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PREFACE

In the Monthly General Meeting for August 1864 of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, Dr. W. N. Lees, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Society, read a memorandum 1 detailing the progress of Persian historical works in the Bibliotheca Indica series and the policy decided on in connection with the publication of such works. In discussing the projected publication of the 'Muntakhab al-Tawārikh or the Tārikh i Badāoni', which had been suggested by Mr. E. B. Cowell in 1862 2, he referred to the 'Tārikh i Nizāmi or the Tabaqāt i Akbari' as a very important work of reference and added that it is "well worth consideration, however, whether in conjunction with this work, we should not publish in lieu thereof a certain portion of the Tabaqat i Akbari which Abd al Qādir professes only to have abridged and which all later historians have made good use of"; the consideration of this suggestion, however, was deferred to a future meeting. In 1868 he wrote 3, "it is inconceivable to me why so erroneous an estimate seems to have been formed of the Ṭabakāt-i-Akbar-Shāhī that it has not attracted more attention. It is the history which joins on to the Tārikh-i-Firoz-Shāhī, and is admitted by all contemporary and subsequent authors to be the standard history in continuation of those authorities. Unquestionably then the thread of the narrative as given by Nizām ud-din Ahmad should be taken up where the authors of the Tārikh-i-Firoz-Shāhī have dropped it, giving him the preference to 'Abd al-Kādir of Badān, or any other author, however excellent." Blochmann 4 in 1869 remarked "It is a matter of regret that the printing of the Tabaqat i Nizām i Bakhshī was allowed to be deferred". Unfortunately nothing further happened till the

---

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

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

The subject-matter in the following pages of the preface has been arranged under the following heads:

1. Life of Khwājah Niẓāmuddin Aḥmad Bakhshī.
2. Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbari, its sources and importance.
3. Life of Mr. Brajendranath De, M.A., I.C.S. (retd.), the editor and translator of the work.

**Life of Khwājah Niẓāmuddin Aḥmad Bakhshī.**

The author is variously styled as Mīrzā Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad, Khwājah Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad or Niẓāmī (vide Lowe's
translation of ‘Muntakhabu’t-Tavārikh’, vol. II, p. 479, 1924). In Maāthir-ul-Umarā he is called Khwājah Niẓāmu’d-Dīn Aḥmad, while by Abū-l-Faḍl1, Mir Abū Turāb 2, Firishtah, and others the appellation of Bahshi is added after his name.

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

1 Akbarnāma, text edition, vol. III, p. 695 (1886) and Beveridge’s translation of vol. III, p. 924 (1912–1939). In these notes various volumes of the Akbarnāma and the Ā’īn-i-Akbarī are cited as they have been issued in the Bibliotheca Indica series. It may, however, be noted that the Ā’īn, which has been issued in three volumes, really formed the third and final volume of Akbarnāma (see Blochmann’s Preface to the first volume of the Ā’īn, Philott’s edition, p. v, 1939).


of Akbar's reign. Al-Badāoni's statement, in view of the fact that he was a close friend of Niẓāmuddīn Ahmad, and was actively associated with him in the compilation of the Ṭabaqāt, appears to be more reliable, and I have little hesitation in accepting it as correct. The year of his birth may, therefore, be taken as 958 A.H. or 1551 A.D.

Unfortunately we have very little information about Khwājah Niẓāmuddīn Aḥmad's ancestry beyond the fact that he was the son of Khwājah Muqīm Harawī (of Herat), who was one of Bābur's officials and about the close of his reign was the Diwān-i-buwaytāt 1. After the death of Bābur, when Gujarāt was conquered by Humāyūn and the province of Aḥmadābād was entrusted to Mirzā 'Askari in 1535 A.D., Khwājah Muqīm was appointed his wazīr. He accompanied Humāyūn to Agra when the latter fled after his defeat by Sher Khān Sūr at Chausa in Bihār on 26th June, 1539. Khwājah Muqīm also, according to the Ṭabaqāt (De's translation of vol. I, p. i) and Maʾthir-ul-Umarā, served under Akbar; this is again referred to in the Ṭabaqāt (De's translation of vol. II, p. 336) where in the account of the twelfth year it is stated "the author's father remained in Agra, performing government work."

We know very little about the earlier years of life or the education of the young Khwājah, but according to Dowson 2 he was one of the pupils of 'Mullā All Sher', a learned man, and the father of Faidī Sirhindī, the author of Akbar-Nāma. There can be little doubt, however, that Niẓāmuddīn Ahmad was a well-educated and well-read young man who, "according to the instructions of his worthy father 3, occupied himself with the study of historical works, which brightens the intellect of the

---

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

¹ Ṭabaqāt, De’s translation of vol. I, p. iv (1911).
² Muntakhabatu’t-tawārikh, Haq’s translation of vol. IIII (1925).
⁴ Vide Muntakhabatu’t-tawārikh, Lowe’s translation of vol. II, p. 328 (1924). This is the famous Tārikh-i-Alfi, the introduction of which was written by Abū-l-Fadl, but curiously the Emperor commanded its preparation in 990 A.H. even though the history was to deal with the events that had happened “in the seven zones for the last one thousand years.” See A’in-i-Akbarī, translation of Blochmann, vol. I, revised by Phillott, pages xli and 113 (1939).
His interest in Sufism and theology is indicated by his association with Şûfis, Šaikhís and religious people in general. He may thus be assumed to have had a religious frame of mind, and his writings and the regard in which he was held by such bigoted Muhammadans as Al-Badâni seem to indicate that he must have been quite orthodox in his views and observances. Miyân Kamâl-ud-dìn ʻHuṣain of Širāz, a well-known religious leader, wrote to Al-Badâni after the Khwâjah’s death as follows: “For a long time I endured great grief and sorrow from hearing of the death of that repository of humanity, inseparably connected with liberality, him (sic) who had acquired all perfections, Mîrzâ Nizâmu-d-dîn Aḥmad, and from the passing away of all the excellence of that phoenix of the age and of his love and faithful affection for you, my lord.” After his recall from Gujarât in 1589 A.D., when he came into closer contact with the Emperor Akbar, he became less orthodox—apparently in accordance with the prevailing atmosphere of the Royal Court, and does not appear to have looked askance at the innovations of the Divine Faith (Din ʻIlâhî) of the Emperor. Nizâmuddin Aḥmad’s ruse in mentioning Šaikh ʻHuṣain’s name when some of the orthodox leaders were summoned to the Imperial Court, also indicates the skilful way in which he managed to keep himself safe from his own religious beliefs being questioned. This view is confirmed by Blochmann (loc. cit., 1869, p. 138) who in commenting on the change in the religious feelings of Al-Badâni resulting from his past misfortunes and exclusion from Akbar’s Court, sums up the situation in the following sentences: “He may have found it necessary to assume a more conciliating attitude towards the ‘heretics’ of the Court, and the members

2 See Al-Badâni in Ranking’s translation of vol. I of Muntakhabu-l-tawârikh, p. 9, where he is described as “a kind and complaisant man of wealth, orthodox and religiously disposed.”
of Akbar’s ‘Divine Faith’, who were in office and had partly brought about his pardon. He may have imitated the example of his friend Nizāmuddin, the historian, who, though a pious Muslim, managed to rise higher and higher in Akbar’s favour by keeping his religious views to himself.”

In addition to being a scholar he was a good soldier and administrator, as is clear from the meagre records available from such sources as the Ṭabaqāt and the Akbarnāma. There is practically no reference anywhere to any office held by the Khwājah up to about the thirty-fifth year of his life, the 29th year (vide infra) of Akbar’s reign, though according to the Dhakhīrat-al-Khwā‘in 1, he was, at the beginning of his career, Akbar’s Divān of the presence (Divān-i-Ḥudār), but no mention of this appointment is made in any other work. In the account of the 12th year of the reign (974 A.H., 1567 A.D.) the author states (De S’s translation of vol. II, p. 336) that when the Emperor went to attack ‘Ali Quli Khān the author remained at Agra with his father, and spread a vague rumour about the heads of Khān Zamān and Bahādur Khān having been brought to Agra. From the 12th to the 27th year (1567-1582 A.D.) of the reign there is no mention anywhere of Nizāmuddin Ahmad, but he was apparently closely associated with the Emperor as one of the Court officials, for after crossing the Sind Sāgar, the Emperor sent him with a message to Shāhzāda Shāh Murād (vide De, loc. cit., p. 549, but Al-Badā‘i says “to the prince Shāh Murād and the Amīrs” vide Lowe’s translation of vol. II, p. 302). He traversed seventy-five karobs “in one day and night” and after delivering the message to the Shāhzāda, returned with his reply to the Emperor at Peshāwar. He then accompanied the Emperor on his march to Kābul and must have held some important post, for when the Emperor 2 had a list of all pious-


2 See Lowe’s translation of Mu‘takhabat tawārikh, vol. II, p. 305. A curious inaccuracy to which reference may be made occurs here. Al Badā‘i here states that he had become acquainted with Khwājah Nizāmuddin Ahmad about a year back, i.e., about 999 A.H. or 1581 A.D., but Blochmann (op. cit., p. 122), apparently misinterpreting the reference to
people (Lowe translates اهل حماده as the people of piety), who were accompanying the army or were absent, prepared by the ۱۸در-ی-حاحن, he arranged that Al-Badāonī, who was absent, be shown in the return as sick. In the 29th ۱ year of Akbar’s reign (991 A.H., 1583 A.D.) the government of Gujarāt was transferred from Shihābuddin to ۲Tumād Khan who, after the murder of Sultan Mahmūd, had been the virtual king of Gujarāt till its conquest by Akbar in 980 A.H., and Khwājah Niẓāμuddin ۲Aḥmad was appointed the Bakšshī. Abū ۲Torāb’s

Niẓāμuddin ۲Aḥmad’s activities at Ágra in 974 A.H. referred to above and in the Muntakhab (text, vol. II, p. 99), states that Al-Badāonī met him at Ágra in 974 “and became his warm friend.”

۱ Khwājah Niẓāμuddin ۲Aḥmad in the ۲Tabaqāt (De’s translation of vol. II, p. 561, 1936) includes this in the account of the events of the 29th year which begins on page 558 and is followed by Al-Badāonī (Lowe’s translation of vol II of Muntakhabu’t-tawārikh, p. 332) and in Madīthir-ul-Umard (text edition, vol. I, p. 661). Abū-l-Faḍl in Akbarīnāma (vol. III, text edition, p. 403, English translation, p. 596) states, these appointments took place in the 28th year of the reign. In this connection reference may be made to De (Tabaqāt, English translation of vol. II, p. 559, note 1) where several discrepancies in the dates between Akbarīnāma and ۲Tabaqāt are pointed out; the former places the various events enumerated by De a year advance of the dates given in the latter. Inaccuracies in regard to the reckonings of the years of Akbar’s reign on the part of Niẓāμuddin ۲Aḥmad are pointed out by Al-Badāonī (vide Lowe’s translation of vol. II, pp. 353, 363), and he explains these as being due to the author having not taken into account “the intercalated days, which every three years makes a difference of one lunar month, there is a difference in each cycle of a whole year, between the solar and lunar years”, and his being away from the Imperial Camp in Gujarāt. After the death of Niẓāμuddin ۲Aḥmad the dates in the ۲Tabaqāt were checked and at least one corrected by his son Muḥammad Sharīf. In spite of the above, as Al-Badāonī follows the ۲Tabaqāt, it seems that the dates as they now stand in the ۲Tabaqāt are the corrected dates.

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

۲ Niẓāμuddin ۲Aḥmad’s name is included in the list of Bakshīs of Akbar’s reign (vide Philott’s edition of Blochmann’s translation of ۲Aṭτπ-і-۲Aḥbast, vol. I, p. 599), and apparently at this time no distinction was made between Bakšshī and Mīr Bakšshī, as what is called Bakšshī
account (loc. cit., pp. 100, 101) of these appointments is rather vague, but in the Tābāqāt (p. 563) the author refers to his joining I'tmād Khān at Bijāpūr en route to Aḥmadābād after his appointment as the Bakhshī. The vacillating policy in reference to the affairs in Gujarāt¹ adopted by I'tmād Khān and the disturbances due to the intrigues of Shihābuddin Aḥmad Khān and Qutbuddin Khān led to Aḥmadābād being occupied by Nannā or Muṣaffar Gujarātī, and the rout of the Imperial forces outside the town. The Khwājah sent an account of all that had happened to Akbar, and as a result Mirzā Khān ² son of Bairam Khān was sent with a well-equipped army to quell the disturbances in Gujarāt. It is not necessary to deal here with the campaign against Sultān Muṣaffar of Gujarāt, but a review of the period distinctly shows that throughout the campaign and earlier Nizāmuddin Aḥmad proved a very valuable officer, and whether as a commander, and even as an active fighter, he gave a very good account of himself.

² He successfully carried out negotiations with Shihābuddin, made arrangements for the defence of Aḥmadābād in the

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


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

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

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

about this time that he was appointed in-charge of the provinces of Ajmir, Gujarât and Mâlwa, apparently of the Khâlsâ lands. Towards the end of Shâbân, 999 A.H., he was granted the parganah of Shamasâbâd as his jâgir and was allowed five months’ leave of absence to arrange matters there. In the year 1000 A.H. (1591-92 A.D.) when Aśaf Khân Bakhshî was appointed to the Kabul campaign, Nizâmuddin Ahmad was appointed as the Bakhshî in his place.

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

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

---

1 See Beveridge’s translation of Akbarnâma, vol. III, p. 924.
2 See Lowe’s translation of Muntakhabu’t-tawârikh, vol. II, p. 393. According to Lowe, Bakhshî was the paymaster-general.
3 Vide Tabaqât, Do’s translation of vol. II, p. 652. The last sentence is quoted incorrectly in the life of the author in Madâhir-ul-Umarâ.
The events preceding his death are described in greater
detail in Akbarnāma where it is stated that on 14th Şafar,
1003 A.H. (19th October, 1594 A.D.), at Shāhām 'All, near
Lāhore, he developed high fever while on a hunting expedition
with the Emperor. His sons obtained leave to convey him to
Lāhore, but he died on the 23rd Şafar (28th October, 1594 A.D.)
on the banks of the river Rāvi.

In the Akbarnāma (loc. cit.) it is stated that Akbar’s “dis-
cerning heart was somewhat grieved, and he begged for forgive-
ness for him at the court of God. Strangers and acquaintances
mourned, and honesty (rāstī) indulged in grief.”

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

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

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

(A priceless pearl has left the world.)

TĀRIKHI-AKBAKI: ITS SOURCES AND IMPORTANCE.

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

---

2 Fadl Sirhindī in Akbar-Nāma, as noted already, gives 22nd
Șafar, 1003 A.H. as the date of death of Khwājah Nizāmuddin Āḥmad
Bakhshī (vide Dowson in Elliot’s History of India, vol. VI, p. 130, 1875);
this is certainly incorrect.
3 Text edition of Muntakhab Al-Tawarikh by Lees, ʿAbīr al-Dīn
4 See De’s translation of vol. I, p. 6 (1911). The date comes to 1001
A.H. (50+900+1+40+10) or 1592 A.D. The author died in 1003 A.H.,
1594 A.D., and he was apparently working at it for several years before his
death. See Ranking’s translation of Muntakhab u-tawsīkh, vol. I, pp. 9,
Akbar-Shāhi and stated that the name Niẓāmī, the name of the author, gives the chronogram of the date of its compilation. In Rawdat-ut-Tāhirīn by Tāhir Muḥammad, the work is called Tārīkh-i-Sulṭān Niẓāmī 1, but this name has not been adopted by any of the later writers. The work is called the Tārīkh-i-Niẓāmī by Muḥammad Hāshim Khān in Muntakhab-ul-lubāb (vide text-edition in the Bibliotheca Indica series, vol. I, p. 238, 1869). The same name was also used by 'Abd-ul-Qādir, also known as Al-Badāoni 2, in his Muntakhab-ul-tawārīkh, but he also calls it 'Niẓāmu-t-Tawārīkh' (vide Ranking's English translation in the Bibliotheca Indica series, vol. I, pp. 9, 10, 1888). Firishtah (Tārīkh-i-Firishtah, Persian text, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, p. 4, 1884) designated it as the Tārīkh-i-Niẓāmuddīn Ahmad Bakhshī, and Col. Briggs in his translation (History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India, vol. I, Author's Preface, p. xlviii, 1829) calls it 'History of Nizam-ood-Deen Ahmud Bukhsy'. Blochmann (loc. cit., p. 115), as noted already, calls it 'Ṭabaqāt i Niẓām i Bakhshī'. Several manuscripts, however, bear the name Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, and under this name the work is cited in various descriptive catalogues of Persian Manuscripts in most well-known European libraries (for details

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

1 Vide W. H. Morley, A Descriptive Catalogue of Historical Manuscripts, p. 68 (1864), and Dowson in Elliot's History of India, vol. V, p. 177 (1873). For details of the work Rawdat-ut-Tāhirīn see Beveridge, Journ. As. Soc. Bengal (n.s.) vol. XIV, pp. 269–277 (1918). Unfortunately the only manuscript of this work in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. 42, vide Ivanoff's Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts, p. 18, 1924) is incomplete, and I have not, therefore, been able to verify this reference.

2 For a critical note in reference to Al-Badāoni see Blochmann, loc. cit., pp. 119, 120 (1869).
see M. Hidâyat Hosain's preface to *Tā rijh-i-Shāhī*, p. vii, footnote 1, 1939). This name was apparently first adopted by Elliot ¹ who remarked that "the name by which it is best known in literary circles is Tabakāt-i-Akber"", and this was also selected for the edition issued by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in preference to *Tabaqāt-i-Akbar-Shāhī*, to avoid confusion with a work of the same name by Khwājah ʿAṭā Beg Qazvīnī written about 1014 A.H., 1605 A.D. According to Ranking (loc. cit.) the work is simply known as 'Tabaqat,' while Lees (*Journ. Roy. As. Soc. (n.s.*) vol. III, p. 455, 1888) erroneously designates it as the 'Tā ri khoi-Tabakāt-i-Akbar-Shāhī'.

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

---

¹ Elliot's *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammedan India*, vol. I (the only volume ever issued), p. 179 (1849). Also see Elliot's *History of India*, vol. V, p. 177 (1873).
was his own composition, based on a study of several historical works and such independent information as he could collect from various sources by research and industry. His history of the Akbar's reign is based on personal observations, on information obtained from firsthand sources and probably to some extent on Abū-l-Faḍl's opus magnum the Akbarnāma.

In the introduction and dedication of the Ṭabaqāt Khwājah Nizāmuddin Aḥmad explains the genesis of the work as follows:

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

---

1 The words in Madīḥir (loc. cit.) are

و خون جز رسی و دقت در تنفیق اخبار و سعی تمام بفواهم آورده

صلوات بکار برده

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

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

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

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

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

5. Ṣabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī.
7. Tughrulq-Nāmah.
8. Tārikh-i-Firūzshāhī by Ṣīyān Barnī.
10. Tārikh-i-Muḥārakshāhī.
11. Futūḥ-us-Salāfīn.
12. Tārikh Maḥmūdshāhī Hindwī (Mandvi according to
Rieu).
13. Tārikh Maḥmūdshāhī Khurd Hindwī (Mandvi ac-
cording to Rieu).
14. Ṣabaqāt-i-Maḥmūdshāhī Gvjarātī.
15. Muʾāthīr-i-Maḥmūdshāhī Gvjarātī.
17. Tārikh-i-Bahādurshāhī.
18. Tārikh-i-Bahamani.

---

19. Ṭārīkh-i-Nāṣiri
20. Ṭārīkh-i-Muẓaffarshāhī
21. Ṭārīkh-i-Mīrzā Ḥaidar
22. Ṭārīkh-i-Kashmir
23. Ṭārīkh-i-Sīnd
24. Ṭārīkh-i-Bāburi
25. Wāqi‘āt-i-Bāburi
26. Ṭārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmshāhī
27. Wāqi‘āt-i-Muṣṭāqī

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

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

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

---

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

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

Zain-ul-Âkhabâr is a general history of Persia from the Pîshdâdiyân dynasty, dealing particularly with the governors and rulers of Khorasan up to ca. 440 A.H. (1048 A.D.). Unfortunately a large portion of the work is lost, but an edition of the first thirteen sections of the text was published by Muhammad Na'izim 1.

As is pointed out by Muhammad Na'izim, Khwâjah Niẓāmuddîn Ahmad Bakhshî was the first author to utilize this work for his account of the Ghaznavid sovereigns in the Tâbaqât-i-Akbarî, and the discovery of this rare work must remain to his credit. Firishtah also included Zain-ul-Âkhabâr amongst the sources of his Târîkh, but in view of the fact that his account of the period dealt with in the Zain was based mainly on the Tâbaqât, it seems likely that he had only taken this reference from Niẓāmuddîn Ahmad's list.

3. Raûdat-us-Safâ by Muhammad bin Khâwand Shâh bin Ma'hmûd. Very little information is available about the birth or early life of the author, but he is stated to have died at Herât in 903 A.H. (1497 A.D.). Raûdat is a work on general history, from the creation of the world to the author's time. For details see Habib-us-Siyar, Bombay edition, volume II, pp. 198, 339, and Rice's Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum, vol. I, p. 87 (1879). A full account of the work and translations of some extracts by Sir H. M. Elliot are published in Elliot's History of India, vol. IV, pp. 127-140 (1872).

4. Tâj-ul-Maadîrî by Hasan Niẓâmil of Nishâpur deals with the history of part of the reign of Mu'izzuddin (assassinated 602 A.H., 1206 A.D.), the entire reign of Quṭbuddîn Aibak.

---

1 Vide note 3, p. xxii. The editor cites Elliot's History of India, 1869, as the first notice of this work. This is incorrect, as Elliot in his Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammadan India, p. 83 (1849), had published a detailed note regarding the Ouseley Manuscript No. 240 which is now preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford; this was reprinted in Elliot's History of India, vol. IV, pp. 557, 558 (1872), while the 1869 reference cited by the editor is only a casual notice of the work in vol. II of the same publication (p. 432).
(602–607 A.H., 1206–1210 A.D.) and the first seven years of
the reign of Shamsuddin Ilutmish (1211–1217 A.D.). A
detailed account of the Tâj was published in Elliot's History
of India, vol. II, pp. 204–243 (1869), while Ethé in the Catalogue
gives full bibliographic references.

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

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

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

1 For details see Mohammad Wahid Mirza—The Life and Works of
Amir Khusrau, p. 225, footnote 1 (Punjab Univ. Orient. Pub., Calcutta,
1935).

2 The Khazainul Futah edited by Syed Moinul Haq (Publications of

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

4 English Introduction by M. Ḥabīb to M. Haq's text edition,
pp. 1–15 (vide Note 2 supra).
7. Tughluq-Nāmah by Amir Khusrau was quite unknown till recently, as no copies of it are preserved in any of the European or Indian libraries. Al-Badāoni (Muntakhab-u-t-tawārīkh, Ranks'ing's translation of vol. I, p. 301) remarks that it was the last of Amir Khusrau's works, and "was written in verse in honour of the Sultan and in obedience to his order". Ethé in his Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office, p. 405, in the account of Haft Iqlim, notes that the work consisted of 3,000 baits (verses). A manuscript entitled Jahāngīrīnāmah by Ḥayātī Ḵāshī in the personal library of Maulānā Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān Shirwānt of Ḥabībganj was recently identified as the Tughluq-Nāmah of Amir Khusrau by the late Maulví Rashid Ahmad Anṣārī. A detailed introduction, a summary of this work by the editor Saiyid Ḥāshmi Farīdābādī, an incomplete descriptive note by Maulví Rashid Ahmad in Urdu, and the text was published at Aurangābād, Deccan, in 1352 A.H. (1933 A.D.).

Relying on the statements in Kashf-uẓ-Ẓunūn and ‘Abd-ul-Qādir Al-Badāoni’s Muntakhab-u-t-tawārīkh the Tughluq-Nāmah is believed to have been composed in 725 A.H. (1325 A.D.), but some part of the work had been lost even in Akbar's time, and in 1019 A.H. (1610 A.D.), Jahāngīr commissioned Ḥayātī Ḵāshī to supply the missing parts to complete the work. The work, as published, is believed to be what has been preserved of Ḥayātī’s revised version, and consists of 2,920 verses. In view of the presence of a ترک (catch-word) on the last page of the manuscript and a statement by Ḥayātī (vide verses 168–177) that he intends to complete the work by adding some further verses at the end, it is surmised by the editor that some of the folios at the end are missing. 179 verses in the beginning of the work are definitely identified as Ḥayātī's work, leaving a balance of 2,742 verses. ¹

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

8. Târikh-i-Firûzshâhi by Diya' Barnî is a history of the Sultâns of Delhi from the accession of Ghiyâthuddîn Balbân, 662 A.H. (1266 A.D.), to the sixth year of Firûzshâh’s reign, 758 A.H. (1357 A.D.). It is the most important history of the period and was apparently the authority on which Nizâmu’dîn Aîmad and Firishtah based their works. The work was published in the Bibliotheca Indica series (1860–1862). A translation of the introduction and of the major part of the work was published by Dowson in Elliot’s History of India, vol. III, pp. 93–268 (1871).

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

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

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

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

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

---

5 Remarks: “I can find no mention of this work.”
6 Vide Note 2 supra.
of Agra. In the Urdu and English prefaces of this edition the editor briefly discusses the historical and literary merits of the Futūḥ, while a short critical notice is published in his monographic study¹ of Muḥammad bin Tughluq. Prof. A. S. U’sha of Madras has also published an ‘Īṣāmī Nāma and discussed the merits of ‘Īṣāmī’s publications, but I have unfortunately not been able to refer to his publications²; his views have been adversely criticized by M. Ḥusain and M. Ḥaq³. A critical review⁴ of the work is also being published in the Urdu monthly Ma’ārif by Ṣabāhuddin ‘Abd-ur-Raḥmān.

Futūḥ-us-Salāṭin originally consisted of about 12,000 verses, but according to the editor, only 11,524 verses were found in the India Office manuscript; of these, nineteen verses (Nos. 11294–11312) are quite illegible. The work was completed in five months and nine days (10th December, 1349–14th May, 1350 A.D.). For his sources the author does not specify any special works, but states⁵ that he based his account on the Hadith, various descriptive works, old legends, information gathered from friends and personal observations.

Dr. M. Ḥusain sums up the historical importance of the work as follows⁶:—“It presents in tolerably accurate chronological order events of the political history of India for over three hundred years, and it also throws light on the beginning of the Bahmani rule in the Deccan; on the psychology of the 14th century India; on the principal towns and their respective distances; on the nature of punishments then inflicted; on the Hindu amirs and princes; and on the Hindi words and idioms then in Muslim usage.” He further regards the Futūḥ as a

² References to Prof. U’sha’s contributions are given in M. Ḥusain and M. Ḥaq.
⁵ Vide page 579, verses 11437–11443 of the text edition.
literary work of exceptional merit, and 'Iṣāmī as the best epic writer of the age.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25. Wāqiʿāt-i-Bābūrī. In reference to this work also it is not possible to decide which of the Persian translations of the Tuzuk-i-Bābūrī is referred to by the author of the Ţabaqāt. The translation of Shaikh Zain or ‘Zainu’d-din of Khwaf’ was made during the lifetime of Emperor Bābur (vide Mrs. Beveridge’s Bābur-Nāma, preface p. xl, 1921, and Rieu’s Catalogue, vol. III, p. 926), a second one by Pāyandah Ḥasan Ghaznavi and Muḥammad Quli Mughal Hišārī was begun in 991 A.H. (1583 A.D.), and completed in 994 A.H., 1586 A.D. (vide Mrs. Beveridge, op. cit., pp. xliii, xlv, and Rieu’s Catalogue, vol. II, p. 799), and finally a third by ‘Abd-ur-Raḥīm Khān Khānānān, which was made at Akbar’s orders to help Abū’l-faẓl in the Akbar-nāma”, and on its completion was presented to Akbar in 998 A.H., 1589 A.D. (vide Mrs. Beveridge, op. cit., p. xlv, and Rieu’s Catalogue, vol. I, p. 244).

26. Ṭāriḵ-i-Ibrāhīmshāhī. No work of this name is known, and appears as if Ibrāhīmshāhī is a lapsus calami on the part of the author of the Ţabaqāt for Ibrāhīmī. The Tāriḵ-i-Ibrāhīmī1, also known as Tāriḵ-i-Humayūnī, by Ibrāhīm bin Ḥarīr (probably Jārīr as suggested by Ethé) is “a general history of the world from Adam to A.H. 596 (A.D. 1199)”—see Ethé’s Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office, p. 33, No. 104 (1903).

