | 38, 38, 38, 38, 47, 53, 56 |
| Malik, a dynasty | 9 (f.n. 4), 35 |
| Mandu, variant for Manjhi | 7 |
| Manjhi, in Madhya Pradesh, capital of Malwa Sultanate | 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 |
| Mangrol, in Gujarat | 63, 68, 80 |
| (f.n. 2) | 90, 92 |
| Manjha, son of Jaal Bakht, supervisor of a construction | 75, 76, 77 |
| Marwar, Rajput chiefs of | 16, 17 |
| Masriqi, a composer | 3, 5 |
| Mathur, Dr. B.S., author | 17 (f.n. 2) |
| Maulana Imamul-Din, see 'Imam'ul-Din, Maulana | 57 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manlānā Mahbūb, <em>alias</em> of Manlānā Ya'qūb</td>
<td>Muhammad Khān Sūr, governor of Bengāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78, 81</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manlānā Muhammad Wali, Saudāgar</td>
<td>Muhammad Sha'bān Afghānī, a scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 (f.n. 6)</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manlānā Ya'qūb, Tomb of, at Pātān</td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, of Gaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64, 78, 79 (f.n. 3), 80, 81</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medīnī Rāi, ruler of Chander</td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, father of Ahmad Shāh, of Mālwā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6 (f.n. 7), 7 (f.n. 2), 8</td>
<td>7 (f.n. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehkar, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, son of Sultān Nāsirūd-Dīn, cf Mālwā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, 47, 57, 58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehānā, a district in Gujarāt</td>
<td>Muhammad Shāh, Sultān, Sūr king of Bihār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 64, 73</td>
<td>9, 10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mewār, Rājput chiefs of</td>
<td>Muhammad Hashid, chief of Nāgaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17, 26</td>
<td>18, 19 (f.n. 1), 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūndī, variant for Medīnī</td>
<td>Muhammad, a post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8, 32, 33, 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīnakār, Fakīr, wrongly read as</td>
<td>Murtadā II Nīgān Shāh, of Ahmadāagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>47, 59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīr Abūl-Qāsim, a builder and trustee</td>
<td>Murtadā Khān Bukhārī, Nawāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85, 86</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrzā Abūl-Qāsim, father of Mirzā Khān</td>
<td>Mughal official and builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84, 85</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrzā 'Azm Koka, governor of Mālwā</td>
<td>Nāṣraīl, variant for Anhillwār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47, 53</td>
<td>old name of Pātān (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrzā Khān, Safūd-Dīn, son of Nawwāb Abūl-Qāsim, builder</td>
<td>13, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83, 84, 85</td>
<td>Nagāpur, road to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyān 'All, see Khāzīdā Miyān 'Ali</td>
<td>16 (f.n. 20), 17 (f.n. 2, 3), 18, 19 (f.n. 3), 20, 21, 22 (f.n. 1), 23, 24, 25, 26 (f.n. 6), 27 (f.n. 4), 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37 (f.n. 3), 35, 39, 40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyān Hassār</td>
<td>Nāsīr, in Rajasthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyān Husain Farnī, a Lodi nobleman</td>
<td>16 (f.n. 20), 17 (f.n. 2, 3), 18, 19 (f.n. 3), 20, 21, 22 (f.n. 1), 23, 24, 25, 26 (f.n. 6), 27 (f.n. 4), 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37 (f.n. 3), 35, 39, 40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokal, Rānā, of Mewār</td>
<td>Nāsīr, variant for Nāgothānā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>Nāgothānā, road to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monghyr, in Bihār</td>
<td>46, 48, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nānghānā, road from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘āmala, i.e. a district</td>
<td>51, 52, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 34, 59, 61</td>
<td>Narānā, in Rajasthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘āmalat Dandā, see Dandā</td>
<td>16, 18, 29, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu‘āsirūd-Dīn, title of Muhammad ‘Ādī</td>
<td>Nāg’ī, in Mahārāṣṭra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 9 (f.n. 4), 13 (f.n. 3), 17 (f.n. 3), 20, 25, 41, 47, 53, 60, 63, 89</td>
<td>46, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughal, a dynasty</td>
<td>Nāg’īr Shāh, Khali Qutb-ud-Dīn Mālwā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, the Holy Prophet</td>
<td>Nāsīr-ud-Dīn wa‘d-Dīn Abūl-Mughal, title and kāyêt of Muhammad Shāh Sūr, of Bihār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 32, 33, 71</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of Ahmad, Sultān of Mālwā</td>
<td>Nawwāb Burhān Nīgān Shāh II so-called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, son of Sha‘bān</td>
<td>Nawwāb Abūl-Qāsim Nāmīn, Mughal nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad, father of ‘All (s.v.)</td>
<td>Nawwāb Mirzā Abūl-Qāsim, see Mirzā Abūl-Qāsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawwāb Murtaḍā Khān Bukhārī, see Murtaḍā Khān</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawwāb Qutb'ud-Din Muḥammad Khān, see Qutb'ud-Din Muḥammad</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimbātī, in Maḥārāṣṭra</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīmgān, in Maḥārāṣṭra</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niğām Şāhī, a dynasty</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niğāmû'd-Dīn Ahmad, a historian</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niğāmû'd-Dīn Auliya, Ḥaḍrat, a saint</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nūhānī, Daryā Khān</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omeri, I.A., official</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan, a country</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pande, Prof. A.B., author</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purgoa, a revenue division</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārgana Borla, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārgana Dīv, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārgana Shriwardhan, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirzīz, Mughal prince</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṭīn, in Gujarat</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paumār, in Maḥārāṣṭra</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen, in Maḥārāṣṭra</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegūrū i.e. Chief-Minister, a post</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phulkaś, a builder</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirānpūr, near Chanderi in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirzāda, family of Nāgaur</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohnekar, N.S., a scholar</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratīpāpī, mentioned in an inscription</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratīpāpī, mentioned as Bāyādūs (a.v.), a builder</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piṭālā Khān, Khānẓāda, mentioned in a document</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qāḍī Ahmad Jūdha, a saint</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāḍī Dost Muḥammad, Mughal official</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāḍī Hamīdū'd-Dīn Nāţāur, a saint</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qādīrī, a Ṣaft order</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qutb, a Ṣāfī grade</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qutb'ud-Dīn Muḥammad Khān, Nawwāb, Mughal official</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājā Bakht Singh, of Mārwār, see Bakht Singh</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājasthān, a state</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājpuri, creek in Maḥārāṣṭra</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājpūt, a clan</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmāḍān Khān, Khānẓāda</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmdās, a mason</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānā, see Mokal</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānā Kumbhā, see Kumbhā</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānā Mokal, chief of Mewār, see Mokal</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānā Sāṅgā, chief of Mewār, see Sāṅgā</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānkamb, at Bū, in Maḥārāṣṭra</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāvanbāry, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reğāvī, road from</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reğfandā, variant for Reğfandā (a.v.)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reğfandā, in Maḥārāṣṭra</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohankhod, in Bulḍāna district</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saḥb Khān, father of Ahmad Khān of Mālwā</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saḥb Khān, wrong reading for Saḻah Khān</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saḥb Khān (a.v.)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saḥb Khān, son of Muḥāhid Khān, Khānẓāda</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saŏlūd, road to</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Name and Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65, 67</td>
<td>Sāliha Bānū, wife of Khwājā Khalīfu'l-lāh, official and builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Sālih i.e. Mughal emperor Jahāngīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, 55, 56</td>
<td>Sāliyā, road to Sāliyā, probably same as Sāliyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Salsābī, a stream in paradise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (f.n. 2)</td>
<td>Sām, father of Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30, 31</td>
<td>Samhār, in Rājasthān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (f.n. 7), 7, 8</td>
<td>Sāngā, Rānā, chief of Mewār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sarangpur, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30, 31</td>
<td>Sarasati, modern Sirā in Haryānā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Sarkār, a revenue division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62, 85-87</td>
<td>Sarkhej, in Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Sarvang, a composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Saurāshtra, in Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 22</td>
<td>Sayyid, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 (f.r. 5)</td>
<td>Sayyids of Khāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Sayyid Ādām, son of Sayyid Qāsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 (f.n. 6)</td>
<td>Sayyid Ahmad Maulānā, a scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81, 82, 83</td>
<td>Sayyid 'Ali, a bukhār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (f.n. 2)</td>
<td>Sayyid 'Ali Tabāqābā, a historian (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Sayyid Fayyāz Husain Qādiri, of Pātan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sayyid Isām Nūr, Ḥadīt Gregory, Dargāh of at Nāgaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sayyid Khāmnīsh, uncle of the author of Siyār al-Āuliya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75, 78, 79 (f.n. 4), 81, 82</td>
<td>Sayyid Mahmūd, father of Sayyid Qāsim (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75, 70, 77, 80</td>
<td>Sayyid Qāsim, son of Sayyid Mahmūd al-Ḥusaini (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Sayyid Qāsim 'All, son of Ibrahim, epigraphical tablet in the house of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Sayyid Ruknuddin, of Pātan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Sayyid Sulaimān, son of Sayyid Qāsim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 (f.n. 2)</td>
<td>Sayyid Tājuddin Qādiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shāh Bānūn, father of Muhammad Afghānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shāh 'All, title of Alp Khān Hoshang Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 (f.n. 1)</td>
<td>Shāh Alambhak, Sanskritic form of Shāh 'Alam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shāh Alap Khān, same as Alp Khān (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88, 89</td>
<td>Shāh Baig Usbāgh, a governor and builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Shāh Dāwār Bakhsh, Prince Dāwār Bakhsh (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 63 (f.n. 5), 64, 88, 89, 92</td>
<td>Shāh Jahān, Mughal emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Shaikh 'Abdu'l-Qādir Julānī, the famous divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87, 88</td>
<td>Shaikh Ahmad Khātūn, saint of Sarkhej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Shaikh Shāh Muttaki,Traditionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Shaikh Burhānuddin, a saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Shaikh Burhānuddin-Haqq wa'd-Dīn, same as Shaikh Burhānuddin (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Shaikh Farīd, a saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Shaikh Hakkāk, the custodian of Prophet's Shrine and Mosque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79, 80, 81</td>
<td>Shaikh Husamuddin, renovation of the tomb of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Shaikh Iṣām al-Jabrātī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78, 79, 80</td>
<td>Shaikh Jamāluddin Muhammad, of Pāthan, Traditionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Shaikh Kabir Muhammad, son of Ṭahāq (s.v.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76, 77</td>
<td>Shaikh Muhammad, son of Tūhr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 (f.n. 4), 69</td>
<td>Shaikh Nūgānu'l-Mīllat wa'd-Dīn al-Chāhīt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Shaikh Zainuddin, a saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78, 79, 80</td>
<td>Shaikh Zāda Manjūh, a Lodī nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (f.n. 7)</td>
<td>Shaikh Zāda, of Chanderi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shams Khān, father of Firdaw Khān I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 22 (f.n. 3), 23, 24 (f.n. 1), 31, 32-33, 35, 37</td>
<td>Shamsuddin, a title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Shamsuddin Ata Khān, fosterfather of Akbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shamsuddin-Dunyā wa'd-Dīn, title of Muhammad Khān Sūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shārūq, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (f.n. 4)</td>
<td>Shaṭarūl-Mulk, Mālwa official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 29, 30</td>
<td>Sherdikhanī, father of 'Alā (f.n. 1), 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sher Shāh Sūr, a king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72, 73</td>
<td>Shihāb-i-Hakim, see 'Ali Kirmānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72, 73</td>
<td>Shihāb Khān, Mughal official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shihābuddin, son of Nāṣir Shāh Khālji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Shihābuddin Ahmad, a nobleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shīq, a revenue division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, 59, 61, 62</td>
<td>Shīwardhān, in Mahārāshtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76, 81</td>
<td>Shīru'd-Dīn Ḥarūqī, of Pāthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Shiddiq, father of Hasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (f.n. 3), 3, 17 (f.n. 3), 38, 39</td>
<td>Sikandar Lodhi, a king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sīrā, in Haryānā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Solomon, the Prophet and king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somāripet, in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>46, 47, 53, 55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorāth, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scingi Rūbi, Inscription from Śaff Śāhib, popular name of Ḥamīdū’d-Dīn Su’āli (a.v.)</td>
<td>16, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūr Sāber, surkhār of</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Ahmad Shāh, son of Sultan Muhammad Shāh of Mālāwā</td>
<td>2, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Ahmad Shāh I, of Gujarāt</td>
<td>22 (f.n. 1), 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Burhān Nizām Shāh II, also see Burhān Nizām II</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Hoqā‘ī Shāh of Mālāwā (a.v.)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Maḥmūd of Mālāwā</td>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Mahmūd I, of Gujarāt</td>
<td>75 (f.n. 2), 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Muhammad son of Sultan Mahmūd of Mālāwā</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Muhammad, regal name of Sāhib Khān</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Muhammad Shāh Sūr, surnamed ‘Ādil</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Muẓaffar III, of Gujarāt</td>
<td>70 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Nāṣīr-ud-Dīn, father of Sultan Mahmūd</td>
<td>7 (f.n. 5) 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Qutbu’ud-Dīn Ahmad II, of Gujarāt</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Sikandar Lodī, see Sikandar Lodī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan’s of Bengāl</td>
<td>9 (f.n. 1, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan’s of Gujarāt</td>
<td>16, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan’s of Mālāwā</td>
<td>16, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultanul’-Maḥāl Khān, popular title of Ḥadhrat Nizāmud-Dīn (a.v.)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultanul’-Ṭārikīr, see  Ḥamīdu’d-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūr, a dynasty</td>
<td>9 (f.n. 4), 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surajgarh, near Monghyr</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat, a district in Gujarāt</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabātabā, Sayyid ‘Ali, a historian (a.v.)</td>
<td>47 (f.n. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhir, father of Ahmad, a builder</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāhir, father of Shāikh Muhammad, a Traditionist</td>
<td>68 (f.n. 4), 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tājū’ud-Daulat wa’d-Dīn, title of Malik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lādla Khālās (a.v.)</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tājū’ud-Dīn, a saint</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālisk, a revenue division</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehrān, in Iran</td>
<td>74 (f.n. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thāneddar, a post</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thengade, R.A., a scholar</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughrul, a dynasty</td>
<td>9 (f.n. 1, 4), 13, 17, 20, 24, 35, 63, 64, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjain, a district in Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>5, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usmān I. Desai, official</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faqīl, a post</td>
<td>7 (f.n. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasrāvī, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>63, 68 (f.n. 7), 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnu Joshi, inscriptional slab in the field of, at Cheul</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṭthal Chinnalal Bangre, inscription in the compound of</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajāhu’l-Mulk, father of Shams Khān (a.v.)</td>
<td>33, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardhā, a district in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>46, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Tower, at Nāgaur</td>
<td>24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wazir Khān, a viceroy</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamani, nīṣab, of ‘Abdu’l-Latif (a.v.)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya’qūb, Maulānā, see Maulānā Ya’qūb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazdānī, Dr. G., scholar and epigraphist</td>
<td>49, 59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeotmāl, a district in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūsuf Paṭel, Sarpanch of Vasrāvī</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafar Khān, of Gujarāt</td>
<td>20, 24, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafāru’d-Dunyā, Nasrū’ud-Dunyā wrongly read as</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaima’ud-Dīn Shāikh, see Shāikh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaima’ud-Dīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabīd, in southern Arabia</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1971

SOME FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPITAPHS FROM CAMBAY IN GUJARĀT

By Dr. Z. A. Desai

India's relations with countries of the Middle East are believed to have existed not only from pre-Islamic times but even from times immemorial, but we do not have much in the form of written records or similar evidence for this. Anyway, the advent of the Arabs as a trading community and the growing world-consciousness (not in the material but geographical and one-world concept) which they brought with them must have naturally given further impetus to this traffic, which was and remained for centuries to come, as it is so even now, in the main commercial or exploratory, for in the very early years of Islam, even sporadic efforts to establish political authority on the Indian soil were firmly discouraged by the second caliph Hadrat 'Umar who has gone down in history, as is wellknown, as having severely reprimanded his general for his expedition to the place on western coast identified as Thānā.

No doubt, as distant lands of Africa, Central Asia, Persia, etc., gradually came within the fold of Islam, the eastward political penetration resulted in the Arab occupation of Sind in the early part of the 8th century. But the real political association of the Muslims with India came only three centuries later, through the invasions, from time to time, first of the rulers of the House of Subuktigin of Ghazna and subsequently of their Ghori supplanters, culminating in the establishment of the Muslim rule after the victory of Muḥammad bin Sām at the battle of Tarāin in 1193.

But even in this interregnum—between the conquest of Sind in 712 and the foundation of Muslim rule in northern India in 1193, the country particularly through its extensive coast-line did have relations with its neighbours in the Middle or Near East, as is amply born out by the accounts of a number of Arab authors in their geographical works or travelogues. But these works immensely valuable as they are—as a matter of fact, they contain authentic and eye-witness description of the various aspects of Indian life—they cannot fully satisfy the curiosity to know the nature of these relations in their details, because by their very nature, these works suffer from a limitation in that the information furnished by them was bound to be of a particular type. It is not unlikely that apart from the works of the geographers, there might be some unexplored material in Arabic and other foreign languages which might contain some information on the subject. Regrettably, no sustained efforts to trace these, if any, have been made nor does there appear any intention or likelihood to do so.

In any case, the material relating to these from the thirteenth century onwards, being available in somewhat greater degree, the pattern of relations becomes a little clearer. Here too, it may be pointed out, the available material is non-Indian and is mostly in the form of
biographical works in Arabic. But in this case, again the difficulty is that unfortunately, even published Arabic works, let alone manuscripts, pertaining to this branch of history, are not easily available in India.¹

There is one more source, unfortunately not so detailed, but more important in a sense, which has a bearing on this aspect. I refer to the epitaphs or rather such of those as have survived not so much the ruthless ravages of time as the thoughtless hand of the vandal and are found at different places of historical importance. In this article, it is proposed to study thirty such epitaphs of the fourteenth century, from an important seaport and commercial centre of the period in Western India, namely Cambay, in Kairā district of Gujarāt State.²

There is a considerable number of epitaphs to be found in this one-time port, majority of which is not in situ. They were set up from the first half of the thirteenth century onwards—when Gujarāt was still ruled over by the Chaulukyas and the Vāghelas, and refer to men in different walks of life—officials, scholars, merchants, sailors, craftsmen, etc.³ The group under study is fairly representative in this regard: Of the thirty persons and odd mentioned therein, four were officials or men in authority—one of them was a (royal) Secretary and Minister; two (and perhaps one more) can be distinctly recognised as men of vast learning and erudition; at least three belonged to the community of merchants and business-men including three belonging to what appear to be, prominent, local families; three were 'freed-slaves', that is to say, they started their career with bondage but were later freed by their masters whose names are also given in each case; and lastly, at least three of the deceased were ladies, who, it can be easily supposed, came from families of status—as a matter of fact, one of them is clearly mentioned as having been the spouse of a great merchant and official, as will be presently noted. In the case of the remaining twelve persons or so, it is difficult to ascertain their vocations for want of any specific mention in the text, but it is a reasonable surmise that most of these also belonged to the mercantile community.⁴

On the other hand, there is little doubt about the foreign origin of these persons. Almost all of them, with the possible exception of one or two, were settlers from Persia and adjoining territories, as the appellations to their names as al-Banū, al-Gilānī, al-Hādānī, al-Kānimī, al-Ardastānī, a't-Tifšī, al-Bāsī, al-Iqfāhānī, etc., tend to suggest. These persons mostly belonging to the mercantile class, had settled down, may be, from more than one generation for carrying on trade and business at Cambay which, being a flourishing port and wealthy town, was directly suited for the purpose. This and the information about the places from which they originally hailed should provide some material for the nature of relations between different countries and pattern of the foreign settlers on the Indian soil, who must have subsequently merged in the local population.

¹ The importance of these works can be judged by a couple of articles published by me incorporating the information gleaned from a few works available to me: 'India and the Near East during 13th-15th centuries', *Mālik-i Rām Felicitation Volume* (Delhi, 1972), pp. 209-27; 'Relations of India with Middle-eastern countries during the 16th-18th centuries', in *Professor H. K. Sherwani Felicitation Volume*, Hyderabad, 1975.

² References to works containing an account of Cambay and its monuments and inscriptions will be found in *Epigraphia Indica Arabic and Persian Supplement* (EIAPS), 1961, pp. 3 (f.n. 7), 4 (f.n. 1-5); *ibid.*, 1962, pp. 3 (f.n. 2), 6, 19, 20, 27; *ibid.*, 1963, pp. 10 (f.n. 2), 18, 21, 32, 36, 39, 42, 49; *ibid.*, 1970, pp. 74 (f.n. 2), 83.

³ As many as five thirteenth century epitaphs from Cambay, dated 1222, 1249, 1524, 1287 and 1291, were published in *ibid.*, 1961, pp. 7, 9, 17, 19, and 22 respectively.

⁴ Some of the epitaphs mention more than one person (apart from his or her father and fore-fathers), as for example, the masters of the freed slaves. Of course, in the absence of any information about the early careers of these freed slaves, their masters cannot be necessarily deemed to have lived in Cambay, but the specific mention of the relationship in the death-record should indicate that in all probability it was so.

⁵ The surname Khwāja in the case of a few of them, may perhaps be taken to indicate this.
The epitaphs of freed-slaves throw interesting sidelight on the life of this particular class, and the institution of 'slavery'. Apart from the indication contained in these and some other records about their social status (and indirectly financial too), the very fact that no attempt was made to conceal their antecedents shows that there was no stigma attached to, or any thing ignominious about, this state; it was evidently a case of economic condition. These records prove that these people must have enjoyed sufficient rights and could easily avail of the opportunities for showing their talents in different fields including state service.

The families known from these epitaphs to which a reference has been made above are Bammî, Irbîlî and 'Alângarî. The first has only one representative in the present group but two earlier members of the family were noticed in a previous number of the series. The Irbîlîs are represented by two members in this group; one more member of this house also lies buried at Cambay. Incidentally, in the later of the two Irbîlî epitaphs here, the sobriquet 'Fatolîa' occurs, as was the case with the third Irbîlî record under reference. Likewise, 'Alângarî too has two representatives in the present group; a third member of this family had died, if not lived, at Rânder, an old habitation near Surat, where his tombstone may still be seen. If the family-name 'Alângar meaning a lance- or banner-maker is any indication, its members might have been engaged in the manufacture of lances or banners.

About the officials and the learned men too, the present group supplies new and hence welcome though unfortunately scanty, information except in the case of one, Maliku'ul Sharâq 'Umar al-Kâsarûnî, who is mentioned only by the celebrated Moroccan traveller Ibn Battûta, as will be pointed out in the proper place.

Calligraphically too, these inscriptions provide a rich feast to the eyes. In general design they follow more or less the same pattern. I had occasion to dwell upon it at some length on a previous occasion but it may perhaps bear some repetition here. These epitaphs except in the case of one are engraved on arch-shaped tablets, usually of white marble, which are again divided into rectangular panels and arches of different shapes and decorative designs, and the texts comprising, almost as a rule, Quranic verses and the obituary proper are inscribed respectively in the arched portion, in the running borders of the stone as also in some of the horizontal lines of the vertical rectangular portion and in the remaining lines of the last mentioned. The style of writing, broadly speaking, is varied—it is basically Naskh or 'ulîh or rather Riqâ' in the main text and Kufi or Thuluth in the headings or Basmalah.

This pattern of tablets and their style of writing is found to have been more or less standardised in epitaphs to which it is exclusively found employed, more or less for two centuries, without any modification. Since many such epitaphs are found in Gujarât, mostly at Cambay and also at other far-flung places like Ahmadâbâd, Rânder, Verâval (in the western part of the province), Pâfan, etc., I was first led to describe the style as typical of Gujarât, at least in India, but since those lines were written some one hundred years ago, my notice which shows that this pattern was also in fashion in southern Arabia. I was also told, almost a decade and a half back, by an Indonesian delegate to the International Conference on Asian Archaeology held at New Delhi in
1961 that in his country too, this type of tombstones was in vogue. But I have not been able to procure any further information in this regard.

A striking aspect of the epigraphs studied below is that as many as twenty-six out of the total thirty belong to persons who died in the first half of the century, the latter half only claiming four. Representing as they do a fair sample-survey of epigraphs from Cambay, this fact may not be without significance and may perhaps be taken to reflect the fluctuations in the social and economic life of Cambay. Could the diminishing number in the latter half of the fourteenth century have been due in some measure at least, to the fact that it was not as peaceful as the earlier half, politically speaking, both for the province and the town, or to any change in the status of Cambay consequent upon the concentration of political power in the north of the province, to wit, at Patan (Nahrawān of Muslim historians)?

As has been stated earlier, most of these epigraphs, twenty-one to be exact, had been noticed and listed by the Archaeological Surveyor of the Western Circle more than half a century back, but unfortunately, their notices are usually incomplete and incorrect.

It may be noted that all but three of these epigraphs are not in situ. The tablets of most of them are built up into the walls of the Tomb of a local saint popularly known as Parvaz Shāh, Parvār Shāh or Parvāz Shahid, which is situated on the north-western outskirts of the town. The entire area around the tomb particularly on its west and south sides is strewn with tombs and graves. While most of their tombstones have either disappeared or lie buried in the ground, one can still see a few lying about here and there. It is from this burial ground that the headstones now preserved in the Tomb of Parvāz Shāh must have been removed. They were lying loose in the Tomb premises at the time of the survey referred to above (for they are mentioned in the Report as 'Tombstones collected in the Tomb') and must have been built up into walls, as of now, in 1946 when its present building was constructed. A few more headstones from this burial ground seem to have been removed to the Tomb of Pir Tāju’d-Din, also situated in the same graveyard half way to the Tomb of Parvāz Shahid, while a few seem to have found their way to some tombs and mosques of the town.

Of the epigraphs studied here, nineteen are from the Tomb of Parvāz Shāh (with two more from outside it) and two each from the Tomb of Pir Tāju’d-Din, Tomb of Buhārī Shāhid and Faraspur kī-Masjid. The remaining three are the only ones in situ—two fixed at the head of graves.

1 EIAPS, 1961, pp. 3-4.
3 The tomb, a modern structure constructed about three decades back, comprises a large rectangular hall, with the grave of the saint under a wooden canopy. Nothing is known about the saint or his times except that his name was Shāhī ‘Ali Jawālīqi, according to a framed short notice in Arabic, which runs as follows: 'Praise be to Allāh and obligation too. And salvation and peace be on Muhammad the best of mankind and his progeny and companions. This edifice of the (tomb)garden (which is) from among the gardens of Paradise, (containing the remains of) His Holiness the martyr, Shāhī ‘Ali Jawālīqi, known as Pir Parvār, may his secret be sanctified, was raised from its very foundation a second time and completed on the 20th of the month of Dhul-Qa’dā of the year five and sixty and three hundred after one thousand, from the Migration of the Prophet (39 Dhul-Qa’dā 1365=25 October 1946).'
4 There are in all twenty-six headstones thus preserved in this Tomb, out of which eleven occur in the east, six in the west, four in the south, and two in the north wall. These have been listed in our annual reports, but through oversight, the walls have been wrongly specified in the provenance of fifteen of these, viz. Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy (ARIE), 1956-57, Nos. D, 69-83. The correct provenance is: Nos. 69, 70, 72 and 81, in the south wall. Nos. 71, 77 and 80, in the east wall, Nos. 73, 74, 75, 76, 78 and 82, in the west wall and Nos. 79, and 83, in the north wall.
in the mausoleum forming the southern annexe of the Jāmī’ Mosque and one at the grave of Bībī Rānī at Nagarā, a village five kilometres to the north of Cambay.

I. EPITAPH DATED A.H. 699 (1300 A.D.)

The first epigraph is engraved on an arch-shaped tablet of white marble, measuring 68 cm. from apex to bottom and 36 cm. at the base, which is fixed at the head of a grave on a low platform, situated to the left of the passage just outside the entrance of the Tomb of Parvāz Shāh. A margin inscribed with Qur'anic verses runs all along the tablet, except at the bottom; its arched portion is decorated with a trifoil arch resting on jambs with foliated patterns at their sides, and above the arch is inscribed the formulae vesting the proprietorship of the entire worldly kingdom in Allāh. The rectangular portion under the arch is divided into seven horizontal panels, the first containing the First Creed, the second a Qur'anic verse and the rest, the obituary proper, according to which the grave was that of Kamālū’d-Dīn Sulaimān son of Aḥmad son of Husain son of Abī (i.e. Abū) Sharaf al-Banmī who had died on Monday, 30th Jumādā 699 (22nd February 1300). The text designates the deceased as al-Gharib meaning ‘the stranger in the land’ that is to say a foreigner or emigrant, which may be taken to indicate that he had not yet finally settled down in Cambay when death overtook him. He seems to have been one of the merchants from foreign countries carrying on trade here. His nisba al-Banmī shows that Kamālū’d-Dīn Sulaimān belonged either by birth or origin, to Banmī, a famous fortress-town between Kiūnān and Zāhīdān in the Kirmān province of Irān.

The deceased appears to have been a member of what appears to be the Banmī family residing at Cambay. Two more persons with this nisba who find mention in epigraphs from Cambay are Sa’īd son of Abū Sharaf son of ‘Ali son of Shāpur al-Banmī (alive in 1218) and Sharafū’d-Dīn Abū Shams son of Abū Shams son of Abū Sharaf al-Banmī (died in 1249). Taking their nisbas and their dates into account, all the three appear to have been the offspring of one fore-father as per the following genealogical table:

```
[Diagram of genealogy]
```

3 See the next two foot-notes.
4 He built a mosque at Cambay in this year (*EIAPS*, 1961, pp. 5-6, pl. I a).
5 For his epitaph, see *ibid.*, pp. 9-10, pl. II a.
The text is executed in the Riq'ah-mixed Naskh style of writing of a fairly good quality and reads as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate I(a)*

(a) *Margin.*

إنه لا إله إلا الله هو الوصي والملاك و آراء العلم قابلا بال껴ط لا إله إلا هو العزيز

الحكم إن الذين عند الله الآلام وما اختلف الذين أوتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءهم هم العلم

بغي بينهم ومن يكره بذلك وإن كان الله سريع الحساب

(b) *Above the arch.*

ملكه الوحد القهار

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) الله الأ لله محمد رسول الله

(2) كل من عليها فان و يبقى وجه زوال الجلال و الأكرام

(3) هذا قبر عبد الصمد الغريب المرجوم المتعجر

(4) المنين المجتاج إلى راحة الله تعالى كمبال الدين

(5) سليمان بن أحمد ابن حسن ابن الراشد الغني تغد فيه

(6) بالرحمة و الرضوان و أسكنه في دار الجنان توني يوم

الإثنين سلخ جمادى الأول سنة تسعين و سبعين و ستمية

**TRANSLATION**

(a) ‘Allah bears witness that there is no god but He, and (so do) the angels and those possessed of knowledge, being maintainer of justice; there is no god but He, the Mighty, the Wise. Surely, the true religion with Allah is Islaam, and those to whom the Book had been given did not show opposition but after knowledge had come to them, out of envy among themselves; and whoever disbelieves in the communication of Allah—then surely Allah is quick in reckoning.’

(b) The kingdom belongs to Allah the One, the Subduer (of all).

(c) (1) (First Creed:) ‘There is no god but Allah, Muhammed is the apostle of Allah’.

(2) ‘Every one on it must pass away. And there will endure for ever the person of Your Lord, the Lord of glory and honour.’

1 Qur’ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18.
2 Cf. ibid., Chapter XL, verse 16.
3 Ibid., Chapter XL, verses 26-27.
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 699 (p. 6)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 700 (p. 7)
(3) This is the grave of the weak creature, the stranger (or emigrant), the one who is called unto Allah's mercy and pardoned,

(4) the sinful, the dependent on the mercy of Allah the Exalted, Karrâhu'd-Din

(5) Sulaimân son of Ahmâd son of Hussain son of Abî Sharaf al-Bammî (lit. of Bammî), may Allah cover him

(6) with (His) mercy and pleasure and settle him in the abode of Paradise. He died on Monday, the last day of the month of Junâdâ the First (of the ) year (A.H.) nine and ninety and six hundred (last day i.e. 30 Junâdâ I 699-22 February 1300).

II. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 700 (1301 A.D.)