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

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


On comparing the above list with Firishtah’s sources it is found that the latter gives a list of 35 main works consulted by him for the compilation of his History, while another twenty are cited in the body of the work. Of the works cited in the Tabaqāt Firishtah does not mention Khuzān-i-Futūh, Tadbīr-ul-Namāh, Tārikh-i-Nāṣiri, Tārikh-i-Mirzā Haidar, Tārikh-i-Bābur and Tārikh-i-Ibrāhīmshāhī, while I have doubtfully identified Firishtah’s Tārikh-i-Jāmī (or Ḥāji) with Muḥammad Bihāmad Khān’s Tārikh-i-Muḥammadī of the Tabaqāt. In addition there are twenty works which are mentioned in the body of Firishtah’s Tārikh and which are included in a subsidiary list by Briggs. Of these, two, Futūh-i-Salāṭīn and Wāqi‘āt-i-Mushtāqi (? Travels of Abūl Nūsr Nusktty—No. 7 of Briggs’s list), are also included in the Tabaqāt. Firishtah’s list includes the following additional works ¹ which are not mentioned in the list of the authorities in the Tabaqāt:

1. Mulḥiqāt-i-Shaikh ‘A’inuddin Bijāpuri.
2. Bahman-Nāmah of Shaikh Ḍihāri.
3. Tārikh-i-Binakiti.
5. Tārikh-Alfi.
6. Habīb-ns-Siyar.
7. Tārikh-i-Bangālah.

¹ For this comparison I have used the lists as given in Briggs’s translation of Firishtah entitled History of the Rise of the Muhomedan Power in India, vol. I, pp. xlix–lii (1829). Sources of Firishtah are also discussed by Mohl in Journal des Savants, pp. 220–224 (1840).
10. Nuskhah Quthi.

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

The opinion of 'Abd-ul-Qadir, Al-Badawi, the author of the Muntakhab-ut-tawarikh, has already been referred to. Up to the year of Nizamuddin Ahmad's death, his history, though embellished with additional facts, is an abridgment of the Tabaqat¹ and Tarih-i-Mubarakshahi. He corrected some of the dates of the Tabaqat, but mainly relied on it for the historical facts.

Several chapters of the Raudat-ut-Tahirin by Tahir Muhammad, which was written between 1011 A.H. (1602-1603 A.D.) and 1015 A.H. (1606-1607 A.D.) are, according to Elliot (op. cit., p. 300), copied verbatim from the Tabaqat.

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

The Tarih-i-Shahi (or Tarih-i-Salatin-i Asafhina) was composed soon after the compilation of the Tabaqat (before 1594 A.D.) and before 1020 A.H. (1611 A.D.) when the Makhzan-i-Ashfani was written (Elliot's History of India, vol. V, pp. 1, 2, 1873). The author Ahmad Yadgar mentions Nizami's History or the Tabaqat and Ma'dan-i-Akhbar as his authorities and, as M. Hidayat Hosain ² has recently shown, he has copied verbatim the account of the reign of Humayun from the Tabaqat.

¹ According to Elliot's Bibliographical Index of the Historians of Muhammadan India, p. 221 (1849), Al-Badawi in his work 'Nijatu-r-Rashid' designates his own history "as a mere abridgment of the Tabakat."

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

M. ‘Abdul Muqtadir in the Preface2 to the Haft-Iqlim (completed 1002 A.H., 1593 A.D.) of Amin Ahmad Rāzī remarked that “for the Indian portion of the history he relies mainly upon the Tabaqāt-i-Akbari”.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

1 Dowson in Elliot's History of India, vol. VI, pp. 116–146 (1878).
3 Vide Elliot, Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammadan
India, Preface, pp. v–xxx (1849).
is not of the most puerile or contemptible kind; and without any observation calculated to interrupt the monotony of successive conspiracies, revolts, intrigues, murders, fratricides, so common in Asiatic Monarchies." With the restraining influences of ostracism and even death under the despotic monarchs during whose times these histories were compiled, there could hardly be any chance for the development of individual character or the expression of unbiased opinions. In common with the authors of the times, and this was not restricted to Muhammadan authors only, Islam in the Ṭabaqāt is lauded above all other religions, the Muhammedans are of the true faith and all others are infidels; when the former are killed in battle or otherwise they drink "the cup of martyrdom", while the souls of the infidels "are despatched to hell". Patriotism and bravery of the Kāfirs are condemned in very strong terms, while even cowardice, intrigues, wholesale massacres and desecration, and demolition of the religious institutions of the Hindūs are applauded. All the same the author deserves full credit for being far in advance of his times and to a great extent free from religious bigotry when he, as against Ḍiyā Barmi, the author of the Tāriḵ-i-Firūzshāhi, who describes Ḵhusrav Kān Ḵān on the occasion of his battle with Ghazāl Malik "as the effeminate wretch who could not bear the attack of men", applauds him as "having with great bravery and courage fought to the end of the day." ¹

Similarly in narrating the chivalrous treatment of Sulṭān Maḥmūd at the hands of Rānā Sānkā (Sangrāma Singh, Rānā of Mewār) and restoring to him the kingdom of Mālwhā after the former's defeat and capture by the latter, Ḵhwājah Niẓām-uddin² shows himself a true historian untrammelled by any religious bigotry or prejudices. In dealing with Akbār, his king and patron, he employs the usual eulogistic high sounding

¹ Vide De's translation of vol. I of the Ṭabaqāt, p. 207.
² Ṭabaqāt text edition, vol. III, p. 203:

فارس امکل بصرفت پرشیده نماد - که کرمان سانکا از ملت مظفر بالا فرست - چه ملت مظفر نهاد بره را مخدع نمود - و رانانه سانکا لذت را در حرب گرند رمیل داد - و مثل این قضیه غیری نمایند معلم نیست •
titles and phrases, but cannot, like Abū-l-Faḍl, be accused of uncouth flattery, both in form and style, or of wilful concealment of facts. As a historian he casually mentions the “Divine Faith”, but does not go into any great detail regarding the observances of the faith or criticize the Emperor, Abū-l-Faḍl and any of the other followers. He was writing a history of the period from personal observations and information collected from all available sources and has succeeded more than any other author of his time in producing what Dowson rightly styles a contemporary history of very high authority.

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

Brajendranath De 3

(1852–1932).

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

---

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The author summed up his autobiography as follows:

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

¹ Translator's Preface to the translation of vol. I of the Muntakhab ibn-t-lawdilah, p. i (1898).
Mr. Brajendranath De had a charming personality. His circle of friends was wide and all who knew him respected him for his honesty, straightforwardness and gentle nature. Though rather shy and somewhat reserved, he was very generous and kind hearted, and was possessed of a subtle sense of humour.

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

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

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

آسان بار امانت نتوانست کشید
قرعه فال بنامی دیرانه راند

was assigned to me. None of my critics would be more capable of disapproving this unbecoming choice, but rather than let the
work remain incomplete, with the serious consequences of an already almost illegible manuscript becoming quite useless if left till such time when some really suitable editor could be found for completing it, I agreed to undertake the work. Even good intentions and resolutions have their limitations, and on looking through the material I found an almost impossible task before me. The manuscript, as remarked above, was very nearly illegible; it had been written in a type of shorthand which, though it would have been quite simple for its author to transcribe, was quite beyond an ordinary reader; it took me a long time to master and the deciphering of the diacritical marks involved a great deal of labour. There was also an uncorrected typewritten copy, but this differed materially from the manuscript. Further, there were long blanks and very few, if any, of the text quotations or references had been filled in. Even in the manuscript the references were without page indications and this involved a great deal of reading of the original sources. The quotations from different works were often incorrect, being paraphrases by the author rather than the original versions, while the names of persons and places, though given in inverted commas, were, almost without exception, spelt differently from what they were in the originals. This should not, however, be understood to mean that I am in any way trying to disparage the work of the author or to cast any aspersions on his scholarly attainments, but in fairness to him and myself, I have considered it essential to explain the situation with which I was faced. Several times I felt like giving up the task, but, knowing, as I did, the great amount of time and labour which, in spite of his failing health and eyesight, my late lamented friend Mr. Brajendranath De had put into the work I persevered in completing it as best as I could. My own share in the publication is limited to standardizing the transliteration as far as possible, checking, verifying and correcting the all too numerous references, supplying missing passages in the translation, comparing it with the text-edition which had been changed materially since the translation was prepared, pointing out variations between the text and translation where it would have meant changing the entire account, and finally seeing the work through
the press. 'All this has involved a tremendous amount of work.
more particularly, as I could, with the responsibilities of my
official position, only devote my few leisure hours to this work.
In presenting the work, as now issued, I am fully conscious of
its shortcomings and while craving the indulgence of my readers,
only hope that in view of the circumstances explained, they will
make due allowances for the defects 1.

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

_Museum House, Calcutta._
28th October, 1939.

_Baini Prashad._

---

1 Unfortunately widely different schemes for the transliteration of
the names of authors and their publications are adopted by different
authors. The originals are strictly followed for the citations in the foot-
notes, but the transliterations in the text are, except where within
inverted commas, in accordance with the scheme recommended by the
International Oriental Congress of 1894.
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PREFACE

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

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

Museum House, Calcutta.
12th July, 1939.

BAINI PRASHAD.
SECTION I. THE SULTANS OF THE DAKIN, TWENTY-NINE PERSONS

The 1 Dakini section, 29 persons, and the period of their rule began with the year 748 A.H., and ended in 1002 A.H., and lasted for 2 254 years.

Historians are agreed, that when the sun of the greatness of Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh passed from its zenith, and declined towards its setting, there were troubles in all parts of his kingdom, the hearts of his soldiers became averse to obedience; and many rebellions were brought forth from the womb of time. The real cause of the occurrence of these rebellions was this, that the Sultan entrusted great works to men of mean and evil nature. 5 These men, under the influence of their greed and avarice undertook difficult tasks, and 4 laid unreputable deeds on the ground. As their determinations did not bear fruit, they became annoyed with men, who had any marks of greatness, and caused sorrow to the latter.

Couplet:

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

---

1 The lith. ed. has طبعة سلاطين دکن, which is better.
2 This is the period mentioned in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. The Bhamani kingdom however only lasted for about a century and a half. The Cambridge History of India has a list of 18 Sultans whose reigns extended from 374d A.D. to 934 A.H. (1527 A.D.).
3 The MSS. have إن گروه.
4 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have و عملنامی فیرمکر بر زمین نهرادند, the meaning of which is not at all clear.
5 The first four lines were quoted in connection with the employment of base and unworthy men in the History of Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh; see page
THE SULTANS OF THE DAKIN

Is utterly to lose the thread of thy actions,  
And is like a snake, in thy pocket, to keep.  
As on the worthless, thou placest charges great,  
Know that from salt land thou hop'st for fruit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Cambridge History of India brushes aside Firishtā's story about
Kāṅku or Gāṅgu Brahman as an absurd legend, yet it finds it difficult to
explain the name of Kāṅku or Gāṅgu which frequently occurs in connection
with the names of the Sultāns of the dynasty. It is admitted in note 3 on
p. 170 that the meaning of the addition Kāṅku has not been established,
but in p. 373, it says that it has been credibly explained by Maulavi 'Ala-ud-
Wah as a scribe's corruption of Kaikāns. I have carefully read the Maulavi's
short paper, and I must say with all deference to him and to Sir W. Haig
that the explanation is utterly flimsy. Kaikāns was to have the final س struck
off and the كکاکور which would be left, might be changed to Kaikān, Kankān,
Kāṅku, Gāṅgu, Kāku. How Kaikān (ککاک) can be changed to Kāṅku (ککاک) or
Gāṅgu (گاک) and why of all the variants those should have been selected and
adopted by historians neither the Maulavi nor Sir W. Haig condescend to explain.
I may say that even Zia-ud-dīn Banā ni has Hasan Kāṅku.
accession of Muhammad Shâh, and which comes to a period of 139 years, that any increase over it cannot be conceived. Hasan Gângu declared that he was a descendant of Bahman, son of Isfandi-yâr, and on that account, the attribution of the name of Bahmanyâ to him and his descendants is not inappropriate. And from the year 887 A.H. to the year 935 A.H. which comes to a period of 148 years, the name of Sultân has been attributed to the descendants of Bahman Shâh. But the wretched \textit{(Be Daulat)} Barid and his descendants had, on account of their evil spirit, kept their sovereign princes in confinement, in their house, and had themselves performed the functions of the sovereign power.

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

Also in the year 935, 'Imâd-ul-mulk Kâveli having made his submission to Sultân Bahâdur of Gujrat, had the \textit{Khutba} (public prayers) read and the \textit{Sikka} (coin) struck in his own territory in the name of Sultân Bahâdur. After a year Sultân Bahâdur marched into the Deccan at the instigation of 'Imâd-ul-mulk. As Nizâm-ul-mulk and the other \textit{amirs} had not the strength to oppose him, they also read the \textit{Khutba} in his name.

During that time, Malik Barid, son of Barid, had the helpless Sultân Kalim-ul-lâh imprisoned in the city of Bidar. In the matter of the fixing of the period of the rules of the Bahmanyâ Sultâns, different accounts have come under my notice; but as the book (called) Sirâj-ut-Tawârikh written by Khwâja Muhammad Lâri during the time of those Sultâns, and from that date till to-day, namely 1002 A.H., a period of sixty-seven years, Dakin was governed by four dynasties, \textit{viz.}, the descendants of Nizam-ul-mulk called Nizam-ul-mulkiya, the descendants of Adil Khan called Adil Khanîya,

---

1 This should, I think, be Mahmûd Shâh, the period from the accession of 'Ala-ud-din in 748 A.H. to that of Mahmûd in 887 A.H. is 139 years.

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

1 Sultan 'Ala-ud-din Hasan Shāh, eleven years and 2 ten months
and seven days.

Sultan Muhammad Shāh, son of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din Hasan Shāh,
18 years and seven months.

Sultan Mujāhid Shāh, one year and one month and nine days.

Sultan Dāūd Shāh, one month and three days.

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

5 See note.

Sultan Shams-ud-din, 6 son of Muhammad Shāh, five months and
seven days.

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

Sultan Aḥmad Shāh, 7 twelve years and nine months and
twenty-four days.

---

1 Compare the names and the periods of the reigns of the Bahmani Sultāns
as given in a note in page 40 of Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas. These
names, the note says, were taken from Firishtah's History. Compare also

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

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

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

5 In the list given in Grant Duff's History, the name of "Sultan Ghazee-
ood-deen Shah Bahmani" is given as that of the sixth Sultan between Sultan
Mahmud Shāh and Sultan Shams-ud-din. The correct name is Sultan Ghiiyā-
ud-din; and although it is omit.d from the list in the MSS. and also in the
lith. ed., a short account of his reign appears in its proper place. The name
is given in the list in p. 702 of the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III.

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

7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have the period as given above in the text; but the
other MS. has the period of his reign (was)
Sultân Ahmad Qhiyās-ud-dîn Shâh, twelve years, and nine months and twenty-four days.

Sultân 'Ala-ud-dîn, twenty-three years and nine months and twenty-two days.

Sultân Humâyûn Shâh, son of Sultân 'Ala-ud-dîn, three years and six months and five days.

Sultân Nizâm Shâh, one year and eleven months and ten days.

Sultân Muhammad Shâh Shâzâlî, nineteen years and four months and fifteen days.

Sultân Mahmûd Shâh, forty years and two months and three days.

Sultân Ahmad Shâh, two years and one month.

Sultân 'Ala-ud-dîn, one year and eleven months.

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

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

After that, the four amîrs having gained their independence, have been ruling with complete independence from that day till this day, which is (in) the year 1002 A.H. and the 38th year of the Ilâhi era, 2 which amounts to a period of sixty-seven years. Up to the present time the Dakin is in their possession. Let it not remain concealed, that the foundation of the rule of the four amîrs took place in the year 887 A.H. and they became completely independent in the year 935 A.H.

---

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

2 The text is according to the reading in the MSS. but the lith. ed. has حكومت في 1288 هـ تصرف انتهاك دستة، سي و همّت سلم القبض و نام سلطنت، بر او ولاد ت، بحيلش مي داشندن، i.e., the rule of the Dakin was in their hands but they had for thirty-eight years the titles and the name of sovereignty in the Bahmanî dynasty.
The Sultans of the Dakin

The Nizam-ul-Mulkiahs:
Nizam-ul-mulk Bahri.
Ahmad Nizam-ul-mulk, four years.
Buhann Nizam-ul-mulk, forty-eight years.
Hasan Nizam-ul-mulk, thirty-eight years.
1 Murtaza Nizam-ul-mulk, twenty-six years.
2 Hasan Nizam-ul-mulk, son of Murtaza, two months.
Husain Nizam-ul-mulk, two years.
Murtaza Nizam-ul-mulk, who is at present the ruler, two years.

The Adil Khaniyas:
3 Yusuf Adil Khan, seven years.
Isma'il Adil Khan, twenty-five years.
4 Ibrahim Adil Khan, twenty-five years.
Ali Adil Khan, twenty-five years.
Ibrahim Adil Khan, fourteen years.

The Qutb-ul-mulkiahs:
5 Sultan Ali Qutb-ul-mulk, twenty-four years.
6 Ahmad Qutb-ul-mulk, seven years.
Ibrahim Qutb-ul-mulk, thirty-five years.
Muhammad Quli Qutb-ul-mulk 7 thirty-eight years.

An Account of the Reign of 'Ala-ud-Din Hasan Shah.

The chroniclers of events have narrated, that 'Ala-ud-Din Hasan Bahamani, who is celebrated as Hasan Gangu, came to the capital city of Dehli, according to the vicissitudes of time, in the reign of

---

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

---

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

2 There are slight variations in the readings. One MS. has سعدة Gālbūrkh Ra Kasth, while the other has Sūdānā Gālbūrkh Ra Kasth. The lith. ed. has Gālbūrkh Ra Kasth. It appears from Firisṭah that Hasan Gāngu had already assumed the title of Zafar Khān, and had become well known (اختصاص بانه) in Bakri and Rāibagh and Mīrish and Kalbar Hasanābād Gulbarga and killed Bahrūn Rāy, the governor of the fort of Gulbarga, who was one of the trusted servants of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh.

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

and he was also the younger brother of Malik Gul Afghān (Col. Briggs calls him Mallick Moogh) who was one of the great nobles of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh, and had a large army for the defence of Malwa, who would, if it became necessary, assist and aid his brother. It does not appear that all the amirs of the Dakin agreed to Isma‘īl Fath’s being made the Sultān; for Firishtah says, “That all the amirs of the Dakin, whether they liked it or not (khwāhī na kāwāhī) agreed to make Isma‘īl Fath Afghān, Nāṣir-ud-dīn Shāh; and held the umbrella of sovereignty over his head”. The Cambridge History of India says that the man whom Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah call Isma‘īl Fath has been called Muh, Muyh and Fath, but it has followed the Bibliotheca Indica text of Barani and called him Isma‘īl Muhk the Afghān. Barani however calls him only مغ افغان which may be transliterated Makh or Muhk Afghān.

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

2 The name is Taghi in the MSS., and in Firishtah. The lith. ed. has wrongly خفر, Zafar.

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

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

1 After a time he fell ill, and when he had no hope of living longer, he gave advice and direction to his son, Muhammad Kḥān, received reinforcements of fifteen thousand infantry from the Rāy of Telingana, who was aggrieved with Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq, and of five thousand horsemen from Nāsir-ud-dīn attacked 'Imād-ul-mulk. The battle was well contested and lasted all day. In the end victory declared itself for 'Ala-ud-dīn; and 'Imād-ul-mulk was killed.

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

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

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

1 An account of the reign of Sultān Muhammad Shāh, son of 'Ala-ud-din Hasan Shāh.

When the term of rule came to Muhammad Khān, he sat in the place of his father, and assumed the title of Sultān Muhammad Shāh.
He was a young man, adorned with (a sense of) justice and equity. The people were happy and contented during the period of his rule;

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

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

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

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

سباست کہ الابق بکفار

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

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

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

---

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

The Rāya who was proud of his power became angry, and paraded the man, who carried the order, mounted on a donkey all round the city of Bijānagar and immediately collected thirty thousand horse and nine hundred thousand foot soldiers and three thousand elephants for the conquest of the Bahmani kingdom. He established a camp in front of أودني (Adoni in the map). Sultān Muhammad ordered the army of Daulatābād to assemble (those of Bidar and Berar being exhausted with the campaign against Tilang) and after proper religious observances set out to oppose the Rāya of Bijānagar. The latter
by rapid marches, with a large body of horse and foot to the country of Badhūl, and had seized the fort and made martyrs of the Mussalmans

being assured of safety owing to the Krishna being in flood was engaged in besieging the fort of Mudkal (Madgall in the map N.-W. of Adoni). The fort was at last taken, and all the garrison was put to the sword, except one man who concealed himself and who escaping from the fort and crossing the Krishna, went and gave information to Muhammad Shāh at Hasanābād Gulbarga. I have stated in an early part of this note that Badhūl may be identical with Mudhal; but from the context of both the Tabaqāt and Firishtah Mudkal is more likely to be identical with Badhūl.

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

A long time had not elapsed after this, that swift messengers brought the news, that 1 Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy had placed also encamped at a distance of three or four karohs. The Sultān then convened a majlis, but still feigning illness left it early. He then sent for his commanders in secret, and ordered them to array the army for battle. At midnight he joined the army, and advanced towards the Bijānagar camp; where the Rāy and his commanders, presuming on the Sultān's illness were engaged in drinking and looking at the dancing of Naught-girls. When they became aware of the Sultān's approach, they were completely helpless, and the Rāy fled, and did not draw rein till he arrived at Bijānagar. There the people reviled and reproached him; and he at their instance sent emissaries to the Sultān to sue for peace. The latter was at first unwilling to grant their request, but demanded that his original demand for the payment of the musicians should be complied with. The emissaries at once agreed, and in fact there and then paid the amount. Then at the request of the emissaries, the Sultān said that hereafter he would never order the massacre of prisoners and the general slaughter of the people. After this he returned to his capital.

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

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

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

2Suddenly the hand of 3 death tore asunder the garment of life on his body; and drew off the robe of life from his soft bosom.

Verses:

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

---

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

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

3 One MS. substitutes َأَجَلَ for َنَا.
Be not secure that this turbulent stream,  
Hath forgotten its habit of devouring men.  
The period of his reign was eighteen years and seven months.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF MUJAHID SHĀH.

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

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

2 According to Firishtah, Mujahid Shāh wrote to the Rāy of Bijānagar, that the territory and the forts between the rivers Krishnā and the Tungābhadrā were held jointly by them; and there were, therefore, many disputes between them. It would, therefore, be better if the Rāy would cede that territory to him. The Rāy did not agree, and said that the whole of the tract had from ancient times belonged to Bijānagar, and should be left in his possession. Mujahid Shāh then collected his army, and crossing the Tungābhadrā laid siege to Udnā (Adoni). He left Safdar Khān Sistānī to carry on the siege, and marched quickly towards purgana Kankawati, where he was informed that Kishan Rāy (according to Mr. Sewell his real name was Bukka I) was encamped.

The people informed the Sultān of a ferocious and man-eating tiger that infested the jungle there, and he, with only seven companions, entered the forest, on foot, and when the tiger made its appearance, he told his companions to do nothing, and with his first arrow he shot the animal dead. This so frightened Kishan Rāy, that although he had a large army, he fled into the trackless forests (Mr. Sewell says the forests in the valley of Sandūr), and the Sultān pursued him for six or seven months. Then Kishan Rāy and his sons fell ill. He said he had been wandering about in the forest, because he had thought that the Sultān would fall ill, but instead of that he himself had fallen ill. He then went to Bijānagar and fortified himself. The Sultān left his commanders, to carry on the siege of Bijānagar, and himself went on to Setban (Setubandha) Rāmpār (the site of the bridge built by Rāma); and there he repaired a mosque, which Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Khālji had built; and demolished the idol temples. As regards this see Sewell, pp. 41, 42, and also notes in Briggs' History, II, pp. 332, 333.

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

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

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

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

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

A NARRATIVE OF THE REIGN OF DĀŪD SHĀH, 3 son of the uncle of Mujāhid Shāh.

After the assassination of Mujāhid Shāh, 4 Dāūd Khān, who was the son of his uncle, took his place on the throne of sovereignty, and

---

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

2 See note 1. He was an uncle and not a cousin of Mujāhid Shāh.

3 See the preceding note.

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

2 An account of the reign of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, son of Mahmūd, son of Bahman Shāh.

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

1 The account of the reign of Dāūd Shāh, as given by Firishtah, does not differ much from that given in the text. Firishtah, however, says, that the amirs did not at first all unite in acknowledging him. There were two parties; one on the side of Dāūd Shāh, while the other was in favour of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh the youngest son of Sultān ‘Ala-ud-din Hasan; but Malik Nāb Saif-ud-din Ḥūrī had the public prayers read in the name of Dāūd Shāh, in spite of the opposition of the sister of Mujāhid Shāh, who bore the name of Rūh Parwar ᴜғha. She persuaded a young man of the name of Bāka, who had been high in the favour of Mujāhid Shāh, on account of his sincerity and bravery, to avenge his patron’s murder; and he agreed to devote his life in the attempt. On Friday, the 21st of Muharram, 780 A.H., May 19th, 1378 A.D., he slew Dāūd Shāh in the Jāma’ mosque, and was himself cut down by Masnad ‘Ali Muḥammad Khān. According to Firishtah, Dāūd Shāh reigned for one month and nine days. According to the list in the note on page 40 of Grant Duff’s History of the Maharratas, he reigned for about one month. It is said there also that he was assassinated at the instigation of Roopurwur Agah.

3 The history of the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, which extended to nineteen years, is given by Nizām-ud-din in a few lines. Apparently he knew very little
of mention has come under my notice among the particulars connected with him. Towards the end of his life the thanadar of about the history of the reign. Even the name is incorrect, the correct name according to Firishtah being Sultan Mahmud Shah; but see note 2 in page 47 of Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar", from which it would appear that the name on all the coins of this Sultan is Muhammad (Dr. Codrington, Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd series, Vol. XVIII, page 201) and not Mahmud; and this is confirmed by the Burhan-i-Ma'asir and two other authorities (Major King, in Indian Antiquary, July, 1899, page 183, note 39) so that, after all, Nizam-ud-din is right and Firishtah wrong. But the Sultan's relationship with the previous Sultan was probably not known to Nizam-ud-din. According to Firishtah he was the youngest son of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din Hasan, the founder of the dynasty; and Mr. Sewell also says that he was 'Ala-ud-din's youngest son. But according to one MS. of the Tabaqat he was the son of Mahmud, son of Bahman Shah; and according to the other he was the son of Mahmud, son of Shah Bahmani; and according to the lith. ed., he was the son of Mahmud, son of Husain Shah. The name of Bahman Shah (incorrectly Shah Bahmani) supports the statement made by the Cambridge History of India that the founder of the dynasty styled himself Bahman Shah. The Husain Shah of the lith. ed. is of course a mistake for Hasan Shah. As I am not translating Firishtah's history, it is not necessary for me to go through the whole of the history of the reign, as written by him, which extends over nearly three quarto pages of closely printed lithograph. I can only refer to such portions of it as will explain the one fact, which is mentioned in a very doubtful form, at the end of Nizam-ud-din's account.

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

1 An account of the reign of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn.

Ghiyās-ud-dīn sat on the masnad of sovereignty in the place of his father, on the 7th Rajab; and all the amirs and the attendants send a body of chosen men to the gate, when he would be able to capture the fort. In accordance with this plan the fort was seized. The reference to Sāghir or Sāgar as it is called in the Cambridge History of India is brief and, I venture to think, slightly confused. It is said there that Muhammad II imprisoned Khān Muhammad, who had been a general in the service of Muhammad I, but who had afterwards been Dāūd’s principal supporter, in the fortress of Sāgar, where he shortly afterwards died, and punished his accomplices.

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

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

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

As 1 Sultān Shams-ud-din sat on the masnad of sovereignty, by the exertions of Taghalji the amirs and the great men made their submission to him, but the two 2 Shāhzādas Firuz Khān and Ahmad hand. The Sultān, who was a lad of seventeen, and was more or less intoxicated made a struggle for his life, and tried to escape. Taghalchīn caught him by the hair of his head and rooted out his eyes, with the point of his dagger. He then sent for the nobles and the attendants of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-din, on the pretext that the latter was calling for them; and as they appeared, one by one, murdered 21 of them; and he then sent for the younger brother of Ghiyās-ud-din, who was called Shams-ud-din, and who was a lad fifteen years of age and placed him on the throne. Sultān Ghiyās-ud-din was kept in imprisonment, for two months, in the fort of Sāghir. It does not appear what happened to him after that.

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

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

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

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

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN FIRŪZ SHĀH.

Sultān Firūz Shāh was a bāḏshāh of great splendour and magnificence and vigour and learning and wisdom. He sat on the throne of grandeur on 1 Thursday, the 24th Safar 800 A.H. 2 In the splendid
period of the days of his rule, the laws of generosity and the customs of truth and honesty and the foundation of justice and equity became stronger. And all sections of the people had peace and comfort under the wings of his justice and beneficence.

Couplet:

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

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

As all matters connected with his government were properly regulated after his accession, he made the 1 conquest of Bijānagar the

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

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

Kolis headed by a Hindú chieftain on the north bank of the Krishná. Firishtah
also says that when Sultán Firúz was still at Sākhir, news was brought that
Narsingh Rāy the ruler of the fort of Kehrlā (Wali Qila’-i-Kehrlā, the Hindu
kingdom of Kerala) or more properly perhaps the Rāja of Kehrlā as Col. Briggs
describes himself, had invaded the country of Berár and plundered and devastated
as far as the fort of Māhūr and had caused much insult and loss to many
Musalmáns; and that he had done this at the instigation, and with the aid of the
rulers of Mandū and Asf (i.e., the Muhammadan kings of Máliwa and Khandesh),
and also at the instigation and motion of the Rāy of Bijná Nagar. The Sultán had,
therefore, to send back the armies of Berár and Daulātábād to redress these
matters; and he himself started for the Krishná with twelve thousand horsemen.
This invasion by the Rāja of Kehrlá has not been mentioned by Nizám-ud-dín;
but the Cambridge History of India agrees with Firishtah. It calls the Rāja of
Kehrlá, Narsingh the good Rāja of Kherlā.