This epitaph is from the Tomb of Pir Tâfu’d-Din, a small modern open four-walled enclosure, referred to above,1 which must have originally formed part of the main burial ground of the town but fenced off not very long ago.2 There are three graves in this enclosure, and the epigraph studied below is the one from the middle grave.3

The marble-tablet is as usual arch-shaped and comparatively plain. Measuring 52 cm. from apex to bottom and 35 cm. in width at the base, it has a margin all around except at the bottom, which contains one of the two Quranic texts usually found in epitaphs from Cambay. In the arched portion is inscribed the First Creed, and below it, the first and the second of the six horizontal panels contain Basmâla and a famous Quranic verse on the mortality of human beings. The epigraph contained in the remaining four lines marks the grave to be that of Tâfu’d-Din Muhammâd son of Muhammâd a’z-Zakariyyâ al-Qazwini who is stated to have expired on Monday, the 9th Junâdâ II 700 (19th February 1301).

The nisâba al-Qazwini makes the deceased Tâfu’d-Din an Iranian settler or emigrant. Though locally venerated as a saint, there is nothing in the text to invest him with any saintly status or spiritual powers. Very probably, he was one of the innumerable merchants, traders, craftsmen or artisans who are usually found at such busy ports as Cambay was in those days.

The text which is executed in Riqâ’-mixed Thuluth style of a fairly high quality has been deciphered as follows:—

TEXT

Plate I(b)

(a) Margin.

شهد الله ان له دنا هو الخلاقان و اوّلوا العلم قابتا نالت ي الله الا هو العزيز
الحكم ان الذين اذن الله الإسلام وما اختلف الذين اوّلوا الكتاب الا من بعد ما جاءه هم العلم
بنيا بينهم و من يكفر بابًا إلى أن شرع الحساب

1 ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 117. It was first noticed in PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 32.
2 Here on a small platform at the back may be seen the epitaph dated A.H. 630 or 1232 A.D. (EIAS, 1961, p. 7, Pl. I b).
3 There are four more headstones embedded into the north and east walls (ARIÉ, 1959-60, Nos. D, 118-121). These tablets must have been brought to this place from the graveyard after the visit of the Archaeological Surveyor in 1919-20, since they are not mentioned in his report but the one under study is (PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 32).
(b) *Within the arch.*

لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) بسم الله الرحمان الرحيم
(2) كل نفس ذائقة الموت
(3) هذا قبر العبد الضعيف الراحى إلى دومة الله
(4) تعالى تاج الدين محمد ابن محمد الزركية التزويقى
(5) تغمى الله بالرحمة و الرضوان و الحج على دار الجنان
(6) وقد تو في يوم الاثنين التاسع من شهر جمادى الآخر سنة سبعماة

**TRANSLATION**

(a) *Qur'ān,* Chapter II, verses 17-18.1

(b) First Creed.2

(c) (1) *Basma:* In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful.
(2) ‘Every soul shall taste of death’.3
(3) This is the grave of the weak creature, hopeful of the mercy of Allāh.
(4) the Exalted, Tājū’d-Dīn Muḥammad son of Muḥammad a’z-Zakariyyā al-Qazwīnī (i.e. of Qazwin).4
(5) may Allāh cover him with (His) mercy and pleasure and settle him in the abode of Paradise.
(6) And he died on Monday, the ninth of the month of Jumādā the Second (of the) year (A.H.) 700 (9 Jumādā II 700–19 February 1301).

**III. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 707 (1307 A.D.)**

The arch-shaped tablet bearing this extremely interesting epitaph is of considerable size measuring 1.12 metre from apex to bottom and 53 cm. in width and is built up into the north wall of the Tomb of Parvāz Shāhid.5

The record comprises religious text and the epitaph proper, as in the case of the two preceding epitaphs, but in this instance, there is more Qur’ānic text and the arrangement of the whole record is also somewhat more elaborate. In addition to the three-sides margin, there are two inner vertical panels, the arch-base is converted into a separate horizontal panel and the arched area on the tablet is ornamented with a trifoil arch. The central or main portion consists of ten inscribed panels of uniform size except the first one which is wider.

---

1 For translation, see p. 6.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 Qur'ān, Chapter III, verse 184.
4 Qazwin is a famous town in Iran.
The outer and inner margins contain two different sets of Quranic verses, the arch-base is inscribed with the Basmala, the first two horizontal panels are taken up with the First Creed and a Quranic verse, the third, fourth and part of the fifth record a Tradition of the Prophet on the fleeting character of human life, and the rest contain the obituary stating that the grave belonged to Shamsu’d-Din Muḥammad son of ‘Ali son of Yāḥyā son of al-Jauzī al-Jazrī who expired on Tuesday, the 17th Rabī’ II 707 (18th October 1307).

The epigraph was briefly noticed in the Progress Report referred to above, where the year of death was wrongly quoted as A.H. 709 and the name of the deceased and those of his father and grandfather were given as ‘Shamsuddin Muḥammad bin Suraihi ibn all Jawzi al-Jazrī’.¹

While nothing is known about the deceased, the epithets used for him in the text show him to be a leading personality of his times, at least in the field of religious knowledge and learning. He is described as ‘the savant well-versed in the subtleties of knowledge, the leading teacher and pursuer of Truth and the Mufti (i.e. giver of Fatawa or religious decisions) of sections and groups.’

It has not been possible to identify the deceased or to get hold of any particulars of his life.² The epigraph calls him a martyr which means that he had met his death in one of the ways laid down in the religious law for martyrdom, such as killing, drowning, snake-bite, etc. Also, he is mentioned as al-Gharib i.e. a stranger or one from another land, indicating that he was an emigrant or a new-comer to Cambay.

The text is executed in the same Riqā’-like Naskh which marks the calligraphy of the thirteenth century epitaphs of this type and reads as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate II(a)*

(a) Outer margin.

الله لا إله إلا هو الحا التقي لا تأخذ[ه] سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض من ذئذ اللى يشع عندَه لا باذنه يعلم ما بين ايديهم وما خلفهم لا يهبطون سهك عن عمه اللى يطاه وسع كرسيه السماوات والأرض ولا يؤهد حظهما وهو الال العظيم لا كثرا في الدَّين قد تبين الرشد من انى فسيتكر بالطاغوت ويومن بالله قد استمسك بالمرأة الوطى لا انفصم لها وأنت سمع عليكم

(b) Vertical panels, right and left.

شهد الله إنه لا إله إلا هو والملكيّة وءولو[ال] العلم فايمبا بالقبط لا إنه إلا وهو العزيز الحكيم إن الدَّين عند الله الإسلام وما اختلف الذين أوتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءه[هم] العلم يغدا بينهم ومن يكرر بايات الله فان الله سريع الحساب

¹ *PRWC*, 1919-20, p. 49, Appendix Q. No. 3.
² It is difficult to say if Muhammad bin Muhammad al-Jazrī (d.A.H. 833), the celebrated author of the famous work *al-Hisna l-Husn*, was among his descendants.

I DGA/74
(a) Qur'ān, Chapter II, verses 255-56.¹
(b) Ibid., Chapter III, verses 17-18.²
(c) 1 Basmala.³
2 First Creed.⁴
3 Qur'ān, Chapter III, part of verse 184.⁵
4 "Their Lord gives them good news of mercy from Himself and (His) good pleasure and gardens, wherein lasting blessings shall be theirs;"
5 "abiding therein for ever; surely Allāh has a Mighty reward with Him."⁶

¹ For translation, see p. 10.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ For translation, see p. 8.
⁴ For translation, see p. 6.
⁵ For translation, see p. 10.
⁶ Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.
(6) This is the grave of the creature, the stranger (who is) received into (Allāh’s) mercy (and is) hopeful of

(7) the mercy of Allāh the Exalted, Miṣbāḥ, the freed slave of the Lord, Zainu‘d-Dīn

(8) 'Ali son of Muẓaffar al-Malāḏharī, may Allāh illumine his grave with His ample pardon.

(9) He died on the twentieth (of the month) of Jumādā the Second (of the year) (A.H.) nine and seven hundred (20 Jumādā II 709-25 November 1309).

V. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 710 (1310 A.D.)

This arch-shaped headstone also comes from the Tomb of Parvāz Shahīd, where it is built up, fourth from right, in the eastern wall. It is smaller in size being only 55 cm. in height and 25 cm. in width and has a single marginal border inscribed with Quranic text and horizontal panels within, containing religious texts followed by the epitaph proper.

This tombstone was originally set up on the grave of Ḥāji Abū Bakr son of 'Allī son of Abū Bakr Irbili, who died on the 25th Muḥarram 710 (24th June 1310). In the Progress Report where the tombstone is noticed, the deceased’s nisba is given as Adhali.

As in the case of the other persons mentioned in the preceding epitaphs, nothing is known about Abū Bakr Irbili. But there are found at Cambay at least three epitaphs bearing this nisba Irbili i.e. of Irbil, a town near Mosul in modern Iraq, and from this it can be safely surmised that he belonged to the same family, which guess is further corroborated by the names of the three persons—Ḥāji Ibrāhīm son of Muḥammad son of 'Ali al-Irbili known as Fatolia (d. A.H. 690), Ḥāji Abū Bakr son of 'Ali son of Abū Bakr al-Irbili, mentioned in the epitaph under study (d. A.H. 710) and Shamsu‘d-Dīn Muḥammad son of Abū Bakr son of 'Ali Irbili (d. A.H. 736), whose epitaph has also survived (No. XXIII, infra). We would not perhaps be much wrong, on the basis of this information to draw up a genealogy of these persons as under:

Abū Bakr

     \[ \text{Ali} \]

\[ \text{Ḥāji Abū Bakr} \quad \text{(d. A.H. 710)} \]

\[ \text{Shamsu‘d-Dīn Muḥammad} \quad \text{Fatolia} \quad \text{(d. A.H. 736)} \]

\[ \text{Ḥāji Ibrāhīm} \quad \text{Fatolia} \quad \text{(d. A.H. 690)} \]

Very probably, thus, the deceased belonged to the Irbili family of Cambay, which appears to have been a leading business-house of the town: Ḥāji Ibrāhīm has been described in his epitaph as ‘the magnificent chief, the great and glorious master, king of merchants and prince of shipmasters’, etc., while the epitaph under study calls Ḥāji Abū Bakr ‘the respected chief’. In

---

1 The text has Maulā, an equivalent of Khwāja in Arabic-speaking countries
2 ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 123.
3 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 20.
the case of the other two members, the *alīs* ‘Fatolia’ is used, but the present epitaph omits it. As has been stated elsewhere, Fatolia appears to have been a sobriquet for the family rather than for the individual.¹

The calligraphy of this record is similar to that in the previous records, the script being *Riqāʿ*-mixed *Naṣīḥa*. Its text is quoted below:—

**TEXT**

*Plate III(b)*

(a) *Border.*

(b) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) *La ilāh āla allah al-Rasūl allāh*

(2) *Bism allāh ar-rahmān ar-rahim*

(3) *Bi shah rám râm mar fawwād wa fahlan wa jāhlan lā iktā ba‘ṣ bi‘rām bāb fawwād wa fahlan wa jāhlan kāfara ba‘ṣ bi‘rām bāb fawwād wa fahlan wa jāhlan kāfara bi‘rām bāb fawwād wa fahlan wa jāhlan kāfara*

(4) *Qurān, Chapter III, verses 17-18.*

(5) *First Creed.*

(6) *Basmala.*

(7) *Qurān, Chapter IX, verse 21.*

(8) This is the grave of the respected chief, one who is taken into (Allāh’s) mercy (and) pardon, hopeful

(9) of the mercy of his Nourisher, Ḥāji Abū Bakr son of ‘Alī son of Abū Bakr

¹ *EIAPS*, 1961, p. 23, where the word Fatolia has been explained.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ For translation, see p. 6.
⁴ For translation, see p. 8.
⁵ For translation, see p. 10.
⁶ One who has performed the *Ḥajj*, i.e. made a pilgrimage to the Ka‘ba at Mecca.
(6) Irbili (i.e. of Irbil, near Mosul), may Allah illumine his grave with His ample pardon. He died on Wednesday.

(7) the twenty-fifth of (the month of) Muharram (of the) year (A.H.) ten and seven hundred (25 Muharram 710 = 24 June 1310).

VI. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 713 (1314 A.D.)

This is the epitaph of another person who has been described in the text as a freed slave. It is inscribed on an arch-shaped headstone fixed, second from right, into the north wall of the Tomb of Firdaws Shahid1 and conforms, more or less, to the ornate two-margins type of the tombstones in the present group. There is, however, a slight variation in the Quranic text.

According to the epigraph, the grave belonged to one Amin ud-Din Kafir, a freed slave of the merchant Sharafu'd-Din Mahdi son of Muhammad al-Hamadani, who had died on 1st Dhu'I-Qa'da A.H. 713 (17th February 1314). No further information is contained in the text about Amin ud-Din, except that his former master was a merchant by profession and had hailed from Hamadani, the famous city in western Iran.

The notice of this epitaph by the Archaeological Surveyor in his Progress Report is misleading and confusing: The deceased is stated to be 'Asruddin Kafir Atiq (ibn) Sharfuddin Mehdii ibn-Muhammad al-baqir-ul-Hamadani'. Both the one-time slave and master have been mistaken as son and father due to the ignorance about the term 'Atiq, and the Arabic term for merchant, (a't-Tajir), due to lack of diacritical marks and peculiar style of writing, was erroneously read as 'al-baqir'.

The style of writing is again typical Riq'a-like Naskh and the calligraphy is of a fairly high order. The tablet measures about 102 cm. from apex to bottom and is 38 cm. in width.

The text has been deciphered as follows:

TEXT

Plate III(a)

(a) Outer margin.

هو آلل Gareth ل اه لا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن الرحيم هو اتح الذات ل النا [الله هو الملك القدوس السلام المؤمن المهين المزيز

(b) i. Corners at the arch-base.

الملك الله

ii. Vertical panels and top (arch-base) panel.

شهد الله أنه لا اله إلا هو الملاكهة و اولوا العلم قابا باقرا لا اله إلا هو العزيز الحكيم ان الذين عند الله الإسلام و ما اختلف الذين اتوا الكتاب الا من بعد ما جاءهم الالم بنيا بينهم و من يكبر بآيات الله فافاني الله سريع الحساب صدق الله

1 ARIE, 1956-57, No. D, 83, where it is wrongly stated to be in the eastern wall.

2 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, Appendix Q, No. 4.
(a) "He is Allāh besides whom there is no God: The knower of the unseen and the seen; He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. He is Allāh, besides whom there is no god; the King, the Holy, the Author of peace, the Granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty."

(b) Kingdom belongs to Allāh.

(c) Qur’ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18, followed by the phrase 'Rightly says Allāh'.

(d) (1) Basmala.

(2) First Creed.

(3-4) Qur’ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.

(5) This is the grave of the creature, received in (Allāh’s) mercy and pardoned, Aminu’d-Din Kāfūr,

(6) the freed slave of the one who is taken into (Allāh’s) mercy, Sharafu’d-Din Mahdī son of Muḥammad, the merchant, al-Hamadānī (i.e. of Hamadān),

(7) may Allāh cover him with His mercy and pleasure and grant him abode in the centre of His Paradise. He died on Wednesday,

(8) the first (of the month) of Dhu’l-Qa’da (of the year A.H.) thirteen and seven hundred (1 Dhu’l-Qa’da 715=17 February 1314). And Allāh’s salutation be on Muḥammad (the Prophet).

VII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 715 (1315 A.D.)

One more family or professional name has come to light through this epitaph, which is inscribed on an arch-shaped tablet of white marble, now fixed, seventh from right into the eastern wall of

---

1 Qur’ān, Chapter LIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 For translation, see p. 8.
4 For translation, see p. 6.
5 For translation, see p. 12.
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 713 (p. 15)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 710 (p. 14)
(a) Qur'ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18.¹

(b) (1) First Creed.²

(2) Basmala.³

(3) This is the grave of the weak creature taken into (Allāh's) mercy (and) pardoned,

(4) Hājī son of Muḥammad son of Aḥmad, popularly known as 'Alamgar (i.e. lance- or banner-maker),

(5) may Allāh render his sleeping-place cool. He died on Monday, the eighth

(6) of the month of Ramadān (of the) year (A.H.) fifteen and seven hundred (8 Ramadān 715-6 December 1315).

The sixth day of December of the year 1315, according to Ephemeris, was not Monday, but Saturday. This may perhaps be due to the calculations based on the actual sighting of the moon or the reckonings of the Calendar followed in the Arab countries.

VIII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 716 (1316 A.D.)

This is quite an interesting epitaph. It furnishes some important, though meagre, historical information, not found elsewhere. It mentions two persons, one-time master and slave who, judging from the titles and epithets appended to their names, held position of authority during their lifetime.

The epitaph is engraved on an arch-shaped tablet of marble, measuring 102 cm. from apex to bottom and 38 cm. at the base, which is fixed into the eastern wall of the Tom.b of Parvāz Shabīd, ninth from right.⁴ The text is executed in a slightly more elaborate and artistic way, but the somewhat crowded writing fails to produce the desired effect. The calligraphical style is the usual Nashī with strong Riqa' tendency.

The epitaph was intended for the grave of the great, the just and the learned Malik Šalāhu'd-Daulat wa'd-Dīn who is reported to have met a martyr's death on Tuesday, the 17th of Jumādā II 716 (6th September 1316). The deceased's name and title are indicative of the high official status held by him in life. That he had risen to the position of a great Malik from that of a slave is clear from the fact that the text describes him as a freed slave of Mukhlīs a's-Sulṭānī, who too, from his appellation a's-Sulṭānī appears to have been an official of high rank. It may be particularly noted that the deceased is stated to have been a man of great learning.

But it is unfortunate that we do not have more details about either the Malik or his one-time master or about their duties, place of postings, etc. For want of any such possible information it is not possible to say if the deceased had served his master in Gujarāt or elsewhere. Even then, its importance as a historical document of note is apparent, having preserved the name of an official of position who flourished during the early years of the consolidation of the Muslim rule in Gujarāt—having died hardly within two decades of the conquest of the province by 'Alā'ud-Dīn

¹ For translation, see p. 6.
² For translation, see p. 8.
³ For translation, see p. 8.
⁴ *ARIE*, 1899-60, No. D, 128.
⁵ *Ibid.,* has 18th which is a misprint.
Khalji in 1297-98. This information is all the more valuable since contemporary, let alone later, historians give practically no information about the officials posted in the province. As it is, apart from one epigraph, dated 1314, mentioning the Gujarāt governor and two other officials, from Peştād,¹ not far from Cambay, it is only at Cambay that records preserving the names of officials who flourished within the first quarter of the Khalji conquest of Gujarāt are found. It may be recalled here that in this town lies buried a governor (hākim) of Cambay (d. 1299), probably its first.²

As usual the brief notice of the inscription as given in the Progress Report is confusing and incorrect: according to it, the tombstone belonged to Sālihud-din Ātiq who died on the 17th Jamādī-ul-Ākhir, 716 A.H. is styled Muhkāmi-i-Sultāni and was most probably an officer who had served Sultan ‘Ala’uddin Muḥammad Khaljī of Delhi in person.³ This notice suffers from a number of inaccuracies, which can be corrected with the help of the text and translation quoted below:—

TEXT

Plate IV(a)

(a) Arch-margin.

هو إلهنا الذي لا إله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن [الرحيم] هو إلهنا الذي لا إله

لا هو الملك القدوس السلام الدومن المهين العزيز

(b) Outer margin, under (a).

آلهنا الذي لا إله إلا هو الحي القيم لا تأخذ سنة ولا توم له ما في السموات وما في الأرض من

ذى الذي يشع عنه إلا باذنه يعلم ما بين أيديهم وما خلفهم ولا يحيطون بشيء من علمه

لا بما شاءه ومع كرسيه السموات والأرض ولا يؤده حفظهما وهو العل العظيم لا أكره في

أندين قد تبين الرشد من الغي فل يكثر بالطاغوت و يو من بابه قد استنسك بالعروة الموهية

لا أنفسهم لها و آلهنا سميع علم

(c) Vertical panels, right and left.

شهد آلهنا الذي لا إله إلا هو و الملائكة و أولو[ا] العالم ثانيا بالضبط لا آلهنا إلا هو العزيز

الحكيم ابن الذين عند آلهنا الإسلام وما اختلف الذين أو توا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءه[ه]

آلهنا بغي بليهم و من يكفر بآيات آلهنا فان آلهنا سريع الحساب صدق آلهنا العظيم

(d) Horizontal panels.

(1) إنه آلهنا لبعده رسول آلهنا

(2) يبشرهم ربهم برحمته منه و رضوان

¹ EIM, 1917-18, p. 33, pl. XI b.
² EIAFS, 1962, pp. 3-4, pl. I a.
³ PRWC, 1919-20, pp. 49, No. 1.
⁴ Ibid., p. 57.
TRANSLATION

(a) 'He is Allāh besides whom there is no god: the Knower of the unseen and the seen; He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. He is Allāh, besides whom there is no god; the King, the Holy, the Author of Peace, the Granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty.'

(b) Qur'ān, Chapter II, verses 255-56.

(c) Ibid., Chapter III, verses 17-18, followed by the phrase 'Rightly says Allāh the Magnificent'.

(d) (1) First Creed.

2-3) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verse 21.

(4) This is the grave of the great and learned Malik,

(5) the just, the one taken into (Allāh's) mercy and pardoned, the fortunate,

(6) the martyr, Ṣalāḥu'd-Daula wa'd-Dīn (lit. welfare of the State and Religion),

(7) the freed slave of Mukhlīṣ a's-Sultānī, may Allāh render cool

(8) his resting-place. He died on the night of Tuesday, the seven-

(9) teenth of the month of Jumādā al-Ākhar (of the) year (A.H.)

(10) sixteen and seven hundred (17 Jumādā II 716-6 September 1316).

IX. EPIGRAPH, DATED A.H. 721 (1321 A.D.)

In general design as well as arrangement and execution of text, this epitaph resembles the preceding one to a fairly large extent. It also contains the same Quranic text with small additions in two three places. These facts may perhaps be indicative of a similar status of the deceased for whose grave this tombstone was intended.
The tablet is as usual arch-shaped and measures 85 cm. from apex to bottom and 50 cm. in width. It is now preserved in the Tomb of Parvāz Shāh where it is built up, sixth from right, into the southern wall, but it was originally meant to mark the grave of one Fakhrūd-Dīn Ahūmad son of Husain son of Abū Bakr, popularly known as 'al-Qāḍī'īl-Iṣfahānī' i.e. the Iṣfahānī Qāḍī, who is stated to have died a martyr on Sunday, the 25th Rabi' II 721 (24th May 1321).

The cognomen recorded in the text by which he was popularly known shows that the deceased discharged the duties of the local judge and might have headed the judicial department as it existed then. It also proclaims him not only to be of Iranian extraction but probably a fresh immigrant. Needless to say, whatever position he might have held in his time, he is not known from any other source.

The style of writing is Riqū-like Naskh and the text reads as under:—

TEXT

Plate V(b)

(a) Arched margin.

هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن [الرحيم هو] الله الذي لا إله إلا هو الملك القدوس السلام الموفين الفومن العزيز

(b) Outer margin.

الله لا إله إلا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذه سنة ولا نوم له ما في السمون وما في الأرض من ذي الذي يشفع عنه إلا باذنه يعلم ما بين أقدامهم وما خلفهم ولا يعيثون بشيء من عده إلا بسماه[ه] ومع كربه السمون والماء ولا يؤدؤهن حقهنما ولا هو العليم العظيم لا أكره في الدين قد تبين الرشد من الذي فن يكفر بالطغوت وپومن بهم قد استمسك بالعروة الوثقى لا انقصام لها و لله سميع عليم صداق الله

(c) Vertical panels, right and left.

شهد الله أنه لا إله إلا هو و الملكة وأولوا العلم قايينا بالقسط لا الله إلا هو العزيز الحكم إن الدين عند الله الإسلام وما اختلف الذين اوتوا الكتاب إلا من بعد ما جاءهم[ه]هم العلم بغيبي بينهم وما يكفر بآيات الله فإن الله سريع الحساب وم لا عمدا رسول

(d) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله
(2) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(3) يبشرهم برحمة منه و رضوان و جنت لهم فيها نعم
(4) مقيم خالدين فيها إبدا إن الله عنهما أجر عظيم

1 ARJE, 1939-90, No. D. 125 ; PRWC, 1919-90, p. 50, No. 19.
TRANSLATION

(a) Qurʾān, Chapter LIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.¹
(b) Ibid., Chapter II, verses 255-56,² followed by the phrase 'Rightly says Allāh'.
(c) Ibid., Chapter III, verses 17-18.³ 'And Muḥammad is no more than an apostle'.⁴
(d) (1) First Creed.⁵
(2) Basmala.⁶
(3-4) Qurʾān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.⁷
(5) This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allāh's) mercy and pardoned, the fortunate, the martyr, Faḫrū’d-Dīn
(6) Abū al-ʿAbdALLĀH Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq, commonly known as al-Qādiʿu’l-Isfahānī (i.e. the Isfahānī Qādiʿ or Qādiʿ, originally from Isfahān).⁸
(7) may Allāh cover him with His mercy and pleasure and grant him abode in the centre of His Paradise. He died on Sun-
(8) day, twenty-fifth (of the month of) Rabīʿ u’l-ʿAkhār (of the) year (A.H.) one and twenty and seven hundred (25 Rabīʿ II 721 = 24 May 1321).

X. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 728 (1327 A.D.)

This is yet another tombstone preserved in the Tomb of Pir Parvāz Shahid. It is arch-shaped, measuring 86 cm. from apex to bottom and 42 cm. in width and is embedded, first from right, into the eastern wall.⁹ It more or less conforms, in general design and execution, to the other tombstones in this group.

The epitaph was originally set up on the grave of Khwāja Kabirū’d-Dīn Muḥammad son of Maṣūr al-Kuhramī, i.e. of Kuhrām, who died, according to the text, on Friday, 5th Muḥarram 728 (20th November 1327). The text contains nothing which could throw light on the life of the Khwāja; only his nisba al-Kuhramī can be taken to indicate that he hailed from Kuhrām, probably an important fort of that name (Kohrām) in the Punjab in the medieval period. If so,

¹ For translation, see p. 20.
² For translation, see p. 10.
³ For translation, see p. 6.
⁴ Qurʾān, Chapter III, part of verse 143.
⁵ For translation, see p. 6.
⁶ For translation, see p. 8.
⁷ For translation, see p. 12.
⁸ Isfahān is the name of a famous city in Iran.
⁹ ARIE, 1956-57, No. D, 71, where it was stated to be in the northern wall.
Plate V

(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 728 (p. 23)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 721 (p. 21)

Scale: 15

Scale: 17
it would mean that though not a foreigner in the strict sense, he was a new comer to Cambay. Whether he came there in the capacity of an official, a mere visitor, or a trader, it is difficult to say. Nevertheless, the distinct reference to a North-Indian resident of Cambay, is not without historical interest.

The epitaph was briefly and correctly noticed in the Progress Report except that the nisba of the deceased is omitted there and the day of the month is stated to be 6th instead of 5th Muḥarrām.¹

The text is inscribed in the usual Riqq-like Naskh style and has been read as under:

TEXT

Plate V(a)

(a) Arched margin.

(b) Vertical panels, right and left.

(c) Horizontal panels.

i. Arch-base:

ii. Below i:

TRANSLATION

(a) Qurʾān, Chapter LIIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.²

¹ PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 16.
² For translation, see p. 20.
(b) Qur'ān, Chapter II, verse 255, followed by the phrase 'Rightly says Allāh'.

(c) i. 'In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent, the Merciful. Say: He, Allāh, is One. Allāh is He on whom all depend. He begets not, nor is He Begotten. And none is like Him.'

ii. (1) First Creed.

(2-3) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.

(4) This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allāh's) mercy and pardon, the hopeful of the mercy of his Nourisher, Khwāja Kabīru'd-Dīn.

(5) Muḥammad (son of) Mansūr al-Khawāṣir, i.e. of Kuhrām, may Allāh cover him with His mercy and pleasure and inhabit him in the centre of His Paradise. He died

(6) on Friday, the fifth of the month of Muḥarram (of the) year (A.H.) eight and twenty and seven hundred (5 Muḥarram 728-20 November 1327).

XI. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 730 (1329 A.D.)

The arch-shaped tablet on which this epitaph is inscribed measures 75 cm. in height and 35 cm. at the base and is built up in the southern wall of the Tumb of Parvāz Shahid. It contains, as usual, religious text, comprising in this case, in addition to the Quranic texts a saying of the Prophet on the transitoriness of the world. According to the epitaph, the grave belonged to Abū Bakr son of Alīmad ališ Nāṣir al-Dīn, i.e. of Bārān (Rānder), who died on the 13th Muḥarram 730 (16th November 1329).

The deceased belonged, according to his nisba, to Rānder, which is the name used by the Arab writers for Rānder near Surat, across the River Tapti. No other information about him or his vocation, etc., is furnished by the record or any other source. But the epigraph furnishes an important piece of information that the deceased was popularly known as Nāṣir al-Dīn which is a Gujarāti word meaning 'associated with or related to wood'. This ališ may perhaps signify his profession—dealer in timber or so, or some trait or distinguishing character of his.

The style of writing is the Rūḵ mixed Nāshī of more or less the same type as is found in Camābāy epitaphs of the period.

The text reads as under:

TEXT
Plate VI

(a) Arched margin.

لا هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن الرحيم هو الله الذي لا إله

لا هو الملك الذي الصيد السلام المؤمن المؤمن العزيز الجبار

---

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 Qur'ān, Chapter CXXII.
3 For translation, see p. 8.
4 For translation, see p. 12.
5 ARIE, 1936-7, No. D, 70, where it was stated to be in the northern wall.
6 I. ibid., the ališ is given as Zakariyyā.
7 In PBWO, 1919-20, p. 49. No. 11, an incomplete text is given.
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 730 (p. 26)

(5) Another epitaph of the same date (p. 24)

Scale: 1/22

Scale: 1/2
(b) Outer margin and arch-base.

و سبق الذين اتقنا ربيهم إلى الجنة زمراً حتى إذا جاءها و فتحت أبوابها و قال [لهم]

خزتها سلام عليكم طينكم فادخلوا [ها] خالدين و قالوا الحمد لله الذُّن مثقلنا وعد و اوثرنا الأرض

لتونو من [الجنة حيث نشأ Invoke the angels and ترى الملائكة حافين من حول العرش يسيرون

يهدد ربهم و قضى بينهم بالحق و قبل الحمد رد رب العالمين

(c) Inner margin.

شهد الله أنه لا إله إلا هو و الملائكة و أولوا العلم قائما بالقسط لا إنه لا هو العزيز

الحكيم أن الذين عند الله السلام و ما اختلف الذين اوتوا الكتاب الا من بعد ما جاءهم العلم

بغي بينهم و من يكفر بايت الله فان الله سريع الحساب صدق الله العظيم

(d) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(2) يبشرهم جميعهم برحمة منه و رضوان و جنات لهم فيها نعيم

(3) مقيم بالذين فيها ابدأ ان الله عنده إجر عظيم

(4) قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كن في الدنيا

(5) كانتك غريب او كعابر سبيل و عد نفسك من أصحاب القبور

(6) هذا ثير العبد المرحوم أبو بكر بن أحمد عرف لكرية الزرنيس

(7) تور الله قبل قد انتقل من دار الفنا يوم السبتمFalatteen من

(8) شهر المحرم سنة ثلاثون و سبعين و ورش الله على محمد

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur’ân, Chapter LIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.1

(6) 'And those who are careful of (their duty to) their Lord shall be conveyed to the garden in companies; until they come to it, and its doors shall be opened and the keepers of it shall say to them: Peace be on you, you shall be happy; therefore enter it to abide. And they shall say: (All) praise is due to Allâh, who has made good to us His promise, and He has made us inherit the land; we may abide in the garden where we please; so goodly is the reward of the workers. And you shall see the angels going round about the throne glorifying the praise of their Lord; and judgment shall be given between them with justice, and it shall be said: All praise is due to Allâh, the Lord of the worlds.'2

(c) Qur’ân, Chapter III, verses 17-18,3 followed by the phrase ‘Rightly says Allâh the Magnificent’.

---

1 For translation, see p. 20.
2 Qur’ân, Chapter XXXIX, verses 73-75.
3 For translation, see p. 6.
(d) (1) First Creed.¹

(2-3) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.²

(4-5) Tradition of the Prophet.³

(6) This is the grave of the creature received into (Allāh's) mercy, Abū Bakr son of Aḥmad al-Insī, a son of Rānārī, i.e. of Rānārī,

(7) may Allāh illumine his grave. He passed away from the house of mortality on Saturday, the thirteenth of

(8) the month of Muḥarram (of the year A.H.) thirty and seven hundred (13 Muḥarram 730=16 November 1329).

13th Muḥarram of the Hijra year 730 fell on Monday and not on Saturday as stated in the text. This could be due to calculations as pointed out in a similar case in the previous lines.

XII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 730 (1329 A.D.)

This damaged epigraph, noticed here for the first time, is engraved on a fragmentary arch-shaped tablet: its upper part is missing. Since in other respects, it conforms to the general type of tombstones from Cambay, the missing portion must have contained religious text.

The tablet is built up into the north wall of the Tomb of Buḥūl Shahid, situated in the Tin Limdī or Chhipwāl locality of the town.⁴ The Tomb itself is a modern structure, being nothing more than a rectangular room, approximately 9 by 2-5 metres, and is situated just across the road, at the back of the mosque of the said locality. There is a loose tombstone lying in the Tomb which is also included in the present study (No. XXIX, infra).

The headstone originally belonged to the grave of one Tājū'd-Dīn 'Iwāñ son of 'Abdu'l-'Azīz Qaswīnī i.e. of Qaswín, a famous town in Irān, who died on 7th Muḥarram 730 (31st December 1329). The deceased's name proper is written without any diacritical mark and was earlier read⁵ as Ghawwāz meaning a 'diver' (the alif of the word ʿibn preceding it was taken to belong to that name). But since the names vogue at this period as a rule were double, comprising both the title and the name proper (e.g. Ka'nālū'd-Dīn Sulāínān, Tājū'd-Dīn Muḥammad, etc.), and also since the alif is written across the word ʿibn and after the word in question, the reading 'Iwāñ is preferable.

The deceased was an Iranian immigrant to or settler in Cambay.

The epitaph is calligraphed in the same Nashkh style bearing a greater resemblance to Riqā'. It reads as under:

TEXT

Plate VI(a)

(a) Margin.

إِنَّ الَّذِي لا إِلهَ خَلِيفَةً إِلَّا الَّذِي خَلَفَ فَلَا نَزْوِمَهُ مَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَمَا فِي الْجَاهِلِيَةِ مِنَ الْيَدِ الَّتِي يَكِفْرُ بِالْخَلِيفَةِ وَيُؤِنِّمُ بَيْنَ الْمَهْيَةِ وَالْغُلَامِ. فَأَنَّهُ قَدْ اسْتَمْسَكَ بِالخَلِيفَةِ إِلَّا أنْفُصَمَ لَهَا وَاللَّهُ سَمِيعُ الْعِلْمِ [صَدِيقُ اللَّهِ الْعَزِيزِ]

¹ For translation, see p. 6.
² For translation, see p. 10.
³ For translation, see pp. 10-11.
⁴ ABIE, 1930-39, No. 1, 107. It measures 37 cm. by 47 cm.
⁵ Ibid.
**Some Fourteenth Century Epitaphs from Cambay in Gujurát**

(b) Horizontal panels.

(1) [لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله]

(2) يبشرهم رحمته منه و رفوا و جنات لهم فيها لائم مقيم

(3) خالدين فيها ابدا ان الله عنده اجر عظيم

(4) هذا قبر العبد المرحوم المغفور تاج الدين عوض ابن

(5) عبد العزيز قزويني تغمد الله برحمته و غفرانه و اباحه بجيحه

(6) جناها توفي يوم الاثنين السابع شهر المحرم سنة تلثون و سبعماة

**Translation**

(a) Qur'an, Chapter II, verses 255-56 (middle portion lost), this was probably followed by the phrase 'Rightly says Allah the Magnificent'.

(b) (1) First Creed.

(2-3) Qur'an, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.

(4) This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allah's) mercy and pardoned, Tāju’d-Dīn ‘Iwād son of

(5) ‘Abd’al-‘Azīṣ Qazwīnī (i.e. of Qazwīn), may Allah cover him with His mercy and pardon and settle him in the centre

(6) of His Paradise. He died on Monday, the seventh (of the) month of Muḥarram (of the) year (A.H.) thirty and seven hundred (7 Muḥarram 730-31 December 1329).

**XIII. Epitaph, Dated A.H. 730 (1330 A.D.)**

This is also one of the epitaphs preserved in the Tomb of Parvāz Shahīd, where its arch-shaped tablet, measuring 100 cm. from apex to bottom and 45 cm. in width is built up into the eastern wall, eighth from the right side.

In general design and arrangement this epitaph conforms to the ornate variety of the group dealt with in this article. From the text, it appears that it was originally set up on the grave of one Sīrāj’ud-Dīn ‘Umar son of Sa’d’at-Tifīsī (in Georgia), who had died on Wednesday the 11th Sha’bān 730 (30th May 1330). The deceased, thus, originally belonged to Tifiss, that is to say modern Tbilisi—the capital of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic. It would be perfectly safe to presume that he was one of the foreign merchants stationed at Cambay.

---

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 For translation, see p. 12.
4 *ARIE*, 1959-60, No. D, 127. It is the same as *PEWC*, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 22, where it was stated to pertain to 'Tajuddin Umar bin Saiyad Aslanf (?)', and the year of demise was quoted as A.H. 720.
The style of writing is Riqû'-like Nashk of the same variety as in other epitaphs under study, and the text has been read as follows:—

TEXT

Plate VII(b)

(a) Arched margin.

هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو عالم الغيب و الشهادة هو الرحمن الرحيم هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو الملك القدوس السلام السلم الهمين العزيز الجبار المتكبر

(b) Outer margin, including arch-base.

الله الذي لا إله إلا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذه سنة ولا توم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض من ذئب الذي يشغف عندم لا ياذنه يعلم مين اديهم وما خلقهم ولا يحيطون بشئ من علمه إلا بما شاءه ومع كرسيه السماوات والأرض ولا يوده خفيفهما وهو العليم العظيم لا إكراه

في الدين قد تبين الرشد من الذين فن يكثر بالطاغوت و يوم بئس فقد استسبك بالعروة الوثقى

لا انقضى لها و اذن سميع علم

(c) Vertical panels.

و سبق الذين اتقوا ربهم إلى الجنة زيرا حتى إذا جاؤها ففتحت أبوابها و قالت لهم خونتها

سلام عليه وسلام فادخلواها خالدين و قالوا للحمد الله الذي صدنتنا وعده و اورثنا الأرض لبوا من الجنة حيث نشا[*] فنصم نجوم العاملين و ترى الملائكة حافين من حول العرش يسبعون بهد

 мире وقبعهم بالحق و قيل الحمد لله رب العالمين

(d) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(2) باسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(3) بيشرهم ربهم برحمه منه و رضوان

(4) جنات لهم فيها نعيم مقيم خالدة فيها

(5) ابدا إن الله علمنا إجر عفوان

(6) هذا قبر الblind المرحوم المغفور سراج الدين

(7) عمر ابن سعد التقليسي تغضب الله برحمته و غفرانه و اباحه بحبوبة

(8) جملة توفي يوم الأربعا الحادي عشر من شهر شبان سنة

(9) ثلثون و سبعمئة و سبعمون الله علمن عمد و الله اجمعين
TRANSLATION

(a) Qur'ān, Chapter LIX, verse 22 and part of verse 23.1
(b) Ibid., Chapter II, verses 255-56.2
(c) Ibid., Chapter XXXIX, verses 73-75.3
(d) (1) First Creed.4
(2) Basmala.5
(3-5) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-23.6
(6) This is the grave of the creature, taken into (Allāh's) mercy and pardoned, Sirāj ud-Din
(7) 'Umar son of Sa'd a t-Tiifsī i.e. of Tiflis (modern Tbilisi), may Allāh cover him with His mercy and pardon and settle him in the centre of
(8) His Paradise. He died on Wednesday the eleventh of the month of Sha'bān (of the) year (A.H.)
(9) thirty and seven hundred (11 Sha'bān 731=30 May 1330). And Allāh's salutations be on Muhammad and his progeny, all of them.

XIV. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 731 (1330 A.D.)

This is a fragmentary tombstone built into the west wall of the mosque in the quarter of the town called Faraspur or Piraspur,7 which is locally believed to have been a corrupt form of Pirūspūr or Fīrūspūr so called after either Firūz Shāh of the Tughluq dynasty, or after some local official or man of note. The mosque itself is a modern structure, and this as well as another epitaph, included in the present study (No. XXVII, infra) which is also built up into the same place, were apparently brought to this mosque to save them from disappearance or damage.

The arched portion of the tablet is lost. The writing is also badly affected by prolonged exposure to elements of nature, neglect over centuries and perhaps hand of vandal too. The result is that the letters are damaged in many places, particularly in the horizontal panels where the epitaph proper occurs. It is on this account that the name, the title and the nisba of the deceased as also the name of his father, etc., which are usually met with in such epitaphs are illegible. However, the name has been tentatively read as al-Hājj Ibrāhīm while that of his grandfather as Muslihī. The deceased is stated to have departed from this world on the 5th Rabi' I 731 (17th December 1330).

This epigraph also does not seem to have come to the notice of the officers of the Archaeological Survey of India or any other agency earlier.

---
1 For translation, see p. 20; the Quranic verse is continued to two words further, meaning ' the Supreme, the Possessor of every greatness'.
2 For translation, see p 10.
3 For translation, see p. 25.
4 For translation, see p. 8.
5 For translation, see p. 8.
6 For translation, see p. 12.
Its style of writing is Riqa'-like Nashk. Its text is quoted below:

**TEXT**

*Plate VII(a)*

(a) **Outer margin.**

لا إله إلا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذه سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرض من ذي الندى ........................................... بالطاغوت ويرموه بالله فقت استمسك بالهوة الوثني لا النصام لها و الله سميع عليم صدق الله

(b) **Vertical panels, right and left.**

.. شهد الله ان لا إله إلا هو/the מלאקה والعلم تعالى بالقسط لا إله إلا هو .....

الأمن بعد ما جاءهم العلم فهيا بينهم و من يفتقر يفتقه الله فكان لله سريع الحساب و ما عمد إلا 

(c) **Horizontal panels.**

(1) لا إله إلا هو/Surah 4:1

(2) يبشرهم ذي الندى برحمة منه و رضوان و كلت لهم فيها

(3) تعزم مقيم خالدين فيها إبدا ان الله علبه ابراهيم

(4) هذا نهر العباد المغفور الحاج الأعمالين بن 

(5) مصلح ......... تعزم الله برحمته 

(6) و غفر إنه تؤدي يوم القيامة خمس من ربع الأول سنة ثلاثين و سبعاً

**TRANSLATION**

(a) Qur'an, Chapter II, verses 255-56 (middle portion lost), followed by the phrase 'Rightly says Allāh'.

(b) Qur'an, Chapter III, verses 17-18 (middle portion lost). 'And Muḥammad is no more than a prophet'.

(c) (1) First Creed.

(2-3) Qur'an, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.

(4) This is the grave of the creature, taken into (Allāh's) mercy and pardoned al-Ḥājī Ibrāhīm(?) son of ..............

---

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 Qur'an, Chapter III, part of verse 143.
4 For translation, see p. 6.
5 For translation, see p. 12.
Plate VII

(c) Epigraph dated A.H. 721 (p. 26)

(d) Epigraph dated A.H. 720 (p. 26)
(a) Another epitaph dated A.H. 731 (p. 31)

(b) Third epitaph dated A.H. 731 (p. 33)

Scale: 3

Scale: 22
(5) Müşlih ............may Allâh cover him with His mercy
(6) and pardon. He died on Wednesday, the fifth of Rabi‘u‘l-Awwal (of the) year (A.H.) one
and thirty and seven hundred (5-Rabi‘I 731-17 December 1330).

XV. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 731 (1331 A. D.)

This tombstone is built, fifth from left, into the west wall of the Tomb of Parvâz Shahid,
and measures 25 by 47 cm. The writing at the top in the arched margin is slightly damaged.

The epigraph was originally placed on the grave of a man well-versed in Islamic lore, for,
the text calls him the greatest Imâm Maulânâ Muḥammad son of Aḥmad al-Jauhar al-Fârsî (i.e.
of Fârs or Iran proper),3 who died on Saturday, the 24th Rajab 731 (3rd May 1331). From the
epithets used with his name, it would appear that the Maulânâ was considered to be a man of
learning and erudition and was respected as a great savant. His nisba indicates his Iranian origin
if not birth. It would be futile, as usual, to expect any details about the Maulânâ from any
other source. As it is, the epigraph under study is the only document which has preserved even
his name for posterity.

This epigraph was noticed in the Progress Report where the Maulânâ's name has been correctly
read, but the date is stated to have been lost.3 This is rather inexplicable as the date is very
much there and quite distinct too. The tablet is small and the design is also simple reflecting
very probably, one is tempted to feel, the simplicity of the deceased's life. The script is Riqâ'-
like Naskh and the text has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate VIII(a)

(a) Margin.

......................شهد الله إنه لا الله إلا هو و العلامة و اوولوا العلم قديما بالقسم لا الله إلا
جاءهم العلم فنيا بينهم و من يكفر بآيات الله فان الله سريع الحساب ص[دق الله

(b) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا الله إلا الله محمد رسول الله
(2) يبشرهم فيهم برحمه منه و رضوان و جنان لهم فيها
(3) لعمم مقيم هذا[1] قبل العبد المرحوم المغفور التقي إلى الله
(4) تمالى مولانا إمام الأعظم محمد ابن أحمد الجوهر الفارسي تغمد الله برحمة و
(5) غفرانه تولى يوم السبیت وقاع و عشرین من شهر رجب سنة احد و ثلاثين و سبعیة

1 ARBE, 1956-57, No. D. 82, where it is wrongly stated to be in the west wall.
2 The present Fars province of Iran with Shiraz as its capital.
3 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 6.
TRANSLATION

(a) Qur’ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18 (middle portion lost), followed by the phrase ‘Rightly says Allāh’.

(b) (1) First Creed.²

(2) Qur’ān, Chapter IX, verse 21.³ This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allāh’s) mercy and pardoned, one who is supplicant of Allāh

(4) the Exalted, Maulānā (lit. our master), the greatest Imām Muḥammad son of Aḥmad al-Jauhar (lit. related to or associated with Jauhar i.e. essence) al-Fārsi (lit. of Fārs i.e. Irān proper), may Allāh cover him with His mercy and

(5) pardon. He died on Saturday the twenty-fourth of the month of Rajab (of the) year (A.H.) one and thirty and seven hundred (24 Rajab 731-3 May 1331).

XVI. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 731 (1331 A.D.)

This epitaph is almost of the same design as the preceding one, but is larger in size. It is also preserved in the Tomb of Parvāz Shāhīd where it may be seen built up, second from left, in the southern wall.⁴ The tablet, slightly damaged at the top, is arch-shaped, measuring 60 cm. in height and 36 cm. in width.

The epitaph states that the grave—for which it was obviously meant—contained the remains of one Zainu’l-Dīn ‘Allī son of Najīb son of Ḥamīd al-Hanjūrī, who is stated to have expired on the 8th Dhū’l-Qa‘dā 731 (14th August 1331). The nisba is indicative of the deceased’s foreign origin, but due to lack of reference books here at Nāgpur, it is not possible to locate the place to which he originally belonged. Zainu’l-Dīn ‘Allī was evidently one of the fraternity of foreign settlers in the town carrying on trade or following some similar vocation.

The epigraph was also noticed in the Progress Report where, the name of the deceased’s father and his nisba were wrongly read. According to this notice, the epitaph records the death of one Zainudin ‘Alli bin Mujib bin Jahn-ul-Hanjwini.⁵ The similarity between the place-name Hanjwain indicated by this wrongly read nisba and the name of the town Hamyamana or Himalamana mentioned in two Sanskrit copper-plate grants of the Silahāra dynasty of Konkan gave rise to the speculation that the name mentioned in the Arabic inscription may be the same as Hamyamana. It was also suggested in the same notice that it may be from this Hanjwain, or Hamjaman that Zainu’l-Dīn ‘Alli’s father may have migrated to Cambay.⁶

In view of the fact that the place-name mentioned in the epigraph is clearly Hanjur or Hanjwar,⁷ this identification loses whatever validity it might have had. I take the town to be positively non-Indian, though at the moment, for the reason stated above, I am unable to indicate its geographical position.

---

¹ For translation, see p. 6.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ For translation, see p. 10.
⁴ AIE, 1956-57, No. D, 72, where it is stated to be in the west wall.
⁵ PBWC, 1919-20, p. 49, Appendix Q, No. 14.
⁶ This has been wrongly identified with modern Sanjār or the basis of the Pārsī legends (Epigraphia Indica, vol. XII, pp. 258 ff).
⁷ PBWC (1919-20), pp. 57-58.
⁸ For want of diacritical marks, its exact pronunciation cannot be determined. It could also be Hanjaur, Hinjaur, Hijjaur and Hinjwar, but it is obvious that it has nothing to do with Hanjawin or Hamjamana.
The style of writing is the usual Riq'â-type Naskh. The text reads as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate VIII(b)*

(a) Margin.

الله لا إله إلا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذه سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأرذ من ذي الذي يشغف عنه إلا باذاته يعلم ما بين أيديهم ومن خلقهم وليجيرون بكم من علمه إلا مما شاء وسع كريمه السماوات والأرذ ولا يؤده حفظهما و هو العلي العظيم لا آكره في الدين قد تبين الرشد من الغفل من يكلف بالطاغوت و يؤمن بِالله فقد استمسك بالعفو الوليق لا انفهام لها و الله سميع علم.

(b) Horizontal panels.

(1) لا الله إلا ابتدأ محمد رسول الله

(2) [نَسْمَة] الله الرحمن الرحيم

(3) كله نفس ذائقة الموت ثم أليتنا ترجعون

(4) هذا القبر (كذا) العبد الضعيف المرحوم الدغوفي زين الدين علي

(5) بن نجيب بن حميد الهنجورى غفر الله له ولوالديه و لجميع

(6) المؤمنين و المؤمنات يوم الرباع الثاني من شهر

ذالقعدة سنة إحدى و ثنين و سبعا

**TRANSLATION**

(a) Qur'ân, Chapter II, verses 255-56.¹

(b) (1) First Creed.²

(2) Basmala.³

(3) "Every soul must taste of death, then to Us you shall be brought back."⁴

(4) This is the grave of the weak creature, taken into (Allâh's) mercy and pardoned, Zainu’d-Din ‘Ali

(5) son of Najib son of Hamid al-Hanjari, may Allâh forgive him, his parents and all the

---

¹ For translation, see p. 10.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ For translation, see p. 8.
⁴ Qur’ân, Chapter XXIX, verse 57.
(6) faithful men and women. (He died) on Wednesday, the eighth of the month of
(7) Dhu’l-Qa’d (of the) year (A.H.) one and thirty and seven hundred (8 Dhu’l-Qa’d 731 = 14 August 1331).

XVII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 731 (1331 A.D.)

This arch-shaped tombstone, also from the Tomb of Parvāz Shāhid, is built up, tenth from
right, into the eastern wall and measures 1 metre from apex to bottom and 47 cm. in width.
It was intended for the grave of one Khwāja Shihābūd-Din Aḥmad son of ‘Umar al-Humānī who
died on Sunday the 19th of Dhu’l-Qa’d 731 (24 August 1331).

From the text, it is difficult to say anything definite about the social or professional status
of the late Khwāja, but if the fact that in general design and execution, the epitaph belongs to
the ornate type, is any indication, the deceased was a man of standing. The surname Khwāja
prefixed to his name may also be reasonably taken to indicate that Shihābūd-Din belonged to
the respectable class of traders. That he was also a foreigner is clear from his nisba, though for
want of reference books, its exact connotation cannot be determined.

The epigraph was also noticed in the Progress Report, where the nisba is doubtfully read
as Hamānī and the day as Saturday.¹

The script employed is the same stylish Riq’ī-like Nashk which while conforming in general
to the characteristics of most of the epitaphs of the town, is in particular akin to that of the previous
epitaph. The text has been deciphered as under:

TEXT

Plate IX(a)

(a) Arched margin.

هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو عالماً النسيب والشهادة هو الرحمن الرحيم الملك الملك القدوس
السلام عليه

(b) Outer margin and arch-base.

وسبق الذين أتىهم إلى الجنة زورا حتى إنها جاؤا وفتحت أبوابها وأتىهم خزنتها
سلام عليكم طلبتكم فادخلوها خالدين وسألوا الحمد للذى صدقنا وعهدنا وورثنا الأرض نمو[ت]
من الجنة حيث شاى[ها] فهدم أجر العاملين وترى السعادة حافين من حول العرش ي سبحانه يعيد روبهم
و قضى بينهم بالحق وقبل الحمد لله رب العالمين

(c) Vertical panels, left and right.

شهد الله انه لا إله إلا هو والملاكاه وآله[اه] العلم قابلاً بالنسبة لله إلا هو العزاز
الحكيم إن الذين عهد الله الإسلام وما اختلاف الذين اتوا الكتاب الآمن بعد ما جاءهم الفصل
بغيما بينهم و من يذكر بآيات الله فإن الله سريع الحساب

¹ ARIE, 1929-30, No. D 129.
² PEWC, 1919-20, p 49, No. 2.
SOME FOURTEENTH CENTURY EPITAPHS FROM CAMBAY IN GUJRĀT

(d) Horizontal panels.

١ لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله
(٢) ﷺ ﷺ
(٣) ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ
(٤) ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ 

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur'ān, Chapter LXI, verse 22 and part of verse 23.
(b) Qur'ān, Chapter XXXIX, verses 73-75.
(c) Qur'ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18.
(d) (1) First Creed.
(2) Basmala.
(3-4) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.
(5) This is the grave of the creature, taken into Allāh's mercy and pardoned, one who is dependent of Allāh.
(6) Khwāja Shhābu'd-Din Aḥmad son of ‘Umar al-Hurnāmi, may Allāh cover him
(7) with His mercy and pardon and settle him in the centre of His Paradise. He died
(8) on Sunday, the nineteenth of (the month of) Dhul-Qa‘da (of the) year (A.H.)
(9) one and thirty and seven hundred (19 Dhul-Qa‘da 731=24 August 1331). And may
(Allāh's) salutation be on Muḥammad and his progeny!

XVIII. EPITAPH DATED A.H. 732 (1331 A.D.)

This is an historically important record which was set up to mark the last resting-place of a high official, about whom nothing is known from any other source. That the importance of

---

1 For translation, see p. 20 (up to 'Granter of security' with some portion missing).
2 For translation, see p. 25.
3 For translation, see p. 6.
4 For translation, see p. 6.
5 For translation, see p. 8.
6 For translation, see p. 12.
the record was not realised so far is not due to lack of the knowledge of its existence. As a matter of fact, it happens to be one of the tombstones listed in the Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey, but due perhaps to the incorrect decipherment of its text, the true identity of the deceased remained unestablished. The tombstone was described in the said report as that of Shamsu'd-Din Mahmūd son of Jamāl-ud-dīn Aḥmad bin 'Umar al-mārūf (?) ad-dīn. According to our reading, the text states that the grave contained the remains of the ‘Prince among ministers and accomplished men’ Shamsu’d-Din Mahmūd son of Jamālu’d-Din Aḥmad son of 'Umar, commonly known as the ‘Dabīr’ i.e. Secretary. He is stated to have died on Friday, the 8th of Muharram 732 (11th October 1331).

The deceased thus held a fairly high official position in his life-time. He worked, as the sobriquet ‘Dabīr’ implies, in the epistolary department with the rank of minister. Whether he acted as Secretary at the Imperial court or in the provincial administration, it is neither clear from the text, nor is it possible to ascertain, but from the title ‘prince of ministers’ used for him, it may be inferred that he was an imperial officer. Again, it is difficult to say if he was posted at Cambay, the place of his burial and presumably that of his death too, or he had been here on a short visit. In any case, the inscription furnishes the information, not to be found elsewhere, about a Tughluqian official: that he is called prince among the ministers and accomplished men and a Secretary shows that he was not only adept in the art of belles lettres, but was also celebrated for learning. The text unfortunately offers no clue as to his nationality or place of origin. The absence of any nība should perhaps be reasonably taken to indicate his Indian stock.

The arch-shaped headstone bearing the record, which is built up, fifth from right, into the eastern wall of the Tomb of Parvāz Shāhīd, is fragmentary: measuring in its present state 55 cm. by 65 cm., almost whole of the arched portion of the original tablet at the top is gone, and consequently, the texts contained in the arched margin and within the arch, if any, and greater portion of the Basmala are lost. It is difficult to determine the cause of the damage, natural or otherwise, but it is almost perfectly arch-shaped even now. As was pointed out in the case of another tombstone from the same premises, published earlier, it is normally observed that when a tablet is broken by accident or through natural causes, it does not take arch shape, though the broken tablet may be so refashioned at the time of its letting up into the wall. But we have quite a few fragmentary tomb-stones which have not been so treated. Another possibility is that the reverse was used at one stage or the other for a fresh epitaph, for which the new arch-shape was given, but this cannot be ascertained unless the tablet is dislodged.

From the artistic point of view, the tablet is a little more ornate resembling somewhat in visual effect and design to the tombstone of another official of the time of Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh, namely Malik Parviz al-Kāzarūnī (pl. Xb, infra). A thick panel of arabesque contrasts the horizontal panels with the margin enclosing them, and the text also has some variety—it contains a totally different set of Quranic text. The obituary also is differently worded: instead of the usual commencing phrase indicating the grave, it starts with a prayer invoking mercy and pardon for the deceased.

In the style of writing, too, there is a slight variety. While the bulk of the text is inscribed in the usual Riq̣‘ī-type Naskh, the Basmala has been executed in artistic Kāfī of the florid variety.

---

1 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 17.
3 EIA PS, 1961, p. 23, f.n.4.
The text has been deciphered as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate IX (b)*

(a) *Vertical panels, right and left.*

(1) قل اعوذ برب الناس ملك الناس إله الناس من شر الوضاء الشنن الذي يعوس في صدور الناس من الجنة و الناس - قل اعوذ برب الفلق من شر ما خلق و من شر غاصق إذا وقب و من شر النفاثات في العقد و من شر حاسد إذا حسد

(b) *Arch-base.*

(1) [يسمى الله الرحمن الرحيم]

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) الم ذلك الكتاب لارب فيه هدى للمتقين
(2) الذين يؤمنون بالله و يقيمون الصلاة و مما رزقناه من فقرا
(3) و الذين يؤمنون بما أنزل الله و ما أنزل من قبله و بالأخرى هم يؤمنون
(4) اولئك على هدى من ربيهم و اولئك هم المفلحن
(5) الله ارحم بركة القرآن و اغفر بالرحمة و الرضوان
(6) صاحب هذا القبر المرحوم المغفور عند الوزراء
(7) و الفضلاء شمس الذين محمود ؛ ابن جمال الدين أحمد
(8) ابن عمر المعروف بالدبي دف يووم الجمعه
(9) الثالث من شهر المحرم سنة ألف و ثمان و سبعين

**TRANSLATION**

(a) ‘Say, I seek refuge in the Lord of men, the king of men, the God of men, from the evil of the whispering of the slinking (devil), who whispers into the hearts of men, from among the jinn and the men.’

‘Say: I seek refuge in the Lord of the dawn, from the evil of what He has created, and from the evil of the utterly dark night when it comes, and from the evil of those who cast (evil suggestions) in firm resolutions and from the evil of the envious when he envies.’

(b) *Basmala.*

---

1 Qur'an, Chapter CXIV.
2 Ibid., Chapter CXIII.
3 For translation, see p. 8
(c) (1-4) 'I am Allâh, the best Knower: This book, there is no doubt in it, is a guide to those who guard (against evil), those who believe in the unseen and keep up prayer and spend out of what we have given them; and who believe in that which has been revealed to you and that which was revealed before you, and they are sure of the hereafter. These are on the right course from their Lord, and these it is that shall be successful'.

(5) O Lord, have mercy through the blessings of the Qur'ân on, and give pardon through (Thy) mercy and pleasure, to

(6) the occupant of this grave, the one taken into (Thy) mercy, the pardoned, Maliku'l-Wuzârâ

(7) wa'l-Fu'dalâ (lit. prince among the ministers and accomplished men) Shamsu'd-Din Ma'mûd son of Jamâlu'd-Din A'mad

(8) son of 'Umar, commonly known as the Dabîr (lit. Secretary). He died on Friday,

(9) the eighth of the month of Mu'harram, year (A.H.) two and thirty and seven hundred (8 Mu'harram 732=11 October 1331).

XIX. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 732 (1331 A.D.)

This headstone, fixed into the left mihrâb of the one-wall open mosque situated just outside the Tomb of Parvâz Shahid and to its south-east, is quite different in design from the preceding ones. Its small rectangular tablet, which is 25 cm. in width and 32 cm. in height, appears at first sight to be in tact, but the text in the margins comprising First Creed and a Quranic verse is incomplete and therefore, it is very likely that originally there was a little more portion at the top, which is now lost.

The epitaph suffers badly in comparison with its class, in visual effect. The penning is not bad, but the style of writing is plain or rather quite inartistic Naskh. Likewise, the composition of the Arabic text too is not happy.

The epitaph records the death of one Qâsi n son of Isâ who died on one of the Fridays of the month of Mu'harram of the year 732——day of the month is not given (Mu'harram 732=October 1331).

The text reads as under:

TEXT

Plate X (a)

(a) Margin.

i. Right:

اَشْهَدَ اَنَّ لاَ اَللَّهَ إِلَّا اَللَّهُ

ii. Left:

اَلَّا وَجَهَهُ ثُمَّ اَلِيَّنَا تَرِجُوُنَّ

1 Qur'ân, Chapter II, verses 1-5.
2 ARAB, 1939-60, No. D, 133.
(b) **Horizontal panels.**

1. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
2. كل نفس ذائقة الموت
3. ثم إلينا ترجعون
4. ذلك في التاريخ من شهر
5. الحرم يوم الجمعه سنة
6. سبماية و للين و إثنا
7. قاسم ابن عباس نور الله قبره

**TRANSLATION**

(a) i. 'I bear witness that there is no god but Allâh. ....................... 12

ii. '........................ except His Face. 2 Then to Us you shall be brought back. 13

(b) (1) **Basmala.**

(2-3) 'Every soul must taste of death, then to Us you shall be brought back. 14

(4) This (was) on the date in the month of

(5) Muḥarrām, Friday, year (A.H.)

(6) seven hundred and thirty and two (Muḥarrām 1732, October 1331).

(7) Qâsin son of 'Isâ, may Allâh illuminate his grave, (died).

**XX. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 734 (1333 A.D.)**

This is perhaps the most pleasing epitaphic headstone of the whole lot to look at. It is remarkable for its overall symmetry, pleasing shape of the arch, impressive panelling and artistic borders all round in geometric designs. Also, it is one of the few epitaphs, if not the only one, of the present group that is in situ. The beautiful grave of marble to which the headstone of the same material is attached is remarkable for its execution of artistic mouldings and panellings and lies in the centre of an imposing tomb jutting out from the middle of the southern wall of the stately Jâmi' Mosque of the town. The area in which the Tomb is situated stretches along the south side of the mosque and has an imposing entrance in the centre of the south face. The entire area measures about 62 by 15 metres. At the west is the mosque belonging to the tomb, and as it stands to-day may be considered as a continuation of the Jâmi' Mosque through the parti-

1 This word is engraved in the left bottom corner panel of the margin.
2 Second Creed. The remaining part in its English translation would read: Who is one and has no partner and I bear witness that Muhammad is His creature and apostle.
3 Qur'an, Chapter XXVIII, part of verse 88. The meaning phrase of this verse is: Everything will perish.
4 Ibid., Chapter XXIX, part of verse 57.
5 You translation, see p. 8.
6 Qur'an, Chapter XXIX, verse 87.
tion wall; the mosque and the Tomb were roofed but the rest of this court is open. Unfortunately, the large and striking done with a diameter of 11.8 metres which was originally carried on tall pillars to cover the Tomb has fallen. Nevertheless, the Tomb is, like the Mosque, architecturally important in so much as it has preserved one of the few specimens of early tomb-architecture in Gujarát, which provides a useful and instructive link for the proper study of the origin and development of pre-Mughal architecture of Gujarát. There is inside the enclosure another similarly executed fine, but smaller grave which also has an inscribed headstone of marble (No. XXVIII, infra).

This epitaph is inscribed on the headstone attached to the larger grave, which as stated earlier, belongs to the ornate variety of the tombstones and is characterised, apart from some distinguishing features referred to above, by some variety of religious text also. But in the style of writing, it more or less conforms to the prevalent design at Cambay except that, as in the case of the fragmentary epitaph of another state official, Shamsu’d-Din Mahmūd the Secretary, studied above (No. XVIII, supra), the Basmala here is executed in florid Kufi script.

The record states that the grave belongs to the fortunate martyr, prince among the princes of the East and ministers, one who was well-known in India as well as Arab countries, Zākī’Daulat wa’d-Dīn ‘Umar son of Aḥmad al-Kāzarūnī entitled Parviz Malik, who expired on Wednesday, 9th Safar 734 (22nd October 1333).