Firishtah does not say that Firúz Shāh wanted to conquer Bijná Nagar. On
the other hand he has a great deal to say about the Sultán’s harem, which
contained nine ladies from Arabia, nine from ‘Ajam, besides ladies from Turkey,
Firang (Europe), Khita (China), and Afghanistán and Rájputána and Bengál
and Gujrát and Tílang and Kanará and Mahratta. These ladies had attendants
from their own countries, so that they might conform to their own customs, and
speak their own languages; and the Sultán conversed with every one of them in
her own language.

Firishtah also says that according to various historians he carried on
Cizāz (religious war) with the Káfirs twenty-four times, that Mulla Dádd Bidarl,
and the author of the Siraj-ut-tawárkh have described some of them in detail;
but he does not himself mention particulars of any of them. Then he goes on
to say that in the year 801 A.H. Dád Ráy of Bijná Nagar invaded the Doab of the
Tungábhadrá and the Krishná with a large army for the conquest of the forts of
Mudkál and Ráichore and some of the parganas in their neighbourhood.

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

It would appear, therefore, that instead of what Nizām-ud-dīn says about Firūz Shāh's martial spirit inditing him to invade Bijānagar, he was only compelled to march towards Bijānagar to repel the invasion of Bukka II.

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

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

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

---

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

2 The words in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are در انبیہ مراد; in the other MS. they are در انبیہ مراد و مطلمہ.

3 The account of what the Qazi and his companions did is given in much greater detail by Firishtah; and there are also many differences in matters of detail, which it is not necessary to mention here, except that according to Firishtah, the Qazi and one of his companions entered the majlis having assumed the female garb, ogling and smilling and dancing and playing on the mandals; and making no doubt very grotesque figures of themselves. One matter of detail is however of very considerable importance, namely that it was the Ray's son and not the Ray himself, that was holding the majlis and that it was the Ray's son that was assassinated. This is confirmed by Mr. Sewell also, who says that after his son had been murdered, "Bukka reached Vijayanagar in safety, and took refuge behind its fortifications".


and uproar of the Hindūs reached the Sultān, he in his own person crossed the river. He made that crowd, without a head, food for the sword, and those who escaped the sword were carried off as slaves. So much booty fell into his hands, that the accountant of time found it difficult to make a note of it all. The Sultān made Fulad Khān governor of that sūba, and returned to his capital. There he arranged a great festival, and made all the well-known amirs happy by his favours and great rewards. The grand assemblage and the festivities for the conquest of Bijānagar had not yet been concluded, that a messenger came from Badhūl, and submitted the report, that Deo Rāy had on account of his great pride and hauteur sent an army of three hundred thousand infantry to that neighbourhood, for the following reasons, viz., that he had

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

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

1 As to the beautiful maiden, Firishtah, on the authority of Mullah Dā'ud Bādārī says, that she was the daughter of a goldsmith who lived in a village in the neighbourhood of the town of Mudkal. Mr. Sewell apparently, on the authority of Firishtah makes her the daughter of a farmer living in the town of Mudkal; but both the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Col. Briggs say that she was the daughter of a goldsmith living in a village near Mudkal. According to the lith. ed. of Firishtah her name was Fīrūz, Parthāl and Mr. Sewell calls her Parthāl, but Col. Briggs gives her the name of Nehāl. Her parents, following the customs of the country, wanted to betroth her in her girlhood to a youth of her own caste, but she prayed that the ceremony might be delayed, with such earnestness, that they consented. Then a Brahman, who was returning from Benares saw her and was struck with her beauty. He taught her music and dancing, and they went to Bijānagar, and went to the Ray. According to Mr. Sewell the reigning Ray was Bukka II's successor and brother, Deva Ray I, who began to reign in November, 1406 A.D. On hearing the Brahman's account of the girl's beauty and accomplishments, the Ray sent him back with rich gifts to bring the girl, and her parents to Bijānagar. The parents were overjoyed, but when they attempted to throw a beautiful jewelled necklace, which the Brahman had brought, around her neck, and the wearing of which would be the mark of her betrothal, she with tears besought them to desist, and told them, that if she became a Rāni of Bijānagar, she would never again be allowed to see them or any of her other relations. Her parents acceded to her tearful requests, and the Brahman had to go back disappointed to Bijānagar. The maiden afterwards told her parents that she had long had an inward conviction, that she was destined to be the wife of a prince of the faith of Islām; and asked them to await the will of Providence.  Nizām-ud-din does not say so, but it may be mentioned here, in passing, that she afterwards became the wife of Hasan Khan, the son of Sultan Firūz, who died not, however, succeed him.

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

1 Firishtah places this campaign in 802 A.H. 1399 A.D., long before the war against Bijanagar, which took place in 809 A.H. The campaign, according to Firishtah, was also of longer duration. Narsingh Ray the Raja of Kehral (Nizam-ud-din calls him Harsingh Ray) met the Sultan's army, at a distance of two manzils or stages from his capital (Col. Briggs says two days from Kehral); and there was a severe conflict, and the Sultan's army was at first beaten, and it was reported that the Khan Khannan had been slain. Mir Fazl-ul-lah, however, fought bravely; and he was joined by the Khan Khannan; the Hindies were defeated and Kosal Ray (called Gopal Ray by Col. Briggs) the son of Narsingh Ray was taken prisoner. Kehral was then besieged, and after two months the garrison being reduced to great distress, Narsingh sued for peace, which was soon concluded; Narsingh Ray giving one of his daughters, in marriage, to the Sultan, and also valuable presents including 46 elephants and a large sum of money.
He then traversed many stages, and arriving at Kehrlā (the ancient Kerala), laid siege to that fortress and devastated the country all round it. Harsingh Rāy the Rāy of Kehrlā, having with great humility, made his submission petitioned for the pardon of his offences; and bringing some valuable presents, gems and gold, and twenty \(^1\) chains of elephants came to render homage; and presented the keys of the forts. The Sultān gave him a seat in front of the throne, and having given him Arab horses and a gold embroidered robe and a jewelled belt gave him permission to go back (to his capital).

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

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

---

\(^1\) The word سلسلة, \textit{Sisila} a chain. I have never seen it used before, with reference to elephants. The expression for an elephant is \textit{ek zinjir} \textit{fil}. \textit{Sisila} probably is synonymous with \textit{zinjir}. A \textit{halqa} of elephants is the collective name for one hundred elephants.

\(^2\) Firishtah mentions the building of Firūzābād, but the date of the building of the city cannot be ascertained. From what is said in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, it would appear that Firūz Shāh's love for fair women had something to do with the building of the city. It is said there سلطان فیروز شاه چوں بزنگی نیپور کے ری ٹیوس زیب زیبی نام داشت شہبہ نے کہا کہہ موسوم بیفوئز ایاد بناء کوری نہتی باکریش گردارید. Col. Briggs, however, does not say anything of the kind. He simply says, “Firūz Shāh built a town on the bank of the river Beema”. Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs says anything about the flowing water being brought into all the houses; but they say that a canal was brought from the river into the fort, and along this, kiosks were built for the ladies. It may be mentioned here, that the palace at Firūzābād was, later on, allotted by Ahmad Shāh, the next Sultān, to Hasan Khān, the indolent and lotus-eating son of Firūz Shāh.
And about this time, news came that Amir Saiyyad Muhammad Gisū-darāz, who was one of the holy men of the age, and among the disciples of Shaikh Nasir-ud-din Muhammad Dāūdi, was coming from the direction of Dehli. His Majesty the Sultān was highly pleased and happy on account of the grandeur of the noble advent of that great Saiyyad, and went forward to welcome him. After having the pleasure of meeting him, the Sultān suggested that as that country had now become illuminated by the reflection of the sun of his grandeur, he hoped that the shadow of the safety conferred by his presence should continue to be spread over the people of the country. His holiness the Saiyyad acceded to the prayer, and took up his residence in the city of Gulbarga.

1 Firishtah places the arrival in 815 A.H., 1412 A.D.

2 He is called Amir Saiyyad Muhammad Gisū-Darāz in one MS., and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. and in Firishtah he is called Mīr Saiyyad Muhammad Gisū-Darāz. There is considerable difference between the statements of Nizām-ud-din and Firishtah as to the treatment accorded to the holy man. According to the former, Firūz Shāh showed great respect and reverence to him, but he was annoyed with him when he refused to bless his son Hasan Khān, and said that Ahmad Khān, his brother, and not Hasan Khān, would succeed him. On the other hand Firishtah says that Firūz Shāh at first received him with great respect, but when he found him deficient in فنون عالم و فنون عالم خصوصاً معرفات, i.e., natural sciences, specially those founded on the reasoning faculty, he did not pay him so much attention as before; but the king's brother Ahmad Khān had very great belief in him, and continued to attend on him. Nizām-ud-din says, that Firūz Shāh took his son Hasan Khān to the holy man, and telling him that he had made him his heir, asked for his benediction, when the Saiyyad told him that his son was not fashioned for the robe of a Sultān; but Firishtah says that Firūz Shāh, after declaring Hasan Khān his successor, and giving him all the paraphernalia of royalty, sent men to the Saiyyad for his blessings, the latter said, that when the Sultān had already declared Hasan Khān to be his successor, what necessity was there for his prayers in his favour. When the Sultān again sent men to him and asked with greater insistence for his prayers, then he said, that it was his brother, and not his son, that would succeed him.

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

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

built or erected by a descendant of the Saiyyad, Muhammad Amin Hussain in 640 A.D., in the reign of Muhammad 'Aḍil Shâh of Bijânpûr.

1 There are slight variations in the readings here. One MS. has حکایت، i.e., an anecdote, they say. The other MS. has only گوگند؛ they say; while the lith. ed. has رازیت کنند، they narrate.

2 According to Fīrūstah he did not march against Warangal or Telingâna, but in 820 A.H., 1417 A.D., he sent ambassadors to the Rây of Telingâna demanding arrears of tribute; and the latter sent enough in money and goods to satisfy him. Then Fīrūz Shâh marched against the fort of Pângal, which Fīrūstah says, was in his time called Bilkonda, and was situated at a distance of eighty faraangs (240 miles) from the fort of Adoni. Col. Briggs says in a note that at the present time Pângal has no other name, and is 70 miles from Adoni. Nizâm-ud-din apparently mixes up the two incidents of the demand of tribute from the Rây of Telingâna, and the siege of Pângal. He does not give the name of the fort, but it is clear that it was Pângal that he was referring to. It would appear, however, from what Nizâm-ud-din himself said, that Pângal was in Bijânpûragh and not in Telingâna; and Fīrūstah also says, that he besieged the fort, completely disregarding his relation with the Rây of Bijânpûragh.

Mr. Sewell, however, calls it the Warangal fortress Pângal (page 65).
climate of the place, most of the men and quadrupeds (in his army) were destroyed. When Deo Ray of Bijanagar became acquainted with what had happened, he took advantage of the opportunity, and sent a large army of cavalry and infantry, and obstructed the entrances and the exits. The Sultan was compelled, therefore, to leave the place for the return journey. Deo Ray's soldiers attacked the army with arrows and spears. The warriors belonging to the Sultan's army then attacked Deo Ray's troops, but as the ways were narrow they were unable to accomplish anything. They represented to the Sultan, that at such a crisis, it would be fit and proper for him to hasten away and reach a place of safety; for the safety of the army, they said, was bound up with the safety of the sovereign. The Sultan said, "How can it be allowed in the religion of manliness and humanity, that I should go to a place of safety, and leave my soldiers to perish or to be taken prisoners". At this juncture, a person having the form of a demon and the nature of an evil spirit, coming from the enemy's army, inflicted a wound on the Sultan, and fighting bravely, escaped out of the orbit of the Sultan's army. The amirs, seizing the Sultan's bridle took him out of the danger, and carried him away to Gulburga.

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

---

1 Firishtah's account is different, and altogether more probable. He says that Mir Fazl-ul-lah, rallying the soldiers, nearly defeated the Bijanagar army, when he was seduced by the promise of a high dignity by Deo Ray, killed him by inflicting a serious wound on his head. The Sultan's army was now routed, and the Sultan with the assistance of Ahmad Khan escaped, with the remnant of his army. Firishtah does not mention the Sultan's being wounded by a person with the form of a demon and the nature of an evil spirit.

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

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

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

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

Verses:

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

The Khān Khānān, desirous of rendering the rights, which his brother had by having trained him, and brought him up, went alone into the palace and kissed the ground of service. Firūz Shāh descended from the throne, and took him into his arms, and holding his hand led him up to the throne. He opened his mouth with pleasant and kind words, and filled Ahmad Khān’s ears, with the precious gems of advice. They both wept out of brotherly love, and Firūz Shāh commended his children to the care of his brother; and ¹ on the night of the 4th of Shawwāl 825 A.H., when the dawn raised its head over the turrets of the horizon, the hand of that marauder, Death, plundered the capital of his life. ² According to

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

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

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

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

1 A NARRATIVE OF THE REIGN OF SULTÁN AHMAD SHÁH BAHMANI.

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

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

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

He says و در بعضى كتب بنظر در امدة كه احمد شاه بوسوسة و تعريج خواهره زادة خود شير خان فيروز شاه را خفه كرده بكشت و الله عالم بعقيفت العال which may be translated as "And it has come to my notice, in some books, that Ahmad Sháh had Firúz Sháh strangled to death, at the instigation of his sister's son Shir Khán; but God only knows the real truth of the matter.

1 There are variations in the heading. One MS. has ذكر سلطان احمد شاه سلطان بن شیروز شاه بهم; the other leaves out the word ذكر. The reading in the lith. ed. ذكر سلطان احمد شاه بن شیروز شاه بهم is altogether incorrect. Ahmad Sháh was the brother, and not the son of Firúz Sháh.

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

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

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

1 The name appears to be written Qasāb in the MSS. and Tasāb in the lith. ed. It is Qasāb (butcher according to Col. Briggs) in Firishtah.
2 I cannot find any mention of this in Firishtah. On the other hand the latter says سلطان احمد شاه ……. خاص و عام را مطبع و منفادات خود ساخت و سرحد گجرات را با امرای معتبر سپرده خاطر اجازه طرف جمع کرد which means that Sultān Ahmad Shāh ……. made high and low submissive to himself, and placed the frontier of Gujrat in charge of trustworthy amirs, and thus assured his mind on that side.
3 Instead of the very vague and sketchy account of the campaign which follows, Firishtah has a long and graphic account, which may be summarised thus. The Sultān advanced with forty thousand horsemen to the Tungabhadrā. The Rāy of Bijnagar also advanced to the river, after summoning the Rāy of
advanced towards Bijnagar, on the first Nauroz after his accession. After traversing many stages, when he arrived within the territories

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

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

After a short time, the Sultān wrote a letter to Nasir Khān of Asir proposing a marriage for his true son Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; and sent it by the hand of 'Azīz Khān Nāmī. When the letter reached Nasir Khān, he agreed to the alliance, prepared the necessary things for the chaste and pure veiled one; and sent her with his sons and attendants and servants and troops to the capital (Ahmadābād Bidar or Gulbarga) so that the usual rites and ceremonies of festivity might be performed, and gave permission with all politeness and respect, to 'Azīz Khān to return. Sultān Ahmad welcomed the delightful advent of the guests with pleasure and gratitude, and made them happy with his great lavishness and

surrounded, and had to take shelter in a mud enclosure; but as he was riding, he was probably riding down antelope.

1 One MS. inserts the word مناسب (suitable), after مناسب.

2 The marriage, according to Firishtah, took place some time after 830 A.H., 1426 A.D., and after the expeditions to Talingāna, which according to Nizām-ud- dīn occurred in 828 and 828 respectively, so that according to the correct chronological order, the account of the marriage should succeed and not precede the account of the Talingāna campaign. The ruler of Asir is called Nasir Khān ruler of Asir. He claimed to be a descendant of his holiness 'Umar Fārūq, in the Persian text of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs calls him "Nuseer Khān Farookey ruler of Kandesh". The bride was sent, according to Firishtah, to Ahmadābād Bidar, and was lodged in a garden outside the city. The festivities continued for two months, and the bride was brought into the city, and at an auspicious moment the marriage took place.
benefactions; and spread the shadow of safety and of his kindness on the guests and the residents; and kept open the gates of pleasure and enjoyment, so that men might occupy themselves in various pleasures; and take what was due to them from the cup bearer of time. The Sultān summoned the Qāzīs and the learned men, and the men possessing the knowledge of God, and the great men of the city and arranged the marriage assembly; and (afterwards) he sent back the sons and the adherents of Nasīr Khān after showing them every honour, and conferring on them many marks of his kindness.

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

---

1 The meaning is not quite clear. The actual words are از ساتی وقت داد خود بسکانند, according to the MSS. The lith. ed. has از ساتی داد وقت خود نسکانند.

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

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

In the year 829 A.H., news came that the Rāy of Māhūr had strayed from the path of allegiance, and was bent on war and bloodshed. Sultān Ahmad Shāh collected an army, which was beyond all calculation, and advanced to punish him. The Rāy fortified himself in the fort of Māhūr. The Dakini army ravaged the neighbourhood of the fort, and rased everything to the ground. In the end the Rāy came forward with humility and repentance, and joined the band of the Sultān’s 1 loyal adherents; and whatever had been in his possession came again into the Sultān’s possession.

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

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

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

a diamond mine, which had up to that time been in the possession of the ruler of Gondwara.

1 The date of these transactions is not given either by Nizâm-ud-din, or by Firishtah, but it appears that they took place between 829 and 833 A.H.

2 The meaning of this is not clear; but the following passage from Firishtah, who after saying that the Sultân made 'Alâ-ud-din his heir says و برادر کوچک اور شاہزادہ محمد خان گدا کوچک ترنس فرندان برق شریک شامی وی گرداند which means, that he made his (i.e., 'Ala-ud-din's) youngest brother, Shâhzâda Muhammad Khân who was his youngest son, co-sharer in the kingdom with him (i.e., with 'Alâ-ud-din).

3 According to Firishtah the distribution was different. He says Ramgar (Ramgar according to Col. Briggs) and Mâhûr and Kalan and a small part of Berar were given to Shâhzâda Mahmûd Khân; and Shâhzâda Dâûd Khân was sent, with the insignia of royalty, and some old and trustworthy amîrs to assume the government of Tilang.

4 It may be mentioned that the four noble classes of the community here mentioned somewhat resemble the four sections of the Indian people as originally classified by the Indian Nátrás of Brâhma, Kshatriya, Vaisya, and Südra, though of course they were not castes, as they later became in India. Firishtah
esteem; viz. first, learned men, for their minds are the fountains of philosophy and Divine knowledge; second, writers, as this great band adorn the cheek of the country, and the face of the state, with constructive guidance, by the tongues of their pens.

Couplet:

As the Shāh-in-shāh's sword lays the foundation of the state,
The tongue of the pen, of rules becomes its guide.

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

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

---

1 The words the meaning of which is obscure appear to be بحعل تعمیر in one MS., and in the lith. ed. and تعمیر in the other MS.

2 The words here are also somewhat obscure. The words in one MS. are لمعان نواسان فننة نشان تکامبان دین و دولت; the other MS. has left out the whole passage from لمعان to لمعان. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MS. but substitutes نواسان, نواسان, نواسان, and نواسان for تکامبان, تکامبان, تکامبان, and تکامبان. I think that نواسان and نواسان are both incorrect; and the proper reading should be نواسان نواسان نواسان نواسان. I have adopted this reading.

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

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

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

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

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

Khân, the grandson of Isma'il Fatî, respectively, and the centre under Shâhzâda 'Alâ-ud-dîn. He placed four hundred elephants in different groups, and himself with three thousand selected horsemen and twelve elephants remained in ambush. Sultân Húshang arrived with seventeen thousand horsemen; and before he could arrange his troops, the battle began, and Sultân Húshang was defeated, as mentioned in the text.

1 This is the battle referred to in the latter part of the last note.
2 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. call it شَهِر بَدْر, the city of Bedar or Bidar; but Firishtah in the corresponding passage says و سُلُطَان در هِمِان پُرِش چِوٯ
they found the ground verdant, and the fields pleasing to the heart, and the Sultān selected the place for his capital; and at the moment fixed by the astrologers, laid the foundation brick of the citadel in the ground, and divided it among the amirs; and for the palace, made a plan of a grand mansion. After its completion, the poets, who had accompanied him in the journey, composed verses to be used as inscriptions on it. Shaikh Āzuri, who was with him in that expedition, wrote some couplets which were inscribed on the gate.

Couplets:

Oh brave! such a palace strong, that for its grandeur great,
The sky itself is the threshold of its gates sublime,
The sky could not say, that this transgresses courtesy’s rule,
'Tis the palace of the world emperor Ahmad Shāh Bahman.

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

When the country of the Deccan was purified of the weeds of all enemies, and came into the uncontested possession of Sultān Ahmad,
he, in the year 835 A.H., marched to capture the fort of Tanbūl, which is situated on the boundary of Gujrāt, and arriving near it by successive marches, surrounded it. When the siege had been prolonged for two years, Sultān Ahmad of Gujrāt, at last, with great amity and courtesy sent an emissary with this message: “If this faqīr had been present at the (wedding?) festivities of Shāhzāda ‘Alā-ud-dīn, he (Sultān Ahmad Bahmani) would have shown him some courtesy. It is now the power of the faqīr, that in place of that courtesy, he would leave this fort in the possession of its owner”. Sultān Ahmad Bahmani, turning from the high way of generosity and the path of politeness, began to take the course of having a consultation on the matter. Some of his vazīrs said that the right of gift can only be exercised, if the fort comes into his (i.e., the Sultān’s) possession; while another body said that the prayer of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī should be honoured with the courtesy of acceptance. The Sultān preferred the first opinion; and sent a reply, that when the fort should come into his possession, it would be made over to his (Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī’s) servants. The latter was enraged on receiving this reply, and sent a large body of troops to reinforce the garrison of the fort; and when this news reached the ear of Sultān Ahmad Bahmani, he withdrew his forces from the foot

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

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

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

---

1 The following incidents which occurred in 836 and 837 A.H. and which are mentioned by Firishtah have not been referred to by Nizam-ud-din: (1) the completion of the city of Ahmadabad Bidar in 836 A.H.; and (2) the execution, by order of Sultan Ahmad, of his nephew Shhr Khan, at whose instigation he had caused FiruZ Shah to be strangled to death, and whose continued existence appeared to be likely to be the cause of his son being deprived of the empire. This also was in 836. And in 837 A.H., Hushang Shah of Malwa, seeing the hostility between the Sultans of the Dakin and of Gujrat, invaded the territory of Narsingh Ray, and the latter was slain in battle, and Hushang Shâh seized the fort of Kehrla. Then Sultan Ahmad advanced towards Kehrla when Nâsr Khan of Asir intervened; and peace was concluded on the condition that Kehrla should belong to Sultan Hushang and Berar to Sultan Ahmad. After that Ahmad Shâh marched into Talingana, and after his return he ordered Shhr Malik to be thrown under the feet of an elephant. This was mentioned by Nizam-ud-din in the beginning of his account of Sultan Ahmad's reign. Firishtah also gives a rather long account of Sultan Ahmad's veneration for learned and holy people, and of his sending emissaries to Shâh Nis'amat-ul-lah of Kirmân, and the latter's sending one of his favourite disciples, Mullâ Qutb-ud-din, and later on his grandson Mir Nur-ul-lah.

After Shâh Nis'amat-ul-lah's death, his son Shâh Khâllî-ul-lah came to the Deccan with his family, and his sons Shâh Habib-ul-lah and Shâh Muhibb-ul-lah. Shâh Habib-ul-lah married a daughter of Sultan Ahmad Shâh, and Shâh Muhibb-ul-lah, a daughter of Sultan Alä-ud-din and they attained to great distinction. One of them was distinguished as a military commander and received the title of Qhab, and the town of Bir and the surrounding country as his jâigir,
God would forgive my offences”. He delivered his life to the creator
of life between sunset and the time of sleeping at night, on the 20th
of Rajab with the text of the unity of God on his tongue. The
period of his reign was twelve years and nine months and twenty-
four days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTÁN ‘ALÁ-UD-DIN, 2 SON OF
AHMAD SHÁH

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

---

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

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

3 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have Sultán Ahmad Sháh; but this
is clearly a mistake, and I have corrected it to ‘Alá-ud-din Sháh.

4 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has شهرت عظيم
کرده; the other omits the word عظيم پانده; while the lith. ed. has
شهرت عظيم پانده. I have adopted شهرت عظيم پانده.

5 This agrees with Firishtah, who however says that Diláwar Khán was
made Vaktí-ush-Sháhí. He also says that Khwaja-i-Jahán Astrábádí was made
Vasír Kul, (Minister-in-charge of all departments), and 'Imád-ul-mulk Ghúrí
was made Amir-ul-Umrán.
In the year 839 A.H., Nasir Khan, son of 'Alam Khan, the ruler of Asir, raided a part of the territories of the Dakini kingdom. The

Firishtah does not mention this invasion of 839 by Nasir Khan, who, it will be remembered, was Sultân 'Alâ ud-dîn's father-in-law; but contrary to what is said here, he says that in 841 Aghâ Zainab, who had the title of Malka-i-Jahân, Sultân 'Alâ-ud-dîn's queen, and the daughter of Nasir Khan, sent a letter to the latter, that the Sultân was altogether cold to herself, and was paying all attention to the daughter of the Raja of Sonkehr (which Col. Briggs says has not been identified), whom Dilâwar Khan had, after defeating her father, brought with him, and had presented to the Sultân, who was charmed by her beauty, and her great knowledge of music, and had given her the name of Zib Chehra (Col. Briggs calls her Peri Chehra) (having the face of a fairy). On receiving this letter, Nasir Khan planned the conquest of Berâr. The Sultân of Gujrat promised to support him. Nasir Khan also made secret overtures to the amirs of Berâr; and they promised to join him as he was a descendant of 'Umâr Fâruq and they would become Ghâzis and Shahids if they died fighting on his side; and he marched into Berâr, with his own army, and that sent by the Raja of Gondwâra. The Berâr amirs wanted to take Khan Jahân, the governor of Berâr, prisoner, and to take him to Nasir Khan; but he shot himself up in the fort of Tarnâla (Col. Briggs calls it Tarnala) and sent a report to Sultân 'Alâ ud-dîn. The latter held a council of war, when the amirs suggested that the Sultân should march in person against Nasir Khan, as the latter would be joined very probably by the Sultâns of Gujrat and Mâlwa, as well as the Rây of Gondwâra. The Sultân suspecting treachery on the part of his advisers appointed Khâlîf Hasan Malik-ut-tujjâr to the command of the army. The latter accepted the appointment, but pointed out that his defeat at Mahâim was due to the treachery of the Dakini and Habshi amirs, who were envious of the foreigners like himself. He hoped to be successful, if the Sultân placed under him only foreigners (Mughals), without any Dakinis or Halshlas. The Sultân complied with his prayer; and he marched to Daulatâbâd, where he deputed the Dakini and Abyssinian amirs to guard the frontier of Gujrat and Mâlwa. Then with seven thousand 'Arab horsemen he marched into Berâr. At this time Khan Jahân came out of Tarnâla and joined him. Khâlîf Hasan sent him to Elichpur to prevent the Rây of Gondwâra to enter Berâr by that route, and himself marched to Rohankehra where Nasir Khan was encamped. At the foot of the ghâât he was met by a body of Khândesh troops, whom he routed with great slaughter. Nasir Khan, considering this defeat to be an evil omen, retreated with precipitation to Burhânpûr. Khâlîf Hasan, after recovering possession of the neighbouring country, pursued Nasir Khan to Burhânpûr. The latter was unable to meet him, and shut himself up in the fort of Laling. (Col. Briggs says, in a note, that Laling is a small and now insignificant fort, but Nasir Khan apparently considered it his safest retreat).
Sultan sent Khalf Hasan Malik-ut-tujjar to oppose Nasir Khan. After the parties had met, Nasir Khan fled, and went back to Asir. Malik-ut-tujjar pursued him as far as Asir, and after raiding and laying waste the part of that territory returned; and in the same year Nasir Khan became the subject of the inevitable (i.e., died); and according to another statement, this happened in the year 840 A.H.

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

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

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

Firistah’s account is somewhat different. He says that Shahrzada Muhammad Khan was sent with ‘Imad-ul-mulk Ghuri, who was made Amir-ul-Umra, and Khwaja Jahang against Bijanagar, as the Ray had not sent five years’ tribute. They marched into Canara, and began to plunder and ravage the country. The Ray in great distress sent the tribute with valuable presents. When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Mudkal, some discontented officers told Muhammad Khan that the Sultan should either place him by his own side on the masnad, and allow him to act with himself in the management of affairs, or should give him half the kingdom. The Shahrzada was deceived by these words; and he tried to induce ‘Imad-ul-mulk and Khwaja Jahang to join him. They refused to do so, whereupon they were
to conquer Bijānagar. 1Malik 'Imād-ud-dīn Ghūrī, who was in those parts from before the time when the Shāhzāda was sent, when he heard that the Shāhzāda had arrived at the bank of the river Krishnā, joined his army without any hesitation. As the Shāhzāda was not satisfied with the fact that the kingdom should belong to the Sultān, and was waiting for an opportunity, he put Malik 'Imād-ud-dīn, who was perfectly innocent, to death, and raised the standard of revolt and hostility. The Sultān, on receiving information of these occurrences, advanced to punish Muhammad Khān. When the armies met, victory and triumph blew on the plumes of 'Alā-ud-dīn's standards. Muhammad Khān frightened and depressed fled with shame and disgrace.