The published text of the inscription prepared by the late E. Rehtak from the facsimile supplied by James Burgess, on which subsequent notices of the epitaph are based, contains two serious errors: the word Sharq in the title Malik-i-Mulik’ sh-Sharq and the title Parviz Malik of the deceased have been wrongly read as Sarwar (translated as ‘ prince ’) and Zaurul-Malik.

It may be recalled here that until this epigraph was discussed by us, the identity of the Malik had not been established. Indian chronicles have totally igonored him like many others of his ilk. But fortunately, he has been mentioned by the celebrated fourteenth century Moroccon traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa who was in Cambay within a decade of Malikush-Sharq’s death. As usual Ibn Baṭṭūṭa furnishes information about him, which stands corroborated by the present record.

According to this, he was called Malik’Tujiyār al-Kāzarūnī and was surnamed Parviz, Sultān Muḥammad bin Tughluq Shāh had assigned to him the city of Cambay as an iqṭa’ and had promised him charge of a vezirate; about this time, at the instance of the Malik’Tujiyār, his friend and fellow-countryman Ṣhibību’d-Dīn al-Kāzarūnī came from Iran, equipped with presents for the Sultān (of which the details are given). When he arrived at Cambay, he found the Malik’Tujiyār preparing to leave for Delhi with all the revenue collected from the territories under his charge together with presents. But on his way, he was killed by some mischievous persons at

---

1 For a detailed description, plan, illustration, etc., of the Tomb, see J. Burgess, On the Muhammadan Architecture of Borsah, Cambay, Dhokla, Champaner, and Mahmudabad in Gujarāt (London, 1896), pp. 27-28, plates XVIII and XXII-XXIV. A detailed description of the Janjī Mosque is also given there.


3 J. Burgess and H. Consens, Revised List of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency, etc. (Bombay, 1897), p. 329.


5 Dr. Mahdi Ḥusain, The Ruba’ī of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (Beaulieu, 1953), pp. 67-68, 173.

6 According to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ‘majority of its inhabitants (i.e. of Cambay) are foreign merchants, who continually build these beautiful houses and wonderful mosques—an achievement in which they endeavour to surpass each other’ (ibid., p. 172).
the instigation of the prime minister Khwâja Jahân who had great influence there, having administered the province including Cambay for quite some time and therefore having become jealous and worried because of the Sultân’s promise to raise the Maliku’t-Tujjâr to the vezirate.¹

Ibn Baṭṭûţa’s account thus authenticates the high sounding title Malik-i-Maliki’i’sh-Sharq wa’l-Wuzara’ and his title-name Malik Parvîz employed in the text and also the manner of his death, that is, martyrdom. On the other hand, the epigraph furnishes some new information: for example it gives his full name and personal title, Zakîn’Dîn ‘Umar, his father’s name Aḥmad and quotes the exact day, date, month and year of his death. But neither Ibn Baṭṭûţa nor our record specifies the place of death, which was at some distance from Cambay. The house of the Maliku’t-Tujjâr, reckoned among the grand buildings of Cambay by Ibn Baṭṭûţa was, according to the same authority, adjacent to his mosque.² This mosque must definitely be other than the Jâmi’ Mosque which was built, according to its inscription, about a decade earlier by (Malik) Daualat-shâh Muḥammad Bûtabârî,³ but it could have been in the immediate neighbourhood, as the practice of selecting one’s own house or mosque for the last resting-place has been not so uncommon.

Incidentally, there are two more epigraphs at Cambay which mention al-Kâzarûnî: one is the epitaph of his wife Fâţima who lies buried in the smaller grave in the tomb-enclosure (No. XXVIII, infra) and the other furnishes the information that a former slave of his, Khâlîṣ by name, had set up a marble prayer-niche of a mosque at Cambay itself in A.H. 726 (1326 A.D.).⁴

The headstone is arch-shaped, measuring 145 cm. from apex to bottom and 70 cm. at the base. The letters are slightly affected by weather, but the text is perfectly legible.

TEXT

Plate X (b)

(a) Margin.

يس و النزآن الحکم الذي لعن المرسلين على مراق مستقيم تنزيل العزیز الرحیم للنذر قوما
ما انذر آباؤهم فهم غافلون لند حک القول على أكثرهم فهم لا يؤمنون أنا جعلنا في اغلالهم
إبلا فئی الى الانتان فهم متحون و جننا من بين ادبيهم سدا و من خلفهم سدا فاغشينهم
فهم لا ينصورون و سواء [ه] عليهم [ه] انذرتهم ام لم تذنرهم لا يؤمنون لما تذنر من اتبع الذکر و
خشي الرحم بالنابغ بنابرء بمغفرة و اجر كريم اذا تجدنا نحن نحن نحن نحن الموت و نكتب ما قدموا و
اؤرهم و كل شيء أحصئن في إمام مبين و أضرب لهم مثل إصباح التریة إذ جاءنا ها المرسلون
اذ أرسلنا اليهم الثروي تذكروهم فعزنا بثالث

¹ For details, see Mahdi Ḥussain, op. cit., pp. 67-68.
² Ibid., p. 173.
⁴ ARKE, 1938-37, No. D, 32. Also PRWO, p. 57, where it was stated to purport the carving of the miṣrâb by ‘Zaqiuddîn Ahmad Qâzerûnî’ himself, who is further described as ‘the greatest architect of Cambay’. Al- Kâzarûnî is also stated there to have built the Jâmi’ Mosque (cf. Burgess and Coosew, op. cit., p. 96) and been buried under the great dome of the principal gateway. All this is incorrect.
(b) In the arched portion.

أشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له و أشهد أن محمداً عبده و رسوله

(c) i. Inner margin, around (a).

أُنَفَّض الله أَنَّهُ النَّعْيَة الْقُلُوبِ لَتُغْلِبُهُمْ ضِعْفَهُمْ وَلَيَبْسُوهُمْ وَلَا يُحْتَضِبَهُمْ بَيْضَةَ من علمه إلا بما鲳ى وَإِن كَرِهَهُمْ السَّمَوَاتُ وَالْأَرْضُ وَلَا يَوْدُوهُ حَفَظًا مِّنْهُ وَهُوَ الْعَلَّٰمُ الْعَظِيمُ

ii. Arch-base.

هذا ما وعد الرحمن وصدق المرسلون انا لله وانا اليه راجعون

(d) Vertical panels, right and left.

شهد الله أنه لا إله إلا هو وملكه واروآت العلم قالوا بالقسط لا الله إلا هو العزيز الحكيم إن الدين عند الله الإسلام وما اختالف الذين اوتوا الكتب إلا من بعد ما جاءهم العلم بغيب بينهم ومن كثر بآيات الله تعالى آن سرعة الحساب

(e) Horizontal panels.

(1) يَسِيرُ اللَّهُ الرَّحْمَنُ الرَّحِيمُ
(2) وَلَا يَجِينَ الْكَذِبُ الْكَذِبَاءَ بِسَبِيلِ اللَّهِ إِلَّا إِزَاحَةً [عَلَى] إِيَبَالْهُمْ
(3) يَبْرِرُونَ فِرْحَةَ بِمَا أَتَى هُمْ مِن فَضْلٍ وَيَبْسُطُونَ الْحَزْمَمَ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُخَلَّقُوا
(4) يَبْهُم مِّن خَلْقِهِمْ إِلَّا خَوْفَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا يَمْتَعُونَ الْحَزْمَمَ
(5) يَتَّبِعُهُمْ مِنَ الأَنتَ فَضْلُ وَهُوَ اللَّهُ لَا يَضِيعُ أَجْمَالَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ
(6) هَذَا قَرِيرُ الْعَبْدِ الشَّيْعِ السَّعِيدِ السَّهِيدِ المرحوم السَّيِّدِ المَغْفُورِ مَلَكِ
(7) خَلَقَ عَشَرَة وَأَوْزَعَ مِنْهُ مَسْهُرَةَ الْمَرَبِّعِ وَالبَّسْمَةِ الْمُجَابِهِ مَلَكَتِهِ إِلَى الله تَعَالَى
(8) بِالرَّحْمَةِ وَالْفُضْلِ وَأَوْسَكَنَّى فِي دَارِ النَّجَانِ المَتَوَفِّى إِلَى رَحْمَة
(9) اللَّهِ تَعَالَى فِي يَوْمِ الأرْمَاعِ النَّافِعِ مِنْ سَنَةِ سَابِعَةِ أَرْبَعٍ وَثَلَاثَينَ وَسَبْعُمَايَةً

TRANSLATION

(a) 'O man! Consider the Qur’ān full of Wisdom; Most surely you are one of the apostles, on a right way. A revelation of the Mighty, the Merciful, That you may warn a people whose fathers were not warned, so they are heedless. Certainly the word has proved true of most of them, so they do not believe. Surely We have placed chains on their necks, and these reach up to their
chains, so they have their heads raised aloft. And We have made before them a barrier and a barrier behind them, then We have covered them over so that they do not see. And it is alike to them whether you warn them or warn them not; they do not believe. You can only warn him who follows the reminder and fears the Beneficent God in secret; so announce to him forgiveness and an honorable reward. Surely We give life to the dead, and We write down that they have sent before and their footprints, and We have recorded everything in a clear writing. And set out to them a parable of the people of the town, when the messengers came to it. When We sent to them two, they rejected both of them, then We strengthened (them) with a third.'

(b) Second Creed.  

(c) i. Qur‘an, Chapt.x II, verse 255.  

(ii. 'This is what the Beneficent God promised and the apostles told the truth.'  

Surely we are Allāh's and to Him, we shall surely return."

(d) Qur‘ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18.  

(e) (1) Basmala.  

(2-5) 'And reckon not those who are killed in Allāh's way as dead; nay, they are alive (and) are provided sustenance from their Lord; rejoicing in what Allāh has given them out of His grace, and they rejoice for the sake of those who (being left) behind them, have not yet joined them, that they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve. They rejoice on account of favour from Allāh and (His) grace, and that Allāh will not waste the reward of the believers.'

(6) This is the grave of the weak creature, the fortunate, the martyr, the one taken into Allāh's mercy, the pardoned, Malik-i-

(7) Mūlākī’š-Shārq wa’l-Wuzarā (lit. the prince among the princes of the East® and ministers) one who is celebrated in Arabia and other Islamic countries, Zāku’d-Daulat

(8) wa’d-Dīn (lit. one who is just in the matters of State and Religion), ‘Umar son of Aḥmad al-Kaṣarānī entitled Parviz Malik, may the Exalted Allāh cover him

(9) with (His) mercy and pardon and settle him in the abode of Paradise, one who returned to the mercy

(10) of the Exalted Allāh, on Wednesday, the ninth of (the month of) Ṣafar (of the) year (A.H.) four and thirty and seven hundred (9 Ṣafar 734=22 October 1333).

XXI. ANOTHER EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 734 (1333 A.D.)

This fragmentary headstone is preserved in the Tomb of Parviz Shahid, where it is built up, third from left, in the west wall.® Its top portion which was presumably arch-shaped, is gone. In its present state, it measures 40 by 50 cm.

1. Qur’ān, Chapter XXXVI, verses 1-13 and part of 14.
2. For translation, see p. 39 and f.n. 2.
3. For translation, see p. 10.
4. Qur’ān, Chapter XXXVI, part of verse 52.
5. Ibid., Chapter II, part of verse 166.
6. For translation, see p. 6.
7. For translation, see p. 8.
8. Qur’ān, Chapter III, verses 166-70.
9. Generally used for nobles of very high rank.
10. A.R.E, 1935-37, No. D. 73; FRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 8, where the year of death and the sobriquet are wrongly given as A.H. 731 and ‘Ālamgīr respectively.
The epitaph was originally set up on the grave of another member of the 'Alamgar family already referred to above (No. VII, supra). He is Hasan son of Abū Bakr 'Alamgar (lit. lance or standard-maker), who is stated to have expired on Friday, 19th Rabi' I 734 (8th December 1333).1 Except for this, no other information is available about him.

The style of writing is the Riq'ī-type Naskhī characteristic of Cambay epitaphs, and so is the general design, but of the less ornate variety. The text reads as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XI (a)*

(a) **Margin.**

الله لا اله الا هو الحي القيوم لا تأخذته سنة ولا نوم له ما في السماوات وما في الأراضي

من ذه الند إلى يشتق

يؤده حتبهم وما العين العظيم وما محمد رسول الله قد خلت من تبلغه الرسول اليوم يغفر الله لكم و هو الرحمان الرحيمين

(b) **Horizontal panels.**

(1) لا اله الا محمد رسول الله

(2) يبشرهم رحمه منه و رضوان و جنات لهم فيها تعبهم

(3) مقيم خالدين فيها ابدا ان الله علده اجر عظيم

(4) هذا قبر المحسن المغضور الفقير إلى الله تعالى

(5) حسين بن أبو بكر علمكم تغمده الله برحمته و غفرانه و إياها

(6) يحبوه جناته توفي يوم الجمعه التاسع و عشرين من شهر ذي العقار الأول سنة او

(7) بعده و ثلاثون و سبعمئة و صلى الله على محمد و علي آلله

**TRANSLATION**

(a) Qur'an, Chapter II, verse 255 (middle portion lost).2 ‘And Muhammad is no more than an apostle’.3 ‘This day; Allah may forgive you, and He is the most merciful of the merciful’.4

(b) (1) First Creed.5

(2-3) Qur'an, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.6

---

1 According to ephemerides, this day was Wednesday.
2 For translation, see p. 10.
3 Qur'an, Chapter II, part of verse 145.
4 Ibid., Chapter XII, part of verse 92.
5 For translation, see p. 6.
6 For translation, see p. 12.
(4) This is the grave of the creature taken into (Allah’s) mercy (and) pardoned, the dependent on the Exalted Allah.

(5) Hasan son of Abu Bakr Alamgar (lit. Lance- or Banner-maker), may Allah cover him with His mercy and pardon and settle him

(6) in the centre of His Paradise. He died on Friday, the twentieth of the month of Rabi’ul-Awwal, four

(7) and thirty and seven hundred (29 Rabi‘I 734-8 December 1333). And Allah’s salutations be upon Muhammad and his progeny.

XXII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 736 (1335 A.D.)

This headstone too is fixed up next to the previous one, that is fourth from left, into the west wall of the Tomb of Parvaz Shahid, and is, like it, fragmentary. But its top has been shaped to a flattish arch design almost in the same way as another fragmentary epitaph in the east wall published some time back. In view of this and a couple of other fragmentary epitaphs in the present group (Nos. XVIII, XIX, etc.), it would appear that the slabs were so shaped at the time of letting them up into the wall and there may not have been any subsequent epitaph engraved on the reverse as was suggested earlier.

The slab measures, in its present state, 45 cm. from apex to bottom and 20 cm. in width and was meant to serve as the headstone for the grave of Kamalud-Din Kamal son of Husain al-Basri (i.e. of Basra) who died on Thursday, 2nd Safar 736 (21st September 1335). The deceased seems to have died quite young, as apart from the size of the tablet, the text calls him ‘the dear son’, which could be further taken to indicate that the text of the epitaph was dictated by his bereaved father. From his nisba, the father of the deceased, Husain, appears to be an Iraqi merchant settled or at least carrying on some business at Cambay.

The writing is executed in the usual Rubi‘-type Nasli. The tablet having been exposed to elements of nature before its removal to the present place, the writing is slightly damaged in the margin, but the extant text is quite legible.

The text has been read as follows:

**TEXT**

Plate XI (b)

(a) Margin, right and left.


-------

1 ARIE, 1936-37, No. D, 78, where it is stated to be in the southern wall.
2 EIA, 1962, p. 23.
3 Ibid., f.n.4.
4 A famous port-town in Iraq.
5 This epitaph also was noticed in PRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 7, where his name proper was omitted.
(b) Horizontal panels.

1) لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله
2) يبشرهم برحمة منه و رضوان
3) و جنات لهم فيها نعم مقيم
4) هذا قبر الولد العزيز
5) كمال الدين كمال بن حسين البصرى
6) توفي يوم الخامس الثاني من شهر
7) عشر شهر سنة ثلثين و سبعاء

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur'an, Chapter III, verse 17 and part of verse 18 ( upto knowledge).1

(b) (1) First Creed.2

(2-3) Qur'an, Chapter IX, verse 21.3

(4) This is the grave of the dear son

(5) Kamalu'd-Din Kamal son of Husain al-Hasri (i.e. of Basra).

(6) He died on Thursday the 2nd of the month of

(7) Safar (of the) months of the year (A.H.) six and thirty and seven hundred (2 Safar 736=21 September 1335).

XXIII. ANOTHER EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 736 (1336 A.D.)

The man on whose grave this epitaph was originally set up has been mentioned above as a member of the Irbili family (p. 13, supra). The epitaphic tablet is also preserved in the Tomb of Parviz Shahid, where it may be seen, second from right, into the eastern wall.4

The design of the epitaph is of the simple variety, but the calligraphy is of a high order. The style of writing is the usual Riq'i-like Naskh. The writing is damaged due to adverse effects of weather to which the tablet seems to have remained exposed before its removal to the present premises; the writing in the left marginal panel is almost obliterated.

According to the text, the tombstone marked the grave of Shamsu'd-Din Muhammad son of Abu Bakr Irbili (i.e. Irbil),4 alias Fatoliya who died on the 25th Dhul-Qa'da 736 (5th July 1336). In the Progress Report where it was first noticed, the nisba has been recorded as Adabali instead of Irbili and the unit of the year of death is not given.5

---

1 For translation, see p. 6.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 For translation, see p. 10.
5 Irbil was a town near Mosul in modern Iraq.
6 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 18.
(a) Another epitaph dated A.H. 736 (p. 47)

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 738 (p. 48)

Scale: 0.17

Scale: 0.22
It has been pointed out elsewhere, on the basis of another epitaph from Cambay, that the alias Fatoliya does not appear to have been the nickname of the deceased or of any other individual but was very probably the cognomen by which the family was known. This nickname is clear in the present epigraph and, as has been suggested earlier, appears to be a Gujarati word, derived from Fatol meaning 'soft', etc. in relation to betelnuts. That the deceased, another foreigner settled at Cambay, was a merchant can be safely presumed.

The arch-shaped tablet measuring 60 cm. from apex to bottom and 28 cm. in height contains the following text. It is somewhat unusual that there is a grammatical mistake in the text—in the very beginning of the epitaph proper after the Quranic verse in the fourth horizontal panel.

\[
\text{TEXT}
\]

\[
\text{Plate XII (a)}
\]

(a) Margin.

\begin{align*}
\text{لا اله الا الله} & \text{ هو الحبيب} \\
\text{لا تأخذ سنة ولا نوم له ما في السموات وما في الأرض} & \text{من ذئب الذي يشع عندله إلا باذنه يعلم ما بين إيديهم وما خلفهم ولا يسيطرون بشيء من عليه}
\end{align*}

\text{ابن الشام ومع كرسيه السموات والأرض [و لا يوجد حفظهما و هو العلي العظيم]}

(b) Horizontal panels.

\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله} \\
(2) & \text{بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم} \\
(3) & \text{كل نفس ذائقة الموت ثم} \\
(4) & \text{أيننا ترجعون هذا القبر } \\
(5) & \text{الذين بدرهم أبو بكر} \\
(6) & \text{أرمل فنولله غفر الله له في} \\
(7) & \text{تاريخ الخامسة والعشرين ذو الحجة سنة ست و ثلاثين و سبعاً}
\end{align*}

\text{TRANSLATION}

(a) Qur'an, Chapter II, verses 255.
(b) (1) First Creed.
(2) Basmala.

\(3-4\) 'Every soul must taste of death, then to us you shall be brought back.' This is the grave of the [creature ?]

---

1. EIAPS, 1961, pp. 22-23.
2. Ibid., p. 23.
3. For translation, see p. 10.
4. For translation, see p. 8.
5. For translation, see p. 8.
6. Qur'an, Chapter XXIX, verse 57.
(5) Shamsu'd-Din Muhammad son of the one who is received into (Allah's) mercy namely Abu Bakr

(6) Irbili (i.e. of Irbil), alias Fatoliya, may Allah pardon him. (He died) on
(7) the date twentyfifth (of the month of) Dhul-Qa'da (of the) year (A.H.) six and thirty and seven hundred (25 Dhul-Qa'da 736-5 July 1336).

XXIV. Epicraph, Dated A.H. 738 (1337 A.D.)

The headstone bearing this epitaph is attached to the grave of a lady, locally called Bibi Rani at Nagara, a small village situated at a distance of about 5 kilometres to the north of Cambay, representing the site of ancient Cambay. The Tomb of Bibi Rani, which I visited in 1959 is an ordinary hut-like modern structure, but the finely carved marble sarcophagus is original and resembles those of Malikush-Sharq 'Umar al-Kasaruni and his wife, mentioned above. The design of the epitaph, however, though pleasing, is devoid of artistic decorations.

According to the text, the grave belongs to a lady named Fatima daughter of the late Sayyid Taju'd-Din Husain al-'Alavi, who died on Monday, 4th Safar 738 (1st September 1337). Nothing is known about the lady or her father from any source. That she hailed from a respectable family of ‘Alavi Sayyids is clear from the honorific ‘Sayyid’ and niebo ‘Alavi appended to the name of the father. The text is silent on the married status of the deceased which is unusual: Could the absence of the husband’s name be taken to mean that she died a virgin or was a divorcée at the time of death?

There is some variation in the religious text. The epitaph is engraved on an arch-shaped tablet measuring 82 cm. from apex to bottom and 45 cm. in width. The reverse of the upper part of the tablet is inscribed with Quranic text, and so is the eastern side of the sarcophagus itself. The style of writing is in the main the usually fine Riqa'-like Naskh, while the Basmala is executed in ornamental Kufi.

The text has been read as follows:

TEXT

Plate XII(b)

(a) Margin.

آمن الرسول بما أنزل من ربنا العمنا كل آمن باهتته و ملاكته و كتبه و رسله
لا تفرق بين أحد من رسوله قالوا سما و اطعنا يغفر لنا و اتكن المصير لا يكلف الله نفسا
لا وسمها لها ما كسبت و عليها ما أكتسبت ربنا لا تواخذنا أن نسنا أو إطالتنا و بنا و لا

1 ARIE, 1959-90, No. D, 136. It was first noticed in PRWC, 1919-20, p. 50, No. 33.
2 For a brief account of Nagara and its remains, see Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. VI (Bombay, 1880), and Ratnamani Rao Jojo, op. cit., pp. 143-50. However, no mention of the Tomb or the epitaph is found in either of these or Burgess, op. cit. or Burgess and Consens, op. cit.
3 The term Sayyid seems to have been used here in the Indian sense of the term indicating descent from Prophet Muhammad through his daughter Fatima, wife of ‘Ali. Incidentally, the term ‘Alavi is also usually applied to ‘Ali’s progeny from wives other than Fatima.
4 ARIE, 1959-90, No. D, 137.
5 Ibid., No. D, 138.
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(a) The apostle believes in what has been revealed to him from his Lord, and (so do) the believers; they all believe in Allâh and His angels and His books and His apostles: We make no difference between any of His apostles and they say: We hear and obey, our Lord. Thy forgiveness (do we crave), and to Thee is the eventual course.

Allâh does not impose upon any soul a duty but to the extent of its ability; for it is (the benefit of) what it has earned, and upon it (the evil of) what it has wrought: our Lord! Do not punish us if we forget or make a mistake; our Lord! do not lay on us a burden as thou didst lay on those before us; our Lord! do not impose upon us that which we have not the strength to
bear; and pardon us and grant us protection and have mercy on us; Thou art our Patron, so help us against the unbelieving people'.

(b) Qur'ān, Chapter II, verses 255-56.
(c) (1) First Creed.
(d) (1) Basmala.
(2) 'Every soul shall taste of death, and you shall only be paid fully your reward
(3) on the resurrection day; then whoever is removed far away from the fire and is made
to enter the garden,
(4) he indeed has attained the object, and the life of this world is nothing but a provision
of vanities.
(5) This is the grave of the lady received into (Allāh's) mercy (and) the pardoned one
Fāṭima daughter of the one who is taken into (Allāh's) mercy (and) the pardoned one Sayyid
(6) Ta'jul-Dīn (lit. the crown of Faith) Ḥusain al-'Alavi (i.e. descended from 'Ali the
fourth caliph), may Allāh cover her with His mercy and pleasure
(7) and may Allāh pardon her and her parents and all the Faithful men and women.
(8) She died on Monday the fourth of (the month of) Safar, may Allāh end (it)
(9) with goodness and victory, (of the) year (A.H.) eight and thirty and seven hundred
(4 Safar 738=1 September 1337).

XXV. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 741 (1340)

This otherwise finely excuted epitaph, noticed here for the first time, is fragmentary though
at first glance it looks complete. The slab seems to have broken in such a way that its
middle portion was lost, and its upper and lower portions were properly edged and put together
at the time of their being built up into the wall in such a way that the tablet appears to be whole,
but the lack of continuity of the religious texts and the absence of the usual initial phrases of
the obituary notice clearly shows that the middle portion is missing.

The arch-shaped tablet is built up at the northern end of the eastern wall of the Tomb of
Parvaz Shahid. Apart from being fragmentary, the writing is considerably damaged, rendering
the decipherment of the epitaph proper extremely difficult. As a result of all these, it could
only be deciphered tentatively and the details about the deceased could not be made out except
the date of death. According to this tentative reading, the deceased was a lady and her father
was a big merchant named Sa'd, who from his name appears to be a foreign immigrant. Beyond
this nothing can be made out.

The oft-quoted Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey does not mention this record,
which is perhaps due to the damaged nature of the epigraph.

1 Qur'ān, Chapter II, verses 255-56.
2 For translation, see p. 10.
3 For translation, see p. 6.
4 For translation, see p. 8.
5 Qur'ān, Chapter III, verse 184.
6 ARIE, 1936-57, No. D, 80, where it is stated to be in the southern wall.
The style of writing is the same Riqq'ī-like Naqsh and the tablet measures 45 cm. at the base and 50 cm. from apex to bottom.

The text has been deciphered as under:—

TEXT

Plate XIII(a)

(a) Outer margin. ¹

من ذى الذي يشفع عنه إلا باذنه يعلم ما بين أيديهم و ما خلقهم و لا يحيطون

(b) Within the arch.

لا اله الا الله

(c) In the border, below (a), right and left sides.

العزة لله

(d) Vertical panels.

شهد الله أنه لا اله الا هو والمليكنة.....العلم بنيا بينهم و من يكثر بآيات الله فان الله سريع الحساب

(e) Horizontal panels.

(1) بنت أمير التجار سعد (؟) تغدها الله بالرحمة و الرضوان
(2) و اسكنها في دار الجنان تورع ليلة الارضبة الساع
(3) عشرين من المحرم سنة احدى و اربعين و سبعا و و سلم تسليما

TRANSLATION

(a) Qurʾān, Chapter II, verse 255 (middle portion lost).²

(b) 'There is no god but Allāh'.

(c) The kingdom belongs only to Allāh. The glory belongs only to Allāh.

(d) Qurʾān, Chapter III, verses 17 and 18 (middle portion lost).³

(e) (1) ......daughter of the prince among merchants Sa’d(l), may Allāh cover her with (His) mercy and pleasure

(2) and settle her in the abode of Paradise. She died on the night of Wednesday, the seventh

¹ Only the writing in the margin of the arched portion has survived.
² For translation, see p. 10.
³ For translation, see p. 6.
(3) (and) twenty of the month of Muharram (of the) year (A.H.) one and forty and seven hundred (27 Muharram 741=23 July 1340). And may peace be (upon the Prophet).

The 23rd of July 1340 was Sunday.

XXVI. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 746 (1345 A.D.)

This tombstone built up, first from left, into the west wall of the Tomb of Parvaz Shahid, is one of the few records noticed earlier in the above-mentioned Progress Report with comments. It belongs, in general design and execution, to the simple one-border type of Cambay tombstones and must have been originally fixed at the grave of a lady (Sitti) named Sharaf, daughter of Kamalud-Din Muhammad son of 'Abdu'l-Baqi son of 'Amir son of Tarahin Ansari, who expired on the 13th Jumada II 746 (11 October 1345). The notice in the said Progress Report, quoting the genealogy of the deceased, a lady, viz. 'Musammam Sharaf Sati', daughter of Najmu'd-Din Muhammad son of 'Abdu'l-Jabbar son of Amr son of Tarkhan', is incorrect and confusing. Particularly, the wrong reading of the name Tarkhan gave rise to the following misleading comment: The record contains the earliest reference to the class of Tarkhan clan of Khurasan who later on founded a kingdom for themselves in Sindh, after the decline of the Musalmans-Rajput Samsas in the 16th century A.D. But this is not true. The name in question is Tarahin, which and the name of his son Amr and the nisha Ansari are sufficient indications of their Arab descent. Therefore, it would be wrong to see any earliest reference in this record to the Tarkhan clan.

The epitaph thus belonged to a foreign settler, but it unfortunately does not give any details about the deceased or her husband, if any. The record speaks of her as a devout and respected lady.

The headstone is as usual arch-shaped and measures 55 cm. from apex to bottom and 35 cm. in width. The text is inscribed in Riqa'-type Naskh but has sharp pointed final ha, which makes it more artistic.

TEXT

Plate XIII(b)

(a) Margin.

الله لا اله الا هو الحي القيوم لا تاكذب سنة ولا تكذب سنة ولا تؤد ما في السموات وما في الأرض من الذي يجعل عينه لا باذن يعلم ما بين اثنيهم وما خلقهم ولا يحيطون بشيء من علمه إلا ببصيرة وس عكرسي السموات والارض ولا يودد حفظهما وهو الظلم.

1 ARU, 1936-37, No. D, 74.
2 PRWC, 1919-20, p. 49, No. 9.
3 Ibid., p. 58.
4 The Ansaris are descendants of Ansar (lit. helpers)—those residents of Medina who, after embracing Islam played host to and helped Prophet Muhammad and his companions when the latter migrated there in 622.
5 In this context, see p. 48.
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(b) Horizonal panels.

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم [وله] الحمد
(2) رَبّتَنَا لَن تَمَزَّقَ الْوَلَّادَانَ إِذَا هُدِيتَنَا وَهُمْ لَنَا مِنْ لَدَنَا وَهُدَّا
(3) الْاَكْتَبَ الْوَهْابَ - هَذَا قُرْءَانُ الْمُحْتَجِر
(4) الْمُسْتَوْرِهِ الْصَّاعِمَةِ الصَّالِحَةِ الخَالِيَةِ مِنْ عَذَابٍ رَبِّهِ [كَذَا] الْرَّاجِية
(5) الْوَاحِدَةِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلِيمٌ مَا كَنَّا نَسَيْنَا إِنَّ الْاَكْتَبَ الْوَهْابَ
(6) عَلِيمٌ الْأَبْلَاءِ بَيْنَ عُمْرِنَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ طَيِّبٌ إِلَى اللهِ ثُمَّا وَجَعَلَ الْجَنَّةُ
(7) مَثْواهَا تَوْفِيقَ مِنْ لِيْلَةِ الْأَثْرَاءِ الثَّلْثُ عَشْرُ مِنْ جَمِيْعِ الْأَخْرَجِ سَتِّي وَأَرْبَعِينَ وَسَبْعَ مَايَةَ

TRANSLATION

(a) Qur’ān, Chapter II, verse 255.¹

(b) (1) 'Kingdom belongs to Allah.' Basmala.² 'And to Him is due Praise.'

(2) 'Our Lord! Make not our hearts to deviate after Thou hast guided us aright, and grant us from Thee mercy;

(3) surely, Thou are the most liberal Giver.'³ This is the grave of the one who is taken into (Allāh’s) mercy, the respected,

(4) the veiled, the fasting, the pious, the one who always feared: the punishment of her Lord, the hopeful

(5) of the mercy of the exalted Allāh, named Sittī Sharaf daughter of Kamāl(u’d-) Din Muḥammad son of

(6) ‘Abdul-Bāqī son of ‘Āmir son of Ṭaraḥān Anṣārī, may Allāh render her earthly abode (lit. earth) pleasant and make Paradise

(7) her abode. She died on the night of Monday, the thirteenth of (the month of) Jumādā al-Ākhar (of the) year (A.H.) six and forty and seven hundred, (13th Jumādā II 746= 11 October 1345).

XXVII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 778 (1376 A.D.)

The next epitaph, interesting in its own way, is dated A.H. 778, that is after a gap of more than four lunar decades. The tombstone is built up into the west wall of the Faraspur or Piraspur-ki-Masjid,⁴ whence also came the epitaph noticed above (No. XIV, supra), and like it, the present epigraph is noticed here for the first time.

¹ For translation, see p. 10.
² For translation, see p. 8.
³ Qur’ān, Chapter III, verse 7.
⁴ The Arabic term Sittī is a term of respect and is roughly equivalent to 'Lady' in English.
⁵ ARIS, 1939-60, No. D, 100.
The first thing that strikes the onlooker about the record is its shape and design, which are entirely different. It is neither arch-shaped nor arranged in elaborate panelled design like most of its counterparts in the present group. Likewise, the style of writing is also somewhat different, being Thulith with strong Riqa' flourishes.

As to the contents, it is more or less on the same pattern—Quranic text, though limited, and the obituary proper.

The epitaph was set up to mark the grave of Jamālū'd-Dīn Ḥāji Muḥammad son of 'Abdu'llah, popularly known as Kūkband, who is stated to have expired on Friday, 3rd Jumādā al-Ākhar 778 (15th October 1376). The text calls him 'the great Shaikh,' the devout, the righteous and the religious,' which indicates that he was a saintly person. The exact connotation of his alias 'Kūkband,' which appears to be a Persian term is not clear, but that may have been either his popular epithet or professional name. The appendage Ḥāji shows that he had performed the prescribed visit to the Holy Ka'ba at Mecca and presumably Medina too. The text offers no clue as to the country of his origin.

The style of writing of this epigraph may be described as Thulith with very strong Riqa'-features. The tablet is squarish measuring 40 by 50 cm. and contains the following text:—

TEXT

Plate XIV(a)

(1) Basmala.

(2-5) Qur'ān, Chapter III, verses 17-18, Chapter XI, verses 26-27. This is the grave of the great Shaikh, the devout, the righteous, the religious.

1 This term literally meaning 'old' or 'aged' is also applied to persons of great eminence, particularly in the field of learning or sainthood.

2 It may be pointed out that not in all cases, particularly of Naṣāb and Thulith, the epigraphical specimens conform to the laid down rules.

For translation, see p. 8.

For translation, see p. 6.

For translation, see p. 6.
(6) Jamâlu'd-Din Hâji Muḥammad son of 'Abdu'llâh, popularly known as Kûkband, may Allâh be merciful to him with (His) mercy

(7) unbounded and pardon him with His overwhelming pardon. He was taken into the mercy of the Fardoning Allâh on Friday, the third

(8) of the month of Jumâda al-Ålî (of the ) year eight and seventy and seven hundred from the Migration of the Prophet, may (Allâh's) peace be upon him (3 Jumâda II 778-18 October 1376).

XXVIII. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 783 (1382 A.D.)

This epitaph stands at the head of the smaller grave in the Tomb of Maliku'sh Sharq 'Umar al-Kâzarûnî, already referred to above (p. 40). The grave enshrines the remains of al-Kâzarûnî's wife and is of the same ornamentation as that of the husband.

The tablet was originally arch-shaped, but the top portion having been lost through damage, it has been restored with cement-plaster. Roughly rectangular, it measures 42 cm. by 74 cm., and though simple and not highly ornamented in design as the other headstones, it is quite pleasing: particularly its horizontal panels are made more artistic by dividing every alternate panel into three parts, the side ones having been filled with geometrical and floral designs and the middle ones with text which states that the grave belongs to Bibi Faţima daughter of the late Khwâja Husain of Gilân and wife of Zakiu'd-Din 'Umar al-Kâzarûnî, who died on the 20th Shawwâl 783 (7th January 1382).

The chief importance of the epigraph lies in the fact that it provides the name of the wife of a prominent person of his age and that of her father and her land of origin, a piece of information not available from any source. Her father too would appear, like her husband, to be a merchant of Iranian origin, hailing from Gilân.

The calligraphy of the record is quite good, but not as good as that of the epitaph of her husband. The script is Rûqâ'-type Nâshîh except for the Basmala which is executed in ornamental Kûfî of quite a pleasing type. There is also in the text a minor grammatical error which is rather unusual.

An incomplete and incorrect reading of this epigraph too, made by Professor E. Rehtasek was published by Burgess and Cousens in their List. The deceased, for example, is stated therein to have been 'crown of treasures' and one who had performed the pilgrimage to Karbalâ'.

The epitaph reads as under:

TEXT

Plate XIV(b)

(a) Margin.

لا هل الا هو الى التيم لا تاخذه سنة ولا نوم له ما في السموت وما في الأرض من ذئب لا يحبون ذئب من عله الا ظهاء ومع كربه السموت والارض ولا يوجد ذئب هو العموم

(b) Within the arch.

لا هل الا هو سول [و [م محمد

1 ARIE, 1956-57, No. D, 46.
2 Burgess & Cousens, op. cit., p. 230, No. 16. Karbalâ is the place where the Prophet's grandson Husain attained martyrdom and where he lies buried.
(c) **Horizontal panels.**

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(2) كل من عليها فان و يبقى
(3) وجه
(4) ربك ذو الجلال والاكرام
(5) هذا القدر (كذا)
(6) المرحوم المغفورة فخرب النساء تاج الجراير
(7) ببي فاطمة بنت
(8) المرحوم الخواجة حسين الكيلاني زوجة الملك المرحوم
(9) زكي الدين عمر الكازرونی الخالق بنملك برويز نور
(10) الله قرها توظت في العشرين من شوال سنة ثلاث و ثمانين و سبعمائة

**TRANSLATION**

(a) **Qur’ān,** Chapter II. verses 255.1
(b) **First Creed.**
(c) (1) **Basmala.**
(2-4) **Qur’ān,** Chapter XL, verses 26-27.4
(5) This is the grave
(6) of the lady taken into Allāh’s mercy and pardoned, the pride among women, the crown of free women (i.e. women of noble lineage),
(7) **Bibi Fāṭima,** daughter of
(8) the Khwāja who is taken into (Allāh’s) mercy, Ḥussain al-Gilānī (i.e. of Gilān, a province in Iran) (and) wife of the Malik (who is) taken into Allāh’s mercy (viz.)
(9) **Zakiu’d-Dīn Umar al-Kāzarūnī** entitled Malik Parviz, may illuminated
(10) by Allāh be her grave. She died on the twentieth of (the month of) Shawwāl (of the) year (A.H.) three and eighty and seven hundred (20 Shawwāl 783 = 7 January 1382).

**XXIX. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 786 (1384 A.D.)**

This short epitaph, noticed here for the first time, seems to have escaped the notice of the officer when the epigraphical survey of Cambay was made in 1919-20, for it is not included in his list. The tablet is lying loose in the Tomb of Pīr Buhlūl Shāhid in Tin-Limūdji or Chipwāj, where one more epitaph, noticed above (No. XII, supra), is preserved.

The squarish slab measuring 22 cm. by 27 cm. is fragmentary in that a little bit from its top left corner has disappeared. Whether it was originally arch-shaped or not, it is difficult to say for certain, but perhaps it was not.

---

1 For translation, see p. 10.
2 For translation, see p. 6.
3 For translation, see p. 8.
4 For translation, see p. 6.
5 *ARIÉ: 1939-60,* No. D, 108.
(a) Epitaph dated A.H. 786 (p. 57)

Scale: \textasciitilde0.4

(b) Epitaph dated A.H. 798 (p. 58)

Scale: \textasciitilde0.17
The brief obituary note, too, is not fully clear. The text calls the deceased as Aḥmad ‘Ali, but such compound name not being in vogue in those days, very probably the idāfāt-i-ibnī is intended in this case, making it Aḥmad-i-‘Ali i.e. Aḥmad son of ‘Ali. This is, of course, usually not done in Arabic texts, which is the case here, but as stated above, the text is faulty and the composer not very conversant with Arabic language. Unfortunately, again, an important word indicating his nisba which could have disclosed his origin or profession or like information cannot be deciphered satisfactorily. This is so despite the usually fine, distinct and clear-cut script, which is Riqā’-like Naskh, but the lack of diacritical marks coupled with calligraphical flourishes has prevented its definite decipherment: it reads like Kirātīṣ or Kirātīṣṭ.

So, according to our tentative reading, the epitaph was intended to mark the grave of one Ahmad (son of) ‘Ali Kirātīṣ (†). The given date, viz. Saturday, the 16th of Jumādā al-Ākhar 786 (5th August 1384) is evidently the date of his death.

The text has been deciphered as under: —

TEXT

Plate XV(a)

لا الله الا الله محمد رسول الله

كل من على مثنا و يبقى وجه

زيك ذو الجلال و الاكرام هذا البر (كندا) الاعز

أحمد على كرايتست(كرايتست) في ذلك الإذن يوج السبب

السادسة عشرة من جمادى الآخر سنة ستو ثمانين و سبعمامة

TRANSLATION

(1) First Creed.¹

(2-3) Qur‘ān, Chapter XL, verses 26-27.² This is the grave of the most beloved (†),

(4) Ahmad (son of) ‘Ali Kirātīṣ or Kirātīṣṭ (†). And this was on the date Saturday,

(5) sixteenth of (the month of) Jumādā al-Ākhar (of the) year (A.H.) six and eighty and seven hundred (16 Jumādā II 786-5 August 1384).

XXX. EPITAPH, DATED A.H. 798 (1395 A.D.)

The last epitaph of the group is from the Tomb of Pir Tāju’d-Din referred to above (p. 7), where it is built up into the eastern wall,³ and is noticed here for the first time. The arch-shaped tombstone conforms to the ornate type, with the arch being trifoiled with a vase hanging from its apex on chain, and decorated with floral designs here and there.

The tablet measuring 78 cm. from apex to bottom and 40 cm. in width seems to have weathered considerably, for the writing is quite damaged. But the text is more or less legible except the nisba of the deceased which has defied several attempts at decipherment. According to the text, the epitaph belonged to the grave of Khwāja Asil⁴ son of ‘Umar son of Sa’du’d-Din, who expired on Sunday the 8th of Muḥarram 798 (23rd October 1395). The deceased is spoken of in the text as ‘the chief of merchants, pride among the great and the free-born’, which shows that he was a prominent member of the mercantile community. His native place cannot be determined as the nisba could not be deciphered.

¹ For translation, see p. 6.
² For translation, see p. 6.
³ ARIE, 1959-60, No. D, 121.
⁴ In ibid., the name is read as Sādān.
The style of writing is the usual ṭiqā'-type Nasīḥ of excellent quality. The text is quoted below:

**TEXT**

*Plate XV(b)*

(a) *Within the arch.*

لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

(b) *Margin.*

[إِنَّهُ لا إِلَهَ إِلَّا الَّذِي كَبْرَى الْقِبْوَمَ لا تَأخَذَهُ سَنَةً وَلَا نَومٌ لَّهُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الأرْضِ من ذِئْبٍ الَّذِي يُقَلِّل عِنْدَهُ الْجَزَاءٌ يَعلمُ مَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِمْ وَمَا خَلْفَهُمْ وَلَا يُسِرُّونَ بِشَيْءٍ مِّنْ عِلْمِهِ الَّذِي بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ وَلَا يَعْلَمُونَ بِهِ[هو الْعَلِيَّ الْعَظِيمُ]

(c) *Horizontal panels.*

(1) بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
(2) يبِشَّرُهُمْ رَبُّهُم بِرَحْمَةٍ مِّنْهُ وَرُحْمَانَ وَجَنَائِزَ لَهُمْ فِيهَا نُعِيمٌ
(3) مَتَمَّ عَلَى دُلُوْقِهِمْ فِيهَا إِبَادَةٌ إِنِّي أَنْعَمْ عَلَيْهِمْ
(4) هذَا قَبْرُ العِبَادِ الْضِّعِيفِ النَّجِيفِ الْرَّاجِيِّ إِلَى رَحْمَةِ اللهِ تَعَالَى
(5) صَدَرُ الْنَّجَارِ مِنْ شَهَرِ الْأَكَابِرِ وَالْإِحْرَارِ خَوْاِجَهُ أَصِيلٌ وَأَمْرُ اِنْعَمَ اِنْسَدَ الْذِّلِّينِ
(6) [طَيَّةٌ تَغْضَمَ قَرْنَةَ اللَّهِ بِالرَّحْمَةِ وَماَكِتَهُ فِي دَارِ الْجَانِّ تَوَهَّمَ يَوْمَ الْأَخِرِ]
(7) الْأَمْامُ ثَانِيٌّ مِّنْ الْمِهْرَجِ تَنَانِثٌ وَتَسَعُونَ وَسَعْمَةٌ
(8) حَمَادًا لَّهُ وَصَلَاةٌ وَسَلَامٌ عَلَيْ رَسُولِهِ مَعْمَدٍ وَالْوَلَاةِ وَالْإِلْهَامِ

**TRANSLATION**

(a) (1) First Creed.¹
(b) Qur'ān, Chapter II, verse 255.²
(c) (1) Basmala.³
(2-3) Qur'ān, Chapter IX, verses 21-22.⁴
(4) This is the grave of the weak and infirm creature, hopeful of the mercy of the Exalted Allah,
(5) the chief of the merchants, pride of the great and the free-born, Khwāja Asīl son of 'Umar son of Sa‘du’d-Dīn
(6) al........i. may Allāh cover him with (His) mercy and settle him in the abode of Paradise. He died on Sun-
(7) day, the eighth of the month of Muḥarrār (of the) year (A.H) eight and ninety and seven hundred (8 Muḥarrār 798-23 October 1395).
(8) Praise be to Allāh and salutations on His apostle Muḥa ad. Arḍ salutation and peace.

---
¹ For translation, see p. 8.
² For translation, see p. 10.
³ For translation, see p. 8.
⁴ For translation, see p. 12.
TWO MUGHAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM SAMANA, PANJAB

BY S. S. HUSAIN, EPGRAPHICAL ASSISTANT

I propose to publish here two Mughal inscriptions from Sāmānā. The town, a Tahsil headquarters in the Pašīlā district of Panjāb, is situated in 30°9' north latitude and 76°15' east longitude, about 27 kilometres south-west of Pašīlā town, with which it is connected by a fine metalled road. Sāmānā now a modern town containing well-built houses and fields along the borders of the town, finds frequent mention in historical works and enjoyed considerable importance during the Muslim period, as is attested to by numerous mosques and tombs some of which are unfortunately either in a ruinous condition or occupied by displaced persons from Pakistān for residential purposes, while others which were in good shape are turned into schools, Temples or Gurdwarās.

The original name of the town is said to have been Niranjan Khepā. Later on, from time to time it was known as Ratangarh, Dhobi Khepā and Sāmānā. During the Sultanate period, Sāmānā was an important stronghold. It was first surrendered along with Sarsuti (Sirsā), Ghuram (Kuhrām of historical works) and Hānsi to Muḥammad Ghori by Prithvi Rāj after his defeat in 1192. During the Maḥālūk period, when the Mongols were plundering the upper Panjāb and Delhi, Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Balban (1265-87) established military cantonments to prevent their inroads into the north-west frontiers, and appointed his son Bughrā Kān to the charge of Sāmānā to reinforce and guard the Beās line. Under the Khaljis too, for the same reason, its importance as a military cantonment was realised and Sāmānā was made the headquarters of the most experienced commanders with well-equipped troops to check the Mongols. But under the Tugluq dynasty, Sāmānā and other sub-divisions namely Sunām, Hānsi, Sarusti (Sirsā), Kalānaur, Jullundhar and Sirhind remained under chaos due to rebellions of the governors and internal as well as external conflicts. It was only under the just rule of Fīrūz Shāh (1351-88) that this region heaved a sigh of relief and obtained prosperity. But with his passing away, the closing years of the fourteenth century brought havoc and plunder to Sāmānā and nearby territories in the wake of the invasion of Delhi by Timūr. But under the Sayyid and Lodī dynasties, no important event seems to have taken place at Sāmānā except perhaps that it was here that Sultān Buhlūl Lodī (1451-89) who had gone there in his early career, along with two of his friends to see his uncle Iṣlām Kān Lodī, is said to have met a Darwīsh, Sayyid Abban or Sādā by name, who offered and ‘sold’ the kingdom of Delhi to him.

During the Mughal rule, Sāmānā again finds occasional mention. Humāyūn had halted here after defeating Sikandar Sūr and was enchanted with its climate. It was saved from plunder

---

4 Dīyān 'd-Dīn Barānī, Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz-Shāhī (Calcutta, 1862), p. 80.
5 For an eye account of the advance of Timūr's army in the region, see Elliot & Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. III (London, 1871), pp. 431, 493, etc.
and loot by the timely action of Akbar when Sher Muḥammad Diwānā a servant of Bairam Khān, when the latter fell out with the emperor, created disturbance there and killed one Mir Dost Muḥammad who was sent to Sāmānā to manage its affairs by Mullā Nūru’d-Din Muḥammad Tarkhān.¹

Under Jahāngīr’s reign, Sāmānā was famous for its fine cloth and was mostly inhabited by the weaver community, who supplied silk and other types of textiles to the royal harem. The fine textiles produced here seem to have been known by the name Semianoes or Sanyanoes.² In 1621, the East India Company is reported to have bought it at the rate of Rs. 2 1/2 to Rs. 4 1/2 per piece.³ After this Sāmānā appears to have passed into oblivion.

Sāmānā seems to have had quite a few mosques and tombs, which, though ‘magnificent’ or ‘restored’ had several inscriptions on them¹¹ but it is a pity that no systematic effort was made to copy these inscriptions, almost all of which have now disappeared or are untraceable. Fortunately, the Survey report made by Charles Rodgers mentions about half a dozen epigraphs (including one included in the present study), of which I could only trace one in the course of my tour in October 1971. According to him, the earliest available record was of the time of Sikandar Lodī (1483-1517), one of Jahāngīr (included in this article) and two of the time of Shāh Jahān.⁴ It is surprising that Rodgers was not aware of one more inscription of Shāh Jahān which I discovered during my visit to the town. This epigraph belonged to the Imān-bārā in the Sayyidon-ki-Maḥalla (now called Maḥalla Chaklā) which is now converted into a Gurdwārā. It is an interesting record purporting the construction of a mansion, as we shall presently see. The inscription of Jahāngīr was noticed by Rodgers, but he has read its date as A.H. 1014 instead of 1024, a difference of one decade.

Taking this inscription first, it is carved on a marble slab, measuring 50 by 37 cm. which is fixed on the central outer arch of the three-domed Jāmi’ mosque, which is situated in the northwest part of the town.⁵ The right half portion of the central dome has fallen inside the central hall. Except for this, the general condition of the rest of the mosque is good. Architecturally, the mosque is in the tradition of the Lodi-Sūr monuments and not in the style of the Mughal buildings initiated by Akbar.

The epigraph consists of three couplets in Persian and written in relief in ordinary Nasta’liq letters. It records the construction of a mosque by Mirzā Momīn in A.H. 1024 (1614-15 A.D.) during the reign of the Mughal emperor Nūru’d-Din Jahāngīr. The date is given in a chronogram contained in the second hemistich of the third couplet. Rodgers who was the first to notice this inscription and publish its reading three quarters of a century back had, due to the misreading of the chronogrammatic phrase, calculated the date as A.H. 1014 (1605-06 A.D.). He had mistaken the word ٢٣٥١ for ٢٣٥٣ and hence the difference of 10 in the date.⁶

I have not been able to identify the builder viz. Mirzā Momīn from contemporary chronicles. Possibly, he was an official which would mean that but for this record, he would have remained unknown. Even otherwise, he appears to have been a man of local importance and hence the record under study is an important source at least for the local history.

² According to IG, p. 306, emperor Jahāngīr used to wear this cloth made by the weavers of Sāmānā whose descendants had in their possession annuities from the emperor.
³ IG, p. 2, f.n.1.
⁵ For details, see ibid., pp. 21-22.
⁶ ARIE, 1971-72, No. D, 133.
⁷ Rodgers, op. cit., p. 22.
The text has been read as follows:

TEXT

Plate XVI (a)

(1) بعد شاه نور الدين جهانغير
كه حكمت پرهمه روی زين است
(2) بنای خبر میزرا مون انفرخخت
كه سعيش داينا در راه دين است
(3) بتاریخی عطارد خوش رتم زد
لسجد مون مسلمین است

TRANSLATION

(1) In the reign of Shāh Nūrū’d-Din Jahāngir, whose rule is (established) on the whole surface of the earth.

(2) Mirzā Momin, who always strives in the path of Faith, erected (this) bountiful edifice.

(3) For its date, (‘the Scribe of the Heaven’) Mercury beautifully wrote, ‘it is: Verily the mosque of Momin (lit. a believer) is for the Muslims.’

The chronogram yields A.H. 1024 (1614-15 A.D.).

The other inscription is published here for the first time. It was discovered by me while searching for the inscriptions of Sāmānā listed by Rodgers, who surprisingly omits to mention it. The tablet bearing this inscription is fixed on the right enclosure wall of the passage of the gate of the Gurdwārā Singh Ṣafā Ṣahib in Maḥalla Chaklā in the heart of the town. This building is reported to have been used as an Imāmbara called Bārā in the pre-partition days, which after the migration of the Muslim population was converted into the Gurdwārā. There is a modern mosque in the premises just within the entrance gate. The inscription slab, measuring 114 by 47 cm., is fixed at a height of about a metre and a half from the ground and it is doubtful if it is in situ. It appears to have been brought from some other place for it records the construction of an ‘abode of joy’, as will be seen presently.

The inscription is in Persian verse, comprising five verses written in raised letters in finely executed artistic sets of horizontal panels, vertically separated from each other by geometrical figures, which coupled with its Nasta’liq of a fairly high quality, has made it an elegant epigraph. The text records the construction of a lofty palatial building designated in the text as ‘an abode of happiness’, and likened to a ‘palace from Paradise’. The name of the builder is not explicitly given but from the manner he is spoken of viz, the Khān who is worthy of the sphere of Daulat (lit. good fortune), it is certain that it is Daulat Khān. The construction took place, the inscription further states, in A.H. 1044 (1634-35 A.D.) under the superintendence of one Gopāl Bhaṭṭ and the work was executed by one Iṣḥāq. The text also gives along with the Hijra year, the 6th regnal year which must pertain to Shāh Jahān whose name is surprisingly omitted in the text, but the 6th regnal year officially ended on the last day of Jumādā I 1043 (2nd December 1633). Therefore, either there is some inadvertent mistake on the part of the sculptor in engraving

---

1 There is a fine pun on the word Momin, which is the name of the builder and which also means a true believer.
2 Rodgers, op. cit., pp. 21-22.
3 ARIE, 1971-72, No. D, 134.
(1) The foundation of this everlasting abode of happiness was laid at an auspicious and blessed moment.

(2) This happy mansion appears as if a palace has been removed from Paradise (to the earth). A.H. 1044 (1634-35 A.D.).

(3) Or this lofty palace is an auspicious heavenly abode which has become the exalted residence (of one) whose standards are (as high as) the high heavens. Regnal year 6.

(4) One who is worthy of the sphere of fortune, (namely) that Khān by whose reflected image, the eyes of the sky are opened wide (i.e. the sky is astonished). Work done by Ishāq.

(5) When I sought the year of its date, Wisdom replied, 'It is: a wonderful, auspicious and airy building'. Superintended by Gopāl Bhāṭṭ.

The chronogram is contained in the last hemistic. The date given in the figure is A.H. 1044, and the chronogram would yield it only if the word binā'ī in the chronogrammatic phrase is taken to consist of two ya and a hamza, though it is normally taken to be one ya and one hamza. As the date is explicitly given in figure as 1044 and the word binā'ī is so written as to indicate that the spelling with two ya and one hamza was intended by the composer for the reckoning, there is no doubt that the date is A.H. 1044 (1634-35 A.D.).
ADIL SHAHI INSCRIPTIONS FROM PANHALA

BY DR. A. A. KADIRI, SENIOR EPIGRAPHICAL ASSISTANT

I propose to study in this article twelve 'Adil Sháhi inscriptions from Panhála, a place of historical interest in the Kolhápur district of Mahárástra. These range in their dates from A.H. 918 (1512-13 A.D.) to A.H. 1020 (1611-12 A.D.) and represent the reigns of four rulers of the 'Adil Sháhi dynasty, viz., Ismá'íl (1516-34), Ibráhím I (1535-57), 'Ali I (1558-80) and Ibráhím II (1580-1636).

The earliest extant inscription from Panhála was published in an earlier issue of this series, where a brief resume of its history upto A.H. 917 (1511-12 A.D.) was given. It would therefore be better to carry forward this local history to A.H. 1022 (1611-12 A.D.), the date of the latest inscription of the present group, which will incidentally show the importance of these epigraphs for the local history of the fort.

From the earliest record dated A.H. 918 (1512-13 A.D.) studied below, it is clear that Malik SíkanDar Haidarí who was, according to an earlier epigraph, the Thánadáar of Panhála in A.H. 917 (1511-12 A.D.), continued to hold that post at least till A.H. 918 (1512-13 A.D.). After this date nothing is known about Panhála or its Thánadárs till A.H. 946 (1539-40 A.D.), when according to inscription No. II, set up in the reign of Ibráhím 'Adil Sháh I, one Yúsuf held the charge of the Panhála fort. After this date, again, nothing is heard about the place till about A.H. 954 (1547-48 A.D.), when Ibráhím I visited Panhála on a pleasure-trip, according to Fírîshta. This is in a way corroborated by inscription No. III in which, Panhála is referred to as the seat of government in the said year, when Dá'ud Áqá was incharge of the place. The latter seems to have continued to govern Panhála till the following year when, according to inscription No. IV, he constructed a tank. It was at about this time that Burhán NígáM Sháh I of Ahmadnagar and Ja'áshád Quüb Sháh of Golconda who followed the Shiite tenets tried to exploit their sectarian affinity with Asad KháN Lári, an 'Adil Sháhi official of great status, urging him to hand over the fort of Belgáum of which he was custodian to NígáM Sháh for monetary consideration. According to Fírîshta, Asad KháN spurned the overtures, imprisoned the persons involved in the offer, and in view of his illness, requested his master to visit Belgáum. But the Ahmadnagar historian 'Ali Tábátabá would have us believe that Asad KháN fell a victim to treachery and invited Burhán, then besieging Bijpúr, to come in person to Belgáum, to receive the charge of this strategic fort from him, but Ibráhím having somehow got an inkling of this, marched to Belgáum a couple of days before the appointed rendezvous of the Ahmadnagar king with Asad KháN there. Fírîshta states at another place that being hard pressed by the manoeuvres of the allied forces of the Vijayanagara king Râm Ráj and Burhán, Ibráhím left Bijpúr which was later besieged by Burhán and went to Panhála. On his way, he appears to have paid a visit to Belgáum on the request of his ailing general Asad KháN who ultimately breathed his last in the beginning

1. Epigraphia Indica Arabic & Persian Supplement (EIAPS), 1964, p. 43.
2. Ibid., pp. 43-44.
4. Ibid., p. 31.
5. 'Ali Tábátabá, Burhán-i-Mu'dthir (Hyderábd, 1936), p. 309.
of A.H. 956 (1549 A.D.). It is possible that having arranged the affairs at Belgaum, Ibrahim might have left for Panhala, which was more formidable and hence more secure than Belgaum. This inference is corroborated by Tabarzad, according to whom, Burhan, having on his way to Belgaum got news that Ibrahim had reached Belgaum and fortified it with men and provision, changed his route, marched on to Panhala and laid siege to the fort. But finding the task impossible, Nizam Shah concentrated on lower fortifications which were reduced after a fight lasting for a day and a half only, and after having destroyed them completely, he left for Satara. Firuz Shah did not know the details, according to his own confession, of the three battles fought between Burhan and Ibrahim, but he refers to the expedition of the allied forces of Rana Raj and Burhan against Bijapur, as a result of which Ibrahim, finding himself unequal to the task of containing them, went to Panhala. Burhan invested Bijapur but fell ill and had to be removed to Ahmadnagar where he died in the same year.

It is a fact that neither the contemporary chronicler like Rafi’u’d-Din nor the later historian Zubairi, mentions these events pertaining to Panhala. Nor are they taken note of in dealing with the events of this period. For example, the Imperial Gazetteer merely gives this information that ‘on the establishment of the Adil Shahi dynasty of Bijapur in 1489, Panhala was fortified with great care’, and ‘in 1659 immediately after the murder of Afzal Khan, Shivaji took Panhala from Bijapur’, while the State Gazetteer enlightens us that ‘Ibrahim I and II took a lot of interest in Panhala and its fortifications. This is shown not only by the numerous Persian inscriptions left by them but also by the architectural style of the monuments at the place’. But far more surprising is that Dr. Radhey Shyam in his history of the Ahmadnagar kingdom should have chosen to ignore Panhala and events about it, so connected with Ahmadnagar history, completely. Moreover, the fort of Panhala contains inscriptions of the time of the Bijapur king ‘Ali I, which evidently do not seem to have been known to all these authorities.

Resuming the narration of the events of Panhala fort, we next find (vide inscription No. V) that in A.H. 964 (1556-57 A.D.), Malik Khand, the Sar Khawas, was very probably incharge of the fort. For the next two decades, nothing is known about its history. But from an epigraph (No. VI, infra), it would appear that in A.H. 985 (1577-78 A.D.), one Shamsu’d Din, the Nabi-i Ghribat of ‘Ali I was incharge there. He seems to have been succeeded, two years later, by one Ahmad ‘Ali son of Raun ‘Ali, entitled Shamsu’d-Mulk (vide inscription No. VII). Some time between this and A.H. 988 (1580 A.D.), a little after the murder of ‘Ali I, Mir Kamalu’d-Din Husain Inju, entitled Murtada Khan, seems to have been imprisoned at Panhala, for we are told by the contemporary chronicler Rafi’u’d-Din Shiri in that Kishwar Khan Lari tried to do away with Murtada Khan Inju and his brother Shah Qasim as he did in the case of Mufasa Khan Ardastani at Bankapur, but the letter of ‘Abdu’l-Mu’imin addressed to Kishwar Khan having

---

1 Firuz Shah, op. cit., p. 31; Zubairi, Basakhals-Salafin (Hyderabadi), p. 64.
4 Ibid., p. 120.
5 Rafi’u’d-Din Shirazi, Tarikatu’l-Mulk (MS).
6 Zubairi, op. cit., pp. 43-44.
7 Such as, for example, Imperial Gazetteer of India (IG), Vol. XIX (Oxford, 1908), p. 396; Gazetteers of India, Maharashtra State, Kolhapur District (Kolhapur Dt. Gr.), Bombay, 1960, p. 67; Dr. Radhey Shyam, The Kingdom of Ahmadnagar (Delhi, 1966), pp. 57-94.
8 IG, p. 396.
10 Radhey Shyam, op. cit., pp. 57-94.
12 SIAPS, 1968, p. 42.
fallen in the hands of Ikhlas Khan, the plan misfired and orders were issued to release the two brothers who left Panhalā and came to Bijāpur.\(^1\)

A little earlier, Khishwar Khan had sent a contingent under the command of Afdal Khan Shīrāzī to relieve the garrison at Bidar which was besieged by the allied forces of Ibrāhīm of Golconda and Murtadā of Ahmadnagar. The faction fights at Bijāpur which ultimately resulted in the death of Khishwar Khan, having lowered the morale of the ‘Ādil Shāhī forces, Afdal Khan had to retreat to Bijāpur.\(^2\) At this stage, Ikhlas Khan, the new prime-minister who had succeeded Khishwar Khan, despatched Rafi’ud-Dīn Shīrāzī to Panhalā to bring the treasure accumulated there to the capital.\(^3\)

After this, we do not hear about Panhalā till A.H. 1016 (1607-08 A.D.), when according to inscription No. IX, one Aqā Maqṣūd constructed a palace on the terrace of the fort in the reign of Ibrāhīm II. This Aqā Maqṣūd appears to have been in charge of Panhalā at least till A.H. 1020 (1611-12 A.D.), when according to inscription No. X, he constructed a mosque at Ibrāhīm-purā, situated outside the upper fortification. Most probably this outer portion of the fortification was destroyed during the Nīṣān Shāhī siege mentioned above.

From the above, it will be seen that much of the history of Panhalā owes its reconstruction to the epigraphic records. These records, as will be seen presently, mention a number of officials of rank, most of them unknown from other sources, apart from scribes. The former include such names as Malik Sikandar Haider (the Thānādār), Malik Yusuf the Ābdār, Malik Dā’ūd Aqā the Nā’b-i-Ghaibat, Shamsud-Dīn the Nā’b-i-Ghaibat, Malik Khijr the Sar Khwāss, Ahmad ‘Ali entitled Shamsihur-Mulk and Aqā Maqṣūd. Some of these held high ranks and the rest were also officials of note.

From the calligraphical point of view too, these epigraphs are not without interest. Four of the twelve epigraphs are inscribed in Nasta’īq character—the earliest of these, the second of the group, is dated A.H. 946 (1539-40 A.D.)—of no particular merit in itself, but their designers have sought to impart to them artistic touch through floral or decorative motifs, but the effect on the whole is not very pleasing. The remaining eight are in Nasqī or Thulūr style which is uniformly good with the exception of one inscription (No. VII) where too it is partly quite good. The style of writing in these seven epigraphs would have made these very attractive specimens of calligraphy were it not for the fact that the designing of the text particularly the placing of the letters and words leaves much to be desired. Fortunately, four of these epigraphs also contain the names of their designers, viz. Maulānā Rajab who wrote three epigraphs and Muḥammad son of Faridud-Dīn, both of whom appear to be talented calligraphers. It is a pity that in the case of the rest, particularly Inscription Nos. I and II, the names of the calligraphers are not known.