Couplet:

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

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

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

1 The wording of the sentence in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. appears to me to be somewhat illogical. It is ملك عمام الدين غوري جند where ملك عمام الدين غوري جند. The proper form of the sentence would be ملك عمام الدين غوري که قبل از فرسودات شاه زاده دران سرحد بود چهار شهر شنید که وی بکتار اب کس رصید; and I have changed the sentence and translated accordingly.
uncle of the Sultan, who had been in the army of Muhammad Khan, was brought before him. The Sultan pardoned his offence, and granted favours to him. When he was again firmly seated on the masnad of government, he sent a farmân containing much good advice to Muhammad Khan to the following effect: that God the ruler of the world and all who are in it chooses whomsoever He likes among the created beings; and as the rule of eternal grace draws the line of distinction on the page of the condition of that chosen one, He entrusts the keys of success and greatness in the world into the grasp of his power. The tree of grandeur which is watered by the stream of Divine favour never receives any injury from the whirlwinds of calamity; and the sublime mansion which is raised by eternal grace is not endangered by the engines of deceit and treachery.

Couplet:

One who is made great by Him, the sky cannot make him small;

One who is made dear by Him, the world never can wreck.

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

---

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

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

---

1 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have 849 A.H., but this is clearly incorrect. Firishtah has Naṣir Khān, Sangesar in the lith. ed. Firishtah, lith. ed., has Sangesar, but Col. Briggs says the situation of the place has not been ascertained. There is a place called Sangameswar in the map attached to Elphinston's history, not far from the coast, about half way between Jinnah and Gheria, which may be the place. There is not much difference between the names in the map and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. The latter only requires a to be inserted.

2 The name is Sakar in one MS. Shankar in the other and Sirkay is mentioned in the index with 129 against it; but I have not been able to find it in that page or elsewhere.

3 Col. Briggs says in a note in page 437 of Vol. II of his translation of Firishtah that "Sirka or more properly Sirkey (the Sirkey of the excellent Maratta History) is the name of one of the most ancient families of the Konkan. The mother of the present Rāja of Satāra was of that house." I have consulted Grant Duff's History of the Marhattas. Sirkey is mentioned in the index with 129 against it; but I have not been able to find it in that page or elsewhere.
the acceptance of Islām. That deceitful man told him, ¹ "You will gain nothing by slaying me, but the difficulties of the road and the great extent of the jungle are known to everybody. If you allow me to live, I shall lead the army, by a road in which not a single thorn will reach the skirts of any horseman." The Malik-ut-tujjār trusting his words made him the pioneer of the army and its guide, and commenced to traverse that country. Although the leaders of the army told him, that it was not proper to place any reliance on the words of an enemy, he did not pay any attention to their words; and the misleading guide took them along a road the sight of which, would have frightened even a demon. They were at last brought to a place on three sides of which there were hills and jungles, and on the fourth side, a deep ravine of water which flowed into the jungle; and at this place Sarka gave intimation to the enemy; and that midnight about forty thousand foot soldiers fell on them; and Khalf Hasan with a body of Musalmāns became martyrs; and the remnant of the army, with great trouble and privation returned to ² Jālna, which was Khalf Hasan's place of residence.

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

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

² Called जाक्ता Jākta in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, where it is described
The Dakini vāzīrā, in whose creed enmity to the great was ingrained, reported these matters to Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn in a very

as the

نشیمکہ خلف حسن بصري

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have بقصد جاالتة, as I have in the text. But the other MS. has بقصد جاالتة, 1 to the town of Jālānā.

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

As the Rāys of Kōkan (Concan) vaunted of their independence, and did not make their submission, the Sultān nominated Dilāwar Kāhn to conquer that country, after conferring on him a special robe of honour; and sent farmāns to the amirs on the frontier that they should collect their men and should join Dilāwar Kāhn. When the latter arrived at the town of 3 Kankūla, 4 he sent Asad Kāhn and

1 Contrary to this Firishtah says: و برایت طبقت مجدد شاهرالملك دکن و نظام الملك غربی در همان مال بعلت برس گرفتار کشته.

2 It appears to me that Nizām-ud-din describes these events, which, according to Firishtah, happened before the invasion by and defeat of Nasīr Kāhn, and the invasion of the Konkan by Khalf Hasan, and the latter's death. (See the early part of note 1, p. 61.) It may be mentioned here that Nizām-ud-din's account differs from Firishtah's in three main particulars: (1) As already mentioned Nizām-ud-din places the expedition at a date long posterior to that of Firishtah. Firishtah says that Dilāwar Kāhn started on the expedition on the Nauroz (Muharram 1st) of 840 A.H. Nizām-ud-din gives no date, but he mentions it after the death of Khalf Hasan and connected events, which took place according to Firishtah in 858 A.H., though Nizām-ud-din unfortunately does not give any date; (2) Firishtah says that Dilāwar Kāhn sent the daughter of the Rāya of Sangesar or Sonkehr, who received the name of Zihā Chehra, and became the cause of Nasīr Kāhn's invasion of Berār, and his subsequent defeat. Nizām-ud-din says that Dilāwar Kāhn sent the daughters of two Rāyas, viz., those of Sangesar and Rāhal, but he does not say anything about what happened to them after they arrived in the Sultān's camp; and (3) Nizām-ud-din says vaguely that the Sultān turned against Dilāwar Kāhn at the instigation of envious people; but Firishtah says, that the Sultān learnt that Dilāwar Kāhn had received bribes from the Rāyas of Konkan, and had not done his best to reduce their fortresses. Firishtah also says that after Dilāwar Kāhn had retired, the eunuch Dastūr-ul-mulk was placed in charge of affairs.

3 Kankūla does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. He only mentions according to the lith. ed. the Rāys of Rāhal and Sangesar. Col. Briggs calls them the Rāys of Sonkehr and Rairee. As to Sangesar or Sonkehr see. p. 61, note 2.

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

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

1 The name looks like رايل, or Railed in the MSS. It is رايل in the lith. ed.
2 Surah lith. ed. also has راهل; and I have accordingly retained Rahl.
3 Briggs has Rairee.
4 There are differences of readings here also. One MS. has صدر خان و ولاد خان و جمعي كه در نسب اموال و غارت ارواح شروع كرمن the other MS. has صدر خان و ولاد خان و جمعي كه در نسب اموال و غارت ارواح شروع كرمن the lith. has صدر خان و ولاد خان و جمعي كه در نسب اموال و غارت ارواح شروع كرمن the 2nd MS. and the lith. ed. appear to me to be nearly correct, but the word كه should be omitted, and a ك inserted before جمعي in the lith. ed.
5 This campaign is mentioned both by Firishah and by Mr. Sewell. The year given by Nizam-ud-din, 847 A.H. (1443 A.D.) is correct; but the campaign
carried away cattle and other goods and chattles. The Sultân, having received information of this unfortunate occurrence, advanced

took place, while the Malik-ut-tujjâr was yet alive, and he took part in it as will be seen later on, so that although the date is correct, the chronological order of Nizâm-ud-dîn’s account is incorrect. Firishtâh commences his account by saying that the Rây of Bijâñagâr convened a council of chiefs and Brahâns, to consider how it was, that in spite of the fact that his country, the Carnâtî, was larger in extent, and had more population and revenue than the Bahmani kingdom, the ruler of the latter was always victorious in all campaigns. The Brahâns, like the Brahâns of Lakshman San’s court at once quoted their Sâstras and said that according to these, they were to be subject to the Musalmâns for thirty thousand years. Others said that the Musalmâns had stronger horses and better archers; and the Rây ordered that Musalmâns should be enlisted in his service, and jâguirs should be granted to them, and a mosque should be erected in Bijâñagâr for their use; and no one should interfere with them in the exercise of their religion; and a copy of the Qurân should be placed in front of his throne, so that the Musalmâns might salute it. He also ordered his soldiers to be trained in archery, so that he soon had ten thousand Musalmâns and sixty thousand kâfîr horsemen, who all had knowledge of archery, and three lakhs of infantry. He then crossed the Tungâbhadra, and conquered the fort of Mudkal and sent his sons to besiege Râijore and Bankâpûr; and stationed himself on the bank of the Krishnâ; and his soldiers raided as far as Sâghir and Bijâpûr. Sultân ʻAlâ-ud-dîn ordered his forces to assemble, and when fifty thousand cavalry and sixty thousand infantry were ready, the Sultân at an auspicious moment marched out with artillery and other munitions of war. Deo Rây advanced to the fort of Mudkal. The Sultân sent Khâlf Hasan Basîr, Malik-ut-tujjâr, with the army of Daulatâbâd against the sons of Deo Rây; and Khân Zamân with the army of Bijâpûr and Khân A-azam with that of Berâr against Deo Rây himself. Khâlf Hasan advanced to Râijore and fought with the elder son of Deo Rây, so that he was wounded and had to flee. He then advanced towards Bankâpûr, and he had not yet reached that place, when the younger son of the Rây fled and joined his father. Then there was a great battle near Mudkal, and both sides suffered heavy losses, the Musalmâns suffering more than the Hindûs. Then a second battle was fought, and the Musalmâns were victorious; and the elder son of the Rây, who had fled from Mudkal was killed by a spear thrown at him by Khân Zamân. The Hindûs fled panic-struck into the fort of Mudkal; and Fakîr-ul-mulk Dehlâvi and his brother pursuing them closely entered the fort, were captured, and were taken before Deo Rây. The Sultân then sent a message to the Rây, that if these two men were killed, he would slay two lakhs of Hindûs to avenge their deaths. Deo Rây then sent a message to the Sultân that if he would in future refrain from attacking his country, he would send an annual tribute, and return
towards the country of Bijānagar. He distributed large quantities of arms and many horses (among his soldiers); and advancing rapidly besieged the fort of Mudkal. As all appliances for the capture of the fort were prepared, and the garrison saw death before their eyes, the Ray of Bijānagar, on account of great misery and wretchedness, sent an emissary and prayed for the pardon of his offences; and entered into an agreement, that he should send tribute every year, and he should at once pay in cash whatever the Sultan should have expended on this expedition. The Sultan then drew the pen of forgiveness across his offences; and returned to his capital; and he (i.e., the Ray) paid whatever he had agreed to pay, and thus gained safety. The Sultan arranged a great entertainment, in the vicinity of the capital, and conferred distinctions on the amirs, bestowing on them robes of honour and other favours. He then stayed for sometime at the seat of the empire.

As Sikandar Khan Bukhari had a great share in the rebellion of Shahzada Muhammad Khan; and although after that Sultan the two prisoners uninjured, and never transgressed the rules of obedience. The Sultan agreed to these proposals. Deo Ray sent the two amirs and the arrears of tribute of some years, and valuable presents; and the Sultan also sent presents, and then returned to his capital.

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

1 The words which I have translated "would pay in cash" are in the MSS. بنقذ جواب گوئد and جواب گوئد the meaning of which I am told is "to pay cash on the spot".

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

tract of country. The Khān A’azam had also at that time died, and there was no one of high rank in Tilang; and the amirs of that province wanted to make Sikandar Khān the Sultān there. Sultān Alā-ud-dīn, in spite of his illness began to collect troops to march against him. Upon that Jalāl Khān held a council and decided that he should hold that country, while Sikandar Khān should march to Māhur, and take possession of it, so that the attention of the Sultān should be distracted between the two rebellions. The Sultān sent a qual-nāma (or agreement) to Sikandar Khān; but as he had had a large share in the rebellion of Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān, and had committed the present acts of hostility, he could not in any way be assured of his safety, and so he sent a message to Sultān Mahmūd Shāh Khaljī of Mālwa, to the effect that Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn had become ill and was dead, but his amirs had for their own purposes kept the matter in concealment; and that if he would now march in that direction, Berār and Tilang would without any dispute come into his possession. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī after consulting the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr started in 800 A.H. on his march to Berār. Sikandar Khān advanced for a few stages and met him with a thousand horsemen. Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn cancelled his expedition to Tilang, and sent Khwāja Mahmūd Ghilānī known as Gāwān against Jalāl Khān. He also sent the army of Berār to meet the ruler of Burhānpūr, who had advanced to support Sultān Mahmūd; and sent Qāsim Beg Saf-Shikan with the army of Daulatābād to meet Sultān Mahmūd; and himself, seated in a palki, followed at a distance of five karāhs. Sultān Mahmūd finding that Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn was alive, and was advancing to meet him returned to his own country. He left an officer under the pretence of assisting Sikandar Khān, but with secret instructions to seize him with his treasurers, and to bring him to Mandū, if he attempted to escape. Sikandar Khān however received information of this, and joined his father at Nālkonda, which Khwāja Gāwān was then besieging. Then both father and son obtained assurance of safety from the Sultān through the Khwāja; and surrendered the fort to the latter. They then came to the Sultān, and again obtained Nālkonda as their jāgīr.
horsemen, for a few stages, and joined him. They then besieged Māhūr, and when a long time passed, and the siege was protracted, Sultān ‘Āla-ud-din came with a large army, to help the garrison, and when he arrived in the vicinity of Māhūr, Sultān Mahmūd marched away at night, and retired towards Mandū. Sultān ‘Āla-ud-din honoured the thānadār of Māhūr with the title of Fakhr-ul-mulk, and conferred many favours on him, and confirmed him in the government of Māhūr, and its dependencies, in accordance with previous custom. He made arrangements for the government of that part of his kingdom; and then returned towards the capital. On the way Sikandar came before him with his head hanging down in shame, and with a shroud tied to his shoulder. The Sultān on account of the great benevolence, which was ingrained in his nature, covered his offences with the skirt of pardon, and exalted him with a special robe of honour.

They say, that Sultān ‘Āla-ud-din was extremely patient and forbearing; and he read the public prayer himself; and praised

---

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

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

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

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

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

2 Firishtah does not say anything about ‘Alā-ud-din’s precepts and advice to Humāyūn Kān. The latter received the title of *Zālim* or the tyrant, so Nizām-ud-din’s description of him as *dāshir* among ‘Alā-ud-din’s sons, does not appear to me to be appropriate.
benefits. My paternal affection, and my great love for my good and able son compel me that I should make heavy his ear of intelligence with those pearls of advice, and those gems of precept.

Couplet:

I tell thee with such eloquence as I have;
Thou mayest benefit from my words, or mayest be wroth.

1 Directions and precepts.

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

1 The reading in the MSS is الرصاي والنصائع, as I have it in the text. In

the 1st ed. it is نصائع كه سلطان علاء الدين يسره خود همايون خان كرده ان يد.

2 One MS. inserts the word بينان, between, and حكومت, governments.

3 There are different readings. One MS. has ودگر تمام و ساعي بالفساد را به‌گرد رآ ندهید, the other has و دگر تمام و ساعی بالفساد به‌گرد رآ ندهد, and the third has و تمام ساعی بالفساد به‌گرد رآ ندهد. All three appear to me to be incorrect; but the first would be correct if ساعی is changed to ساعی.
not also, for a few words or for a suspicion, which may enter your mind, throw an innocent man into the narrow places of danger and the ravine of fear.

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

Couplet:

He who after death leaves a name behind,

Be sure that in life he did great deeds.

Further you should beware (of causing) the lamentations of the oppressed, who have suffered at the hands of tyrants, and of the injured who have suffered privation and hardship; and you should know for a certainty that the¹ real favour of the great and holy God always watches over the condition of the oppressed ones”.

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

¹ The meaning of the words عابث which in one MS. are written as علّم is not clear in the context.
² This is also mentioned by Firishtah, who explains the matter somewhat better than Nizām-ud-dīn. He says, that as contrary to their representation, Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn made Humayūn Shāh Zālim (tyrant), whose manners were hateful to the people, his heir, Nizām-ul-mulk Daulatābādī, who had just
tion of the kingdom, fled and went to his son, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār and was the governor of Junir and from there both of them went away together to Gujrāt. When on the 121st of Jamādi-ul-āwwal, 862 A.H., Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din took his place from the throne (takht) on the plank (taḥfa) of the coffin, 2 Saif Khān, Mallū Khān and other āmirs rendered homage to Hasan Khān Shāh-zāda, who was the younger brother of Humāyūn Khān and placed him on the throne, the common people plundered the palace of Humāyūn Khān and set fire to it. Humāyūn Khān determined on flight 3 with 80 horsemen. It so happened that on the way elephant drivers (filbānān) and officers of the bed-chamber and of the private apartment (pardādārān) and other retainers (ṣāyer ahī-i-hash) saw him and hastened to join his service. Hasan Khān sitting on the throne saw Humāyūn Khān enter the palace, and fear overwhelmed him, and he could not sit firm on that great place, and before that, been made the vakil-ud-sultān, and who was well known for his intelligence and knowledge of affairs, fled before ‘Alā-ud-din’s death, and went to his son, who after the death of Qāsim Beg Saf-shīkan, had received the title of Malik-ut-tujjār, and was the Subahdār of Daulatabad and Junir, and from there, before even the news of the death of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din had arrived, they went away to Gujrāt.

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

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

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

3 The words are صیفلاگ و گزان فیسرت زهیم هزیم ہوئے جنگ, i.e., gave battle to the plunderers; and the plunderers being defeated, took shelter with Hasan Khān. Humāyūn pursued them and entered the palace.
came down from it. The amīrs and vazīrs and all the others then kissed the ground of service; and (Humāyūn Khaan) sat on the throne. The first order that he gave was this, that they should tie Saif Khaan to the foot of an elephant; and drag him through the whole city. Mallū Khan, seeing this (barbarous) punishment fled, and took shelter in a corner.

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

**AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN HUMĀYŪN SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DIN.**

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

---

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

2 According to Firishtah he ordered that Shāh Habib-ul-lah and other should be cast into prison. Mallū Khan fought his way to the frontier of the Carnatic. Col. Briggs says that Hasan Khan's eyes were put out, but I cannot find this in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
of whose mature deliberations. He entrusted the duties of the vazir to 1 Khwāja Najm-ud-din Qāran Gīlānī, who was a wise and understanding man, experienced and God-fearing; and the reins of binding and loosening and the tying and untying of all matters of the government of the country were placed in the grasp of his power; and the title of Malik-ut-tujjār was conferred on him.

And in the spring time of his (i.e., Humāyūn Khān’s) rule, 2 Sikandar Khān Bukhārī, who had formerly rebelled against Sultān Alā-ud-din, and had joined Sultān Mahmūd Khalji became ashamed and repentant, and forgetting the duties of allegiance, made the field of the government of Humāyūn Shāh dark with the dust of disturbance; and having raised the standard of rebellion, went away to Mālkonda with a large force. Humāyūn Shāh determined to march to Mālkonda, and sent 4 Khān Jahān two stages in advance of himself. Sikandar Khān saw that Khān Jahān was weak, and attacked him with force and violence; and defeated him. 5 On the following

---

1 This is the name in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is written by mistake as Sanjam-ud-din. Firishtah, however, says that in accordance with the late Sultān’s direction, Sultān Humāyūn made Khwāja Mahmūd Gīwān, the Malik-ut-tujjār, and the Vakīl-ush-shāhī, and the tarāfdār of Bijāpūr M. Hidayat Hosain has Qārān Gīlānī, where Najm-ud-din is written after the name in the text.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the year 864 A.H., Humâyûn Shâh again determined on the conquest of Tilang. On the way seven of the special associates of Amirzâda 1 Muhibb-ud-din Habib-ul-lah, who on account of some

---

1 There appears to be some confusion in the names. We know Shâh Habib-ul-lah and Shâh Muhibb-ul-lah, but not Amirzâda Muhibb-ud-din. Firishta in the corresponding passage has Shâh Habib-ul-lah. There is not much difference between Nizám-ud-din’s account and that of Firishta, as to the way in which the release of Shâh Habib-ul-lah and Shâhsâda Hasan Khân was effected. But the seven adherents of Shâh Habib-ul-lah, who are called his مخلصان, intimate friends, in the Tabaqât are called specifically his یوسف or disciples. Malik Yûsuf Turk is called Yûsuf Turk Kachâl. Then again the حصار citadel, in which the prison was located, is called the دربار شاهی by Firishta, and the seraglio by Col. Briggs. It appears also from Firishta’s account, that the original intention of the conspirators was to effect the release of Shâh Habib-ul-lah alone; and they released Hasan Khân and Yehayâ Khân and Jalâl Khân Bukhârî, because they begged them to do so. Firishta also says (contrary to Nizám-ud-din’s account) that it was after these men had been released, that the seven thousand other prisoners were set free.

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

The subsequent movements of Hasan Khân and Shâh Habib-ul-lah, some of which are not mentioned by Nizâm-ud-din, are thus described by Firishta. After leaving the city, they remained for six or seven days in the garden of Kamthânâ, which was three karâhs from Ahmadâbâd Bidar. Then with three thousand horsemen and five thousand foot-soldiers they attempted to seize the citadel of Ahmadâbâd Bidar, but finding this to be difficult they went towards the town of Bir, and took possession of the country around. Yûsuf Turk was made Amir-ul-umrât and Shâh Habib-ul-lah vezir; and they commenced to collect troops.

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

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

---

1 A cruel tyrant of Arabia.
Quatrains:

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

When the news of the return of Humâyûn Shâh reached Shâhzâda Hasan Khân and Amîrzâda Habib-ul-lah, they found themselves to be without the power of withstanding him; and turned their faces towards Bijâpur. Sirâj Khân, who afterwards received the title of Mu'zzam Khân behaved towards them with courtesy and flattery; and presented much tribute; and after taking oaths took them into the citadel. He then collected a force in the course of the night, and attacked them. The common people became dispersed. Hasan Khân and Mir Habib-ul-lah and the seven friends, who had brought them out of prison, were besieged in a kiosk, in which they had been accommodated. Hasan Khân after receiving a safe conduct went to the besiegers; but Amîrzâda Habib-ul-lah, in agreement with his friends, said “We are all prepared for death; and the birds of our spirit will not lower their heads into the nest of your safe conduct”. They fought and exerted themselves to the extent of their means, and their strength; and reached the end and object of their hope (i.e., they heroically met their death).

Humâyûn Shâh when he saw Hasan Khân, threw him in his

---

1 This quatrain is quoted with some variations by Firishtah also. He says that it was written by the poet Maulâna Naşrif, who had, according to him, got the title of Malik-ush-shârâ or the king of poets, apparently in imitation of the Malik-ut-tujjâr. In the version printed in the lith. ed. of Firishtah the second line is مزگان دم الوده, and the third line is مزگان دم الوده, and the third line is مزگان دم الوده. I think the third line as quoted by Niżâm-ud-dîn is better.

2 But see note 1, page 80, from which it will appear that, according to Firishtah, they fought two battles with Humâyûn Shâh’s army, near Bir and were victorious in the first. Niżâm-ud-dîn omits all mention of what happened near Bir.

3 Firishtah mentions the atrocities which were perpetrated by Humâyûn Shâh on the companions of Hasan Khân, who were sent to Ahmadâbâd Bidar by Sirâj Khân. It appears from Firishtah that Shâh Habib-ul-lah alone attained to martyrdom; and the others including Yûsuf Tâle, and down to
own presence before a tiger. 1 Saiyid Tāhir, the poet has said the
following chronogram on the date of the death of Amīrzāda Ḥabīb-
ul-lah.

Quatrain:
In the month of Sha'bān, in India, to martyrdom attained,
Ḥabīb-ul-lah Ghāzi, may his tomb be sanctified!
The mind of Tāhir, sought the date of his death;
He found it in rūḥ-i-pāk-i-Naḵmat-ul-lah!

(the holy spirit of Naḵmat-ul-lah).

Saiyid Naḵmat-ul-lah was Shāh Ḥabīb-ul-lah's great ancestor.
They say that Sirāj Khān was afflicted with leprosy in the course of
a short time.

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

(At last) 2 Shītāb Khān who was the guardian of the seraglio

even the menials such as farāshes, water-carriers and sweepers were sent to
Ahmadābād Bīdar; where they were put to death with cruel tortures; and their
wives and children, and others in any way connected with Ḥasan Khān were
also put to death with unheard-of and unnameable cruelties.

1 Firishtah calls him Saiyid Tāhir Astarābādī, and he also quotes the
chronograms.

2 Firishtah has two versions of the circumstances of Humāyūn Shāh's
death. One is that he became ill, and that when he had no hope of his surviv-
ing the illness, he made his eldest son, Niẓām Khān, his heir; and he released
Khwājah Jahān Turk from prison, and sent for the Malik-ut-tujjār from Tilāng;
and appointed the former to be vākt-i-ush-shāhī, and the latter to be the vazīr;
and he directed his son always to act under the guidance of his mother. The
other version is somewhat like that given by Niẓām-ud-dīn; but it is said that
Humāyūn Shāh had been ill, and was murdered after his recovery. The
guardian of the harem is called Shīhāb Khān on much in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
associated some Habshi with him, and on the night of the 127th Dhīqā’dah of the aforementioned year, one of the female Habshi slaves struck Humāyūn Shāh, when he was resting in the seraglio, on the head with a piece of wood and made him like those who had been dead a thousand years ago.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 Firishtah has 28th Dhīqā’dah, 885. Col. Briggs gives September 3rd, 1461, as the corresponding date of the Christian era. Mr. Sewell also gives the 28th Dhīqā’dah, of course from Firishtah; but he has the 5th September, 1461 A.D., as the corresponding English date.

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

3 Firishtah has three years six months and six days, as according to him the death took place on the 28th and not on the 27th Dhīqā’dah. See note 1. above.
AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF NIZĀM SHAH, SON OF HUMĀYŪN SHAH.

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

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

1 The widow of Humāyūn Shah and the mother of Nizām Shah, whom Firishtah describes as a wise woman.

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

3 Firishtah says, the Ray of the Mulk of Aurīyā in concert with zamindārs of Tilang came to conquer the country of the Dakin, by way of Rājahmandir; and they laid waste all the country as far as Kulāz. I cannot say exactly what the word after Aurīyā, which looks like Aurīyā or Uriyā is, and whether the Ray of Orissa and Uriyā represent one Ray or two Rays. Firishtah has the two words all through his account, but Col. Briggs does not mention Aurīyā. Firishtah’s account agrees with Nizām-ul-dīn’s as to the main incident, namely the attack of Shāh Muḥibb-ul-lah on the vanguard of the Orissa army. But before coming to that he says that, Nizām Shah’s advisers proceeded with great calmness to collect troops, and they got together forty thousand horsemen and marched to the camp of the Ray of Orissa and Uriyā, taking the young Sultān with them. The Ray intended to take possession of the territories, and then after extorting tribute to return to his own kingdom. But Nizām Shah’s ministers sent word to him that they intended to invade and conquer Jānjagar and Orissa and Uriyā; but that as he had now invaded the Dakin, matters had become easy for them; and unless he paid tribute, and restored whatever his men had seized, not one of the latter would be allowed to return in safety. 

Immediately after this Shāh Muḥibb-ul-lah, who had come to carry on a jehād (religious war), fell on the vanguard of the Orissa army. The action is
the state of things, came forward with a large body of cavalry and infantry to plunder and ravage Bidar; and by successive marches came within thirty korōhs of the city. The amīrs, in spite of the fact that they were unprepared, marched out for the campaign, taking the eight-year old Nizām Shāh with them. When the distance (between the two) was only eight korōhs, Amīrẓāda Muḥibb-ul-lah with only one hundred and sixty brave and well-armed men separated himself from the army of Nizām Shāh, and advancing forward fell upon the vanguard of the Rāy of Orissa, which consisted of ten thousand infantry and four hundred horsemen. From morning till the time of midday they fought with courage and bravery, till in the end, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the standard of the Ghāzīs; and the vanguard of the Orissa army fled and joined the main army. The Rāy of Orissa marched away at night, and returned to his dominion. The amīrs carried out the customary thanksgiving to God, and returned at the stirrups of Nizām Shāh.

They had not yet settled down at Bidar when Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji at the instigation of Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī invaded the

described by Firishtah in almost the same words as Nizām-ud-din, but Firishtah goes on to say that the Dakin army pursued the Orissa army, which lost two or three thousand men daily. So the Rāy took shelter in a fort, and sent messages expressive of his distress; and finally agreed to pay five lakhs of silver tankas. Col. Briggs says in his translation that the threatening message was sent with Shāh Muḥibb-ul-lah "but his escort being stopped by the infidels he charged the Rāy's advanced picquets so boldly, that supposing the whole army was in motion the Hindoos fell back on their main body". I cannot find anything in the lith.

ed. of Firishtah which agrees with this. There is nothing in it about the message being taken by Shāh Muḥibb-ul-lah. In fact it appears that Shāh Muḥibb-ul-lah only joined the army to carry on a jehād or religious war.

Col. Briggs also says in a note that Firishtah hastily adopted the language of Muhammad Dawood of Bidur and other historians of the Bahmuni dynasty, and "has not exercised any discretion or even much research in not endeavouring to account for the sudden retreat of the Hindoos". I do not quite agree with Col. Briggs. There were many instances of such panic and sudden retreat in the case of the Rāys of Bījānagar and others.