Almost all of these records aremetrical but the quality of verse presented by them is mediocre except in the case of Inscription No. II. With these introductory remarks, we now proceed with the study of the epigraphs themselves.

I. **INSCRIPTION DATED A.H. 918**

The first inscription is carved on the left of the three slabs measuring 68 by 34 cm., which are fixed on the platform of the Dargāh of Ša’dud-Dīn.\(^4\) The Dargāh, the most important of

---

1 Zubairī, op. cit., p. 173.
3 Ibid.
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the Muslim buildings at the place, is about 9 metres square and 15 metres high including the dome.

Evidently the slab is not in situ as it records the construction of a bastion by Sikandar, in A.H. 918 (1512-13 A.D.). The text comprising two Persian verses is inscribed in two lines in relief in Thulūt characters of a high order, but the name of the calligrapher is not mentioned. The date is contained in a chronogram.

The builder is none other than Malik Sikandar Haiðari, the Thānādar of Panhālā, who had, according to another inscription studied in a past issue of this series, excavated a tank and constructed its gate a year earlier.¹

The text has been deciphered by me as under:

TEXT

Plate XVII(b)

(1) ḏīrār-biššat [aṣṭ] tāriḵai in

(2) ḏīnā jābār bimār bāyibāv bīn

Sḵandar bīn am Sḵandar Shu[m]

TRANSLATION

(1) Listen to me, O connoisseur: Its date is (contained in the phrase) Burūj-i-Biḥшла (i.e. the bastions of Paradise).

(2) Hark! I am informing you about the builder. (He is) Sikandar (i.e. Alexander) in name and (also) Sikandar in quality.

The following English rendering of the epigraph was given in the old series of the Bombay Gazetteer of the Kolhāpur district, but it is unintelligible: 'Oh friend listen to the voice of the assembly. The able man Sikandar converted the hill into a road, and named the Sikandar bastion with this date. It informs one of 806 with a golden call.'²

II. INSCRIPTION OF IBRĀHĪM I, DATED A.H. 946

The second inscription of the group and first of Ibrāhīm I occupying a total space of about 1.55 m. by 42 cm. appears on the facade of the structure over the step-well called Andhār-Bāoli in the Fort.³ Its text consists of seven couplets in Persian which are of a fairly good quality and are carved in relief in ordinary Nastaʿlijī characters. The haphazard placing of letters has rendered its decipherment a difficult task. The epigraph states that Yūsuf the royal Ādīr (i.e. Water-bearer), constructed at Panhālā, a bastion and a tank with a structure above the latter in the year A.H. 946 (1539-40 A.D.), in the reign of Ādīl Shīh (i.e. Ibrāhīm I).

This record was also noticed in the Bombay Gazetteer, where its following English translation is given: 'In Panhālā at the commencement of his rule, may God increase his prosperity, good fortune and rank. This will remain as a glorious memorial for him. Now A.H. 909 Abu Yusuf is the official entrusted with the construction of this work. The cause of this building being the best of its day is this, that this lofty building was completed in the reign of the king of the age,

¹ EIAPS, 1964, p. 44, pl. XIV c. It is now preserved in the Kolhāpur Museum.
³ ARIS, 1963-64, No. D, 204.
Adil Shah. A bastion, a reservoir, and this building were constructed (as it were) on the heads of the black-eyed damsels of Paradise. A life-giving spring flows from its reservoir and they placed it on the shelf (as it were) of a palace, by the order of a man of high and excellent rank. With victory, with happiness and excellence, this was brought into sight.¹

The above rendering, apart from the wrong reading of the date, the name of builder etc., is hopelessly corrupt and misleading. The name of the builder is Yūsuf, the ʿAbdār and not Abū Yūsuf. Unfortunately nothing could be gleaned about this Yūsuf from the Persian chronicles available to me. But he appears to have been an official of note and held the honorary rank of the ʿAbdār, i.e. person in charge of the drinks for the king. The epigraph is thus an important document which has perpetuated the name of the ʿĀdil Shāhī official and has also preserved a small bit of information about the posts connected with the royal person like ʿAbdār.

I have read the text as follows:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XVIII(b)*

> در یکن بهوئ پر یکنازگر از خورشید و خیبر
> برج هوش و عمارت بر سر
> آب حوض ز حضماحیون
> یوسف آبادار بنیاد نهاد
> کشت دیگر فریاد بین علت
> شد مرتب سد و فیروزی

**TRANSLATION**

(1) At Pan(h)āla, this lofty edifice was constructed during the government of the Lord,

(2) the king of the age ʿĀdil Shāh, may Allāh increase his fortune, reign and dignity.

(3) (This) bastion, tank and the structure above it, reminds one of *Khwarānaq*² and *Khaibar*.³

(4) The arch of its portico raised its head to the seventh heaven; the water of its tank is from the Spring of Life.

(5) The builder of this edifice, from its foundation (i.e. anew) is Yūsuf the ʿAbdār, of good disposition.

¹ *BG*, p. 422, No. 2.
² A palace in Babylonia.
³ A fort near Medina.
(6) Nine hundred and forty years had passed after the Migration; add (for the date) to it six for no reason (A.H. 946=1539-40 A.D.),
(7) when this edifice was completed on the best of the days, with happiness and victory.

III. INSCRIPTION OF THE SAME KING, DATED A.H. 954

The slab bearing the second inscription of Ibrāhīm I and the third record of the group, is fixed on the facade of the middle gate of the Tin-Darwāzā gate of the Fort. The text is inscribed within a large panel and the all round margin enclosing it. The panel contains two lines of Persian prose commencing with the famous opening verse from the celebrated Persian poem Makhzan-i-Asrār. The margin has on the right, top, left and bottom, respectively, a line in Persian prose, five hemistiches in Persian verse, one hemistich in Persian verse and a Quatrain of the celebrated Persian poet ‘Umar Khayyām, all carved in relief in Nasta’īq characters of a fairly good type. The writing in the panel is set against floral background.

The epigraph states that in the reign of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh the buildings at Panhālā, which is spoken of as ‘the seat of government’ were either repaired or built anew in A.H. 954 (1547-48 A.D.) during the regime of Malik Dā’ūd Aqā, the Nā’ib-i-Ghaibat, that is to say, king’s Deputy. It further states that Dā’ūd Aqā constructed a reservoir of sweet drinking water. The text is stated therein to have been written by one Sālār son of Ahmad, the Dābir (Secretary).

This epigraph was also noticed in the Bombay Gazetteer; its rendering there, though not without mistakes, is fairly accurate in stating the purport.

Nothing could be gleaned about Malik Dā’ūd Aqā, from the contemporary sources, but he continued to be at Panhālā at least for one more year according to the next inscription. These two records are therefore quite important. The one under study is also important as it corroborates the statement of Firigha that at about this time, Ibrāhīm I had left Bijāpur and took shelter at Panhālā, for which reason, evidently, the appellation ‘Dāru’s-Salṭanat (i.e. the seat of the government) Panhālā Fort’ has been used in the text. The inscription has also preserved the name of a calligrapher of some merit. This man, Sālār, was also a secretary, as can be easily surmised from his surname Dābir.

The text has been read by me as follows:

**TEXT**

Plate XVIII(a)

(a) Main panel.

(1) یسم اله (کذَا) الرحمن الرحیم - هست کلید در گنج حکم

(2) تجدید و تجدید عمارات دار السلطنت قلعه پناه ایام دولت خسرو (کذَا)

(3) جمہوری سلطنت پناه ابراهیم عادشاہ خلد ملکه فی تاریخ سنہ اربع خمسین تحملاء

(4) درکو رک[د] ملک داود آقا نایب غیبیت کانی سالار بن احمد دیپر

---

1 ARIE, 1963-64, No. D, 203. It measures 1·78 m. by 48 cm.
2 Makhnavi poem is by Nizāmī Ganjāvī, a twelfth century Persian poet of great eminence.
3 Babīqard-‘i-Umar-ī-Khayyām (Lucknow, 1903), p. 38, No. 279, where the order of the hemistiches is different.
4 BG, p. 423, No. 7. The translation of the text in the margin is also faulty.
5 Firigha, op. cit., p. 120.
(b) Margins.

i Right:

(1) بنای خیر این آب داود آفکند

ii Top:

(1) بنای چنین در همه روزه [زیبین] نیست
(2) هر کس که بنواده به گفت که رحمت
(3) ارسلله چنین نوشته تفاسی

iii Left:

دنیا نکنن وفا تو خوش پاش

iv Bottom:

در دل نتوان درخت انده نشاند همواره کتاب خرمی باید خوانند
می‌باشد خورود و کم دل باید رانند پیداست که در جهان جند خواهی ماند

TRANSLATION

(a) (1) The formula In the name of the Beneficent, the Merciful is the key to the treasure-house of the judicious Lord.

The renovation and (new) construction of the buildings at the seat of the government, Panhālā Fort, (took place) in the reign of the king

(2) having sovereignty over the world, the asylum of the kingdom, Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh, may his kingdom be perpetuated, in the year four (and) fifty (and) nine hundred (A.H. 954= 1547-48 A.D.), during the time of Malik Dā’ūd Āqā, the Nā‘īb-i-Ghābat (lit. Deputy in Absence). Its writer is Sālār son of Aḥmad, the Dabīr (i.e. Secretary).

(b) i. This tank (lit. bountiful edifice of water) was excavated by Dā’ūd Āqā.

ii. (1) Such an edifice is not to be found on the whole surface of the earth; the water which it contains is not inferior to the limpid water (of Paradise).

(2) Whosoever drank from it exclaimed, 'May the mercy (of God) be upon its builder, for there is no bounty better than this'.

(3) The stone-carver engraved on the stone thus:

iii. The world is not faithful (i.e. will not last), so be merry.

iv. (1) The shrub of sorrow cannot be planted in the heart; the book of enjoyment must be read at all times.

1 This should have been چند در جهان.
(2) Wine ought to be drunk and the desires of the heart ought to be fulfilled; (for), it is obvious, how long can one live in this world?

IV. INSCRIPTION OF THE SAME RULER, DATED A.H. 955

The third record of Ibrāhīm I which is also in Persian prose and verse may be seen on the western wall of the Nāg Jhari in the Fort. Carved on a slab measuring 66 by 52 cm., it runs into three lines in Persian, two of which contain two couplets and one a line in prose. The text is executed in relief in Nasta’liq characters which resemble that of the inscription just noticed. A floral border runs all around the text.

The epigraph records that the top of the mountain had been flattened as a result of which a hundred springs of water were released. It also states that though innumerable persons have come and gone, the spring and the mountain had withstood the test of time. The particular spring on which it now occurs, was constructed, according to the text, during the time of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh in A.H. 955 (1548-49 A.D.) by Dā’ūd Aqā. The builder is the same as the builder of the reservoir mentioned in the previous epigraph.

This epigraph was also noticed in the Bombay Gazetteer, the rendering in which is fairly correct.1

The text as read by me is as under:—

TEXT

Plate XVII

(1) کوه و کوهی بهم بهم تهاده مد جسم آب از و کشاد

(2) هر چند که گیاهند و زنده، این جسم و کوه بهدا ساده

(3) در دور ابراهیم عدلشاه خمس خصبن تسعماهی داوود آقا ساکته

TRANSLATION

(1) The mountain and its middle having been put together, a hundred springs of water were brought forth.

(2) However much people have come and gone, this spring and the mountain have stood in their place.

(3) In the reign of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh (in the year) five (and) fifty (and) nine hundred (A.H. 955-1548-49 A.D.), Dā’ūd Aqā constructed (this).

V. ANOTHER RECORD OF IBRAHĪM I, DATED A.H. 964

The fifth record of the group and fourth of Ibrāhīm I, occurs on the western wall of the tank near the Dargah of Sa’du’d-Dīn mentioned above2 and is carved on a slab measuring 1.20 m. by 50 cm. It consists of three lines of writing comprising five Persian couplets, which

1 ARIE, 1963-64, No. D, 292.
2 BI, p. 423, No. 8.
3 ARIE, 1963-64, No. D, 290.
is executed in relief in *Nasta’liq* characters; the style of writing is the same as in the previous record, and it is not unlikely that the two epigraphs were inscribed by one and the same person. The metrical text is of poor quality.

The epigraph assigns the construction of a tank designated *Chashma-i Khîdîr* to Malik Khîdîr the Sar Khwâsî in A.H. 964 (1555-56 A.D.), during the reign of Ibrâhîm I.

This epigraph was also published in the Bombay Gazetteer. Available contemporary Persian chronicles fail to identify Malik Khîdîr, whom the text designates as Sar Khwâsî and who must, therefore, have been an official of note. There is a village Khidarpur in Kolhpûr district which may have been founded by or have had some association with him. The epigraph is thus a valuable document both for the local history of Panâhî and for having preserved to posterity the name of an official and post held by him. The exact duties of the post are difficult to be defined.

My reading of the text is as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate IX(b)*

- (1) نام م (کذا) نخدا صانع دادگر
- (2) به عهد شهنشاه نام آفرین
- (3) عمارت که بهنیت چند حوض خاص
- (4) که این چشم خضر شد یادگر
- (6) به قیام و علی السلام

**TRANSLATION**

(1) In the name of God, the Just Maker, who brings forth sweet water from the rock.

In the reign of the glorious and victorious emperor, Ibrâhîm Shâh the chosen one,

(2) such a special reservoir which you see was constructed by Malik Khîdîr, the Sar Khwâsî.

As to the year, it was nine hundred and sixty and four (A.H. 964=1555-56 A.D.), when this Spring of Khîdîr became a memento (of his).

(3) O God! Preserve it till the day of Resurrection, for the sake of the Prophet and 'Ali. Peace (be on them).

**VI. INSCRIPTION OF 'ALI I, DATED A.H. 985**

This epigraph, sixth of the lot and first of 'Ali I, is now preserved in the Kolhpûr Museum. The inscriptions tablet measuring 92 by 75 cm. contains four lines of Persian verse carved in relief in *Naskh* characters, of a fairly good type, which state that in the reign of emperor 'Ali I,

---

3. There is a pur intend here. The spring of the water of Life is associated with Prophet Khîdîr.
(a) Epigraph of 'Ali I dated A.H. 985 (p. 73)

Scale: '11

(b) Record of Ibrahim I dated A.H. 964 (p. 72)

Scale: '1
a bastion called the Burj-i-Qudrat (lit. Bastion of Might) was constructed by Shamsu’d-Din, the king’s Deputy, out of the treasures of Panhâlâ, in A.H. 985 (1577-78 A.D.).

The notice of this record also occurs in the Bombay Gazetteer, and it is fairly correct. The only error of some consequence is that the builder and the governor is called ‘chief of cavalry’ and ‘deputy governor’ which is not correct.

The epigraph furnishes the valuable information that Shamsu’d-Din was the king’s Deputy and incharge of the fort of Panhâlâ. Persian chronicles appear to be silent about him.¹

The quality of the verse is quite good and the style of writing is also fine Naqâh. The pleasing calligraphic effect is accentuated by a vertical floral border occurring at each of the right and left ends of the text which has been read as under:—

**TEXT**

*Plate XIX (a)*

1) نام خداوند که در هیچ جای به و نباشید بجز وی خدا

2) بیست و یک برج بست برم بهت یافته به بازه

3) بنیادی دهانه دمگردی دیشب و نمود که

4) نمود و نمود بود و هشدار و نمود

**TRANSLATION**

1) In the name of God, except Whom, there was no and there will never be any other God anywhere.

2) In the reign of the emperor ‘Ali, the king, the Burj-i-Qudrat (i.e. Bastion of Might) was constructed through the bounty of God.

3) It was built by Shamsu’d-Din, an expert rider,² who was the victorious deputy (i.e. governor).

4) He constructed a bastion in the fort out of the treasures (at Panhâlâ);³ it was eighty and five above nine hundred (A.H. 985-1577-78 A.D.).

**VII. ANOTHER RECORD OF ‘ALI I, DATED A.H. 987**

The slab bearing the second record of ‘Ali I and seventh of the group is also preserved in the Kolhâpur Museum and measures 1.25 m. by 72 cm. At the time the inscription was noticed in the Gazetteer, the tablet was lying near the Ambâ Bâli’s temple at Panhâlâ and was believed

¹ He does not appear to have to do anything with a contemporary official of similar rank Faubâl Khan, the King’s Deputy at Sholapur, whose name was Shamsu’d-Din (G. H. Khare, *Persian Sources of Indian History*, Vol. V, pt. 1, Poona, 1961, p. 121). For he already held the title Faubâl Khan in Shuhur 964 i.e. A.H. 971 (1563-64 A.D.), while the present record fourteen years later mentions no title.

² Could Gajj here be intended for Gachh the local corruption of gač, that is mortar?—Ed.

³ It is perhaps not correct to translate Shakarwâr as the ‘Chief of the Cavalry’ as done in Bh, loc. cit.

⁴ Please see footnote above.

⁵ *ARIE*, 1963-64, No. D, 191.
to have originally belonged to the Tiger Gate. A portrait engraved in relief, of a lion facing left with a raised right paw and tail occupies slightly less than three-fourths of the entire tablet on the right side, while the remaining portion on the left is inscribed by the Persian text running into six lines executed in bold Thulth characters. A Persian couplet, or rather what is intended as such, for its composition is medeocre, executed in Nashk characters, is inscribed below the raised paw of the animal. The Nashk writing is superior to the Thulth one, but though of fine quality, it loses its impressiveness due to the crowded arrangement of its letters.

The inscription records that Ahmad 'Ali, son of Raun 'Ali, entitled Shamshiru'-Mulk, a devoted servant of 'Ali (I) constructed a bastion in A.H. 987 (1579-80 A.D.). The rendering of this record in the Bombay Gazetteer reads: 'The Lion of God, the victorious one, Ali, son of Abi Talib Ahmad Ali, who hath the title of Shaamshir-ul-Mulk, is in heart and soul, the slave of that Ali. The case of the building of this bastion was A.H. 987.'

It will be noted in the Gazetteer, the letters between أحمد علي and البخاطب have not been taken notice of or have been intentionally overlooked. The letters could either be read as احمد علي or البخاطب. In either case, the builder Ahmad 'Ali's father's name is mentioned in the epigraph. It cannot be asserted with certainty whether the title Shamshiru'-Mulk occurring after the father's name belongs to the father or the son, though it is reasonable to hold that the son must have been so entitled. Contemporary chronicles do not help us in identifying either of the two, but a record dated A.H. 943 (1536-37 A.D.), from Mudgal in Räichur district of Mysore and another dated Shuhr year 950 i.e. A.H. 956 (1550 A.D.), from Räichur fort, mention one Shamshiru'-Mulk as an officer of Ibrahim 'Adil Shâh. At least Shamshiru'-Mulk of the Räichur record is an adherent of the Shiite Creed, like Ahmad 'Ali of our record and hence could have been the father of the latter. In that case, the title would have to refer to the father and not the son or that the son had, as usual, inherited the father's title. Again, as the name of 'Ali, the fourth Caliph, has already been mentioned in the opening lines, 'Ali in the fourth line of the text should most probably refer to the reigning king 'Ali I, who was also a devout Shi'a, which fact seems to have been overlooked in its notice in the Bombay Gazetteer.

My reading of the text is as under:—

TEXT

Plate XX (a)

(a) Left side.

| 1 | اسد الله الغالي |
| 2 | عل ان له طالب |
| 3 | از دل و جان |
| 4 | هست ولام على احمد |
| 5 | عل ان (؟) رومنعل الايحا |
| 6 | يا بپانیشر الملك |

1 BG, p. 424, No. 11.
2 The name Raun 'Ali is quite uncommon.
3 BG, p. 424, No. 11.
5 EIAPS, 1963, pp. 63-64, pl. XX (a).
(a) Inscription of 'Ali I dated A.H. 987 (p. 74)

Scale: \[ \frac{1}{14} \]

(b) Epigraph of Ibrāhīm II dated A.H. 994 (p. 75)

Scale: \[ \frac{1}{12} \]
(b) Under the lion’s paw.

در تواویر این عمارت که ست که بود نهصد و هفتاد و هفت از هجرت

TRANSLATION

(a) (1-2) ‘Ali son of Abi Talib, the Lion of Allah the Overpowering.

(3-6) From heart and soul (i.e. sincere) servant of ‘Ali (i.e. ‘Ali I ‘Adil Shâh) (is) Ahmad ‘Ali, son (?) of Raun ‘Ali, entitled Shan-shiru’l-Mulk.

(b) For the date of the construction of the bastion of this edifice, (know) that it was nine hundred and eighty and seven from the Migration (A.H. 987=1579-80 A.D.).

VIII. INSCRIPTION OF IBRÂHÎM II, DATED A.H. 994

The eighth record of the group and first of Ibrahim II is inscribed on the central slab fixed on the platform in the compound of the Dargah of Sa’du’d-Din, mentioned above, which is obviously not in situ. The slab measuring 1.50 m. by 52 cm. contains two lines of writing of which, the first contains Nâd-i-‘Ali and the second, which is in Persian prose, the historical text, stating that the gate of the fort was built by Maqûd Khân, an official, in the reign of Abu’l-Muqaffar ‘Abd al-Shâh in A.H. 994 (1586 A.D.). The style of writing is refreshingly beautiful Nâshâb. The calligrapher is Mullâ Rajab, who has also inscribed two more epigraphs (Nos. IX and X).

The Bombay Gazetteer has noticed only the historical part of this epigraph but its rendering which follows, is faulty and misleading: In the reign of the victorious Ibrahim Adil Shah. His servant was Maksud Aka, and he built a gate of the Panhala fortress, in the date of the year Shâhur San 994. The inscriber of this was Malaz Ghufman.

In the above rendering, there is no mention of the Nâd-i-‘Ali, the name of the builder is given as Maksud Aka instead of Maqûd, Khân, the year is stated to be in Shuhur San, while it is not so in the text and lastly, the name of the scribe Mullâ Rajab is deciphered as Malaz Ghufran.

The text has been deciphered by me as under —

TEXT

Plate XX(b)

(1) Tada Allah Mâshîr al-jâlib

baj jada ouna lâk fî al-nâ‘l

(2) Dar ‘Abî al-máshîr ibn ‘Abî Shâhîl ‘âdâshâh darowī zâla ba ‘alâm xâdâm mîsâdîd gafîr dzânîbâ

TRANSLATION

(1) Invoke ‘Ali the manifestation of wonders. You will find him succour in miseries.

All grief and sorrow will soon disappear, by thy friendship (with God), O ‘Ali O ‘Ali O ‘Ali O !

1 In BG, loc. cit. it is stated to be on a separate stone.


3 BG, p. 424.
(2) In the reign of Abu'l-Mu'azzar Ibrahim 'Adil Shah, (this) gate of the fort was constructed by the servant Maqṣūd, may his sins be pardoned, in the year four (and) ninety (and) nine hundred (A.H. 994 = 1586 A.D.). Written by Mulla Rajab.

The builder Maqṣūd, for once, may be identified satisfactorily. We are told of one Maqṣūd Khan who was in the employ of the king. When in A.H. 988 (1580 A.D.), taking advantage of confusion consequent upon the death of 'Ali I, 'Ainu'l-Mulk imprisoned the Abyssinian nobles Ikhlas Khan, Hamid Khan and Dilawar Khan and was taking them out of Bijapur in chains, Maqṣūd Khan along with his companions and others followed them and intercepting 'Ainu'l-Mulk at the Allahpur Gate, freed them and brought them to the new king.1 'Ainu'l-Mulk now apprehending trouble from the royal slaves precipitately made way to his fiel.2 But the Abyssinians trio too, on their part, nurtured apprehension from the royal slaves as well as other Deccan nobles and tried to disperse them by appointing them to distant forts and places.3 It was as a result of this strategy perhaps that Maqṣūd Khan was sent to Panhalal as its commandant, at about this time i.e. some time after A.H. 988. He is likely to have continued in that capacity till after A.H. 994 (1586 A.D.), the date of the record under study. Some time before Dhul-Hijja 1003 (Aurust 1596), as Superintendent of the royal elephants, he is reported to have taken part in the battle against Ibrahim Nizam Shah.4 That he was a foreigner Turk from Georgia, is stated by Firuzta,6 and that is why in the next two records (Nos. IX, X), which are written by the same scribe Maulana Rajab, he is called Maqṣūd Aqā. These records are the only source which indicate Maqṣūd Khan's association with Panhalal.

IX. ANOTHER RECORD OF IBRAHIM II, DATED SHUHR 1008

The tenth epigraph of the group and the second of Ibrahim II, occurs on the western wall of the dining hall of the Inspection Bungalow in the Fort, which is known as Sahjā Khānī.7 The slab on which it is engraved in relief measures 85 by 50 cm. and contains three lines of writing in Persian verse, executed in fairly good Thuluth characters, but the quality of the verse is mediocre.

The epigraph states that Maqṣūd Aqā constructed on the terrace of the fort a pleasant palace, one Nauras yard in width and two Nauras yards in height, in Shuhr 1008 i.e. A.H. 1016 (1607-08 A.D.). It was written by Maulana Rajab, the scribe of the previous record.

This epigraph was also noticed in the Gazetteer, where its English rendering is without mistakes but it does convey the purport fairly accurately except that it takes Rajab, the name of the calligrapher, as the month in which the construction took place and that it does not mention Nauras Gaz but only Nauras which by itself is not a term indicating measure of length. The term only indicates nine times, for we commonly come across terms such as Nauras-Hon i.e. nine Hons, etc., in the royal orders of Ibrahim II8 and his successors.10

---

1 Firuzta, op. cit., p. 52; Zubairi, op. cit., p. 176.
2 Zubairi, op. cit., p. 179.
3 Ibid., p. 180.
5 Ibid.
6 ARIE, 1903-04, No. D, 206.
7 This palace, on the terrace of the Panhalal hill, is popularly known by this name, as it was here that Shivaji had imprisoned his son Sambhaji.
8 BO, p. 424, No. 13.
9 His infatuation for the term Nauras is well-known.
The text has been read by me as under:

**TEXT**

*Plate XXI(a)*

(1) During the reign of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh of auspicious countenance, an attractive palace was built on the terrace of the fort.

(2) It was one Nauras (i.e. nine) yards in width and two Nauras (i.e. eighteen yards) in height. This (building of) pleasing view was erected by Maqṣūd Āqā.

(3) In the Shuhūr year one thousand and eight (Shuhūr 1008 i.e. A.H. 1016-1607-08 A.D.), this excellent edifice was constructed. O Lord! May this pure edifice last for ever! Written by Maulānā Rajab.

**X. THIRD RECORD OF IBRĀḤĪM II, DATED A.H. 1020**

The third record of Ibrāhīm II and tenth of the present lot is fixed above the central mihrāb of the Jāmi’ Mosque in the Ibrāhimpūrī locality. The inscriptive slab measuring 68 by 41 cm. contains three lines of writing, of which the first one is in Arabic prose, while the remaining two contain a Persian verse each carved in relief in fairly good Thulūṭī characters. It is stated to have been penned by the same Maulānā Rajab who had designed the two previous records. As it is, it is the best of the three, calligraphically. But as in the case of the other two, the text is a fine specimen of mediocre poetry.

The inscription states that Maqṣūd Āqā constructed a mosque with a clean tank in Shuhūr 1011 i.e. A.H. 1020 (1611-12 A.D.) and that the text was written by Mullā Rajab.

This epigraph was also noticed in the Bombay Gazetteer, and the translation quoted there is as usual faulty, but the purport is correctly stated except for two mistakes of consequence: The first is that the date given is Shuhūr 1021, which is wrong, as the text has 1011 in words which, though not so specified must refer to the Shuhūr era, as this year is equivalent to the Year 1020 given in figure, which is intended as Hijra era. Secondly, here again, the name of the scribe Mullā Rajab is mistaken for the month of Rajab and the word Mullā has been wrongly read as Malāz.

---

I have deciphered the text as follows:—

TEXT

Plate XXI(b)

(1) توله تعالى و ان المساجد مل فل تدعو [1] مع الله احدا

(2) دار زمان إبراهيم عادله صفر بن شن مسجد زعيه بحور مطهر سنة 1020

(3) بناء كرده متصور آقا نيك زاله در سنة احدى عشر و الف شتة تما متر كتبه ملازه

TRANSLATION

(1) The Exalted (Allah) has said, 'And verily, the mosques are for Allah only; hence, invoke not any one else with Allah ''.  

(2) In the reign of Ibrāhīm ʿĀdil Shāh, the valiant (lit. breaker of ranks), the mosque with a pure tank (for ablution) was constructed. Year (A.H.) 1020 (1611-12 A.D.).

(3) It was built by Maqāṣid ʿĀqā of good judgment and was completed in the (Shuḥūr) year one thousand (and) eleven. Written by Mullā Rajab.

XI. FRAGMENTARY RECORD

The eleventh epigraph is carved on the right slab fixed in the platform in the compound of the Dargāh of Saʿdu d-Dīn. 2 The slab measuring 1 m. by 30 cm. is fragmentary and contains one line of writing in Persian verse, carved in relief in Thulth characters of a fairly good type.

The fragmentary slab seems to have lost its portion in the beginning, and hence the earlier part of the text is lost. As a result, it is difficult to determine the purport of the record with certainty. The extant text only refers to the assistance of one Khalaf Khān through which some edifice was constructed. Since the text also exhorts the visitor to show great deference to the place, it is pretty certain that the edifice was the Tomb of a saint. As the composition is faulty it cannot be asserted but the edifice could also be the ʿQadamsāh of Prophet Khīḍr '', i.e. the building containing the foot-print of Khīḍr. It may be, however, pointed out that while the foot-prints of the Holy Prophet Muḥammnad, and even of ʿAli are known, we do not usually come across any such relic of Prophet Khīḍr who is immortal and also hidden from the eyes of mankind. The text is inscribed in Thulth characters of fairly good quality, the calligrapher being one Muḥammnad son of Farīdu d-Dīn.

But, the rendering of this epigraph given in the Bombay Gazetteer, which quotes a date, as also assigns it to a gate, 3 gives an impression that the earlier part was extant when it was then noticed, but that does not appear to be the case, as the rendering and the present extant text are more or less of the same length. Therefore, the confusion is due to nothing else but the wrong reading of the epigraph which resulted in its misleading rendering in English. There is no date in the extant text but from the calligraphy it may be assigned to the first part of the seventeenth century.

1 Qurʾān, Chapter LXXII, verse 18.
3 RG, p. 424, No. 15.
(a) Another record of İbrahim II dated Shuhur 1008 (p. 77)

(b) Third record of the same monarch dated A.H. 1020 (p. 78)
(a) Fragmentary epigraph (p. 79)

(b) Another fragmentary record (p. 80)
The composition of the metrical text, in contrast with its calligraphy, is quite hopeless.
It has been deciphered by me as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate XXII(a)*

بابنداد خان [خان] تامدار باند بی سال ازو مادگر
پی ایادم پامن، اینجا که عجب دزدگم است که دمگاه خضر منزل شاهنشاهست

*Left margin.*

کاتبی محمد محمد ابن فریدالدین

**TRANSLATION**

Through the help of the celebrated Khalaf Khān. May it remain as his memento for many years.

Do not step in here irreverently, for it is a wonderful threshold, for the building of the footprint of (Prophet) Khîdîr is (like the) abode of an emperor.¹

*Left margin.*

Written by the humble creature Mohammad son of Faridu'd-Din.

The calligrapher Mohammad son of Faridu'd-Din appears to be a talented calligrapher, but he does not find mention in chronicles. The record is therefore important for the history of calligraphy and also for preserving the name of an artist of note in this field.

**XII. ANOTHER FRAGMENTARY EPIGRAPH**

The last record of the group is fixed on the eastern wall of the Dargah of Bara Imām in the Fort.² Its one-line text comprising three hemistiches of Persian verse is inscribed on a fragmentary tablet which measures 1-10 m. by 30 cm. The style of writing is excellent Thulūḥ characters executed in relief against floral background. The extant portion of the text seems to refer to the construction of some matchless edifice and to the reign of the king during which it took place.

In the notice of this epigraph in the Bombay Gazetteer,³ it is stated to contain the remaining three lines of a Quatrain, but a look at the text will show that the verses are in a metre different from that employed in Quatrains. Also the translation in the Gazetteer names the king as ʻAli, which again is wrong and nothing more than a result of faulty reading.

¹ This line may also simply mean: ...threshold which is the place which Prophet Khîdîr visits and where the emperors come and alight.
² *AIR*, 1963-64, No. D, 205.
³ *BG* p. 424, No. 17.
I have read the text as follows:

**TEXT**

*Plate XXII(b)*

[Arabic text]

**TRANSLATION**

............ I have not seen that its like is there in the world.  
In the reign of the emperor, of pure religion,  
the king, the lord of crown, the lofty and the chosen............

[Blank line]
THE SHUHUR SAN: DATE EQUIVALENCIES, ORIGINS AND SPECIAL PROBLEMS

BY MARIE H. MARTIN, AHMEDNAGAR

I. INTRODUCTION

Scholars working with Deccani materials from the fourteenth century onwards are familiar with the dating era called the Shuhur San variously called Sur San, Shahur San, Arabi San, etc. Tables and/or discussions of the era are found in both Marathi works and English works. But there are discrepancies in the treatment of the era—for example, Tables do not agree, there is confusion concerning what is actually the first day of each year, and quick calculations (such as subtracting 599 from the Christian year) are not necessarily accurate. By combining English Marathi sources (M. Nizam, G. H. Khare, and B. F. Mojak), tables are available from the last quarter of the fifteenth century through the nineteenth century; and L. D. Swamikannu Pillai offers tables covering the entire period although not immediately relating to the Shuhur San. The Tables are inconsistent, unfortunately, and there is no single source which gives as lucid explanation of the intricacies involved in calculating date equivalencies; therefore, there is no way to judge which tables can be used with the greatest degree of accuracy and confidence.

This essay will attempt to resolve the problems of the Shuhur era; first, there will be a brief introduction to the era, then, an explanation of the reasons for the discrepancies in existing sources for setting the initial day of each Shuhur year; thirdly, a method for calculating Shuhur date equivalencies will be presented; and, finally, there will be a detailed analysis of various specific problems of calendar equivalencies relevant to understanding the calendar systems involved.

This essay has been written because of the interest and help of a number of scholars, professional persons, and institutions. Dr. Z. A. Desai, Superintending Epigraphist for Arabic and Persian Inscriptions of the Archaeological Survey of India, Nagpur, and Dr. A. A. Kadiriri, Senior Epigraphical Assistant in the same office, drew my attention to some of the problems involved in the Shuhur San and suggested bibliography. Dr. G. N. Morje, Head of the Marathi Department, Ahmednagar College, very kindly helped locate Marathi sources and translated the relevant passages for me. And faculty members, professional persons and staff connected with Deccan College, Poonah, the Archaeological Survey of India, South-Western Circle, Aurangabad, and Ahmednagar College, Ahmednagar, have assisted me in various phases of the research. I hope that this article will not only contribute to the study of South Asian History, but also serve as a demonstration of my thanks for their help and confidence.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SHUHUR SAN

One of the earliest descriptions in English of the Shuhur San was given by James Grant Duff in 1826:

The Miry or cultivator's year, always commences in the beginning of our month of June, corresponding with the end of the Hindu month, Veyshak, or beginning of Jesht........
By calculation, it appears that the Soorsun, (generally written Shuhoorsun by the Mussulmans), was introduced on the Mirg, in Heejree 745, which corresponds with A.D. 1344-45; and hence it would appear, that it must have originated with Mohummed Tughluq Shah. It was much more like his character, than that of the emperor Akber, to introduce so useless an innovation; but it was in the reign of Akber that the Fusslee era commenced to the north of the Nerbuddah, and it was introduced into the Deccan by his grandson, Shah Jahan, in the year of the Heejree 1047, or A.D. 1637-38. The Soorsun and Fusslee eras are merely solar years, setting out with the date of the Heejree when they commenced, but without making allowance in future reckoning, for the difference between the solar and lunar years; but which means they differ rather more than three years every century. Both the Soorsun and Fusslee are called Mirg, or the husbandman’s year, from their commencing at the season when the fields begin to be sown.¹

Grant Duff’s comments can be summarized in three categories. The first of these is the information about the era which is agreed upon by other authorities: the Shuhur San is a solar era; the first day of any single Shuhur year corresponds with the ‘Mirg’—i.e., the day when the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrgasiras; and, since the Shuhur year is calculated on a solar basis, it diverges from the Hijri year because each Shuhur year contains more days than each Hijri year. Additional information from other authorities confirmed by records using Shuhur dates, indicates that the Shuhur year is 599 to 600 years behind the Christian year (from about June through December it is 599 years behind, and from January to about June it is 600 years behind); and, that although the Shuhur and Hijri years begin on different dates, any particular day in Shuhur era is identified by the Hijri nomenclature for that day.

The second category of Grant Duff’s comments is his opinion that it was a “useless innovation.” The continued use for several centuries of the Shuhur San by different dynasties and different rulers suggests exactly the opposite. G.H. Khare points out that except for military documents it was used for most official records, particularly those which had to do with land and land revenue.² Upon reflection, its suitability for record-keeping seems obvious: by embracing a complete agricultural year, records concerning land and land revenue could be immediately understood without adjustment. And since the year began with the sowing season and, therefore, NEAR THE ONSET OF THE MONSOON, not only was organised material relevant for tax computation immediately available, but so was also information necessary for budgetary projections and estimations. In terms of an economy based heavily on agriculture, this was a more efficient time-period than a calendar year which changed at about the time of the spring harvest, as by early June some intimation of the potential of the monsoon was available for anticipating the yields of the coming year, and for planning broader budgetary considerations. Thus, for record-keeping purposes in the Deccan, it was an extremely logical calendar period.

The final category of comments has to do with calculations. Grant Duff says that the year begins in early June corresponding with the Hindu luni-solar months of Vaisakha or Jyeshta; however, according to other authors, the year begins as early as 23 May and as late as 7 June. Furthermore, he suggests that calculations indicate that the year apparently was introduced in A.H. 745 (1344-45 A.D.). To verify these statements, a systematic method for finding date

² G. H. Khare, Companion to Researchers (Poona, 1951), p. 112.
equivalencies must first be established, and in order to do this, certain idiosyncrasies of the Christian calendar vis-a-vis the Hindu luni-solar calendar must be examined.

III. CHRISTIAN CALENDAR PROBLEMS

Long before the period of the Shuhur San, the Julian calendar was in effect in the Christian countries of Europe. By the end of the sixteenth century, the Vernal Equinox which had originally fallen on the 21st of March came regularly on the 11th of March. In 1582 Pope Gregory declared that, in all Roman Catholic countries, ten days were to be omitted—the fifth of October was to be the fifteenth of October—in order to correct this shift and to bring the Vernal Equinox back to the 21st of March. In addition, all years evenly divisible by four were to have one extra day (i.e., the 29th of February) except in the case of the beginning of a century when only the first two digits had to be evenly divisible by four. That is to say, the years 1600 and 2000 were to be leap years, while the years 1700, 1800, and 1900 would not be, as the first two digits cannot be evenly divided by four.

The Gregorian reforms, however, were not instituted immediately in the Protestant and Orthodox sections of the Christian world. Of particular importance for South Asianists, they were not accepted in England. The result was that the English Old style calendar was out of step with the Gregorian calendar. From 5 October 1582 until 28 February 1700, the English calendar was ten days behind; and, because the English calendar continued to have a leap year in all years divisible by four, from that date until the English calendar reform in 1752, the English calendar was eleven days out of phase. The English reform took place when 2 September 1752 was followed by 14 September 1752, omitting the eleven day disparity between the calendars and establishing the Gregorian calendar in England.

For those scholars working with materials from the sixteenth century onwards, this raises the problems of reconciling Christian dates with one another. From October 1582 to the end of February 1700 sources which are Roman Catholic (e.g., French, Portuguese, etc.) have a ten day discrepancy; from then until 1752 the discrepancy is eleven days. Furthermore, reforms in Orthodox countries (e.g., Russia, Greece, etc.) did not occur at the same time as the English reform, and in some cases this discrepancy continued into the twentieth century, becoming greater in 1800 and 1900 where the old style Julian calendar prevailed.

In regard to Indian materials, the eleven days omitted by the 1752 reform had the effect of moving all days backward—e.g., any date which before the reform had fallen regularly on 8 May, since the reform omitted eleven days, then fell on 20 May. And any occasion falling with regularity near the end of May, then shifted into early June. So the major reason for the May/June discrepancy in references to the Shuhur San is due to the English calendar reform.

This does not explain the discrepancy completely, as different authorities say that the variation in days between the two calendars was from 23 May to 25 May and from 5 June to 7 June (plus two days, plus eleven days, plus two days, or four days more than the calendar changes explain). This additional disparity is due to the different methods used to calculate the length of the Hindu solar year and the Christian solar year.

Technically, the Christian year is calculated on the basis of the time interval between one Vernal Equinox and the next, a period of a little less than 365 days and six hours. The Hindu
solar year is calculated on the basis of the time required for the earth to complete one revolution around the sun measured in relation to the (apparently) fixed stars, a period of about 365 days and six hours. This time difference means that over a long period of time, the Christian calendar will gain slightly on the Hindu calendar; if a Hindu solar date is equal to 23 May for many years, it will then shift to 24 May, and after many more years it will shift to 25 May.¹

This is the same relationship which is seen between the Hijri lunar calendar and the Christian solar calendar, but in this instance the discrepancy is about eleven days per year and the gain is very rapid. As the disparity between the Christian calendar and the Hindu solar calendar is only a few minutes per year, it takes many years for even a one day discrepancy to appear. But, whenever tables embracing a long period of time are presented in which the opening day of the Shuhur year always corresponds with the same Christian date (with—as m Nāẓim—or without—as in Khare—allowance for leap year additions), the tables are obviously fallacious and have not taken into account this shift.

IV. THE CALCULATION OF SHUHUR SAN EQUIVALENCIES

One source which gives the scholar enough information with which to accurately calculate Shuhur San equivalencies is Pillai's An Indian Ephemeris.² Pillai explains the era briefly, saying that its current year is 599 years behind the Christian year, and that each year begins when the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasiras. In a footnote, he gives an example of how to calculate the first day of any particular year, but without explanation: (1) the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigasiras when his (the sun’s) longitude is 53 degrees 20 minutes (2) the number of days which correspond to this longitudinal figure equals 56; and (3) when the solar year begins as in 1911 on 18 April, the sun’s entry into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras would be 56 plus 13, or 69 days from 1 April, i.e., on 8 June.³

This example in Pillai’s footnote, although it is not particularly clear, describes the procedure for calculating the first day of the Shuhur year. What Pillai does not explain is that the entrance of the sun into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras, because it is a solar phenomenon, takes place every year the same number of days after the beginning of the solar year—i.e., 56 days after the solar new year. Since the first month of the solar year is Mēsa in Sanskrit and Chitirai in Tamil, the first day of the solar year will be found in Pillai’s tables as 1 Mēsa-Chitirai in the column labelled “Solar Reckoning”, under the heading “Cyclic Sidereal year, month, and day”. In bold type, corresponding either to the month of March or April, 1 Mēsa-Chitirai will be seen, and reading across the line the equivalent Christian and Hijri dates will be given. For reasons which will be explained in the section on “The Indian Civil Day”, the information must be read from the tables and not taken from the top of the page which gives the moment of Mēsa Sankranti. Because the entrance of the sun into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras occurs 56 days later, 56 must be added to the March/April date of 1 Mēsa-Chitirai in the tables. To facilitate these calculations, Pillai has included information in all the volumes in the form of an end paper or a book marker entitled “Table III: Days of the English Calendar Year, reckoned cumulatively from March 1 and April 1 respectively”, as well as in the Eye Tables, section q, found in Volume 1 Part 1 on pp. 156-57, 162-63, and 168-69 at the top of the pages.

¹ Actually a simple shift from 23 to 24 to 25 May is not immediately apparent because of the interpolation of a leap year day every four years. This phenomenon and the resultant pattern will be carefully examined in the section “Mēsa Sankranti Equivalencies: An Unusual Pattern”.
² L. D. Swāmikannu Pillai, An Indian Ephemeris, 7 volumes (Madras, 1922 and 1923).
In order to calculate the first day of the Shuhur year equivalent to 1413, for example, the tables indicate that 1 Mesha-Chittirai fell on the equivalent Christian date of 27 March (even though the actual moment of Sankranti was 26-28 March in the Surya Siddhanta and 26-29 in the Arya Siddhanta). To find the date corresponding to 56 days later, Table III is used, the column referring to cumulative days from the first of March. To the 27th day of March, 56 is added, giving a total of 83. The first of May is 62 days from the first of March; and 83 minus 62 will be 21 days after the first of May, or 22 May.

As another example of this procedure, to find the beginning of the Shuhur year which occurred in 1783, the Pillai tables show that 1 Mesha-Chittirai corresponded with 10 April. Since the date is being calculated from 1 April, 10 is added to the 56 days necessary for the sun to enter the Nakshatra Mrigasiras, totalling 66. The first of June was 62 days after 1 April, and 66 minus 62 gives a difference of 4 days after 1 June, or 5 June 1783. According to this procedure, since Table III gives the number of days corresponding to the first of the month, a date equivalency will always be X number of days after the first of the month, and so it is necessary to add 1: the day 6 days after 1 June is 7 June; the days 25 days after 1 May is 26 May, and so forth.

(For those who find no confusion in numbers, there is a slight modification of Pillai's method which simplifies the calculations. During the period of the use of the Shuhur San, all the days 1 Mesha-Chittirai fell either in March or April, and all the corresponding first days of each Shuhur San year fell respectively in May and June. The time from 1 March to 1 May is 62 days, and the time from 1 April to 1 June is also 62 days. Since 1 needs to be subtracted with Pillai's method, the actual difference is 61. So to calculate an exact answer, one need only to subtract 61 from the total of the days of 1 Mesha-Chittirai PLUS 56, remembering that a March date corresponds with a May date, and an April date corresponds with a June date.)

For most scholars, however, calculating the first day of any particular Shuhur year corresponding with a Christian year is not of itself of interest. What is wanted is a method to find a Christian date equivalent to a particular Shuhur date. If the only information given is a particular year—say Shuhur 823—then the addition of 599/600 gives the equivalent Christian years, i.e. 1422/23. Checking Pillai's tables for those two years, Mesha-Chittirai began on 26 March both years, and 26 plus 56 totals 82. Referring to Table III, 1 May was 62 days from 1 March, so that the first day of the Shuhur San in both 1422 and 1423 fell on 82 minus 62 plus 1 May, or 21 May. The Shuhur year 823 began on 21 May 1422 and ended the day before the next year began, that is, on 20 May 1423.

In a case in which both a Shuhur year and a Hijri year are given but with no additional information, an even more precise calculation can be made. For example if the Shuhur year 823 and the Hijri year 826 are given, since Shuhur year 823 embraced 21 May 1422 through 20 May 1423, then the time shared by these two years was from 15 December 1422 (when Hijri 826 began) to 20 May 1423.
Finally, there is the case in which a complete Shuhūr date is cited, as 1 Shawwāl Shuhūr 965. Adding 599/600 to 965 gives 1564/65 as the equivalent Christian years. Pillai's Hijri tables indicate that there was only one 1 Shawwāl which fell into that period, occurring on 2 May 1565.

Since the solar Shuhūr year is longer than the lunar Hijri year, some part of the Hijri calendar will be repeated in each Shuhūr year—e.g., if 1 Muḥarram in a normal 354 day Hijri year should happen to fall on the first day of the Shuhūr year, then the Hijri year would expire after 354 days while the Shuhūr year continues to run, and a second 1 Muḥarram would fall in that Shuhūr year. The eleven days which are repeated would then be distinguished as awwal (first) and ikhar (last) days. Or if 10 Ṣafar should happen to correspond with the first day of a Shuhūr year, then 355 days later 10 Ṣafar would again be the Hijri date in the next Hijri year, but the 355 day Shuhūr year would still be running; in this case the dates 10 through 21 Ṣafar would be identified as awwal and ikhar.

V. THE ORIGIN OF THE SHUHūR SAN

Although finding date equivalencies of Shuhūr San dates is of primary importance to most scholars, the introduction of the era is of historical interest. Several epigraphists have tentatively assigned the date of the era's introduction, but the evidence available does not justify their specificity. Since V. S. Bendrey's discussion includes material not found elsewhere, his comments are given in full:

It is believed that the Arabic era originated from the ascension of Mustak to the throne of his father Abraha in 589 A.D. The first year of the era, however, coincided with 600 A.D., and its commencement occurred in the latter half of May 600 A.D. Another version of the origin of this era is that the era may have been an off-shoot of the Hijrā reckoning probably originated in or closely about the year 745 A.H. (i.e. May 15th, 1344 to 3rd May 1345 A.D.), and it may have been introduced in the southern part of Maharāstrā by Muḥammad Tughluq during his regime. This view finds support in the circumstance that a new era was introduced by the Jawhar Chief in commemoration of his investiture with "Shah"-ship by Muḥammad Tughluq. Whatever be the origin of the era, it is definitely ascertained from the records now available that its initial point must be taken as 600 A.D. for our calculation of this era.²

The reasons for Bendrey's conclusions concerning the Arabi San are not clear. Firstly, Abraha and his son were Ethiopian rulers of Yemen during the period of Ethiopian ascendancy (A.D. 529 to 606) in that area. If the title originated with either of them, since they were not Arabs, they must have been identifying an already extant era; but Bendrey gives no evidence that such an era was in effect in Yemen. And had either of these rulers originated the era himself, one would expect to find the title reflecting their Ethiopian heritage or carrying some reference to their own names. Secondly, there is no indication of which records "now available" demonstrate "that its initial date must be taken as 600 A.D.". Has Bendrey simply subtracted the 599/600 discrepancy between the Christian era to arrive at this figure; and if so, then the correct answer would be from the latter half of May 599, not 600. Also, if the era was instituted in 589, why were the years not numbered until 600? And finally, since the calculation of the beginning of each Shuhūr year is based on a Hindu solar calculation, and since the period of the year is so well suited to Deccani conditions, it suggests most strongly that the era was not imported but was native to the area.

² Bendrey, Study of Muslim Inscriptions (Bombay, 1944), p. 33.
This last statement is highly suggestive, in that it implies that the official introduction of the era for record-keeping purposes was simply a recognition of the suitability of an extant way of dividing the year. It is common knowledge that amongst different communities in the sub-continent the actual beginning of the year for calendar purposes does not necessarily correspond with the beginning of the year for other purposes. For example, the Márwári book-keeping year begins officially with Laksaní Puja, not with either the calendar year or the tax year. In the Deccan, t.'a "Mig" was the beginning of the cultivators' year, and at some point some one in officialdom seems to have recognised the suitability of this year for land and land revenue records. So that actually what is being discussed in terms of fixing the "origin" of this era is, when did the suitability of the agricultural year for record-keeping purposes become apparent, and when was the agricultural year first used as an official record-keeping year?

Returning to Bendre's analysis, it is suggested as it was in Grant Duff that the origins of the Shuhur San lie in the period of Muhammad Tughlaq's domination of the Deccan. Other ephemerists comment on this point, but their explanations lack detail. C. S. Patell, for example, says:

According to Jervis, it was introduced on the 6th of June, 1342 A.D., in 743 of the Hegira; others place it a year sooner. He states that the computation of its agreement with the Hegira year shows it to have begun when the 745th Hegira (A.C. 1344) corresponded with the 745th Shuhur San.1

And R. Sewell and S. B. Dikshit say:

It only diverged from the Hijra in A.D. 1344, according to the best computation, since when it has been a solar year as described above. On May 16th A.D. 1344, the Hijra year 745 began. But since then the Shahr reckoning was carried on by itself as a solar year.2

The basic assumption underlying the two statements above, Bendre's comments, and Grant Duff's description, is that when the Shuhur era was introduced, it bore the same number as the Hijri year current, just as the various Fagli eras did; but, given the solar nature of the era, each year was longer than each Hijri year, so that through the numbering of the years diverged, the Hijri system moving ahead by about three years per century.

A common factor in all four descriptions is the reference to the year A.H. 745, but the commentaries are speculative and contradictory. The Patell statement is internally inconsistent—the era was introduced on 6 June 1342 (which was 1 Muḥarram 743) or a year earlier, but it began in 745. Bendre hinges by saying that it originated "in or closely around" 745. Grant Duff says, "By calculation, it appears" to have been introduced in 745. And Sewell and Dikshit say that it "diverged" from the Hijri year in 745. These contradictions are the result of various fallacious assumptions. Jervis, for example, was aware that in the nineteenth century the "Mig" fell in early June, so he apparently searched for an early June date when 1 Muḥarram might have corresponded with the "Mig"—as in 1277, 1342, and 1375. The year 1342 seemed most suitable given the 599 year discrepancy between the Shuhur and Christian eras. Unfortunatley, he neglected to take into account the calendar reform of 1752 before which the "Mig" would have taken place in May, not in June. The Sewell and Dikshit statement suggests that, since A.H. 745 began on 16 May and the Shuhur year began later, the dates diverged at that time. This assumes, incorrectly, one of two things: either (1) that the Shuhur year and the Hijri year were identified by the same number before 745; or (2) that since the Hijri year began before the Shuhur
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year, the Shuhur year would have had a different number—but this is when the Shuhur year would have had the same number.

In order to resolve the problems above, Table 1 has been constructed showing when it was possible for the Shuhur and the Hijri year to be identified with the same number. Column 1 gives the number of the Hijri year; column 2, the equivalent Christian date of the first day of that Hijri year, of 1 Muharram; column 3, the last day of that Hijri year; column 4, the first day of the Shuhur year; column 5, the Shuhur year; and column 6 the Hijri year current when the Shuhur year began. The asterisks identify years when the Hijri year and Shuhur year were not the same.

A.H. 741 began on 27 June 1340. The Shuhur year and the first day of that year can be calculated with the method explained previously in this essay. 1340 minus 599 gives the Shuhur year 741. In 1340, the first day of Mēsa-Chittirai was 26 March. 26 plus 56 equals 82, and 82 minus 62 equals 20. 1 May plus 20 equals 21 May. So the first day of Shuhur 741 was 21 May 1340. The Hijri year 741, however, did not begin until the end of June—in other words, the Hijri year current when 1 Shuhur San 741 would have taken place was 740. Therefore, if the assumption that when the Shuhur year was introduced it was identified with the number of the Hijri year current is correct, it could not have been introduced in A.H. 741 (1340 A.D.). Following this procedure, all the Hijri dates from 741 through 781 have been given along with the Shuhur dates.

Examining the table, one can see that it was possible for the Hijri and Shuhur years to be identified with the same number only from A.H. 745 through 776 (A.D. 21 May 1344 through 1 June 1375). The Shuhur year, therefore, could not have been introduced before A.H. 745, nor after A.H. 776. And the two eras "diverged" in A.H. 777 (1375 A.D.), not in the period of the 740's.

The numerical evidence alone does not establish the exact year in which the era was first used for book-keeping purposes. It does make highly dubious the assertion that it was introduced by Muhammad Tughluq since from 21 May 1344—the earliest date the era could have been introduced as seen above—he was absent from the Deccan and returned only in 1345 for the siege of Daulatabad. Conditions in the Deccan were extremely unsettled in 1344-45, and political hegemony was not restored until after the establishment of the Bahmani dynasty in 1347. It seems far more likely that the era was first used officially by the Bahmanis between 1347 and 1375 while creating and consolidating their own political and revenue structures, rather than during the confusion of the political collapse of the Tughluqs.

There now remains Bendrey's statement about the "Jawhar Chief". This may be a reference to an officer named Malik Janhur, but the Persian source—which Bendrey does not give—must be studied closely. The statement as given is clearly ambiguous—most political leaders take great pride in introducing a "new era". Usually this is a figurative statement; and when it is literal, it means enumerating years from the time of the ruler's accession rather than introducing a new system.

VI. HINDU LUNI-SOLAR TERMS RELEVANT TO UNDERSTANDING SHUHUR SAN CALCULATIONS

The section describing the method for calculating Shuhur San date equivalencies was presented without explanation because of the complexities of Hindu calendar calculations. In

1 By "Jawhar Chief" is intended the Chief or Raja of the erstwhile Jawhar State situated within the geographical limits of Thana District, near Bombay. Prof. Bendrey has perhaps derived his information from the Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. XIV (London, 1908), p. 88, which too, unfortunately, does not quote any source. Thus any reference to an officer Malik Janhur is out of question; Miss Martin was misled by the similarity of names. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that this particular piece of information needs further scrutiny and study as stated by Miss Martin.—Ed.
order to understand why the method presented is accurate and also to indicate under what circumstances there may be discrepancies in Pillai's tables affecting the Shubhār San, it is necessary to examine certain aspects of the Hindu luni-solar calendar, and also to consider certain assumptions made by Pillai when compiling his tables.

i. The Luni-Solar Year, Siddhāntas and Ankrāntis

Indian calendar systems generally follow the same procedural rules for calculations; however, the constants used to define the length of certain astronomical periods may differ slightly. These constants define systems which are called siddhāntas; and there are two major siddhāntas in use in the sub-continent. One of these systems, the Surya Siddhānta, is found throughout the sub-continent; the other, the Ārya Siddhānta, is used in the South. The only difference between the two systems occurs in the fixing of the time of the exact moment of Sankrānti—the beginning of each solar month; and, for the centuries with which this essay is concerned, this involves a difference of 06 to 11 of a day.

The luni-solar year used in India is calculated on the basis of both lunar and solar phenomena. The solar calculations involve the sidereal year—a year measured in terms of the time required for the earth to move around the sun and return to a particular position determined in relation to the (apparently) fixed stars. Each of the twelve months of the solar year begins when the sun enters a different rāsi—Sign of the Zodiac—and the exact moment of its entrance is called a sankrānti. Pillai suggests that it is helpful to think of these solar months as “hinges” and to consider the lunar months as “doors” which swing on the hinges.¹

The moment of Mēsha Sankrānti—the phenomenon which determines the beginning of the solar year and the first day of the first solar month—is a “hinge”, and the new moon which precedes this sankrānti starts the lunar month associated with that sankrānti—it is the door hanging on the Mēsha Sankrānti hinge. On the second sankrānti of the year, the next lunar month is hung, beginning on the new moon which precedes that sankrānti. Usually (but not always) the solar months have a regular number of days, varying from 29 to 31, depending on the month. The actual length of the lunar month, however, is 29’53 days. It is possible, then, for a month of 30 or 31 days to have two new moons; and that solar month will then have two lunar months commencing within it. Much more rarely, there is no new moon in a 29 day solar month, and so a lunar month is dropped from the calendar in that year.

As stated above, the length of the regular solar months ranges from 29 to 31 days. Occasionally, however, the regular month may contain an extra day. This happens in the Tamilnadu system when the moment of Sankrānti occurs after sunset.² Instead of beginning the new month immediately, it is not extended by one day. It is for this reason that a particular date in a single solar month cannot be identified as always occurring 56 days after Mēsha Sankrānti. And, therefore, in every year the calculation of the day the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrīgasātras must be calculated by the addition of the 56 day difference.

ii. The Luni-Solar Day, Nakshatras and Tīthīs

There are two ways of defining daily time in the Hindu luni-solar system. One of these is in terms of nakshatras. In non-technical terms, a nakshatra corresponds to a lunar mansion, and

---

¹ Pillai, op. cit., p. 25.
² For a more detailed explanation, see sub-section iii. The Indian Civil Day.
there are 27 lunar mansions in the Hindu calendar system. From the point of view of an observer on the earth, this nakshatra cycle is complete when the moon has travelled around the earth until it has regained its position in regard to a fixed group of stars identified as a particular nakshatra—a period of a little over 27.32 days. Since there are 27 nakshatras, the time unit of one nakshatra is equal to a little more than one day, say about 1 day 18 minutes.

The other method of defining daily time is based upon the time required for the moon to move from one new moon to the next. This period is about 29.53 days long, during which the moon not only travels around the earth but also travels with the earth in its orbit. In so doing, it moves to a point further in the earth's orbit, and in order for the sun's rays to be blocked out sufficiently for another new moon to occur, it must move further around the earth as well. There are 30 tithis in this lunar period, so that one tithi is slightly less than the western day, say about 9.8 of a day.

As daily time-keeping units, nakshatras and tithis have no effect on the Shuhūr San. The term nakshatra, however, is used in regard to fixing the first day of the Shuhūr year which occurs when the sun enters the Nakshatra Mrigashīras. A more technical definition of a nakshatra is the portion of the ecliptic occupied by the moon on successive days. Since the ecliptic is the apparent path of the sun through the stars over a period of a year, the sun also moves through the 27 nakshatras. And just as the sun moves around and appears to re-enter the constellation Mēsha once a year, it also will pass through each nakshatra at a particular time each year. In his footnote referred to above, Pillai calculates this time by measuring the distance between the point of Mēsha Sankrānti and the point which indicates the entrance of the sun into Mrigashīras in degrees of longitude and then converts this measurement into days. Since the stars involved are so distant as to seem to be fixed, this distance is a constant, and the time required to traverse it is also a constant. Thus the sun's entrance into the Nakshatra Mrigashīras always occurs 56 days after Mēsha Sankrānti.

iii. The Indian Civil Day

On a day-to-day basis, time is kept according to the divisions of the Indian Civil Day. This day begins at sunrise, not at midnight, and is split into 60 units called ghaṭīkas. Pillai has used the civil day as the basis for his calculations, and when he cites the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti at the top of the page of his Ephemeris dealing with each year, he has expressed that moment in decimal places of the civil day. For example, in 1400 A.D., Mēsha Sankrānti took place on 26.24 March according to the Surya Siddhānta. Checking either the book-marker or end-sheet, the decimal 24 of a day equals 14 and ¼ ghaṭīkas, or 5 hours 45 minutes. This time is reckoned from sunrise; if sunrise were at 6:00 A.M., then the time indicated would be 5 hours 45 minutes later, or 15 minutes before noon. Assuming that the mean sunrise time for India is 6:00 A.M., then any fraction over .75 of a day, or over 45 ghaṭīkas, would take place after midnight; and in western terms that would put it into the following day.

In different parts of India there are different calculations for the commencement of the civil day. In Orissā, irrespective of the moment of Sankrānti, the first day of the solar month begins on the actual day (i.e. civil day, calculated from sunrise to sunrise) of the sankrānti. In areas of Malabār, if sankrānti occurs before 18 ghaṭīkas have expired, then that civil day is the civil sankrānti day; if sankrānti occurs after 18 ghaṭīkas have expired, then the next civil day is identified as the sankrānti day. In Tānilnādu, the cut-off point is 30 ghaṭīkas; if sankrānti occurs when 30 ghaṭīkas have expired, then the next civil day is identified as the sankrānti day. And in Bengāl, when sankrānti occurs during the first 45 ghaṭīkas of a day, the next
day is the civil sankrānti day; if it takes place after 45 chaṭṭikās, the following day is the civil day.¹

Examining Pillai’s tables once again, two things should be noted about the relationship between the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti and the first day of the first solar month, 1 Mēsha-Chittirai. Pillai gives two calculations for the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti, one in the Surya Siddhānta, one in the Ārya Siddhānta. In his tables he gives date equivalencies of Mēsha-Chittirai and the Christian date. Whenever the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti according to the Ārya Siddhānta corresponds to .50 of a day or more, 1 Mēsha Chittirai corresponds to the next Christian day. For example, in 1436, Mēsha-Chittirai took place at 26.56 March according to the Ārya Siddhānta. Pillai gives the day of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai as 26 March. In 1440 however, Mēsha Sankrānti took place at 26.69 March in the Surya Siduḥānta and at 26.52 according to the Ārya Siddhānta. In this case Pillai gives the date equivalency of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai as 27 March. Pillai has used the Tamilnādu system for calculating the civil day in his tables, as well as the Ārya Siddhānta, and both of these are southern systems. Nowhere is it made explicit, however, that the various rulers of the Deccan from the fourteenth through the nineteenth centuries used these two southern systems exclusively for their astronomical calculations.

The effect on the calculation of Shuhūr San dates, if other systems were used, would only occur when certain time periods were involved. Had the Surya Siddhānta been used rather than the Ārya Siddhānta, since the difference is .06 of a day in the fourteenth century and .11 of a day by the end of the nineteenth century, very few dates would have been affected, and only those dates where Mēsha Sankrānti took place at a crucial moment of the civil day. If one of the other three systems of computing the civil day had been used, then only during certain portions of a day would there have been an effect on establishing 1 Mēsha-Chittirai from the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti. In the Malabar system, times from .30 to .50 of a day would not convert to the next day as the Tamilnādu system does; and in the Bengal system, times from .50 to .75 of a day would be the same as the Tamil system; all other times would be one day advanced.