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

Orissa and Auriyā and the Rāys of Talingāna; and themselves advanced with the armies of Bījāpūr, Daulatābād and Borār, at the stirrups of Nizām Shāh against Sulṭān Maḥmūd. The two armies met at the neighbourhood of the fort of Qandahār. Firishtah mentions the attack by the Malik-ut-tujjār, whom, however, he calls Maḥmūd Gāwān, on the left wing of the Mandū army; and says that although Mahābat Khān and Zahir-ul-mulk fought bravely, they were at last compelled to retire and were killed. He also mentions the attack of the left wing of the Dakini army under Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, on the right wing of the Mandū army which was led by Shāhzāda Ghivyās-ud-dīn. This is not mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn. They fought bravely, but the Shāhzāda was wounded and was thrown from his horse, and was about to be killed when he was rescued. This wing of the Mandū army was thus defeated and was pursued by the Dakini army; and the camp was looted, and fifty elephants were seized. Sulṭān Maḥmūd seeing both wings of his army routed, determined on retiring to Mandū but one of the amirs dissuaded him. At this time Nizām Shāh wanted bravely to attack the centre of the Mālwa army. Khwājah Jahān stopped him, but after a time he advanced with ten thousand horsemen to attack the centre of Sulṭān Maḥmūd's army, which consisted of twelve thousand horsemen. At this time Sulṭān Maḥmūd hit the forehead of an elephant, which Sikandar Khān a Turkī slave of Khwājah Jahān was riding. The elephant became furious, and trampled on many men belonging to the Dakini army; and it was likely
At this time, when the men were engaged in plundering, Sultan Mahmûd appeared before Nişâm Shâh’s army with twelve thousand horsemen. Khwâjah Jahân Turk, who was the leader of the centre of the army, turned round, and seizing the bridle of the Sultan’s horse turned towards Bidar; and in spite of the fact that Malik-ut-tujjâr had been victorious over the Mâlwa army, the army of Nişâm Shâh was defeated; and the men who were engaged in plundering were slain at the spot where they were. Malkah-i-Jahân being apprised of the treachery and deceit of Khwâjah Jahân, entrusted the defence of the fort of Bidar to Mallû Khân, and took Nişâm Shâh with her to Firûzâbâd. Sultan Mahmûd pursued the army of the Deccan as that Nişâm Shâh himself should receive some injury. Then Sikandar Khân, either through foolishness or through some enmity which he had against Khwâjah Jahân, did not exhort the army to fight, but carried away Nişâm Shâh, whether he liked it or not, placing him behind himself on the same elephant and they stood a short distance behind the army. The anîrs not seeing the standard of the Sultan in its place turned round one after another, and taking Nişâm Shâh, who was standing in a corner, with them went back to the capital.

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

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

Firishtah, however, goes on to say that the queen-mother had suspicions of the treachery and deceit of Khwâjah Jahân, and knew the defeat was due to his want of firmness and courage; and therefore with the advice of Malik-ut-tujjâr Mahmûd Gâwân (or Gilânî), she placed the defence of the citadel of Mandâbâd Bidar in charge of Mallû Khân. Firishtah goes on to say that Sultan Mahmûd of Mâlwa took the fort of Bidar after a siege of seventeen days, took possession of the greater part of Berâr and Daulatâbâd; so that people thought that the power of the Bahmanîs should pass to the Khaljîs, when news of the approach of the Gujrât army came.
far as the gate of Bidar, and having devastated the country outside the fort, occupied himself with providing the necessary apparatus for its capture.

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

1 The actual words are ۹در فیوز ایاک نفس درست گرد. Firishtaḥ whose language at this part of the narrative resembles that of Niẓām-ud-dīn has نفس راست گرد.

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

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

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

In the year 867 A.H., Sultan Mahmud Khalji again advanced, with ninety thousand horsemen, to attempt the conquest of the headman who wanted to have his revenge (it does not appear for what injury) said that there was no broad road in that part of the country along which the army might march; but there was a road along a waterless desert. The Sultan said, it was better to escape along that road than to be killed by the Dakmis and marched forward. They suffered great privation from heat and scarcity of water, and also from robbers and thieves. When they at last got out of the desert, the Sultan knowing that the crowd of robbers and the concealment of wells, had all been brought about at the instigation of the headman ordered him to be put to death. The Gond said he had had his revenge and he was not afraid of death, because he had sons living; and he expected to be born again, from which Firishtah infers that the Gonds, like other Hindu kafirs believed in the transmigration of souls.

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

2 Firishtah's account of this second invasion does not differ materially from that in the text. In fact Firishtah says that he was indebted for an account of the invasion to Nizam-ud-din Ahamd; but he apparently adds one or two

1 shes of his own, for instance he says that on arrival in the neighbourhood of Khorram, Sultan Mahmud made some display of his grandeur (گرو نوری نمود); 1 Sultdn Mahmud Gujrat sent a well-equipped army without delay or hesitation towards Sultdnpur; and also that the two Sultans, i.e., those of Gujrat and 1 Dakin, who were bright as the sun, and beautiful as Joseph, bade adieu to
Deccan. Niẓām Shāh also advanced after making preparations for war; and asked for help from Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Gujrat. When Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khaljī arrived on the frontier of Daulatābād, his scouts brought the news, that Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Gujrat was approaching. The army of Mandū then left the road (to Bīdar); and marched away towards Mālkonda; and returned to Mandū by way of Gondwāra. ¹ Niẓām Shāh sent a letter to Maḥmūd Shāh (Gujrātī) containing his thanks, and praised him for his help; and ² Sulṭān Maḥmūd, turning back from the way, went to Aḥmadābād in Gujrat.

⁸ In the month of Dḥīqā’ī of the same year Niẓām Shāh became ill, and on account of that illness, he passed away to the vicinity of the great God.

Couplet:

Into the dust, was thrown that flower of state, which the garden of empire

With a hundred thousand caresses, in its bosom, had nourished.

The period of his reign was ⁴ two years.

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

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

² The readings in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. are incorrect. One MS. has W Sultān Maḥmūd az Ra’at Brgštē Bldsh Aḥmad Bn Rft, the other MS. has the same reading, but leaves out the name Maḥmūd. The lith. ed. omits the initial W, and also the name Maḥmūd. The first reading is correct, but I have inserted the word Gujratī after Aḥmadābād to make the meaning quite clear.

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

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

When Muḥammad Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, sat on the masnad of sovereignty, in his 10th year, he in spite of his youth exerted himself in performing the duties of equity and justice. During the period of his rule, all the people had repose in the cradle of peace and safety.

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

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

---

1 This is the heading in the lith. ed. The MSS. leave out the word سلطنت. firishtah has a rather grandiloquent heading, viz., ذكر شامي شمس الدنيا, i.e., an account of the reign of Shams-ud-dunya-wad-din (the sun of the world and of religion) Abū Muẓaffar Al Ghāzi Muḥammad Shāh Bahmani Lashkari. The date of his accession appears to have been the 13th Dhi-qa‘dah, 867 A.H., July 30th, 1463 A.D.

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

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

Unlike former Sultâns in the matter of the capture of forts, and the conquest of towns, he did not consider it sufficient merely to have a show of obedience and submission, and the sending of gifts and presents; but he devoted all his attention to measures by which strong forts might come into his possession. In fact the farmâns of the rule of the Bahmani dynasty ended with his great name; 2 and all disturbances and rebellions which had found their way into the kingdom during the reigns of Sultân Humâyûn Shâh and Niẓâm Shâh were remedied by the grandeur of the personality of Muḥammad Shâh; and all weaknesses and troubles which had crept into the affairs of the kingdom and empire were cured by his attention. After the regulation of the affairs of the empire, he commenced to gratify the hearts of the pillars of the state. He had Khwâjah Jahân, who in the invasion of Sultân Mahmûd Khaljî had determined to undermine the foundation of the greatness of this dynasty, and had besides stretched out his hands for taking and misappropriating the government money, 3 executed in front of the palace.

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

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

2 There is some difference in the readings. I have retained that in the lith. ed. but the MSS. have instead of بتوجه اور صلاح is بتوجه او صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجه او صلاح بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجه اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجه اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاهد بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شاہ بتوجة اور صلاح محمد شا
1 He appointed Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk the governor of Jūnīr to conquer the fort of Kehrīla which now belonged to the rulers of Mandū, after giving him a special robe of honour. Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk arranged his army, and then with a large body of men traversed the various stages, and encamped on the bank of the river which flows at the foot of the fort.  

2 The Mandū army sallied out of the fort, and commenced the battle; but afterwards again fled into the fort. Niẓām-ul-mulk's soldiers pursued them to the gate of the fort. The garrison finding the grandeur and great strength of Niẓām-ul-mulk's army prayed for safe conduct. Niẓām-ul-mulk granted it, and when they were brought out of the fort he gave pān

3 According to FIRIŠTĀH this expedition did not take place till the year 872 A.H., 1467 A.D., i.e., nearly four years after Muḥammad Shāh's accession; and in the meantime, Malīk-ut-tajjār Muḥammad Gāwān was made Khwāja Jahn and anīr-ul-qarād and vakil-us-saltanāt; and when Muḥammad Shāh was fourteen years of age the queen-mother arranged for his marriage, which was celebrated with great grandeur and eclat. After this the queen-mother retired from active participation in the affairs of the state; and devoted herself to devotional duties. But even now Muḥammad Shāh did not put his hand to any important affair, till he had consulted her; and went every morning to offer his respects to her.

2 He was made the सिसे मालवा, commander of the army of Berār; but Col. BRIGGS makes him the governor of that territory.

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

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

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

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

---

1 According to Firistah this expedition was sent in the beginning of 1149 A.D., for the punishment according to the lith. ed. of Firistah راپی سکیسو وکله و تسجیر دیگر قلع کوئی, i.e., of the Rāys of Sangesar and Khān and the conquest of other forts in the Kokan (Conkan). Col. Briggs says that the expedition was “against the Shunkur Ray of Kehna and other fortuous rays in the Concan”. As to Sankar or Sangesar see note 2, p. 61.

2 Firistah, lith. ed., has the purgana and not the town of کهولی پور, and Col. Briggs the district of Kolapore. The name of As'ad Khān is doubtful. He omits the name altogether. Firistah has استمداد خان سعید خان گلیانی, while Col. Briggs has Asaad Khān. According to Firistah Malik-ut-tujjār had taken possession of the ghāt or pass, seeing that the would not be of any use in that country, he sent back the troops whom brought from the capital; and took with him only Sa‘id Khān Gilānī, as of his own tribe, with the army of Jūnir, and Khush Qadam Khān, have, with the army of Dābul and Kalhar.

3 I cannot find any mention of the تنگل کله ينه, or the defile of Kaikania mentioned there. It may be identical with تنگل کله ينه, which means “the ambition quest” as I have translated it.
entered the fort. The army was delayed at the foot of the fort for a period of five months. As the rainy season came on, the amirs after consulting among themselves, returned to Kolapûr and on their arrival there, they cast the shadow of their good fortune on the capture of the fort of 2 Rangta, and seized it in a short time.

When the rainy season was over, the amirs again directed their attention to the punishment of the Rây of Sonkar, and when they arrived at the fort of 3 Mâchal, they attacked it, and conquered it at the first onset, and many of the rebels were slain, and some of their leaders were seized. When the overwhelming strength and power of the Malik-ut-tujjâr became known, the Rây of Sonkar sent a body of intelligent men to him, and prayed that he would pardon his offences, and he would 4 surrender the fort of Kaikâna to him. The Malik-ut-tujjâr pardoned his offences; and having 5 placed the fort in charge of some trusted adherents, and made a

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have fifty days. The other MS. and Firishtah have ٥٠٠٠٠, five months.

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

3 The fort is called ماهال, Mâchal, in one MS., and Mâchîl, in the other; and مهال, Mahâl, in the lith. ed. It does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah.

4 Firishtah's account is rather vague. He says "This time with many plans and stratagems and the scattering of many dirâns and dîhârs, the fort of Khîna, to the turrets to the capture of which, the lasso of the mighty emperors had not reached, in any (former) age, was taken." Col. Briggs's (vol. II, page 484) translation is less literal, but he also mentions the stratagems and gifts of money.

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

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

---

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

2 The reading in one MS. is یکصد و بیست چهار ۱۲۰ ships, and in the other یکصد و بیست و چهار کشتی ۱۲۴ boats. The lith. ed. has یکصد و بیست و چهار کشتی ۱۰۴ boats. Firisṭah has the same reading as the first MS., and I have accepted it. Firisṭah also says that he himself marched by land with his victorious troops and that he returned to Ahmādbād Bidar after the conquest of the Concan and Goa after an absence of three years. The title conferred on Malik-ut-

3 There is a difference in the readings here. The MSS. have مسلم و which appears to be correct; but the word نیز راهی سادات rather indistinct. The lith. ed. has نیز راهی می instead of نیز راهی.

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

The name is doubtful. It is written as جسکه راہی والی قلمه براکر in the MSS., and جسکه راہی in the lith. ed. Firisṭah also gives him the name, but Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 489) calls him Ray Beejy Sing.
of diamonds had been found; 'Ādil Khān was sent with a body of amīrs, after a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt had been conferred on him. 'Ādil Khān in consultation with the other amīrs besieged the fort; and active and enterprising warriors advanced the batteries day after day, and made repeated assaults. In the end Jay Singh Rāy having no more strength left asked for an assurance of safety. 'Ādil Khān having drawn the pen of forgiveness across the page of his action, brought him out of the fort, and placing it in charge of his trusted adherents returned to the capital. Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari 1 conferred that territory on him as his sīf. 2 After

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

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

readings in the MSS. are بعد از مدینّی ملك النجّار خواجه جهان گفت که رای برکینه قدم از جادّة اطّاعت بیرون نهاده لشکر عظم به رسانیده متوجه بندر گروه شد و قلعه ... بعد از مدینّی ملك النجّار خواجه جهان گفت که رای برکینه قدم از جادّة اطّاعت بیرون نهاده لشکر عظم به رسانیده متوجه بندر گروه شد سلطان متوجه شده قلعه برکینه را محاصره کرد.

I do not think that either of the readings is strictly correct. I have adopted a reading which appears to me to be the best after comparing those in the MSS., and the reading in the lith. ed. Firishtah's version is that in 877 A.H., برکینه رای قلعه دلگون بنصرک حمزّات فراماندی بیجاتگر عزّام تسبیر جزیره گروه گردید.

Col. Briggs says "In the year 877 A.H. Birkana Ray (he says in a note ‘the Oriental Scholar will recognize in this penult the language of the southern part of the peninsula’; but not knowing the Dravidian languages, I cannot find out the meaning of this), Raja of the fortress of Belgam, at the instigation of the Ray of Beejanuggur marched to retake the island of Goa.”

As regards Belgam, Col. Briggs says that it is now occupied by British troops, and is deemed one of the strongest on the plains in that part of the country. The name of the Ray as given by Nişâm-ud-din has some resemblance to that in Firishtah; but Nişâm-ud-din does not give the name of the fort; though in one place he gives it, the same name as that of the Ray. Mr. Sewell, on page 100 of “A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar,” gives another translation of the part of Firishtah relating to this matter. In it the Ray is called Parkna, and the fortress Belgaun, which is nearer the Persian than the name in the translation by Col. Briggs. Mr. Sewell goes on to say that “the Burhan-i-Maâsir calls the chief of Belgaun ‘Parkatapatah’, and Major King, the translator of the work, gives a large variety of the spellings of the name, viz.: “Birkanah,” “Parkatapatah,” “Parkatiyah,” “Parkitah,” “Barkabth” (Ind. Ant., Nov. 1899, p 288. note). Briggs gives it as Birkana. It has been supposed that the real name was “Vikrama”. Mr. Sewell does not say from whom and on what authority the supposition emanated. It appears to me that the real name may be Pratâp.

... some derivative from that word.
thirty yards, and the breadth of the moat forty yards. 1 In short, Birkāna Rāy bravely waited in the fort with three thousand horsemen for battle and bloodshed. Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari built a second wall around the fort, in order to shut up all ingress and egress; and distributed the batteries (amongst his amīrs). The batteries were advanced every day, till after filling up the moat with rubbish and grass, they were taken close to the wall; and the victory became a matter of to-day or to-morrow. Birkāna now, owing to his great exhaustion and weakness sent a vakil; and agreed to render allegiance, and pay tribute. Muḥammad Shāh having drawn the pen of pardon across his offences, gave him assurances of safety, and brought him out of the fort. He entrusted that part of the country to Khwājah Jahān, and returned (to the capital).

2 In the year 880 A.H., news came that the Rāy of Orissa had marched into the Deccan from his own country, with an enormous

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

2 Nizām-ul-dīn altogether omits to mention the great famine, which depopulated the Bahmanī kingdom during the next two years. Firishta says, that on his return journey after taking Belānum, the Sultān wanted to pass the rainy season in Bijāpūr; but there was, during that year, want of rain in the Dakin, and all the wells in Bijāpūr were dried up; so the king was compelled to move to Ahmadābād Bīdar. The next year also there was no rain, and town and city and village all became depopulated, and men died; and those who survived took shelter in Mālwa and Gujrat and Jāmnagar. For two years no seed was sown in Tīlang and Mālwa and Marhat and the whole of the Bahmanī kingdom; and in the third year, when “The breezes of Divine favour blew, and there was rain, there was none left who might engage in the work of cultivation.” In his translation Col. Briggs leaves out the name of Mālwa in the last sentence, apparently to avoid a seeming contradiction with the preceding sentence. He explains Marhatt by the word “Maharashtra,” in a note.

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

had slain the ruler, who was a vicious tyrant, and who violated the honour and the property of his subjects; and made the fort over to Hamīrā Oriā in the thirteenth ed.; Bhoomī Ray Oorea, according to Col. Briggs), who had been a protegé of Muhammad Shāh. Hamīrā sent men to the Rāy of Orissa and met him to invade the Dakin, and told him that there were no troops in that country on account of the famine, which had lasted for two years, and he would be easily able to conquer Tilang; and if he made it over to Hamīnā, the latter would surrender the fort of Kandīrīr and its dependencies to him. The Ray of Orissa was deceived, and with one thousand horsemen and six or seven thousand infantry, and taking the Rāja of Jānagar with him, invaded Tilang. Nizām-ul-mulk Basīrī, the governor of Rājamandri, being unable to meet him, shut himself up in the fort; and sent a representation of the facts to the Sultān. The latter paid a year's wages to the soldiers, and started immediately. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the enemy, the latter did not think it advisable to fight; and Hamīrā shut himself up in the fort of Kandīrīr. The Rāy of Orissa crossed the Rājamandri river (i.e., the Godāvari), and encamped on the bank of the river on the side of his own territory. The Sultān arrived near the river, and Nizām-ul-mulk joined him. He could not, however, at once cross the river, and when he had got the boats, the Rāy marched away and went back to his capital. The Sultān, however, was highly incensed at his conduct, and left Shāhnā Ṭāi Ṭāi Mahnūd Khān and the Khwājah Jahan there; and himself advanced with twenty thousand horse to punish that lājīr. Towards the end of 882 a.h., he arrived at the capital of Orissa and plundered and ravaged the country. The Rāy had left the central part of his territory unprotected, and had fled to the extreme end of it; so the Sultān stayed in the capital for six months, and obtained much treasure.

Wealth both by peaceful means and by violence. He then wanted to obtain the Shāhzāda and the Khwājah, and to make the country over to them. The Rāy hearing this sent presents and elephants to him; and said that he did not again help the zamindārs of Tilang. The Sultān demanded twenty other elephants, which had belonged to the Rāy's father, and were very valuable. The Rāy had to comply; and the Sultān then returned towards his kingdom. On the way he besieged a fort belonging to the Rāy, because the people of the neighbourhood told him, that no one had ever before dared to attack it; but he raised the siege on the Rāy having apologized for the ignorance and boorish people. Then he besieged Kandīrīr for six months when Hamīrā in great distress surrendered it to him.
fled from him, and had gone towards Zirbād. The spirit of the Sultān being now excited he marched out of the city, and advanced by successive marches in the direction of Rājmandrī; and when he arrived near it, he left Khwājah Jahān in attendance on the Shāhzāda; and advanced himself with twenty thousand selected horsemen and marching rapidly went to Rājmandrī. When he arrived near it, he found a wide expanse of water, the breadth of which was about one farsakāh, before him. Muḥammad Shāh was compelled to draw rein there. The Rāy of Orissa had encamped on the opposite bank of the river with seven lakhs of infantry and a number of elephants. When he found that Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari had arrived there in person, he left Rāy Mān, who was one of his principal chiefs, in the fort of Rājmandrī, and fled. The following day the Sultān nominated Daryā Khān to pursue the Rāy of Orissa; and himself encamped around the fort of Rājmandrī. He built a second wall round the fort to stop the entrances and exits of the fort; and having distributed the batteries amongst his commanders, planned the erection of covered ways. After four months, when the covered ways had been completed, and the soldiers were able to overlook the garrison, Rāy Mān seeing his own death with the eye of certainty, asked for protection, in great humility and distress, and surrendered the fort, and sent an elephant, which he had in the fort, as tribute; and enlisted himself among the servants (of Muḥammad Shāh). The latter confirmed him in the possession of the fort and its neighbourhood, and returned to his capital. He raised the men who had performed great deeds in the expedition to high ranks and noble positions. It is however mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt Bahādūrī, that the fort of Rājmandrī was not conquered; but the Rāy of Orissa paid tribute, and turned Muḥammad Shāh Lashkari off from all thought of him.

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

---

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

5 This city is known in Sanskrit books as Kanchi or Kanchipuram, and is now known as Conjeevaram. Firishtah's account of the way in which the existence of Kanji came to the notice of the Sultan was that, when he arrived at Kondpura-palli, some people of that place reported to him, that there was a temple, at a distance of ten days' journey from there, which was called Kanji, and the doors and walls and roofs of which were adorned with gold and jewelled ornaments, and decorated with rubies and other fine gems, and not one of the Mussalmân kings had up to that time set eyes on it, and had not even heard
great places of worship of the Hindûs; and it was ten days' journey from Nilwâra. Muhammad Lashkârī selected one thousand men and started for Kanji by forced marches. When he arrived there, there were only forty horsemen in attendance on him. The soldiers galloped into the city, and plundered and ravaged it. The Sultan stayed there for ten days; and then returned to the capital.

In the year 886 A.H., some interested persons, in Golconda, said that the coming of the Rây of Orissa into the Sultan's dominion its name. Sultan Muhammad detached six thousand horsemen adorned with daggers, and started on a rapid march to the place; and ordered Shâhzâda Mahmûd Khân to remain there; and it appears from the concurrent testimony of all the historians, that the Sultan rode so fast that not more than forty horsemen could remain with him.

1 The name is Nilwâra, in both MSS. and Tikwâra, in the lith. ed. As will be seen from the preceding note, Kanji was, according to Firishtah, ten days' journey from Kondapalle, which Col. Briggs calls Condapily. Firishtah's account of what happened at Kanji is somewhat different. According to him there was some hand to hand encounters between the Sultan and the members of his guard, and some Hindûs of gigantic stature, who were the guardians of the temple. These went on till the Hindûs were compelled to retire into the temple; and when the rest of the Sultan's escort arrived, the Sultan entered the temple, and looted it, and slew the men who were inside it. Mr. Sewell quoting from Firishtah says (p. 101) that "the Sultan went to Kondapalle (which he says in a note, Scott, p. 166, calls Ghondapore and Briggs, II, p. 500, Condapilly); and there was told that at a distance of ten days' journey was the temple of Kunchy, the walls and roof of which was plated with gold and ornamented with precious stones". In a note he says, "this evidently means Kânchi or Conjeeveram, but the story is exceedingly improbable. The distance was 250 miles, and the way lay through the heart of a hostile country". Further on quoting the Burhân-i-Ma'âthir, he says (p. 102) that "when Sultan Muhammad was at Mādur which belonged to Narasimha, who was the greatest and most powerful of the rulers of Talingana and Vijayanagar, he was informed that at a distance of fifty farakhas from his camp was a city called Gangi, containing temples, etc., to which he promptly marched, arriving before the place on the 13th March, A.D. 1481 (11th Muharram, A.H. 886). He sacked the city and returned".

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

...ādil Khān, his adopted son, and he knew that while the latter was with him his enemies would not be able to do anything against him. Then Yūsuf Ādil Khān was sent against Narsingh Rāy; and the minister’s enemies entered into a conspiracy to effect his destruction. The details of the conspiracy are the same as in the text; but the names of the conspirators and some other particulars are mentioned. The chief conspirators were Žarīf-ul-mulk Dakinī and Miftāḥ Ḥabshi and Malik Ḥasan Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahārī. The two former and other Hindī slaves became intimate with a Ḥabshi slave of the minister, who was his seal-bearer, and bribed him with money and gems and delicate articles of food and different kinds of Arab horses, etc.; and one day in a convivial assembly, when the slave was inebriated, Žarīf-ul-mulk and Miftāḥ Ḥabshi produced a piece of paper which was twisted up, and said it was an account of one of their friends, to which most of the ministers or heads of departments had affixed their seals, and they asked him to affix the Khwājah’s seal to it also. The slave very foolishly affixed his master’s seal without unfolding and looking at the paper. A letter purporting to be written by the minister to the Rāy of Orissa was forged on this paper, and it was produced before the Sultān, and he without making any enquiry in the matter sent for the minister. What the latter said and did on receiving the summons, what his adherents suggested, and what happened after he had come to the Sultān’s presence are narrated in somewhat greater detail and with more picturesqueness by Firāshtah, but there is no real difference in the substance. The date of the execution is given with Šafar, 888, by Firāshtah.
3rd of Safar of that year. He lived nobly and died a martyr; may the mercy of God be on him! Khwājah Jahān Khwājah Maḥmūd Gilānī was among the most learned men of the age, and was distinguished for great perfection in literary work. He wrote an elegant book on letter-writing, and included in it the letters which he had written to the great and noble men; and named it the \textit{Riyāḍ-u-l-ināḥā}. He also sent presents and gifts to the men of his age in Khurāsān and ‘Irāq and ‘Arab and ‘Ajam; more specially he sent letters to His Holiness Maulānā ‘Abd-ur-Rahmān Jāmī, may his tomb be sanctified; and gave expression to his veneration and respect for him. His Holiness the saint also believing in his sincerity and faith in himself sent him epistles which are extant in his correspondence. Among the \textit{qasīda}s in his collected poems, there is a \textit{qasīda}, which he specially composed in the name of the Khwājah. The opening couplet of it is:

\textit{Couplet:}

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

He has also said in it:

\textit{Couplet:}

To the world he is Khwājah, to \textit{faqr} (poverty with contentment) he is the preface
There is the secret of \textit{faqr}, but under the veils of wealth:
and in a \textit{ghazl} (ode) he has said:

Jāmī! thy heart-stirring verse is an article fine;

\footnote{1} Firishta calls the book, the \textit{Raudat-ul-ināḥā}.  
\footnote{2} These and the following lines are all quoted by Firishta also; but in the second line of the first couplet \textit{nizāl} is substituted for \textit{bādil}, \textit{nizāl} means a present placed before a guest when he first comes, and may be correct. At the end of the first line of the second couplet the words \textit{awṣat} are added; and in the beginning of the second line \textit{a’t}, sign or mark, is substituted for \textit{qālīt}. In the lines from the \textit{ghazl}, which is called a \textit{qīyāh} by Firishta, the second line is \textit{bādil} Az-Ḥusn, a word of grace; and in the fourth line \textit{muḥājir} is substituted for \textit{ṣāḥib}.}
THE SULTANS OF THE DAKIN

Of that article, the charm is from the sweetness of the spirit;
Send it with the caravan to India, that it may receive
The honour of the seal of acceptance of Malik-ut-tujjār.

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

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SHIHĀB-UD-DĪN MAḤMŪD SHĀH,
SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH LASHKARI.

Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn Maḥmūd Shāh, who was the rightful
son of Sultān Muhammad Lashkari, ascended and sat on the throne

---

The Sultāns of the Dakin, 109

1 Firishtah's account of the reign after the execution of the Malik-ut-
tujjār is not so short as that of Niẓām-ud-dīn. There is not much of interest
in what he says; but he mentions the fact that there were many remains of
the great minister in Aḥmadābād Bīdar, specially a college built by him. A
note by Col. Briggs says, that a great portion of this building was demolishèd
by an explosion of gun-powder, which was stored in it, after Aurangzīb had
captured Bīdar, but what remained still attested to its grandeur. Firishtah
gives an account of the life of the minister as given by Mullā ‘Abd-ul-karīm
Hamadānī. Col. Briggs changes Hamadānī to Sindy. Firishtah also gives an
account of the attempts made by Muhammad Shāh to get hold of the wealth
which the minister was supposed to have left behind, but it was found that he
had left none, having spent all his revenue in charity, etc. When he became
convinced of the innocence of the minister, Muhammad Shāh ordered that his
remains should be conveyed to Bīdar for interment. Firishtah goes on to
say, that after this, the nobles all separated from Muhammad Shāh; and the
latter, knowing that an attempt to enforce his authority would end in civil
war, refrained from doing so. He halted for three months at Fīrūzābād,
savouring to beguile the time in pleasure. He proclaimed his son Shāhzādah
Maḥmūd to be his successor. After that he grew weak, and his illness was
drained by frequent indulgence in intoxicating liquors. He died, according
Firishtah, on the 1st Ṣafar, 887 A.H., 24th March, 1482, i.e., about eleven
months after the date mentioned by Niẓām-ud-dīn; and the period of his reign
was twenty years. Mr. Sewell gives 11th Muḥarram, 886 A.H., 21st March,
1481. The Hijri date is more than a year anterior to that given by Firishtah.
of sovereignty and rule, after the death of his father. They say that in the keenness of his intellect, and the nobility of his spirit, and in other perfection, he was distinguished among the Bahmani Sultāns. When his government attained to stability, the duties of the post of vazir were allotted to 1 Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk, and Malik

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

1 He is called ملك توم الملك by Firishtah. The latter describes the coronation ceremony in some detail. It is rather difficult to unravel the plots and intrigues which took place immediately afterwards. According to Niẓām-ud-dīn, Niẓām-ul-mulk was the villain of the piece, and Qiwām-ul-mulk a simple-minded man, who was easily duped by him. Firishtah’s account is not so simple. It appears that there was considerable by-play between Yusuf ‘Ādil Khān on the one hand and Niẓām-ul-mulk on the other. Then it was settled that Niẓām-ul-mulk would become the Vakil-us-saltanat, and his other appointments should be made over to other nobles; and for a time there was peace and amity. But after two or three months Niẓām-ul-mulk and Qiwām-ul-mulk broke the engagement which they had entered into, and intended to remove Yusuf ‘Ādil Khān from Bījpūr, and place ‘Ādil Khān Dakini, who was the deputy governor of Warangal there. They then summoned ‘Ādil Khān Dakini and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk to the capital on the pretense of their coming to congratulate the Sultān; and they came with their troops, and encamped outside the city. Two or three weeks after this, Niẓām-ul-mulk told the simple-minded Qiwām-ul-mulk that he would that day send for the Dakini troops, and he would remove ( ) Yusuf ‘Ādil Khān; and they would then be freed from all apprehension from him; and they would send away all his partisans to their respective thānās. He also represented to Qiwām-ul-mulk that the Dakini amirs were afraid to come out of their houses ( نمي نتراند ) بدر خانة امد the meaning of which is not clear. It may mean what I have said in the text, or it may mean that they could not come to the palace, for fear of the Turkī amirs. If he considered it desirable, an order should be issued, that the Turkī amirs should not come out of their houses that day. Qiwām-ul-mulk accepted this suggestion. The next day the young Sultān was placed on a bastion of the citadel; and a message was sent to Yusuf ‘Ādil Khān and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk Dakini that they should parade their troops in front of him; and should then receive permission to go away to their fīds. Farḥād-ul-mulk, kotwal, getting information of this, intimated to Qiwām-ul-mulk that Niẓām-ul-mulk had traitorous designs against him and all the Turkī amirs; and was merely making the destruction of Yusuf ‘Ādil Khān a pretext; and it would be foolish for them to sit inert and negligent in their houses. Qiwām-ul-mulk had enmity towards ‘Ādil Khān, and had perfect faith in the
Niẓām-ul-mulk; but as the Turkī āmirīs were many in number, their party was the stronger of the two. Owing to this, the fiery furnace of the envy of Niẓām-ul-mulk and all the Indian nobles was inflamed. At last by the exertions of the great and the noble, they entered into agreements with one another, and confirmed them with strong oaths. But the perfidious Niẓām-ul-mulk, taking the thread of flattery in his hand, and having made the simple-minded Qiyām-ul-mulk careless and negligent, stated one day, that ʿĀdil Khān and Daryā Khān and Mallū Khān and certain others wanted that they should, after receiving permission, go back to their respective thānas or posts. They were, however, owing to a fear which they had in their hearts, in respect of the Turkī āmirīs, unable to come out of their houses. It would be advisable that on the day they should receive permission to leave, the Turkī āmirīs should remain in their houses. Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk agreed to this proposal; and on the following day friendship of Niẓām-ul-mulk; and as his destruction was at hand, did not attend to the kotwāl’s warning. ʿĀdil Khān Dakinī and Fath-ul-lah ʿImād-ul-mulk then came into the city with their respective troops from Tilang and Kāwīl; and were honoured by being allowed to salute the Sultān. The latter, who was a puppet in the hands of Niẓām-ul-mulk’s party, sent for the chiefs of the two troops to the top of the bastion and told them that the Turkī slaves were committing excesses, and should be punished. Fath-ul-lah ʿImād-ul-mulk, who was on terms of sincere attachment to Yūsuf ʿĀdil Khān guarded him in the mêlée; and ʿĀdil Khān Dakinī and his troops were ordered to massacre the Turks. Qiwām-ul-mulk was first murdered and Farhād-ul-mulk the kotwāl was put into prison; and other Turks were killed. Yūsuf ʿĀdil Khān and his followers fought their way to the city gate, and brought in Daryā Khān, who had twenty-two thousand troops according to one statement, and ten thousand according to another; and there were skirmishes in the city for twenty days between the two parties; till the learned and wise men intervened, and proposals were made for peace. Yūsuf ʿĀdil Khān with his adherents went away to Bījāpur.

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

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

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

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

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

Couplet:

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

_____________________

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

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

Couplet:

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

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

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

When this news reached Sultân Maḥmûd, he appointed Qiwâm- ul-mulk with fifty thousand horsemen to attack Bahâdur. When

1 Firishtah gives the following account of the antecedents of Bahâdur Gilânî; he was a servant of Malik-ut-tujjâr Khwâjah Maḥmûd Gilânî. After the latter’s martyrdom, he became a servant of Najm-ud-dîn Gilânî; and when the latter was in charge of the port of Goa, he became the kotâwal of that town, and became known for his bravery and courage. When Najm-ud-dîn died, the thought of hostility (مɡھ nakat), or more correctly rebellion, entered his mind; and in the year 889, he took possession of Goa and the entire fief of Kishwar Khân; and in a short time he seized Dâbul and Chaul and Kalhar and Panâla and Kolâpûr and Sarvâla and Nilgawân and Mirich.
Qiwām-ul-mulk arrived at Mahīm, he made enquiries about the different roads. It was at last found out that it would be difficult to reach their destination unless they marched over a part of the Deccan. So after attacking certain villages, he came alone to the court, marching with great rapidity, so that he might represent the true state of things, and obtain permission to trespass into the Dakini kingdom.

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

---

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

Couplets:

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

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

---

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

1 The name is Mālwa in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah the name cannot be made out; the sentence being بیداة رند where the word بیداة appears to be a mistake for the name of the place, but it will be seen from note 2, p. 122, Firishtah has Pīdā as the name for a place, Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 541) calls the place Walwa. The birth of the son is mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but I cannot find any reference to it in Col. Briggs's History.
Maḥmūd Shāh, in accordance with the prayers of the amīrs, drew the pen of forgiveness across the offences of Bahādur Gilānī, and pardoned all his faults. He ordered that if Bahādur would hasten to render homage to him, and would send two elephants, and the tribute, which had been fixed, to the treasury, the forts and towns, which have been taken out of his possession, would again be restored to him. Khwājah Na'īmat-ul-lah wrote to Bahādur that his prayers had been accepted, and he should come with all haste. When the Khwājah's letter reached Bahādur, 1 the crow of pride again laid the egg of conceit and exultation in his head. He cast down the honour which he would have acquired by his (forth-coming) engagements and promises into the dust of wretchedness. The amīrs, taking Maḥmūd Shāh with them, advanced in the direction of the fort of Ḥājkīr. When they arrived on the bank of the river of Kalhar, they distributed the batteries (among themselves), and besieged the fort. When the morning raised the veil of darkness from the cheek of the sky, the whole army at once galloped into the battle-field, and whoever came out of the fort to give them battle, became at once food for their swords. When the greatness and grandeur of Maḥmūd Shāh's army were impressed on the minds of the enemy, and night came on, they gave up all idea of fighting, and took to flight: and owing to their evil destiny 3 the town of Kalhar was sacked.

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

1 This agrees generally with Frishtah; but he adds that Bahādur boasted that he would have the Khutba (public prayers) read in his own name, that same year, in Ahmadābād Bīdar, and the next year in Ahmadābād Gujrat. Col. Briggs (vol. II. p. 34) says that Bahādur "made an attack on the King's baggage", but I cannot find any mention of this in the lith. ed. of Frishtah.

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

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

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

1 Apparently not mentioned by Frishtah.

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


4 Frishtah says that the qaunāma was to bear the sacred seal (mhā’r. of the Sultān) and also the seals of Malik Qasim Barīd Turk, and other chief men. It may be mentioned that throughout the narrative of the expedition against Bahādur Gīlānī, and in fact of the whole reign, both in the accounts of Nizām-ud-din and Frishtah, there are indications of Mahmūd Shāh being a puppet in the hands of Qasim Barīd and other nobles. There are attempts made to show that he had great power and grandeur, but it appears also that he could do nothing without the concurrence of Qasim Barīd and his associates.
(qaunāma) might be sent to him by the hand of the vāzīrs, so that
1 he might, with assurance of safety, come and attend on His Majesty; and for the remainder of his life never transgress the path of obedience. Māhmūd Shāh accepted the prayer in order to put down the flames of disturbance; and sent the qaunāma. Khwājah Na'mat-ul-lah again represented that if 2 Sharf-ul-Ulāmā Ṣadr Jahān and Qādī Zain-ud-dīn Ḥasan should also go with the 3 learned men, it would be the cause of greater faith in the wild (وحشي) Bahādur. (The Sultān) ordered that these revered men should accompany the 4 vāzīrs. When the vāzīrs and noble men arrived near Bahādur (they found) a deep river (in front of them). First of all Khwājah Na'mat-ul-lah and 5 Khwājah Majd-ud-dīn crossed the river, and described the graciousness of the Sultān, and the coming of the vāzīrs.

Bahādur's resolution was again changed, and his evil destiny did not permit that he should keep his feet of grace straight in the path of goodness. The two Khwājahs came back, and stated to the vāzīrs how the matter stood. 6 Khadam Khān who had the reins of the affairs in his grasp of authority, and Quṭb-ul-mulk then crossed the river, and went to Bahādur; and they did everything that was possible in the way of advice. Bahādur welcomed the arrival of the Khāns with all honour and respect, but as his mind had become darkened, it did not at all become clear by the polishing of

---

1 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has 2 They otherwise has 3 The lith. ed. has 4 The first appears to me to be the best, and I have accepted it.

2 He is called 3 Both MSS. have 4 The MSS. have but 5 According to Firishtah he had come with Khwājah Na'mat-ul-lah, bearing Bahādur's petitions.

6 This name is doubtful. It is 7 8 in one MS., and 9 in the other. It is 10 in the lith. ed., and 11 in Firishtah.
their precepts. When they returned Makhdūm Aʿzam, Șadr Jahān and Qādī Zain-ud-dīn Hasan also went, and did not refrain from giving him advice. But as he had fallen a hundred fareakhs away from the path of truth, good fortune did not come to his aid; and wishing only to waste time, he said that if Maḥmūd Shāh should march towards the fort of Mirīch, this slave (that is he himself) would come there and render him homage.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 Firishta says the garden was called Kālbāgh, and it had been planted by Malik-ul-tujjār Maḥmūd Čawān Khwājah Jahān, and not by Fakhr-ul-mulk Khwājah Jahān, as stated by Nişām-ud-dīn. He also says that the Sultān visited it at the invitation of Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān, after sending the camp on to the capital; and the tribute was offered by Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān.
more than can be contained in the desire of anybody, and was
ealted by the gift of a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt.

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

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

1 Firishtah also mentions these presents.
2 It appears from Firishtah, that the defeat and death of Bahadur Gilani,
and the events connected with them, took place on or before 901 A.H., 1495
A.D.; and Nizam-ud-din says that Sultan Mahmud died in 927 A.H., while
Firishtah says that he died in 928 A.H. Col. Briggs has 924 A.H., 1518 A.D.,
so that there was a period of 23 or 26 years between these events. Nizam-ud-
din passes over the account of what happened in the course of these years in
about fifteen lines of the lith. ed. Firishtah gives a more detailed account.
According to him, Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadani, who became the founder of the
Qutb Shahi dynasty was made faradhar of Warangal, and got Hasanabid
Gulbarga and Saghur with their dependencies as his fief. At the same time the
Sultan was informed that the mansabdars were the cause of the strength of the
great amirs, and of the latter rising in rebellion; and therefore except the
mansabdar amirs, all other mansabdars were taken away from Dastur Dinar
and were joined to the royal army. It may be mentioned, in explanation, that
all commanders of less than five hundred were mansabdars; and those of five
hundred and more were amirs. Dastur Dinar was aggrieved at the mansabdars
being taken away from him, and raised the standard of revolt, and took forcible
possession of a part of Tilang, which was contiguous to Gulbarga. The
Sultan demanded help from Yusuf 'Adil Khan, and he came and joined the
Sultan and Qasim Barid; and they fought with Dastur Dinar and 'Aziz-ul-mulk
and all the Habhis and Dakinis who had joined him, near the town of Mahindr
of the garden of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, owing to the assassination of Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk, and the flight of Niẓām-ul-mulk and ‘Imād-ul-

(Col. Briggs calls the place Myndurgy; and says, in a note, that it is situated near Akolkote); and Dastār Dinār was defeated, chiefly by the manly exertions of Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān. He was taken prisoner, and was ordered by the Sultān to be put to death; but he was not only pardoned, but restored in his government, at the intercession of Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān. Some of the rebels took shelter in the fort of Saghir, but it was seized, and made over to Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān.

In 902 A.H., Yūsuf Ghulām Dakīnī and Tughrīsh Khān Dakīnī and Mirzā Shams-ud-dīn (the first two are called Yoosooof Deccany and Yoorish Khan by Col. Briggs) entered into a conspiracy to destroy Qāsim Barīd; but the latter coming to know of it put them all to death. The Sultān also helped to extinguish the flames of slaughter and pillage; but he was so angry with Qāsim Barīd and the other Turks, that he would not, for one month, take their salāms; and at last, at the intercession of Shāh Muḥībb-ul-lah, he was induced with great reluctance to pardon them. After this the Sultān sank again into drunkenness and debauchery, so that his greatness and grandeur completely passed away from the minds of the people.

In 903 A.H., Maḥmūd Shāh asked the daughter of Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān, Bibī Sattī, by name, who was one year old for his son Aḥmad who was four years of age. This was child marriage in excelsis. Col. Briggs does not give the age of the bride, but calls her "the infant daughter of Yoosooof Aṭil Khān." The age of the bridegroom, he says, was fourteen years. The marriage, it was arranged, would take place at Ḥasanābād Gulbarga; and it was arranged that when the bride would attain the age of ten years she should be sent to the Shāhzāda. While the marriage festivities were still in progress, Dastār Dinār and Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān had a dispute about the fief of Gulbarga, the former arguing that Bijāpur up to the bank of the Bithura (Bimā) should belong to Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān, and Gulbarga and Amatgir as far as the boundary of Tilang should belong to him (Col. Briggs has Kooolburga, Sagur and Egeer); and the latter that Ḥasanābād, Gulbarga, Aland, Gajnajutl and Kalīān should belong to him, so that his territory abut on that of the Sultān. A battle was fought between the two contestants, and their partisans, in the neighbourhood of Ganjutl. Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān was victorious, and became very powerful, so that even the Sultān could not sit on the throne in his presence. Then the nobles retired to their fiefs; and Qāsim Barīd returned, and became vakil as before; and now his power became so great that the Sultān without his permission could not get even a drink of water when he was thirsty.

In 904 A.H., Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān led an army against Dastār Dinār; and the latter fled from Ḥasanābād Gulbarga; and at the suggestion of Qāsim Barīd went to Malik Aḥmad Niẓām-ul-mulk, who rendered him much help. Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān being unable to withstand them hastened to Aḥmadābād Bīdār. The Sultān wrote to Malik Aḥmad Niẓām-ul-mulk and directed him not to assi-
mulk; and the hearts of the amirs had become estranged from him. At this time, when he returned from camp, and took up his residence

Dastūr Dinār. Malik Ahmad Niẓām-ul-mulk complied with this, but prayed that the Sultān would direct Yusuf 'Ādil Khān not to molest Dastūr Dinār. Yusuf 'Ādil Khān, at a hint from the Sultān forbore from causing further molestation to Dastūr Dinār.

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

In 912 A.H., Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk and Fakhr-ul-mulk Dakini Khwājah Jahān died and their sons succeeded them. Amīr Barīd tried to seize Bijāpūr but all his efforts were unsuccessful.

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

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

with the Sultān, and placed the latter in such strict confinement that it was impossible for him again to attempt to escape. Firishtah is rather inconsistent in describing the last days of Mahmūd Shāh. He says first that he, i.e., he was not counted among the dead or among the living; but later on he says that he and his son, who were both weak in intellect and indolent, were contented with, i.e., with wine and mistresses and cup bearers and their throne and palace.

Firishtah places the death of Mahmūd Shāh on the 4th Dhil Ḥijjah, 924 A.H., (Col. Briggs has 928 A.H., October 21, 1518), and says that he reigned for 37 years and 20 days.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 In the year 927 A.H., Malik Barîd placed Sultân Ahmad Shâh, son of Mahmûd Shâh, on the throne, in the city of Bîdar, with the concurrence and advice of the amîrs and kâns; but he left only the name of bâdshâh to him; and kept him (confined) in his house. The amîrs all took up their residences in their jâgîrs; and were all independent of one another. The name of bâdshâh was given to

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

The Sultân sent men secretly to Ismâ'il 'Âdîl Khân, and complained of the hardships he suffered at the hands of Amîr Barîd. Ismâ'il 'Âdîl Khân sent an ambassador with presents, and sent some verbal messages, but the Sultân did before the ambassador could arrive.

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

**AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN ‘ALĀ-UD-DIN,**

SON OF MAḤMŪD SHĀH.

When the poor and helpless Aḥmad Shāh died, Malik Barīd, with the concurrence of the amīrs took ‘Alā-ud-dīn, the brother of Aḥmad Shāh by the hand; and made him the bādshāh. He kept him (confined) in the house as he had kept his brother. The nobility of the nature and the high spirit of the prince, however, incited him to collect men round him, and to give fresh life to the ancient customs and rules; and like his great ancestors to conquer fresh territory. Malik Barīd coming to know of this in concert with Nizām-ul-mulk, son of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and ‘Imād-ul-mulk, son of ‘Imād-ul-mulk and ‘Ādil Khān, son of ‘Ādil Khān Sawālī, took away the name of sultānat from him. He in truth released him from bondage and confinement; and raised his brother in his place. The period of his reign, which was passed in confinement and imprisonment, was one year and eleven months.

---

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

According to Firishta Amir Barīd kept the throne unoccupied for fourteen days; but after that, for the same reason as before, he did not himself mount it, but placed ‘Alā-ud-dīn on it. The latter, who was brave and intelligent and knew that his predecessors had ruined themselves by indulgence in wine and sensual pleasures, abstained from them; and exerted himself to effect the destruction of Amir Barīd and the others, who had seized his ancestral dominion.

With this object he flattered and conciliated Amir Barīd. At the same time he collected a body of men for the assassination of Amir Barīd; and kept them concealed in the palace. They were to seize Amir Barīd and his associates when they came to offer their salutations on the morning of the first day of the month. When they came near the Sultan's apartment, one of the men who was hiding happened to sneeze. The plot was discovered. The conspirators were tortured and put to death; and the Sultan was imprisoned and soon after put to death. His reign extended to two years and three months.
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AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTÁN WALI-UL-LAH, SON OF MAHMÚD SHÁH.

When 1 Malik Barid, son of Barid, gave Sultán ‘Alá-ud-din freedom from the imprisonment of sovereignty, he brought his brother, who had the name of Walt-ul-lah, and appended the name of Sultán to him. He however without hesitation entered the Sultán’s harem, and no one had the power to forbid him. Going there he conceived a passion for the Sultán’s wife; and his evil passion led him to administer poison to Walt-ul-lah; and to take the latter’s wife to himself. The period of his (i.e., Walt-ul-lah’s) 2 imprisonment did not reach a year.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF 3 KALIM-UL-LAH, SON OF MAHMÚD SHÁH.

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

---

1 Both MSS. leave out the word Malik before the second Barid. Of course the father was Qasim Barid, and the son Amir Barid.

2 According to Firishtah Walt-ul-lah reigned as a puppet in Amir Barid’s hand for three years. He also like his brother tried to secure freedom. After this, Amir Barid confined him in his harem. The latter then conceived a passion for the Sultán’s wife; and effected his death; and then took his wife to himself.

3 Firishtah also in the heading of his account of Sultán Kalim-ul-lah’s reign calls the latter the son of Sultán Mahmúd Bahmaní; but at the end of his account of the reign of Sultán Walt-ul-lah, calls Sultán Kalim-ul-lah, daughter’s son of Yúsuf ‘Adil Sháh. This is incorrect, because it was Ahmad Sháh the eldest son of Mahmúd Sháh, and not Mahmúd Sháh himself, who married the daughter of Yúsuf ‘Adil Sháh. Col. Briggs makes the same mistake at the commencement of the account of Kulleen Oolla Shah Bahmanú where he describes the latter as “The son of Ahmad Shah by the daughter of Yoososof ‘Adil Shah”. It will be seen from the account of the events of the year 903 A.H. in footnote, page 128, and also from Col. Briggs’ History (vol. II, page 558) that it was Ahmad Shah who was married to the daughter of Yoososof ‘Adil Shah.

4 Both MSS. have از دست ملك برید without any reference to Malik Barid’s parentage; but the lith. ed. has از دست ملك برید بن برید.
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1 When the curtain of agreement was raised from the face of the affairs of the amirs, 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwill went to the aid of Muḥammad Kān son of ʿĀdīl Kān the ruler of Asrī and Burhānpūr, and, after fighting with Niẓām-ul-mulk and Malik Barīd and Khusdawand Kān and all the amirs of the Deccan ran away. Three hundred elephants and a hundred horses and a large quantity of arms fell into the hands of the Dakinī armies. 'Imād-ul-mulk fled to Asrī and Burhānpūr. But in the end, with the help of Sultan Bahādur (of Gujrāt), he regained possession of his dominions. In the year 935 A.H., he read the Khutba in the name of Sultan Bahādur in the towns and parganas of his territories. Again at the invitation of 'Imād-ul-mulk, Sultan Bahādur invaded the Deccan. As Niẓām-ul-mulk and Malik Barīd and the other amirs were not strong enough to withstand him, they in their helplessness, read the Khutba in the name of Sultan Bahādur in Ahmadnagar and all the provinces of the Deccan. The provinces of the Deccan then came into the possession of four amirs; viz., Niẓām-ul-mulk, ʿĀdīl Kān, Qutb-ul-mulk and

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

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

SECTION II. 1 THE NIŻĀM-UL-MULKI LINE OR DYNASTY.

AN ACCOUNT OF NIŻĀM-UL-MULK BAḤRI.

He was a slave of Brahman descent. His name had been 2 بَهَرَو (Bhareu); and by change of letters, he was called Bahri. His son Ahmad, who had in his head an ambition to rule, commenced hostilities, the vażīr of Sulṭān Kalīm-ul-lah made Niżām-ul-mulk Bahri a prisoner, and drawing a pencil across his eyes, ulti-

1 Firishtah begins with an account of the ‘Ādil Shāhī line, and then goes on with the Niżām Shāhīs. The title of the section is not given in the text-edition.

2 Bhareu may be a corruption of Bhairo, which again is a corruption of Sanskrit Bhairava (lit. terrible) one of the names of the god Siva. Firishtah (lith. ed.) says that Malik Nāyib Niżām-ul-mulk Bahri’s name was دِمَبِهْطَ بَهَرَو;  Bhiru. Col Briggs (vol. III, p. 189) says his name was Timāb, son of Bhairoo. It is not clear to me why he was called Bhiru or Bahri which was his father’s name, and not Timāb which was his own name. According to Firishtah, Timābhat and Bhareu were taken prisoners by the Musalmāns in Bijānagar in the reign of Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanī; and Bhareu’s name was changed to Ḥasan when he was enlisted among the Sulṭān’s slaves or guards. He was very intelligent, and so was sent to school with the prince who later became Muḥammad Shāh. In a short time he became well-known as Malik Ḥasan Bhareu; but Muḥammad Shāh in his boyhood being unable to pronounce Bhareu changed it to Bahri; and he became known as Malik Ḥasan Bahri. When Muḥammad became the Sulṭān, he made Malik Ḥasan Bahri a commander of one thousand horse; and the latter gradually rose to be Niżām-ul-mulk Bahri; and by the favour of Khwājas Jahan Gāwān was made ṭaraṣfīr of Tilang. In the text-edition it is بَهِرُ.

3 This is a very brief and incomplete and confused account. Firishtah’s account of the Niżām Shāhī dynasty begins with the reign of Aḥmad Niżām Shāh. The murder of Niżām-ul-mulk is only incidentally mentioned in it, where it is said that when Aḥmad Niżām Shāh, after capturing a number of forts such as Jaund and Lahagar and Tangi, etc., was engaged in the siege of the fort of Dandi Rājpūrī, that he heard of the murder of his father. As this happened before 895 A.H., it could not have been the act of the vażīr of Sulṭān Kalīm-ul-lah, as stated erroneously in the text; but must have occurred in the reign of Maḥmūd Shāh which extended from 887 A.H. to 924, 927 or 928 A.H., according to different accounts.
mately put him to death. His rule had no stability, and has been narrated in the history of the Bahmanis.

1 An account of Aḥmad, son of Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī.

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

3 An account of Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk, son of Aḥmad.

When Burhān sat in his father’s place,4 Shāh Tāhir who was one of the wisest men of the age, came from Sulṭāniya’ in ‘Irāq to the

---

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

2 The words are in one MS. only, but not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have, however, inserted them in the text.

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

4 Firishta begins with a long and detailed account of the previous history of Shāh Tāhir. According to that Shāh Tāhir established himself in 926 A.H.
AN ACCOUNT OF Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk, SON OF BURHĀN.

After his father 1 he sat in the latter's place. It is related traditionally that Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk became enamoured of a 2 prostitute, and married her. One day he asked her in private, what persons she had liked best, and pleased most, among the men who had visited her during the time that she had lived in her former way. She named four persons. He had all four of them seized, and gave orders for those helpless persons being put to death. That prostitute was called Āmlīna and Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk was born of her.

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

Afterwards 'Ādil Shāh espoused the cause of Mirān Shāh 'Ali who was his cousin (aṭimahdād); but Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh advanced with seven thousand horsemen, whom he obtained from Daryā 'Imād-ul-mulk, to Sholāpur, which 'Ādil Shāh was then besieging, and after a severe battle the Bijāpur army was defeated.

2 She is called a ғالحشة لمى مسلحي by Niẓām-ud-dīn. She is annually ғالحشة in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and in Col. Briggs's History (vol. III, p. 215), "Ameena, a dancing girl". Firishtah says, Burhān made her the chief of his harem; and from her he learned to drink intoxicating liquors; and, owing to this, Muhammad Khaṅ who was his vakīl and vazīr during his minority, and had worked with zeal and ability, resigned his office. It is also mentioned by Firishtah that when in 931 A.H. Burhān Shāh married Bibi Marīm, the sister of Ismā'īl 'Ādil Shāh, Bibi Āmlīna did not treat her well; and she complained to her brother, and there was a war between Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk and his allies. Amīr Barī, and 'Alī-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk on the one hand and Ismā'īl 'Ādil Shāh on the other in which 'Imād-ul-mulk was defeated and retired in precipitation to Kāwil; and Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk became unconscious, through heat and thirst; and was carried away in a pālki to Ahmadnagar.
At that time 1 Râm Râj of Bijânagar, which in the Hindi language is known as 2 Bedbânagar, had acquired much strength and power. Husain Nizâm-ul-mulk with ‘Ādil Khân and Qûtb-ul-mulk and Malik Barid attacked him. 3 Râm Râj advanced to meet them with

1 It appears from Sewell’s “A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar,” p. 109, that Râm Râj or Râma Râya, as Mr. Sewell calls him, was not the titular Râja of Vijayanagar. Sadâsiva, who succeeded Achyuta in 1542 A.D., was the Râja de jure, but he “was virtually a prisoner in the hands of Râmâ Râya, the eldest of three brothers, at first nominally his minister, but afterwards independent”.

2 The name is بیدا ناگر in the MSS. and بید ماگر in the 16th ed. In text بید ناگر.

3 This is a very brief and incorrect account of the relations between the Nizâm Shâhî rulers and those of Bijânagar and the final defeat and death of Râm Râj. It appears from Firishtah, that the relations between Burhân Nizâm Shâh and Ibrâhim ‘Ādil Shâh were strained; and in 950, Burhân Shâh sent Shâh Tâhir to congratulate Jamshîd Qûtb Shâh on his accession; and on that occasion he instigated Râm Râj and Qûtb Shâh to invade and conquer a part of the ‘Ādil Shâhî dominion. ‘Ādil Shâh, however, conciliated both Nizâm Shâh and Râm Râj. Some time after that, Burhân Shâh at the instigation of Râm Rây advanced to Gulbarga. ‘Ādil Shâh went forward to meet Râm Rây and a great battle ensued in which Burhân Shâh was at first victorious; but in the end he was attacked by ‘Ādil Shâh, when his troops were engaged in plundering; and was signalised defeated, and fled to Aḥmadnagar, leaving behind his royal umbrella and standards and elephants and artillery.