The circumstances under which a discrepancy might be discovered are limited. When there is an accompanying Hijri date, since the method presented uses Hijri tables for finding the equivalent Christian date, there will be no discrepancy. In cases when only a Shuhūr date is available for establishing the first or last day of the Shuhūr year, there is a possibility of error. The only way this error can be detected and rectified is if a document clearly states that particular serial day of the Shuhūr year fell on a Hijri date (or Hindu date, for that matter) of such-and-such, and it can then be demonstrated that the moment of Mēsha Sankrānti which began that Shuhūr year fell into one of the vital time periods listed in the preceding paragraph.

Recalling what was said earlier in the essay about the introduction of the Shuhūr San suggests that it is more probable that these two southern systems have been used rather than the other systems. To begin with, the Shuhūr San was first introduced in the South, not in the North. It was not until some two centuries later that it appeared in the North as the Fasli era. Furthermore, it seems to have been introduced by the Bahmans, a southern dynasty despite their northern origins, the strength of whose kingdom was dependent upon the agricultural conditions of the South. As the Shuhūr San was applied to Deccani conditions and used Hindu dating calculations for setting its initial day, it is logical to anticipate that local personnel would be used to establish important moments in that local system. Since the Tamilnādu system of calculations was the most widespread in the Bahmani areas—the Bengal system being far removed, and the Oriya

¹ See Pillai, op. cit., p. 8.
and Malabar systems being confined to relatively small regions removed from the areas of Bahman dominance—it is the most likely system to have been employed.

VII. 1 Mēsha-Chittirai Equivalencies: An Unusual Pattern

An examination of Pillai’s calculations for the date of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai indicates an unusual pattern of date-changes which repeats itself over a period of a little more than a century (see Table 2, infra). The reason for this strange-looking pattern has to do with the discrepancy in the Christian calendar calculations between the real length of the year and the length used for calendar calculations. The real length of the year is 365 days 3 hours 48 minutes and 45 seconds, or slightly less than 365.25 days. Every four years an extra day is added to correct the calendar, but since the real calculation is a little less than 1/4 of a day per year, this extra day slightly overcompensates for the real discrepancy. In order to demonstrate exactly what happens, Table 3 has been prepared. For convenience in reckoning, the length of the year has been rounded off to 365 days 5 hours and 48 minutes. In terms of a fraction of a day, 5 hours and 48 minutes equal 348 minutes over 1440 minutes or 87/360ths. The years are imaginary, beginning with XX01, and each year evenly divisible by 4 (e.g., XX01, XX03, XX48) is a leap year.

Following the table, the year XX01 expires after 365 days, but there are 87/360ths of a day left in the real year, so the calendar is missing that fraction of a day, it is minus 87/360ths of a day. The year XX02 will also be a 365 day year, losing another 87/360ths, so that the total time discrepancy will be minus 174/360ths. The same situation applies to the third year, the total time lag at the end of XX03 being minus 261/360ths. The year XX04, being divisible by 4, will be a leap year of 366 days and plus 360/360ths of a day are added; however, the real addition of time is (minus 87/360) (times 4), or minus 348/360ths. The calendar has added plus 360/360ths, so that the calendar has moved ahead of the real time by plus 12/360ths. In next year, XX05, 87/360ths are lost again, and the calendar is once more behind real time, the sum of a positive 12/360ths and a negative 87/360ths being minus 75/360ths. Expanding the table to cover 120 years (because a fairly small and regular fraction has been used), the table comes around to the beginning again as far as the fractions are concerned, and one whole day has been added.

Analysing the contents of the table, it begins with a pattern of three minus signs and one plus sign; then it moves to a pattern of two minus signs and two pluses; the next shift is to a pattern of one minus and three pluses; the fourth change is to a pattern of four pluses; finally the pattern is one day extra along with the original pattern of three minus signs and one plus sign.

Comparing this pattern with the dates of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai from 1348 to 1479, the same pattern is seen (the years do not correspond exactly because the fraction used to compute Table 3 was rounded off rather than a precise fraction). Beginning in 1348, there are three minus years in a row—that is 26 March—and in 1351 a plus year, or 27 March. This pattern repeats for some years. Then in 1379 the pattern changes to two minus and two plus days—i.e., 26, 26, 27, 27 March. In 1406 there is a shift to one minus and three plus days—i.e., 26, 27, 27, 27 March. In 1437 the pattern of all pluses emerges—i.e., 27, 27, 27, 27 March. And in 1467 an entire new day is added, the 28th of March, and the original pattern of three minus and one plus day begins again—i.e. 27, 27, 27, 28 March.

VIII. Another Table for Conversion

Many scholars working with South Asian materials may not have continuous access to Pillai’s An Indian Ephemeris, and moreover, it is difficult to carry when on tour. A small, fairly inex-
pensive volume which is available (originally priced at Sh. 10/50, now perhaps slightly more) is G. S. P. Freyman-Grenville's *The Muslim and Christian Calendars*, London, Oxford University Press, 1963. One drawback to the volume is that the user has to calculate date equivalencies; however, the method is quite simple and can be learned very easily by anyone who is not petrified when faced with normal addition and subtraction. Furthermore, dates in this volume covering the centuries when the Shuhur Sani was in use agree with the dates in the *Ephemeris* with two exceptions: the Freyman-Grenville volume follows the Gregorian reform of 1582, and there is an error in assigning the week day corresponding with 1 January from 1582 through 1878.

For adopting dates up to the calendar reform of 1582 and after the calendar reform of 1752, the following method can be used:

1. On a separate sheet of paper, convert the 1 Mīsha-Chittirai dates of 25, 26, 27 March, etc., and 9, 10, 11 April, etc., to their appropriate dates corresponding with the sun’s entry into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras 56 days later.

2. Using Pillai’s tables for 1 Mīsha-Chittirai, along with the list of equivalencies prepared in 1 above, 25 March will be immediately understood as 20 May, 26 March as 21 May, etc.

3. In the Freyman-Grenville volume in the column labelled “Christian date to Muḥarram 1”, on the right side, enter the correct date of the entrance of the sun into the Nakshatra Mrigasiras corresponding with each Christian year. The column will then read 15 May 1344-21/5; 4 May 1345-21/5; 21 April 1346-21/5; etc. It is easiest to make the entry after the Christian year (rather than before the Hijri year) because every 33 years or so, two Hijri years will begin in the same Christian year (1356, 1388, 1421, etc.).

4. Then treat the date which has been entered with the same method with which all dates in the Freyman-Grenville volume are treated.

Dates in the *Ephemeris* were not reformed until 1752, while the Freyman-Grenville dates are reformed from 1582. So that the tables may be internally consistent, it is necessary to correct the Pillai figures when entering them into the Freyman-Grenville tables. Since 4 October became 14 October in 1582, Pillai dates such as 28 and 29 May will be converted to 7 and 8 June. In 1700 with the leap year day, the discrepancy becomes one day more. By keeping the table in the Freyman-Grenville volume consistent, all dates in the volume can be used the same way. And any figure which is the result of a series of calculations can then be converted at the end to correspond with the English calendar.

The error in assigning the week day corresponding with 1 January is a systematic error from the year 1552 through 1878. Each 365 day Christian year consists of 52 weeks and 1 day, so that if a year begins on a Sunday it also ends on a Sunday, and the next year begins on Monday. In leap years, because of the addition of an extra day, if a year begins on Sunday, then the following year begins on Tuesday. In 1551 the year began on Thursday; in 1552, then, it began on Friday. Freyman-Grenville has put back the day to Wednesday instead of advancing it to Friday, so that from 1552 onward, until 1871, all days are two days out of phase. During this period, whenever Thursday is given as the first day of the year, it must be corrected to read Saturday; when Monday is given, it must be corrected to read Wednesday, etc. In addition there is a typographical error in the year 1705; Saturday is given, but Sunday would be correct in terms of the systematic error. From 1872 through 5 January 1878 the error is reduced to only one day, and those eight years must be corrected by the addition of one day—Wednesday should be corrected to read Thursday, etc.
Table 1
YEARS WHEN THE HIJRI AND SHUHŪR YEARS COULD HAVE BORNE THE SAME NUMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hijri Year</th>
<th>First Day of Hijri Year</th>
<th>Last Day of Hijri Year</th>
<th>First Day of Shuhr Year</th>
<th>Shuhūr Year</th>
<th>Hijri Year Current on First Day of Shuhūr Year</th>
<th>Asterisks indicate years when Hijri &amp; Shuhūr Numbers Differed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>27/6/1340</td>
<td>16/6/1341</td>
<td>21/5/1340</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>17/6/1341</td>
<td>5/6/1342</td>
<td>21/5/1341</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>6/6/1342</td>
<td>25/5/1343</td>
<td>21/5/1342</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>26/5/1343</td>
<td>14/5/1344</td>
<td>21/5/1343</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>15/5/1344</td>
<td>3/5/1345</td>
<td>21/5/1344</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>4/5/1345</td>
<td>23/4/1346</td>
<td>21/5/1345</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>24/4/1346</td>
<td>12/4/1347</td>
<td>21/5/1346</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>13/4/1347</td>
<td>31/3/1348</td>
<td>21/5/1347</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>1/4/1348</td>
<td>21/3/1349</td>
<td>21/5/1348</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>22/3/1349</td>
<td>10/3/1350</td>
<td>21/5/1349</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>11/3/1350</td>
<td>27/2/1351</td>
<td>21/5/1350</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>28/2/1351</td>
<td>17/2/1352</td>
<td>22/5/1351</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>18/2/1352</td>
<td>5/2/1353</td>
<td>21/5/1352</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>6/2/1353</td>
<td>23/1/1354</td>
<td>21/5/1353</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>24/1/1354</td>
<td>15/1/1355</td>
<td>21/5/1354</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>16/1/1355</td>
<td>4/1/1356</td>
<td>22/5/1355</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>25/1/1356</td>
<td>24/12/1356</td>
<td>21/5/1356</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>25/12/1356</td>
<td>14/12/1357</td>
<td>21/5/1357</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>15/12/1357</td>
<td>2/12/1358</td>
<td>21/5/1358</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>3/12/1358</td>
<td>22/11/1359</td>
<td>22/5/1359</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>23/11/1359</td>
<td>10/11/1360</td>
<td>21/5/1360</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>11/11/1360</td>
<td>30/10/1361</td>
<td>21/5/1361</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijri Year</td>
<td>First Day of Hijri Year</td>
<td>Last Day of Hijri Year</td>
<td>First Day of Shuhūr Year</td>
<td>Shuhūr Year</td>
<td>Hijri Year Current on First Day of Shuhūr Year</td>
<td>Asterisks indicate years when Hijri &amp; Shuhūr Numbers Differed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>31/10/1361</td>
<td>20/10/1362</td>
<td>21/5/1362</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>21/10/1362</td>
<td>9/10/1363</td>
<td>22/5/1363</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>10/10/1363</td>
<td>27/9/1364</td>
<td>21/5/1364</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>28/9/1364</td>
<td>17/9/1365</td>
<td>21/5/1365</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>18/9/1365</td>
<td>6/9/1366</td>
<td>21/5/1366</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>7/9/1366</td>
<td>27/8/1367</td>
<td>22/5/1367</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>28/8/1367</td>
<td>15/8/1368</td>
<td>21/5/1368</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>16/8/1368</td>
<td>4/8/1369</td>
<td>21/5/1369</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>5/8/1369</td>
<td>25/7/1370</td>
<td>21/5/1370</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>26/7/1370</td>
<td>14/7/1371</td>
<td>22/5/1371</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>15/7/1371</td>
<td>2/7/1372</td>
<td>21/5/1372</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>3/7/1372</td>
<td>22/6/1373</td>
<td>21/5/1373</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>23/6/1373</td>
<td>11/6/1374</td>
<td>21/5/1374</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>12/6/1374</td>
<td>1/6/1375</td>
<td>22/5/1375</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>2/6/1375</td>
<td>20/5/1376</td>
<td>21/5/1376</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>21/5/1376</td>
<td>9/5/1377</td>
<td>21/5/1377</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>10/5/1377</td>
<td>29/4/1378</td>
<td>21/5/1378</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>30/4/1378</td>
<td>18/4/1379</td>
<td>22/5/1379</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>March Date of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai</td>
<td>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>March Date of 1 Meșha-Chitrāi</td>
<td>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1392</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"1 DGA/74"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>March Date of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai</th>
<th>One Plus Sign' Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1426</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>March Date of 1 Mēshā-Chittirai</td>
<td>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1428</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1432</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1434</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1438</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1446</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1447</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1449</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>March Date of 1 Mēsha-Chittirai</td>
<td>One Plus Sign Indicates One Day's Advance From 26 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1456</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

The pattern of calendar year and real year time discrepancies (see section VII. 1 Mesha-Chitirai equivalencies: an unusual pattern, for explanation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Year</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX01</td>
<td>- 87/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX02</td>
<td>- 174/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX03</td>
<td>- 261/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX04</td>
<td>+ 12/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX05</td>
<td>- 75/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX06</td>
<td>- 162/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX07</td>
<td>- 249/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX08</td>
<td>+ 21/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX09</td>
<td>- 63/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX10</td>
<td>- 150/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX11</td>
<td>- 237/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX12</td>
<td>+ 36/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX13</td>
<td>- 51/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX14</td>
<td>- 138/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX15</td>
<td>- 225/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX16</td>
<td>+ 48/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX17</td>
<td>- 39/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX18</td>
<td>- 126/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX19</td>
<td>- 213/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX20</td>
<td>+ 60/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX21</td>
<td>- 27/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX22</td>
<td>- 114/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX23</td>
<td>- 201/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX24</td>
<td>+ 72/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Year</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX25</td>
<td>-15/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX26</td>
<td>-102/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX27</td>
<td>-189/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX28</td>
<td>+84/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX29</td>
<td>-3/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX30</td>
<td>-90/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX31</td>
<td>-177/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX32</td>
<td>+96/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX33</td>
<td>+9/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX34</td>
<td>-78/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX35</td>
<td>-165/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX36</td>
<td>+108/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX37</td>
<td>+21/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX38</td>
<td>-66/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX39</td>
<td>-153/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX40</td>
<td>+120/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX41</td>
<td>+33/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX42</td>
<td>-54/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX43</td>
<td>-141/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX44</td>
<td>+132/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX45</td>
<td>+45/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX46</td>
<td>-42/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX47</td>
<td>-129/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX48</td>
<td>+144/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX49</td>
<td>+57/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX50</td>
<td>-30/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX51</td>
<td>-117/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Year</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX52</td>
<td>+ 156/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX53</td>
<td>+ 69/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX54</td>
<td>- 18/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX55</td>
<td>- 105/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX56</td>
<td>+ 168/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX57</td>
<td>+ 81/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX58</td>
<td>- 6/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX59</td>
<td>- 93/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX60</td>
<td>+ 180/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX61</td>
<td>+ 93/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX62</td>
<td>+ 6/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX63</td>
<td>- 81/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX64</td>
<td>+ 192/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX65</td>
<td>+ 105/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX66</td>
<td>+ 18/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX67</td>
<td>- 69/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX68</td>
<td>+ 204/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX69</td>
<td>+ 117/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX70</td>
<td>+ 30/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX71</td>
<td>- 57/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX72</td>
<td>+ 216/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX73</td>
<td>+ 129/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX74</td>
<td>+ 42/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Year</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX75</td>
<td>− 45/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX76</td>
<td>+ 228/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX77</td>
<td>+ 141/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX78</td>
<td>+ 54/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX79</td>
<td>− 33/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX80</td>
<td>+ 240/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX81</td>
<td>+ 153/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX82</td>
<td>+ 66/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX83</td>
<td>− 21/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX84</td>
<td>+ 252/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX85</td>
<td>− 165/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX86</td>
<td>+ 78/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX87</td>
<td>− 9/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX88</td>
<td>+ 264/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX89</td>
<td>+ 177/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX90</td>
<td>+ 90/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX91</td>
<td>+ 3/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX92</td>
<td>+ 276/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX93</td>
<td>+ 189/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX94</td>
<td>+ 102/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX95</td>
<td>+ 15/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX96</td>
<td>+ 288/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX97</td>
<td>+ 201/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Year</td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX98</td>
<td>+ 114/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX99</td>
<td>+ 27/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X100</td>
<td>+ 300/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X101</td>
<td>+ 213/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X102</td>
<td>+ 126/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X103</td>
<td>+ 39/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X104</td>
<td>+ 312/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X105</td>
<td>+ 225/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X106</td>
<td>+ 138/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X107</td>
<td>+ 51/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X108</td>
<td>+ 324/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X109</td>
<td>+ 237/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X110</td>
<td>+ 150/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X111</td>
<td>+ 63/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X112</td>
<td>+ 336/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X113</td>
<td>+ 249/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X114</td>
<td>+ 162/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X115</td>
<td>+ 75/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X116</td>
<td>+ 348/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X117</td>
<td>+ 241/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X118</td>
<td>+ 174/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X119</td>
<td>+ 87/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X120</td>
<td>+ 1000/360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraha, king of Ethiopia</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraha, king, father of Musrak</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Bakr, father of Hasan 'Ali Almgar</td>
<td>17, 44, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Bakr, father of Husain</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Baqir, father of Shamsud-Din Muhammad</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Bakr, son of Ahmad</td>
<td>24, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Baqir, son of Ummân, 'Ali Almgar</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Bakr, Hajji, son of 'Ali Irbili</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Bakr Irbili</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Bakr Irbili, father of Ali</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Bakr Irbili, father of Shamsud-Din Muhammad</td>
<td>46, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Sham, son of Abul Sharaf al-Bammi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Sharaf al-Bammi, son of Ali</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul Yasauf, an official</td>
<td>67, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul-Baqi, son of Amir</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abul-Muzaffar, kunya of Ibrahim 'Adil Shah, Bijapur ruler</td>
<td>73, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Adil Shah, King of Bijapur</td>
<td>67, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Adil Shahi, a dynasty</td>
<td>94, 65, 63, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqal Khan Shirazi, 'Adil Shahi Commander</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa, a continent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afshal Khan, murder of</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, son of Ali Kirati</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, son of Husain</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, father of Abul Bakr</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, father of Kamalud-Din Sulaiman</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad al-Farai, father of Maulana Imam Muhammad</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, father of Muhammad</td>
<td>69, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, father of Salar</td>
<td>69, 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad, al-Kazaruni, father of Zakiu'd-Din</td>
<td>40, 41, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Umar</td>
<td>65, 66, 74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad 'Ali, entitled Shamshurul-Mulk, a builder</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadabad, in Gujarat</td>
<td>64, 65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadnagar, in Maharastra</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Aimul-Mula, 'Adil Shahi minister</td>
<td>80, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akbar, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ardastani</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Bammi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Baqi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Gilani</td>
<td>2, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Haji</td>
<td>29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hamadani</td>
<td>2, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Humani</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Jafarani</td>
<td>2, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Jaziri</td>
<td>9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Jaziri</td>
<td>9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Kazaruni</td>
<td>9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Khurrami</td>
<td>2, 22, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Malik</td>
<td>40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Qazwini</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alamgar, profession and family known as (f.n. 1, 3)</td>
<td>3, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alamgar</td>
<td>17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alamgir, wrong reading for 'Alamgar</td>
<td>43, 17 (f.n.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Alau'd-Din Khalji, Delhi Sultan</td>
<td>18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alavi, a visir</td>
<td>48 (f.n. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alif Khan, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, the fourth Caliph</td>
<td>48 (f.n. 3), 60, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74, 75 (f.n. 1), 76, 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, 'Adil Shah ruler</td>
<td>64, 65, 72, 74, 75, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, son of Abul Bakr Irbili</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, son of Shahpur al-Bammi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, son of Yahya and father of Shamsud-Din Muhammad</td>
<td>9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, father of Abul Sharaf</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, father of Haji Abul Bakr</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, 'Ali wrongly read as</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali, father of Abul Bakr</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali Jawaliqi, Shaikh see Shaikh 'Ali Jawaliqi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali Tabataba, a historian</td>
<td>64, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52, 53</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>62, 70, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 &amp; f.n.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>61, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>19, 40, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 (f.n. 2)</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>14, 46, 47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55, 56</td>
<td>76, 78, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>48, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55, 56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>(f.n.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47, 50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ğilân, in Irân</td>
<td>55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golconda, in Andhrâ Prâsadh</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopal Bhaâtî, supervisor of construction</td>
<td>61, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Gregorîan Calendar, reforms in</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gojârat, state and region</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 18, 19, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ğâjî, a term</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ğâji, son of Muhammed</td>
<td>17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ğâji Abû Bakr, son of All</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ğâji İbrahîm, son of Muhammed</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamâdân, in Irân</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamîd al-Hanjûrî, father of Najib</td>
<td>32, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamîd Khân, 'Adî Shâhî official</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanâyama, variant of Hanjawan</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanjawan, variant of Hamjaman</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanjawan, in Irân</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanjûr, probably a place-name</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâsîn, in Haryânâ</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ğâsan, son of Abû Bakr 'Alamgar</td>
<td>17, 44, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon, a coin</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamâyûn, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâsin, father of Ahmad</td>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâsin, father of Fâkhrû'd-Dîn Ahmad</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâsin, father of Kamâl</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâsin, son of Abû Bakr</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâsin, son of Abû Sharaf</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâsin, Khwâja, see Khwâja Hâsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>İbrahîm I, 'Adî Shâhî ruler</td>
<td>61, 34, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67, 70, 71, 72, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrahîm II, 'Adî Shâhî ruler</td>
<td>64, 65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63, 75, 76, 77, 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrahîm, al-Ġâjî, son of Muşîli</td>
<td>29, 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrahîm, Hâjî, son of Muhammed</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrahîm, Nâğâm Shâhî ruler</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrahîmîpurâ, near Pannâl</td>
<td>96, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbn Bâtîtâ, the famous Moroccan traveller</td>
<td>3, 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İkhlât Khân, 'Adî Shâhî official</td>
<td>66, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İmâmâbâd, at Sâmânâ</td>
<td>60, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İmâm, a term</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İndia</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İqût, a term</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İrán, a country</td>
<td>5, 8 (f.n.4), 15, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İraq, a country</td>
<td>13, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iribîl, in İraq</td>
<td>15, 48, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iribîlî, family known as, of Cambay</td>
<td>3, 13, 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'İsâ, father of Qâsim</td>
<td>38, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İsfahân, city in Irân</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İsbâq, a scriber</td>
<td>61, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İslâm Khân Lodi, uncle of Sultan Lahlûl Lodi</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'İmâlîl, 'Adî Shâhî ruler</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Iwâd, Tâjû'd-Dîn, see Tâjû'd-Dîn 'Iwâd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jahân, wrong reading for Hamîd</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahân, Khwâja, see Khwâja Jahân</td>
<td>60, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahângir, Mughal emperor</td>
<td>36, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamâlû'd-Dîn Abûmad, son of 'Umar</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamâlû'd-Dîn Hâji Muhammed, son of 'Abdu'llâh</td>
<td>54, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Burgess, author and archaeologist</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jâmae'î Quŷb Shâh, Golconda King</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jauhar, Malik, so-called official</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawâhâr, erstwhile State in Mahâsîâchtra</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawâhâr, variant of Jawâhâr, Shuwar San</td>
<td>90, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julïon Calendar</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jullundhur, in Punjab</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka'ba, at Mecca</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabîrû'd-Dîn Muhammed, Khwâja, see Khwâja Kabîrû'd-Dîn Muhammed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairâ, in Gujarât</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalânsûr, in Punjab</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamâlû'd-Dîn Hâsin İnjû, Mir, see Mir Kamâlû'd-Dîn</td>
<td>45, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamâlû'd-Dîn Kamâl</td>
<td>52, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamâlû'd-Dîn Muhammed</td>
<td>5, 7, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kâŋrâ, in Himâchal Pradesh</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karâtît, a seeba</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karbalâ, in İraq</td>
<td>55 (f.n.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaïfâr, in Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalâf Khân, a builder</td>
<td>78, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâлиs, a freed slave</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khâlîjî, a dynasty</td>
<td>19, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîdr, Prophet</td>
<td>78, 79 (f.n.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîdr, Malik, 'Adî Shâhî official</td>
<td>85, 66, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîdârûpur, in Kolâhapur district</td>
<td>72 (f.n.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khîwûr, the palace, in Babylonia</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwâja, a surname</td>
<td>2 (f.n. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwâja Asîl, son of 'Umar</td>
<td>57, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja Ḥusain, father of Bibi Fāṭima</td>
<td>55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja Jahān, Tughluq's Prime Minister</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja Kahiru'd-Dīn Mūhammad</td>
<td>22, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja Shihāb-ud-Dīn Ahmad</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirātī, variant of Kārātī</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirmān, in Iran</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishwar Khān, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
<td>65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolhāpur, in Mahrāshtra</td>
<td>64, 72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konkan, a region in Mahrāshtra</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhārīn, in Panjāb</td>
<td>22, 24, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākband, a sobriquet</td>
<td>54, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakārīyā, a sobriquet</td>
<td>24, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi, a dynasty</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi-Sūr, dynasties</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahārāshtra, a state</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maksud Aka, variant of Maqūd Āqā</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabār, a region in Kerala</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malak Ghufran, wrong reading for Mullā Rajab</td>
<td>75, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Dā'ud Āqā, see Dā'ud</td>
<td>64, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Daulatghā Butahārī, see Daulatghā</td>
<td>36, 41, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Jaunhar, see Jaunhar</td>
<td>18, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Khārī, see Khārī, Malik</td>
<td>64, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Parviz, title of 'Umar Al-Kazārūnī</td>
<td>36, 41, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Salāhu'd-Daulat wa'd-Dīn, epigraph of</td>
<td>18, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Sikandar Hādarī, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
<td>64, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik Yau'uf, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
<td>64, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik-i-Mulukī Shāh Shārī wal-wuzūrā, a title</td>
<td>41, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalīk-Tejhrī, a title</td>
<td>40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalīk, a dynasty</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangar al-Khurānī</td>
<td>22, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maqūd Āqā, 'Adil Shāhī official</td>
<td>66, 75, 76, 77, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamālu'l-Dīn Rajah, a calligrapher</td>
<td>66, 76, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kecca, in Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>14, 17 (f.n.3) 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina, in Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>68 (f.n.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mewāt, a region near Delhi</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir Dost Mūhammad, official</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir Kamālu'd-Dīn Husain Injū, official</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrzā Ṣāmīn, builder</td>
<td>60, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīndābād, a freed slave</td>
<td>11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongols, a tribe</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūṣul, in Irāq</td>
<td>13, 15, 46 (f.n.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūghal, in Karnātaka</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūghal, a dynasty</td>
<td>9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40, 69, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhālā, in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjāb, a state</td>
<td>22, 50, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parvāz Shāh, tomb of, at Camboy</td>
<td>4, 5, 8, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 43, 45, 46, 50, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parvīz Malik, title of Maliku’l-Tujjār al-Kāzarūnī, see also Malik Parvīz</td>
<td>40, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parvīz Malik, see Malik Parvīz</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pātān, in north Gujarāt</td>
<td>36, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pašjālā, in Panjāb</td>
<td>1, 2, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia, a country</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peštād, in Gujarāt</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pir Parvār, also known as Parvāz Shāhīd</td>
<td>48 (f.n.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pir Tāju’l-Dīn, Tomb of, at Camboy</td>
<td>4, 7, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithvi Rāj, a ruler</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qadamgāh, of Prophet Khīdhr</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāḍī, a post</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qalādār, a post</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qandahār, in Afghānīstān</td>
<td>39, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qāsim, son of ‘Īsā</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qazwīn, in Iran</td>
<td>8 (f.n.4), 26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafī’u’l-Dīn Shīruḍ, a historian</td>
<td>65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāchur, in Karnāṭaka</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajāb, Mulla, see Mulla Rajāb</td>
<td>64, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajāstān, a state</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rām Rāj, Vijayanagara king</td>
<td>31, 17, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rānder, now part of Surat city in Gujarāt</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāner, variant of Rānder</td>
<td>24, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratangarh, Samānā known as</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raun ‘All, son of Ahmad ‘All</td>
<td>65, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehāteek E., an author &amp; scholar</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’d, a merchant of Cambay</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’d father of Siraju’l-Dīn ‘Umar</td>
<td>27, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’du’l-Dīn, Tomb of, at Panhālā</td>
<td>66, 71, 75, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’du’l-Dīn, father of ‘Umar</td>
<td>57, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’d, son of Abū Sharaf</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’d, Ambru’t-Tujjār</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’d, alias of Sayyid Abīnān</td>
<td>57 (f.n.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhādu’l-Dīn, wa’d-Dīn, Malik, see Malik Sāhādu’l-Dīn, wa’d-Dīn</td>
<td>69, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhādu’l-Dīn, wa’d-Dīn, Malik, see Malik Sāhādu’l-Dīn, wa’d-Dīn</td>
<td>59, 60, 61, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhibāji, son of Shivāji</td>
<td>76 (f.n.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmānā, name of textiles produced at Sāmānā</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjān, in South Gujarāt</td>
<td>32 (f.n.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar Khwāna, a post</td>
<td>66, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarustān, old name of Sirāf, in Haryānā</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarwar, wrong reading for Parvīz</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṭārā, in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayaqīd, a dynasty</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayaqīd Abīnān, a Dewānī</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayaqīd Tāju’l-Dīn Hūsain</td>
<td>48, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semimanes, variant of Samimanes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh Dānī, an official</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh Jahān, Moghul emperor</td>
<td>60, 61, 62, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāhpur al-Bamā, father of ‘All</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāh Qāsim, ‘Adil Shāh official</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāikh, term explained</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāikh ‘All Jawālići, a saint of Cambay</td>
<td>48 (f.n.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsi’r-Dīn, title of Ahmad ‘Ali</td>
<td>65, 66, 74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamshū’r-Dīn Mahāmād, an official</td>
<td>38, 38, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamshū’r-Dīn, ‘Adil Shāh official and builder</td>
<td>65, 66, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamshū’r-Dīn, another ‘Adil Shāh official</td>
<td>73 (f.n.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamshū’r-Dīn Muhammad, son of Abū Bakr</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamshū’r-Dīn Muhammad, son of ‘Ali</td>
<td>9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaq, daughter of Kamāl’u’Dīn Muhammad</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaq, daughter of Kamāl’u’Dīn Muhammad</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaq, daughter of Kamāl’u’Dīn Mahdi, a merchant</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaq, daughter of Kamāl’u’Dīn Mahdi, a merchant</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shīrāz, in Iran</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shivāji, the Marāthā chief</td>
<td>65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shivāji, the Marāthā chief</td>
<td>73 (f.n.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sholāpur, in Mahārāshtra</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shujāt San, solar adaptation of Hijra era</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikandar, a builder</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikandar Haidari, Malik, see Malik Sikandar Haidari</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikandar Lodi, Delhi king</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikandar Sūr, Delhi king</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>'Umar, Haḍrat, second Caliph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,29</td>
<td>'Umar, Malik 'Abd-ar-Rahmān Zākūd-Dīn al-Kāzārūnī, entitled Malik Perviz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>'Umar, son of Sa'd-dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>'Umar, father of Jamāl-dīn Ahmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>'Umar, father of Khwāja Aṣīl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>'Umar al-Humārī, father of Khwāja Shāhāb-ud-Dīn Ahmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>'Umar Khayyān, famous Persian poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'Uthmān 'Alamgar, father of Abū Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,17</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vāghelās, a dynasty of Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Verāval, in Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Vijayanāgra, kingdom of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,11</td>
<td>Yāḥyā, son of al-Jawān al-Jazīrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Yemen, a country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Yūsuf, Malik see Malik Yūsuf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zāhīdān, in Irān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Zakāriyyā, Lakāriyyā so read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.6)</td>
<td>(f.n.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,13</td>
<td>Zainu'd-Dīn 'Ali, master of Mībāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,33</td>
<td>Zainu'd-Dīn 'Ali, son of Najīb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Zaku'd-Dīn, 'Umar al-Kāzarūnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,55</td>
<td>Zaku'd-Dīn, variant of Zaku'd-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.4)</td>
<td>(f.n.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Zaṣur 'Alī, Malik Perviz Malik wrongly read as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Zubair, a historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Zufār, in Oman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(f.n.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tāhātabā, see 'Ali Tāhātabā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Tāhir Khan, son of Daulat Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,27</td>
<td>Tājuddīn 'Ifrād, son of 'Abdu'l-'Azīz Qarwīnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,8,26</td>
<td>Tājuddīn Muhammad, son of Muhammad a'r-Zaḵariyyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Tājuddīn 'Umar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.n.4)</td>
<td>(f.n.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tāptī, a river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tarāīn, battle of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tāshān Anshāri, father of 'Amīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tarkhān, Tarahān wrongly read as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tarkhān, a clan-name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thānā, in Mahārāshtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Thānādār, a post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,29</td>
<td>Tiflis, modern Tiflis in U.S.S.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Tughrūq, a dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Tughrūq Shāh, Delhi Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Turkey, a country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>75202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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