After various other operations and after the death of Shâh Tâhir, Burhân Nizâm Shâh again resolved to attack the Bijâpur territory and sent ambassadors to Râm Râj. The latter was put to great straits by the Marhatta cavalry under Ibrâhim ‘Ādil Shâh. Burhân Nizâm Shâh attacked ‘Ādil Shâh’s camp, when he and his nobles and soldiers were engaged in celebrating the ‘Id, and slow many of them and compelled the rest to run away in all haste. After this Kâliân was surrendered by the garrison. In the mean time, ‘Ādil Shâh marched into the Nizâm Shâhî territory, and devastated Bîr and other parganas; and laid siege to Parinda and captured it. After that ‘Ādil Shâh went back to Bijâpûr and Burhân Nizâm Shâh marched towards Parinda. The thânadîr
one hundred thousand horsemen and two thousand elephants, and arranged them in order of battle; and it was likely that the four

being panic struck left the place and Niżām Shāh recaptured it, and made it over to Khwājah Jahān, and returned to Ahmādnagar.

He again opened negotiations with Rām Rāj; and passing through the Bijāpūr territory, met him in the neighbourhood of Rāichūr; and they settled that Rāichūr and Mudkāl should be seized, and should belong to Rām Rāj; and Sholāpūr and Gulbarga to Būhrān Shāh. They accordingly seized these forts. In 960, Būhrān Shāh and Rām Rāj again invaded the Bijāpūr territory, and settled that they should besiege the fort of Sāghir and Etgar, and should seize the whole of the neighbouring territory up to the river Bīrā; and then seize Bijāpūr and Gulbarga. In 961 when they advanced towards Bijāpūr, ʿĀdil Shāh being unable to meet them retired to Panāla. Būhrān Shāh was engaged in the siege of Bijāpūr and was about to seize it, when he fell ill and going back to Ahmādnagar died there. Fīrishtāh points out that Mahmūd Shāh of Gujrat and Salīm Shāh Sūr died in the same year.

After the accession of Hūsain Niżām Shāh and the death of Ibrāhīm ʿĀdil Shāh the former sent ambassadors to Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shāh; and they marched from their respective capitals, and met at Gulbarga, and laid siege to it; and were about to capture it, when Muṣṭafā Khān Ardistānī, the minister of Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shāh persuaded the latter to detach himself from Hūsain Niżām Shāh; and the latter had to return to his capital without attaining his object. ʿAlī ʿĀdil Shāh who had succeeded Ibrāhīm ʿĀdil Shāh now entered into an alliance with Rām Rāj and Quṭb Shāh, in order to retaliate the injury done to him. Hūsain Niżām Shāh sent Mūllā ʿAlī Mazandarānī to Dāryā ʿImād-ul-mulk of Berār; and the emissary succeeded in bringing about an interview between his master and ʿImād-ul-mulk near Sānpat (the lith. ed. of Fīrishtāh says on the bank of the Ganges, but Col. Briggs says, more correctly, on the bank of the Godavari); and a marriage was arranged and celebrated with great splendour between the daughter of ʿImād-ul-mulk, and Hūsain Niżām Shāh.

Sometime after, in the year 967 A.H., ʿAlī ʿĀdil Shāh with Rām Rāj and Quṭb Shāh advanced towards Ahmādnagar. Hūsain Niżām Shāh's minister, suggested that he should surrender the fort of Kaliān to ʿĀdil Shāh and make peace with the latter. Hūsain Niżām Shāh did not agree, and said that it would be a matter of discredit to him, if he would surrender a fort which his father had conquered with the sword. The allies arrived at Ahmādnagar with one lakhs of horsemen and two lakhs of foot-soldiers. Hūsain Niżām Shāh left Ahmādnagar in charge of his officers, and retired towards Pattaṇ, so that he might get Dāryā ʿImād-ul-mulk, and Mīrān Mubārak Shāh Fārūqī and ʿAlī Bārīd to unite with him. It so happened, however, that Khān Jahan, brother of Amīr Bārīd, who was in charge of ʿImād-ul-mulk's affairs, not only dissuaded the latter from helping Hūsain Niżām Shāh, but proceeded himself with five
rulers should meet with a defeat, when by an act of fate, a cannon ball, shot from the army of Niẓām-ul-mulk, hit Rām Rāj and killed thousand horsemen and foot-soldiers to devastate Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh's territories. He was, however, defeated by Shāh Mulla Muḥammad Naishāpūrī, whom Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh sent against him. In the meantime the allied sovereignties laid siege to Ahmadnagar; but Ḥumāyūn thinking that it would be unwise, that 'Ādil Shāh would have too great a power over Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh, allowed free passage for provisions and emissaries of Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh to enter the fort, through his lines. 'Ādil Shāh, and Rām Rāj, coming to know this, demanded an explanation from Ḥumāyūn, who, without giving it, left in the night and went back to Golconda. Rām Rāj and 'Ādil Shāh finding it difficult to maintain their position retired to the town of 'Āshṭā; and there planned that they should first seize the fort of Parinda, and afterwards return and capture Ahmadnagar. Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh then made overtures to Rām Rāj for peace. Rām Rāj agreed on three conditions, all of which Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh found it necessary to accept, Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh made over the keys of Kaliān to Rām Rāj in fulfilment of one of the latter's conditions; and he sent them to 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh.

In the beginning of 970 A.H., Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh and Ḥumāyūn met in the neighbourhood of Kaliān, and proceeded to lay siege to it, and were about to capture it, when Rām Rāj and 'Ādil Shāh arrived in that neighbourhood, with a large army. Burhān 'Imād-ul-mulk, who had succeeded his father, and 'Ali Barid joined 'Ādil Shāh. Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh then raised the siege and sent away his heavy luggage and his son and other members of his family towards the fort of Aūsa; and he himself intending to give battle to the enemy encamped at a distance of six karōhs from them. The next day Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh advanced to carry on a jihād against Rām Rāj; and Ḥumāyūn also marched forward, with such men as he had, against 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh and his Musalmān allies. It so happened, that although it was not the rainy season, there was heavy rain that day; and Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh's guns, etc., were rendered useless. Rām Rāj and 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh, becoming aware of this, attacked Ḥumāyūn Shāh's camp, and he fled without making a struggle, and took up a position behind Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh's camp. Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh now saw that it was impossible for him to do anything, and retired towards his capital. He was pursued, but he showed such dauntless courage, that the pursuers, after a time, turned back. He then came to Ahmadnagar via Aūsa.

'Ali 'Ādil Shāh, Rām Rāj and their allies marched towards Ahmadnagar, when Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh leaving the capital in charge of his officers, retired to Jūnār. The Hindūs of Rām Rāj's army destroyed mosques and palaces, and committed outrages on the women. 'Ali 'Ādil Shāh was shocked at this, but could not prevent it. He, however, advised Rām Rāj to raise the siege, and to go in pursuit of Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh. Rām Rāj agreed, and they went after Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh. The latter retired to the hilly country, after
him. His army was routed; and much booty fell into the hands of the amirs of the Deccan. Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk ruled for thirteen years. He left two sons Murtaḍā and Burhān.

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

After this in 972 A.H., Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh and ‘Ali ʿĀdil Shāh entered into matrimonial and political alliances; and they also secured the alliance of the other Musalmān sovereigns, except Burhān ʿImād-ul-mulk, for the destruction of Rām Rāj. Niẓām Shāh and Qutb Shāh and ʿĀdil Shāh and ‘Ali Barid advanced with their armies, and crossed the Krishnā, and encamped at a distance of six karōhs from it. Rām Rāj advanced with a formidable army to meet them; and they thinking that it would be impossible to withstand him, made overtures for peace. Rām Rāj refused to listen to them. There was a great battle, in which the Hindūs were defeated, mainly owing to the attack by Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh’s artillery. Rām Rāj was taken prisoner, when the sinhāsan or throne on which he was riding was thrown down by the bearers, when they were charged by some of Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh’s elephants. He was recognised, and taken to Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh, who ordered him immediately to be beheaded. This battle is known as the battle of Talikota, though according to Mr. Sewell, see note 2, page 199 of his book, it did not take place there. Talikota is a small fortress and town near the Krishnā. “The battle took place ten miles from Rāma Rāya’s camp south of the river, wherever that might have been.” Mr. Sewell thinks it probable that it took place near the celebrated fort of Mudkal. “The ford crossed by the allies would appear to be that at the bend of the river at Ingalī; and the decisive battle seems to have been fought in the plain about the little village of Bāyapur to Bhōgapur, on the road leading directly from Ingalī to Mudkal.” Col. Briggs has also pointed out that the battle “has been called the battle of Talikota by the Mahomedans because the head-quarters of the several sovereigns were near that village. The battle was fought on the south bank of the Krishnā, nearly twenty rulers off.” (See footnote, page 126, vol. IIII of his History.)

This again is a very long note, but I have considered it necessary to insert it so that there might be a correct narrative of the events, as far as that can be ascertained by a reference to Firishtah.
AN ACCOUNT OF MURTADA NIZAM-UL-MULK.

By the order and testamentary direction of his father, he succeeded the latter. He was benevolent and friendly to the poor.

According to Firishtah, Murtada's mother Khunza Humayün (called Khoonza Sooltana by Col. Briggs) carried on the government for six years, with Mullâ 'Inayat-ul-lah as the peshwa, and in accordance with the advice of Qasim Beg Hakim. She raised her three brothers to the highest rank of nobility and sat daily with Mullâ 'Inayat-ul-lah to transact public business from behind the parda. At this time, 'Ali 'Adil Shah advanced against the Hindûs of Bijanaganagar. Venkatadri, the brother of Râm Râj applied to Khunza Humayûn for help. She led an army into the Bijapur territory, and compelled 'Ali 'Adil Shâh to retire. Peace was, however, soon made between the two Mulsâman princes; and they entered into an alliance against Tufal Khan, the prime minister of Burhan 'Imâd Shâh, who had seized his master's dominions, and who had not joined them in their invasion of Bijanaganagar. They plundered the country; and on the approach of the rains, Tufal Khan propitiated 'Ali 'Adil Shâh; and the 'Adil Shâhi and Nizâm Shâhi armies returned to their respective territories.

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

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

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

1 The name is ʿĀdil Khān instead of Tufāl Khān in the text-edition.

2 Nizām-ud-din does not mention the circumstances under which the death of Changiz Khān took place. According to Firishtah Shāh Mīrzā Iṣfahānī, who was ḥājib or chamberlain of Qutb Shāh learned that Nizām Shāh’s army would march against Bidar. He first of all offered a large bribe to Changiz Khān so that he might give up the idea of the invasion. Changiz Khān indignantly refused the bribe, upon which Shāh Mīrzā Iṣfahānī bribed Śāhib Khān, whom Firishtah describes as a mercial نظام الملك, and Col. Briggs as a favourite minion of the king; and told him to report to Nizām Shāh that Changiz Khān wanted to make himself the ruler of Berār. Murtada Nizām Shāh at first did not believe the report; but Śāhib Khān persisted in the accusation, and referred Nizām Shāh to Shāh Mīrzā Iṣfahānī. The Sultan sent for him, and Shāh Mīrzā of course corroborated Śāhib Khān’s statement. Murtada Nizām Shāh then gave some credence to the accusation; but to make assurance doubly sure, he told Changiz Khān, that he was tired with the long stay in the camp, and wanted to go back to Aḥmadnagar. Changiz Khān told him that he should remain there for sometime longer. This confirmed the Shāh’s suspicions and his demeanour towards Changiz Khān changed. The latter perceived this, and for some days, on the pretext of illness, he did not go and wait on Murtada Shāh. This confirmed the latter’s belief and he sent a ḥakim to Changiz Khān, with a poisoned draught, which he was to represent as a medicine. Changiz Khān at first refused to drink it; but in the end remembering Murtada Shāḥ’s kindnesse to him, drank it off, after writing a petition to the latter.

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

3 This does not agree with Firishtah’s account. According to him, Murtada Nizām Shāh first made Ḥakim Muḥammad Mīrī his vakil, but after six months dismissed him and appointed Qādī Beg Yazdi to that post. But Firishtah also mentions the outrages committed by Śāhib Khān on the people, and even on the amirs.
his behests. After a time he marched to attack the amirs of Berar, among whom were Mir Murtaḍa and Khudāwand Khān, and others. As the latter knew his intention they forestalled him, and slew him. Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh grieved much, and saw no remedy except in madness. At this time the derangement of his brain became violent; and he secluded himself in Bāgh-i-Bihisht (the garden of paradise); and never came out of it. He also did not allow any one to go near him; and it was only rarely, that any one was received in audience. At all times the vazīrs were engaged in the affairs of the state, and maintained the stability of the government. If a matter of importance had to be dealt with, they submitted a written report to him; and he wrote a reply to it.

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

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

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

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

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

It so happened that 1 Burhan brother of Murtaqa Niizam-ul-mulk escaped from prison, and rose in revolt. The amirs brought out Murtaqa, and defeated Burhan. The latter fled, and went as a suppliant to the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilahi, and received imperial favours. Murtaqa again secluded himself in that garden. No one went near him. This happened in the year 996 A.H. A period of three years passed in this way. There was war several times between the armies of Niizam-ul-mulk and ‘Adil Khan, and peace was each time made. A Circassian (Karjal) slave of Shah Tahmasp of the name of Salabat Khan acquired an ascendency in the service of Niizam-ul-mulk; and became his minister pleni-potentiary. Mir Murtaqa and Khudawand Khan and the other jagirdar amirs of Berar had enmity with Salabat Khan. They came with a large force, and attacked Ahmadnagar. Salabat Khan fought with them and defeated them. The Berar amirs then fled, and went for protection to the threshold of the Khalifa-i-Ilahi, which was the asylum of the world. They obtained reinforcements there, and again came back to Berar. An account of these events has already been given in its place.

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

1 She is called فتى نور نامه in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls her نجفی شاه لولین; and Col. Briggs has "Futteh Shah a dancer"; and he described her apparently as a man, and not as a woman (vol. III, page 264).

2 One MS. has نشته به ماماد از مرتفع نظام الملک; while the lith. ed. has ماماد ص با صت. The phrase ماماد ص is an abbreviation of ماماد ص (correct) and is equivalent to a signature.

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

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

When Šalābat Khān ceased to be in the way Ismā‘īl became the vakil muftaq (minister with absolute power); and he and the woman Fattā acquired complete power and authority. Ismā‘īl committed various acts of tyranny and oppression. As he had made 2 Husain ‘All, son of Sultan Husain Sabazwārī his nāyib, and had conferred the title of Mirzā Khān on him, the latter when the tyranny and violence (of Ismā‘īl) went beyond all bounds, got most of the amirs to join him, and made himself the vakil of Murtada Niẓām-ul-mulk. When he found the field unoccupied, the ambition to rule got into his head; and he released (Mirān) Husain, the son of Murtada Niẓām-ul-mulk, who had nearly attained his majority, and was imprisoned in a fort, and made him the ruler of the country. 3 They

1 Firishtah, however, says that Murtada Niẓām Shāh made Qāsim Bāg ʿAskārī his vakil, and Mirzā Muḥammad Taqlī ʿAskārī his vazir.

2 According to Firishtah, however, it was Sultan Husain Sabazwārī himself, and not his son who was made regent with the title of Naṣir Khān, by Murtada Niẓām Shāh, because the other minister did not agree to the latter’s proposal to effect the destruction of Shāhzāda Mirān Husain.

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

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

**AN ACCOUNT OF ḤUSAIN NIŻĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF MURTADA NIŻĀM-UL-MULK, WHO WAS CALLED MİRĀN ḤUSAIN.**

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

---

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

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

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

Couplet:

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

1 The actual words are میراث شیاست, i.e., is one of your great amirs.

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

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

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

---

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

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

Couplets:

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

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

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

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

2 Firishtah makes it two months and three days. As 5 1/2 ten months in the text-edition.
AN ACCOUNT OF ISMÄ’IL NIZÄM-UL-MULK, SON OF BURHÄN.

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

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

1 According to Firishtah, Ibrahim the elder brother of Ismā’īl was born of a Hābite mother, and had a dark complexion and an unprepossessing appearance. Ismā’īl was a son of a daughter of one of the Nawābats of the Kōhān (Congen), and possessed both good qualities and looks. The fact mentioned by Nizām-ul-din, about his remark about the Kashmiris, does not show that he possessed the former. According to Firishtah, Jamāl Khān was a Mahdawi; and he initiated Ismā’īl in the doctrines of that sect. After this, Salāhat Khān, who was imprisoned in the fort of Kehrla on the borders of Berār, hearing of the murder of Mirān Hūsain, and being aggrieved at the power of the Mahdawīs rose in revolt; but Jamāl Khān defeated him in the neighbourhood of Pāttan, and made him retire towards Burhānpūr. He then marched to meet the ‘Ādil Shāhī forces, and the two armies met near Aśhtī. They confronted each other for fifteen days, after which peace was concluded, on an agreement that Jamāl Khān should send back the pālki of the mother Mirān Hūsain Shāh, with seventy thousand hūns as Na‘bāhā. This is what is mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs says, that the agreement was, that “Chand Beehy, the widow of Aliy Adil Shāh, and aunt to the present King of Ahmudnuggur, should be sent to the Beejapoor Camp, and the Nizam Shahy Government should pay two hundred and seventy thousand boons (Na‘bāhā)” (vol. III, p. 278).

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

3 The lith. ed. has صفر سن خورود سال و only has been adopted in the text-edition.

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

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

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

**AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF BURHĀN NIZĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF ḤUṢAIN, SON OF BURHĀN, WHO IS THE BROTHER OF MURTADĀ.**

For a long time he was kept in imprisonment by order of his brother. By chance he escaped; and went to Blājpūr and was in the court of 1ʿĀdil Khān. From there, he was summoned by some of the amīrs, and came to Aḥmadnagar. As Murtadā was alive, and Šalābat Khān was the peshwā, he was unable to do anything. He then fled to Gjūrāt; and went to Qūṭb-ud-dīn Muḥammad Khān Ghānāvī, who was one of the great amīrs of his Majesty the Khalifā-i-Ilāhī. After that, he was honoured by being allowed to kiss the noble threshold. He was then made an amīr of three hundred, and a jāgir was conferred on him. After some time he was made a commander of a thousand horse and sent to Mālwa. An army was then sent with Aʿzam Khān (with orders), that he should free the Deccan from those intemperate and vulgar people; and make it over to Burhan who was one of the 2 servants of the threshold. Aʿzam Khān arrived at Elichpūr which was the capital of Berār; but nothing was done towards the conquest of the Deccan, and he suddenly elected to return instead of standing firm. Burhan being disappointed again went to the threshold, which was the asylum of the people. These matters have already been mentioned in their proper places.

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

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ʿĀdil Khān; the other has ʿĀdil.

2 The actual word in one of the MSS. and in the lith. ed. is برکشیده، in the other it is برکشیده. In the text-edition M. Hidāyat Ḥosain has rightly adopted برکشیده.
in the Deccan again reached the noble ears, His Majesty summoned Burhān from the country of Bangash; and with much attention and great favour sent him (to the Deccan). A farmān to be obeyed by all the world was then issued to all the amīrs of the sūba of Mālwa, and to all zamindāres and more specially to Rāja 'Alī Khān, son of Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, that they should take such measures that Burhān, who had come for 1 protection to the threshold, should be placed in the seat of his brother. A noble farmān was also sent to Nażr Bē Uzbek and his sons who had jāgīres in Mālwa. Nażr Bē and his sons joined Burhān. Rāja 'Alī Khān, considering the service a means of increase in his position and dignity, advanced (to support Burhān). When Jamāl Khān who had gone to Bijāpūr, and defeated 'Ādil Khān and seized the large number of elephants, heard that Rāja 'Alī Khān was advancing, and intended to bring forward Burhān, he marched rapidly from Bijāpūr and arrived with 2 some troops. Rāja 'Alī Khān, who had detached most of the useful of Jamāl Khān’s men from him, by means of letters and messages, 3 fought a battle. Men began to desert from Jamāl Khān’s army one by one; and the artillery men leaving the guns, etc., unattended to, fled. Jamāl Khān thoroughly amazed at this, exerted himself in spite of the great confusion. At this time one of the musketeers, one of whose relations Jamāl Khān had put to death, 4 fired at the latter, and he fell dead on the battle-field. Rāja 'Alī Khān sent Burhān with great honour and respect to Aḥmadnagar. This event happened in the month of Rajab 999 A.H. He (Burhān) is on the throne of government up to this 5 date.

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have the word که بنی بدرگیا اوروده است the other MS. substitutes که بنیا بدرگیا اوروده است.

2 The word cannot be made out. It is رعکی, in the MSS., and مکی in the lith. ed. The correct word کمکی is adopted in the text-edition.

3 There are some variations in the readings. One MS. has اندک. The other changes بنیا روودن and then says جنگی. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MSS., but substitutes اندکی for اندک.

4 I have translated the sentence as it is in the MSS. The lith. ed. has او بچجو بخارا رستند باهم در مهمک اندکی.

5 This is the end of the history of the Nizām Shāhi dynasty in one of the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but the other MS. takes the history onward to the
SECTION III. 1 THE DYNASTY OF ʿADIL KHÂN.

An account of the rule of Yūsuf ʿAdil Khân.

ʿAdil Khân, who was the founder of the dynasty, was a Circassian slave, whom Khwâjah Maḥmûd Garjistânî had sold to Maḥmûd Shâh Bahmanî. Garjistân is a dependency of Gilân. ʿAdil Khân became possessed of the country of Shôlâpur, as far as the river Krishnâ, in breadth and length from Dâbul to Gulpârga; and proclaimed year 1042 A.H., which was long after the death of Niẓîm-ud-dîn. As this is clearly an interpolation by some subsequent scribe, I have not thought it fit to translate it. It may be mentioned, however, that it contains the account of the rules of Ibrâhîm son of Burhân, of Bahûdur son of Ibrâhîm, and Ḥusain son of Bahûdur. According to Firishta Ibrâhîm succeeded Burhân. Then Aḥmad, son of Shâh Tâhir was set up, but his title was disputed. After that the Mughals stormed Aḥmadnagar. Chând Bibi defended it with courage and intrepidity. The Mughals were repulsed, but Berâr was ceded to them. Then Bahûdur Shâh's claim was established; and Chând Bibi became the regent. After three years, Aḥmadnagar was annexed to Akbar's dominion; and Bahûdur was sent to Gwalîar as a prisoner. After that Murtaḍa Niẓîm Shâh II, was set up as king with Parinda as his capital; but the whole of the power was in the hands of Malik Aḥmad.

1 This is the heading in one MS. In the other it is سلسلة عادل خان كه أول ائشنى بوصف عادل خان است. The heading in the lith. ed. does not mention the dynasty, but simply has ذكر.

2 The words غلامي خرقس برع are taken from the lith. ed. The MSS. omit them. Firishta gives a long and romantic account of the birth of ʿAdil Khân, from which it appears that he was a son of Aghâ Murâd (Amurath II), Sultân of Rûm (Constantinople). His elder brother, Muḥammad, on his accession ordered him to be strangled to death, but his mother smuggled him away; and he was taken to the town of Sâwâ, where he received a good education. His birth being afterwards divulged, he had to leave Sâwâ, and ultimately came to India.

Niẓîm-ud-dîn does not give any account of the events of his reign. Firishta's account extends over about 13 pages of the lith. ed. and Col. Briggs's translation over about 31 pages. According to Firishta his rule began in the year 895 A.H. (1489 A.D.); and according to another account in 896 A.H.; and he died in 915 A.H. (1510 A.D.) having ruled for twenty years and two months according to the lith. ed. of Firishta; and to twenty-one years according to Col. Briggs's translation. So that what little Niẓîm-ud-dîn says is incorrect. Mr. Sewell also says that 'Adil Shâh proclaimed his independence in 1489 (page 106 of his book); and he died in 1510 A.D. (page 115).

Kishîna in the text-edition.
his independence. And in the end he acquired possession of Bijápúr also, he ruled for seven years from the beginning of the year 906 to the year 913 A.H.

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

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

2 These names are differently written in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. The first appears to be ʿĀkbar, and ʿĀkbar Atkīr in the MSS., and ʿĀkbar Ankar in the lith. ed. The second and third are the same in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The fourth is Ṭūğha and Ṭūğha in the MSS., and Ṭūğha in the lith. ed. The first three places are ʿĀkbar, Ṭūğha and ʿĀkbar Bāḍ, which according to Firīshṭah had been taken by Ṭūḡrā Barī during the lifetime of and in collusion with Kamāl Khān, and were recovered by Mīrzā Jāhāngīr. Col. Briggs (vol. III. p. 46) calls them Etīsīr, Sāgar and Nūrīrābād. ʿĀkbar in the text-edition.

3 Sawā in Hindūstān means one and one quarter. I cannot find any reference to the title in Firīshṭah. It may be that the title had reference to Yūsuf ‘Ādil Shāh having come from Sawā. See note 2, page 159. The word Sawā is not in the heading in the MSS., but is in it in the lith. ed. Nīẓām-ud-dīn does not give any real account of the reign of Ismā‘īl ‘Ādil Shāh. Firīshṭah’s account extends over about thirteen pages of the lith. ed. and Col. Briggs’s translation to about forty pages; but I do not think it necessary to
and well-armed and well-equipped horsemen, most of whom were Mughals, in his service, and 1 he looked after them with care. Every year he sent ships to Hurmuz (Ormuz); and summoned men from Irāq and Khorāsān. 2 They say that one day he was a guest in the house of Imād-ul-mulk Kawelī. Imād-ul-mulk placed some dishes filled with gems and made a great show of offering them to his guests. When Imād-ul-mulk became a guest of Ismā'il 'Ādil Khān, the latter brought his army fully arrayed before his guest's eyes; and said "This is all that I have acquired; I shall offer to you any one of my servants, whom you may ask for". He carried on three wars with Nizām-ul-mulk; and was victorious each time. He ruled for a period of twenty-five years, and then passed away.

AN ACCOUNT OF 3 Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān, son of Ismā'il Khān.

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

1 The MSS. have ثُربن، but the lith. ed. has تربت میکرد.

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

3 One MS. inserts حکومت before the name. Firishtah has a short section giving an account of the history of Mallū 'Ādil Shāh. It appears that Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh died on the 16th Safar 941 A.H. (6th September, 1534 A.D.), while he was besieging Nālkonnda on the border of the Tilang country. Col. Briggs calls the fort Kowilconda. Mr. Sewell does not give the name of the fort, but describes it as a fortress belonging to the Qutb Shāhs, see page 100. Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh's sons immediately began to contend with each other for the succession but Asa'd Khān Lāri, knowing that it would be dangerous for them to fall out in a hostile country, told them that the time was inauspicious for the accession; and that they should return to Gulbagha; and after asking for inspiration from the spirit of Saiyid Muhammad Gāsū Darāz, select a Sultan. The princes agreed. Asa'd Khān was himself in favour of Ibrāhīm's succession; but as Mallū was the elder brother, and Ismā'il had directed that he should be the successor, Mallū was placed on the throne; and Ibrāhīm was imprisoned in the fortress of Mirich.

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

AN ACCOUNT OF ‘ALI ‘ĀDIL KHÂN, SON OF IBBĀHĪM.

In accordance with the directions of his father, he sat in the latter’s place. He had two brothers Tāhmāsp and Ismā’īl. He,

Nizām-ud-dīn says very little about the events of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh’s reign, except that he had nine campaigns against Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk. His account is mainly connected with the disputed succession. As regards this also, there are some discrepancies between his account and that of Firishtah. The man whom he called Asa’d Khân, is called Sa‘īd Khân by Firishtah. He says nothing about the disputes about the succession having taken place while the rival claimants were in a hostile country, Golkonda; and the statement that Malik Khân ruled for half a day is of course incorrect. The younger brother of Malik Khân, who is called Ulugh Khân in the MSS. of the Tabaqat is called Alf Khân Aloo Khan by Col. Briggs (vol. III, p. 77).

Firishtah’s account of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh’s reign extends to about eight pages of the lith. ed. and to about thirty-three pages of Col. Briggs’ translation.

1 In the text-edition بک و نم روژ.

2 In the text-edition بکانو, in place of Malkapur.

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

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

---

1 The readings are slightly different. The MSS. appear to have lesen, and the lith. ed. has lesen. The MSS. appear to be incorrect. I cannot find any mention of the two brothers being blinded in Firishtah.
2 The meaning of this is not quite clear.
3 I have not been able to identify these territories. In the text-edition there is a note: باککلا و باسلور و بالکور.
to meet them; and performed the ceremony of submission and allegiance. He inserted the great name of His Majesty the Khalifa-Illāh in the public prayers, and the coins of his realm. He was inclined to the Imāmī religion; and abandoned the custom of his ancestors.

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

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

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

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

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

4 This does not appear to be quite correct. Niẓām-ud-dīn of course mentions 25 years as the periods of the reigns of Ismā'il 'Ādil Shah, Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh and 'All 'Ādil Shāh; but according to Firishta Ismā'il reigned from 915 A.H. to 941 A.H., about twenty-six years. Then Malī reigned for six months, after which Ibrāhīm reigned from 941-965 A.H., which according to Firishta was a period of twenty-four years and six months; and 'All 'Ādil
THE DYNASTY OF 'ĀDIL KHĀN

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

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

Shāh from 965 to 987 A.H., which only gives twenty-two years; but if the correct date of his death was 988, then he reigned for twenty-three years. Mr. Sewell's table has ʻIsāʻīl from 1534 A.D. Mallū or Malū as he calls him from August, 1534 to February, 1535, Ibrāhīm from 1535–1557 A.D. and 'Ali from 1557 to April 11th, 1580 (page 408).

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

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

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

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

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

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

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QULI QUṬB-UL-MULK 3 HAMADĀNI.

He is from the tribe of 4 Mir ‘Alī Shākr Āq Quyunlī. He was one of the five vazirs of the Bahmani Sultāns. As Sultān Muḥammad

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

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

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

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

4 The name is doubtful. It is شکر آتا in one MS. and شکر آتا in the other. In the lith. ed. it is میر على علي شکر آتا فیویتلو. Firishta however says that a detailed history of the Quṭb Shāhī line was written by a man of the name of Shāh Khur Shāh; but he (Firishta) was unable to get hold of a copy of it. Col. Briggs says that he was able, some years ago, to procure a work entitled the "History of Mahomed Kooly Kootb Shah", written about the time that Firishta lived. From Col. Briggs's translation of that work the name of the tribe
showed great favour to his slaves, Sultān Quli sold himself to him, and became one of his slaves. He took possessions of the country of Gölkonda and ruled for twenty-four years and passed away.

1 An account of Jamshīd Qutb-.ul-Mulk, son of Sultān Quli.

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

appears to be Ak Koovinloo; so that the correct name of the tribe may be أك كونلو. It appears however from the quotation of Sultān Quli Qutb’s own words in Col. Briggs’s work, vol. III, page 340 et seq that the Sultān belonged to the Kurra Kooinloo tribe, who were subdued by the Ak Kooinloo tribe; and he fled in his childhood, with his uncle Ameer Alla Koolly; and came to the Deccan. He returned however to Hamadan with his uncle, as he was then too young to remain alone in the country. He came back however later again with his uncle; but the uncle went away; and he remained under the special protection of Sultān Mahmūd Bahmani. He defended the latter with great gallantry, when he was attacked in the fort of Ahmadābad Bidar, and after the campaign against Malik Dinār Ḥabshi he was made governor of Talingāna. Later he fought bravely in Mahmūd Shāh’s campaign against the rebel Bahādur Gīlānī. After the death of Mahmūd Shāh Bahmani on the 24th Dhi-hijja, 912 A.H., May 12th, 1507 A.D., he with the five other Deccan chiefs, threw off the small portion of allegiance, which they had up to that time owed to the Bahmani Sultāns. He was killed by Mīr Mahmūd Hamadānī, governor of Gölkonda, when he was sitting down at prayer, at the instigation of his third son Jamshīd Qutb Shāh on the 2nd Jamādi-ul-sānī 940 A.H., 4th September, 1543. These latter facts are taken from Col. Briggs’s account. According to Fīrishtah he was killed by a Turkī slave in 950 A.H., when he was looking at some jewels. The slave had been instigated by Jamshīd Qutb Shāh with the promise of being made a great amīr; but he was slain by Jamshīd, immediately after he had slain Sultān Quli Qutb Shāh, so that he might not divulge his complicity in the crime. It is difficult to say exactly how long Quli Qutb Shāh ruled as an independent prince. According to Mr. Sewell’s table (p. 410) he reigned for thirty-one years from 1512 to 1543 A.D.

1 It is difficult to find the correct history of this reign. Niẓām ud-dīn gives no account at all; and the histories given by Fīrishtah, and Col. Briggs differ. The former says Shāh Tāhir was sent by Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk to congratulate Jamshīd on his accession. Shāh Tāhir incited him to join Burhān Niẓām Shāh to attack Ibrahim ‘Ādil Shāh. He accordingly invaded the latter’s territory, and built a fort in pargama Kānkī; and then advanced to attack the fort of Atgar. In the meantime ‘Ādil Shāh made peace with Niẓām Shāh.
AN ACCOUNT OF IBRAHIM QUTH-UL-MULK, SON OF SULTAN QULI.

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

and Ram Raja; and Nizam Shah went back to Ahmadnagar. Dad Shah then sent Asad Khan Lari to attack Jamshid Queth Shah. Asad Khan Lari first seized the fort of Kankal and compelled Jamshid Queth Shah to raise the siege of Atgar. After that Jamshid Queth Shah had several campaigns with Asad Khan Lari, in each of which he was defeated; and in the last of these in a hand to hand fight with Asad Khan Lari, one side of his face was severed off by a blow of his opponent's sword. After that he made peace with Dad Shah; and conquered some parts of Kachchh. Then he was ill for two years; and now became very savage; and ordered people to be put to death or imprisoned for slight offences. A conspiracy was then formed to depose him, and place one of his brothers on the throne. He received information of this plot; and imprisoned his brothers, Haidar and Ibrahim. The former died soon after and the latter went away to Bijanagar. Jamshid died of a high fever in 957 A.H.

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

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

As regards the history of his reign, Firishtah says that he sought an asylum with Ram Raja during the reign of Jamshid Queth Shah. After the latter's death, the ministers placed his son, who was an infant of two years of age on the throne; but the Dakkins attacked the palace. Then the ministers determined to send for Ibrahim Queth-ul-mulk; and to place him on the throne. They obtained permission from Ram Raja for bringing him to Golkonda; and when he came to the border of Bijanagar. Mustafa hastened to receive him; and he was made amir jumla or Prime Minister.

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

He reigned for five and thirty years.

being unable to carry on the siege alone, retired to Aḥmadnagar. Afterwards ʿĀdil Shāh and Rām Rāj invaded the Nizām Shāhī territory; and at their request, and somewhat against his will Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh joined them; and they laid siege to Aḥmadnagar. They were about to take it, when Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh left at midnight; and retired in precipitation to Gōlkonda; and Rām Rāj and ʿĀdil Shāh had also to raise the siege.

After that Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh asked for the hand of Ḥusain NizĀm Shāh’s daughter; and at the latter’s request he agreed in concert with him to lay siege to Kaliān. There the marriage feast was celebrated and the siege was begun. Then ʿĀdil Shāh and Rām Rāj and Tufāl Kāhān and Amīr Barid advanced against them, when Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh retired to Gōlkonda, and Ḥusain NizĀm Shāh to Aḥmadnagar, hotly pursued by ʿĀdil Shāh and Rām Rāj. They laid waste both the Aḥmadnagar and the Gōlkonda territories; but peace was last concluded; and Rām Rāj and ʿĀdil Shāh retired to their own territories. Afterwards Murtuḍā Nizām Shāh summoned Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh to come and aid him in besieging the fort of Dārūr, belonging to ʿĀdil Shāh; but before he could arrive the fort was taken. He however joined Murtuḍā Nizām Shāh in the invasion of Hijāpjīr. ʿĀdil Shāh now sent to Murtuḍā Nizām Shāh a letter, which Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh had written to him, about acting in concert with him. Nizām Shāh became suspicious of Qutb Shāh’s fidelity; and Qutb Shāh, retiring in all haste to Gōlkonda, Nizām Shāh looted his camp; and pursued his army, and took much booty and slew large numbers of his men. ʿAbd-ul-qādir, the eldest son of Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh then represented to his father, that if he received permission to do so, he would at once attack the NizĀm Shāhī army and defeat it. Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh became suspicious of his son’s motives; and imprisoned him in a fort, and afterwards caused his death, by giving him a poisoned drink. Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh did in the year 989 A.H. He had ruled for thirty-two years.

Col. Briggs’s account (vol. 111, p. 390) is slightly different. He has a separate section for Soobhan Kooly Koott Shah, the infant son of Jamāheed, who, he says, was seven years of age, when he was elevated to the throne. Then as regards Ibrahim Koott Shah, he says that in the latter part of his reign he conquered some territories in Oriassa. According to Col. Briggs, Ibrahim Koott Shah died on the 21st Rubbee-oos-Sany 988 A.H., 2nd June, 1580. Mr Sewell (p. 410) has 1581.
An Account of Muhammad Quli Qutb-ul-Mulk, Son of Ibrahim.

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

1 Nizam-ud-din does not give any account of the events of the reign; and merely refers to a scandalous matter of a more or less personal nature. According to Firishtah Muhammad Qutb Shâh was the eldest and best of the three surviving sons of Jamshid Qutb Shâh. He succeeded the latter in his twelfth year. He married a daughter of Shâh Mirzâ Isphahân.

He entered into a treaty with Nizam Shâh, and invaded the Bijapur territory, and besieged Shâh Durg; but being unable to take it, went to Bijapur and laid siege to it. They were however unable to take it also, and Muhammad Qutb Shâh was about to retire to Golkonda, when the commander of the Nizam Shâh army, becoming aware of his intention suggested that he should go himself towards Ahmadnagar, laying waste the Adil Shâh country through which he would pass; and Muhammad Qutb Shâh should proceed to besiege Hasanabad Gulbarga. They accordingly did so; but when Muhammad Qutb Shâh arrived near Hasanabad Gulbarga, he left seven thousand horsemen; and many elephants, under Mustafa Khan, to carry on the siege; and himself hastened back to his capital. Mustafa Khan laid waste the country round Hasanabad Gulbarga; but Dilawar Khan was sent with a large army from Bijapur, and he defeated Mustafa Khan who retired in great haste to the borders of Tilang.

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

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

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

2 One MS. calls her a Zanana Patari, the other simply Zanana, while the lith. ed. has only Patari. In the text-edition the name is
SECTION V. ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF GUJRĀT.

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

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

---

1 The word Shāh is in one MS. and in the lith. ed. but not in the other MS. The period is 3 years 8 months and 20 days in one MS., but is 3 years and 8 months and 8 days, in the lith. ed. It may be either 8 or 20 days in the other MS.

2 One MS. inserts ۳۰۰ after the name.

3 The words و سبینہ روز which occur in both MSS. are omitted from the lith. ed. I have inserted them.

4 The words ۳۰۰ which occur in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are not to be found in the other MS.

5 He is called Latīf Khān in both MSS., but Latīf Shāh in the lith. ed. The period is 18 years in both MSS. and 16 years in the lith. ed. I have adopted the reading in the MSS.
Sultan Ahmad, three years and a few months; and
Sultan Muzafer, son of Mahmud, sixteen years and some
months.

(AN ACCOUNT OF) A'ZAM HUMAYUN ZAFAR KHAN.

It is written in books of history, that when the (accounts of the)
tyranny of Nizam Mufarrak, who bore the title of 2 Ashtil Khan,
and who had the government of Gujerat in his hands under Sultan
Muhammad, son of Sultan Firuz Shah, spread over the regions of
the world; and the oppressed who had suffered from his tyranny,
and the victims of his cruelty arrived in the capital city of Dehli
from the country of Gujerat with their complaints; and narrated
tales of his tyranny and oppression before Sultan Muhammad Shah;
and spoke the truth of his violence and insubordination, the Sultan
after much consideration and great deliberation, conferred the fez
of Gujerat on Azam, Humayun Zafar Khan, son of Wajih-ul-mulk,
who was one of the great amirs, after bestowing many royal favours
on him. On the 3rd Rabil-ul-awwal in the year 783 A.H., he conferred
on him a (royal) umbrella, and a red pavilion, which are specially
reserved for badshahs, and granted him permission to go to Gujerat.
Zafar Khan started from the city the same day, and encamped at
the royal reservoir (haud-i-khas). On the 4th of the month, Sultan
Muhammad hastened to Zafar Khan's camp; and made his ears heavy
with the pearls of advice; and after again conferring on him a special
robe of honour retired to the city.

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

1 One MS. has Shâh after Mahmud, but neither the other MS. nor the
lith. ed. has it.

2 Firishtah does not give him the title of Ashtil Khan, but calls him
Farhat-ul-mulk otherwise called Nizam Mufarrak. Firishtah does not speak
much of his tyranny, but he says that he had the intention of hostility (to the
emperor), and therefore treated the zamindars and the infidels of the country
well, and in order to flatter them, gave currency to the customs of heathenism
and idolatry. Therefore the learned and erudite men of Gujerat sent the letter
in which they spoke of Nizam Mufarrak's misdeeds, and prayed the Sultan
to take necessary steps for remedying them.
titles (of the new Governor) should have been written, blank; and he (i.e., the Sultân) wrote the titles with his own hand and they were as follows. 1 "My brother, Majlis 'Ali (the noble courtier), the honoured Khân, learned, just, generous, energetic, the most fortunate of the faith and religion, the defender of Islam and Musalmaans, the binder of the salṭanat, the supporter of the faith,

1 It is rather difficult to understand these lofty titles and to find equivalents for the high flown epithets. Firishtah who in many places copies the Ṭabaqât almost verbatim gives them as

The antecedents of Zafar Khân are rather curious. It appears from Bayley's History of Gujarât, p. 68, et seq that Fīroz, who was a great hunter, went out in pursuit of deer one day, and became separated from his attendants. He came to a village which was one of the dependencies of Thānīṣar. Outside the village he found a party of land-holders seated, and dismounting from his horse, asked one of them to pull off his boots. This man was a master of the science of interpreting signs and appearances. He found on the sole of the Sultân's foot, marks of royalty and the signs of imperial power. The chief men of the village were two brothers Sādhu and Sadharan. For their caste and genealogy see pp. 67-68. They entertained the guest, and gave their sister, who "was peerless in beauty and loveliness" in nikāh to the Sultân. They shortly afterwards became Musalmaans and Sadharan received the title of Wajih-ul-Mulk. He was the father of Zafar Khân. The Sultân was a disciple of Qutb-ul-aqtāb Ḥājrat Makhzum-i-Jahāniân. Sādhu and Sadharan and Zafar Khân also became his disciples. Zafar Khân did some service to the saint, and the latter in return gave him the country of Gujarât. When he went back to his family, and told them what had happened they said "You are well-streicken in years and if the country of Gujarât falls to thee, what life wilt thou have left to enjoy it". He went back to the saint, and made offerings of perfumes, etc. The saint accepted them, and taking a handful of dates, from a plate which was before him, said "Thy seed like unto these in number shall reign over Gujarât." Some say there were twelve, some say thirteen dates and other say eleven.

When Fīroz Khân became the Sultân, he appointed Zafar Khân and his brother Shams Khân to the high position of sharābdār. Owing to this they have been described as kalâts or distillers.
the exterminator of kufr and heresy, the destroyer of the false and the rebellious, the Pole-star of the sky of spirituality, the star of the high heaven, the breaker of the ranks in the day of battle, a fort conquering Rustam, the conqueror of kingdoms, an Aṣaf in policy, the regulator of affairs, the director of the rule of people, the master of success and good fortune, the man of wisdom and success, the distributor of justice and beneficence, the vazir of the lord of conjunction Ulugh Qutlugh Ā'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān.”

In short (he) travelled towards Gujrat by successive marches. On the way news came to him that a son had been born to Tatār Khān, his son, who was the vazir of Sultan Muhammad Shāh; and he had received the name of Ahmad Khān. Zafar Khān was greatly delighted on hearing this joyful news. He arranged a grand entertainment, and conferred honours and robes on many of the soldiers. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Nāgor, the men of Kanbāyat came to petition against Nizām Mufarrāh, praying for justice. Zafar Khān gave them hopes, and advanced towards Nahrwāla. When he arrived there, which is commonly known as Pattan, he wrote and sent a letter to Malik Nizām Mufarrāh (in which he said) that it had been mentioned in the august presence of Muhammad Shāh that Malik Nizām Mufarrāh had spent the revenue of a number of years of the khālsa lands of the Sultan, for his own needs and purposes, and had not remitted one dinār to the treasury. It had likewise (been reported), that he had stretched out his hands for tyranny and oppression, and had greatly harassed the common people living in these places; so that men had repeatedly come to Dehlī with supplications and complaints. (He went on to say) that as the reins of binding and loosening of all state affairs of the neighbourhood had been placed in his hands, the better way would be, that whatever might still be left of the revenue of the khālsa lands for those years should be sent with all promptitude, before he went himself; and after comforting and cheering the oppressed, he should himself proceed to the metropolis of Dehlī.

1 Firishtah does not say that Zafar Khān wrote to Nizām Mufarrāh after arriving at Nahrwāla Pattan.
Malik Nizām Mufarrakh sent a reply to this effect. "You have come a long way, you should remain where you are and should not take the trouble (to advance further). I shall go there and render an account, but on this condition that you will not make me over to custodians." When this reply came and the fact of his rebellion and violence became certain, Ā'zam Humāyūn Zafar Kāhān began to arrange his army. After a few days news came that Malik Nizām Mufarrakh had turned towards that country with a large force, and was advancing by successive marches. Ā'zam Humāyūn sailed out of the city of Pattan with his well-equipped army, with the intention to give battle. A great battle was fought on the 7th of Safar in the year 794, in the village of Kānthū which is twelve karōhs from Pattan. Malik Nizām Mufarrakh went about searching for Zafar Kāhān accompanied by a select body of troops; and he ran about in all directions, like an ordinance of heaven (?). At this time a man belonging to Zafar Kāhān's army having vanquished him (apparently in single combat) inflicted on him a severe wound, and he fell off from his horse on to the ground. The man immediately cut off his head, and brought it to Zafar Kāhān.

Couplets:

When Death into his blood plunged his hand,
Fate his clear seeing eyes did close.
When the key of victory is not in one's hand,
He cannot with his arm, the door of victory break.

On seeing what had happened, defeat fell on the army of Nizām Mufarrakh. Large numbers of men were slain; and much booty fell into the hands (of the victorious army). Zafar Kāhān went in pursuit.

1 Firishtah also says that the tenor of the reply was what it is described in the text.

2 The place is called Kānthū and Kānthū in the MS. and Kānthū in the lith. ed. It is Kānthū in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs calls it Jitpur. Bayley calls it Kambhū. Kānthū in the text-edition. Firishtah's account of the engagement is different. It is figurative and vague. He says that بندر زده من آباد حرب و فرور از آن نامز شد و لازمی از آن بخش دنیا قد مقرح بعد تحصیل بنهرالله کریست.

3 It does not mention what happened to Nizām Mufarrakh after he had fled.

4 The first couplet is not in the lith. ed., but it is in both the MSS.
THE SULTANS OF GUJRAT

for some distance, and then returned to the neighbourhood of Pattan; and sent his agents to all the parganas. In the year 795 A.H., he advanced with the object of punishing the rebels, who had raised the dust of disturbance in the neighbourhood of 1 Kanbâyat. He cleansed that country from the weeds and thorns of the insurgents. He laid the ointment of his kindness and favour on the hearts which had been wounded by the dagger of the tyrant of Nizam Mufarrâb. He then advanced towards 2 Asâwal. He remained there for some days; and having pleased the common people, and all the inhabitants, earned their gratitude and came back to the neighbourhood of Pattan.

In the year 796 A.H., news came that Sultân Muhammad Shâh, son of Sultân Firûz, had accepted the summons of the just God, in the metropolitan city of Dohli, and the affairs of the empire had fallen into confusion; and most of the zamindârs had taken up an attitude of insurrection; more specially, 3 the Râja of Ídar, who had placed his foot outside the circle of obedience and fealty. Zafar Khân equipped an army, and advanced by rapid marches with a large force and elephants of the size of mountains to punish the Râja. As he came with great quickness and proceeded to lay siege 4 the Râja had no time whatever to arrange for his defence. He was, therefore, compelled to shut himself up, and the victorious troops, having overrun the country of Ídar stretched their hands for plunder and rapine. They raised to the ground every temple which they found. In a very short time there was such scarcity and famine in the fort, that the 5 Râja of Ídar, sent his vakîls in great humility

---

1 One MS. has but the other and the lith. ed. have كمبانت.
2 Firishtah says with reference to Asâwal, كد آئین احمد اباد آنجا وقتز اسمر, i.e., that at present Ahmadabad is situated in its place. It will be seen from the accounts of the reign of Ahmad Shâh that he built the city of Ahmadabad near Asâwal.
3 According to Firishtah he had formerly borne allegiance to the rulers of Gujrât but had now laid the foundation of shamelessness, and had withdrawn his head from the yoke of dependence.
4 Firishtah says that there were several severe battles, and Zafar Khân was victorious each time.
5 According to Firishtah the Râja sent his eldest son with some others to sue for quarter.
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and piteousness, and prayed for forgiveness of his offences. Zafar Khān took such tributes from him as he wanted; and advanced towards Sōmnāth.

At this time intelligence came that 1 Malik Nāṣir Rāja celebrated as 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Asīr, had stretched his foot of pride beyond the blanket of his status, and had harassed some of the villages of Nadarbār. A'ẓam Humāyūn, knowing that the protection of his own territory was more incumbent on him than the capture of the temple of Sōmnāth advanced towards Nadarbār by rapid marches. 'Ādil Khān hearing this news returned to his own country. Zafar Khān also returned to his headquarters at Pattan, after showing kindness to the inhabitants of the country.

In the year 797 a.h., he again mustered his troops, and determined to invade 2 Jar and Tar which are situated to the west of Pattan, and after overrunning some places and getting tributes from the headman of that locality, advanced from there, with the purpose of destroying the temple of Sōmnāth. On the way he made the Rājpūṭs food for his merciless sword; and wherever a temple appeared before his eyes, he raised and destroyed it.

When he arrived at Sōmnāth he burnt the temple down and broke up the idol. He slew the kāfsirs, and plundered the city. He planned the erection of a Jāma' masjīd, and having appointed the right men as directed by the shara', and leaving a thāna (military post) there, retraced his steps towards Pattan.

In the year 799, news came to A'ẓam Humāyūn that the Rājpūṭs of 3 Mandalgāh had acquired such power, that the Musalmāns there were abandoning their country and leaving their homes, on account of the injuries caused to them. Zafar Khān collected the

---

1 Firishtah describes him as the ancestor of the Farūqī the rulers of Burhānpūr.

2 The names are written as جرجر in one MS. but the جرجر may be a mistake for جرد نم which is required having been omitted by mistake. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. the names are جرند and the ruler of it جرند. In the text-edition it is جرند.

3 It is Mandalgāh in the MSS. and Karnāl in the lith. ed. Karnāl or Garmā or Girmār is the same as جرنا جگن Jūnāgarh. Firishtah also has مندل جگن.
army of Gujrat, and by successive rapid marches traversed the forests and deserts of that country. The Raja of the place, being proud of the strength of his fortification, occupied himself in defending it. The victorious troops surrounded the hill and the fort, like the centre of a circle, and placed manjaniqs (battering ram or catapults) on all sides; and every day a number of Raja's were slain. But as the fort was so strong, that they were unable to accomplish their object, by the help of the catapults, Zafar Khan ordered that sābāhs (covered ways) should be planned and completed with all speed. But in spite of these the fort could not be taken. In the end after the siege had lasted for a year and some months, the Raja's in great humility asked for quarter; and men and women came with bared heads and prayed for safety. They agreed to pay tributes; and promised that it should be sent every year to Pattan without any demand being made for it. They also agreed, that henceforward they would not cause any kind of injury to the Musalmans.

A'зам Humayun owing to his innate kindliness and natural generosity accepted their excuses, and gave them quarter. He took tribute from them, and having fixed the amounts of the annual tribute, and having assured himself about the safety of that territory he hastened to perform a pilgrimage to the holy tomb of the Shaikh of the path of the Faith, 1 Khwajah Mu' in-ud-din Hasan Sanjari. He pillaged and plundered the towns in that country and left no trace of cultivation and habitation. After finishing this invasion, he moved to the country known as Dandwana and having plundered Dīlwāra and Jalwāra took a large number of prisoners and much booty. 2 He returned to Pattan on the 17th of Ramaḍān in the year 800 A.H. As these campaigns had extended over three years, A'зам Humayun issued an order that all his troops and soldiers

---

1 Of Ajmir.
2 Dīlwāra دیلوارہ in one MS. and Dīlwāra and Jalwāra جلواڑہ in the other and Danduana in the lit. ed. Firishtah has Dīlwāra and Jalwāra. He does not mention Dandwana at all.
3 Firishtah says that it appears from the Tārikh-i-Alfi that at this time Zafar Khan had the Khutba read in his own name, and assumed the title of Muazzafar Shāh.
should be exempted from all service and work of all kinds for the period of one year.

Towards the end of the year 800 A.H., Tātār Khān, Zafar Khān’s son, who held the office of vazīr of Sultān Muḥammad bin Flūz fled from Dehlī owing to the 1 dominance and violence of Mallū Khān, and came to Gujrāt to his father as has been mentioned in the section about Dehlī. In short Tātār Khān came in a state of great humility with a prayer to his father that he should be allowed to take the latter’s army with him, and have his revenge over 2 Mallū Khān. A’zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān was thinking of collecting troops. But as Mīrzā Pir Muḥammad Khān, grandson of His Majesty, the Lord of the auspicious conjunction, Amīr Tāimūr Gūrgān had taken possession of Multān and had seized Sārang Khān. A’zam Humāyūn deferred the carrying out of this determination and the accomplishment of this deed; inasmuch as he had learned by his acumen that Mīrzā Pir Muḥammad was the vanguard of His Majesty, the Lord of the auspicious conjunction. It so happened that after a short time, in the year 801 A.H., news came that Amīr Tāimūr had arrived in the neighbourhood of Dehlī with a large army. Zafar Khān comforted his son, and postponed the march to Dehlī for a suitable opportunity.

At this time they (i.e., Zafar Khān and Tātār Khān) advanced together towards Īdar. They arrived by rapid marches and besieged the fort. They sent detachments every day in different directions, and left no stone unturned in plundering and ravaging the country. The Rāja of Īdar in great humility and weakness sent emissaries, and agreed to pay tribute. As the empire of Dehlī was at this time full of disturbances and rebellion, Zafar Khān remained satisfied

1 Firishtah briefly describes the conflicts between Mallū or Iqbāl Khān and Tātār Khān.

2 He is called بلو اقبال خان in one MS., اقبال خان in the other, while the lith. ed. has only بلو خان. Firishtah does not say that Tātār Khān prayed for the help of his father’s army to revenge himself on Mallū or Iqbāl Khān; but he incited his father, Muẓaffar Shāh, to march to Dehlī, with the object of making himself the bāḏehāh. Muẓaffar Shāh agreed, and began to collect troops; but the news came of the advance of Mīrzā Pir Muḥammad Khān, grandson of Amīr Tāimūr; and upset all their plans.
with the engagement to pay tribute, and returned to Pattan in Ramadān of that year. About this time an immense number of people fleeing from Dehlī from the visitation of Amir Tāmūr arrived in Pattan. Aʿẓam Humāyūn took pity on their condition, according to their different predicaments, and showed each one of them such kindness as his condition merited. After sometime Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Muhammad, son of Sultān Fīrūz Shāh also fled from the Lord of the happy conjunction; and came to Gujràt. Zafar Khān did not accord to him the treatment and respect that was due to him, and he becoming hopeless and heart-broken, went away towards Mālwa, as is mentioned in the proper place.

In the year 803 A.H., Aʿẓam Humāyūn disbursed a year's pay to his soldiers, and with a large force advanced to conquer Idar. When his victorious army surrounded the fort on all sides, and fought battles in succession for some days, the Rāja evacuated the fort, one night, and fled towards Bijānagar. Early the next morning Zafar Khān entered the fort, offered thanks to God, demolished the temples, left a thāna (military post) in the fort, and divided the country of Idar among his nobles. After the accomplishment of the necessary work in that country he returned to Pattan. In the year 804 A.H. (they) sent (the news) to Zafar Khān that the Hindūs and kāfirs had collected round the temple of Sōmnāth and were exerting themselves to the utmost in reviving their ancient customs. Aʿẓam Humāyūn turned his attention in that direction, and sent an army in advance of himself. When the inhabitants of Sōmnāth received information of this, they advanced to meet him by way of the sea, and began a battle. Aʿẓam Humāyūn arrived there on wings of speed, and routed and destroyed them. Those who escaped the sword fled, and took shelter in the citadel of the port of Dip. After a few days the gates of the citadel were opened and the garrison were made food for the sword. He had the chief

1 The reading is obscure; the MSS. have and the lith. ed. has . The word appears to be incorrect; if it was , then the meaning would be some Hindūs and infidels. in the lith. ed. is of course incorrect. Firisṭah in the corresponding passage i.e., the kāfirs of Sōmnāth. He also says that they had overpowered the military post left there by Aʿẓam Humāyūn.
men of that body thrown under the feet of elephants. He demolished the temples, and laid the foundation of Jāmi‘ mosque. He appointed qādis and muftis and other officers directed by the shara‘; and leaving a military post returned to Pattan, his capital.

In the year 806 A.H., Tātār Kha‘n informed his father A‘zam Humāyūn, that Mallū Kha‘n had seized Dehlī; and in spite of the fact that Sultān Maḥmūd had rested content with Qanouj, he would not leave him in that condition. He went on to say “If an army be sent with this slave (i.e., he himself) he would advance to Dehlī, wrest the city from his possession, and having revenged himself again restore his dominion to Sultān Maḥmūd.” A‘zam Humāyūn said in reply, “At present there is no one among the descendants of Firūz Shāh, who is capable of carrying on the duties of the empire. Mallū Iqbal Kha‘n is at present in possession of Dehlī, and the learned in the doctrines of the religion do not approve of dissensions and warfare leading to bloodshed among the followers of Islām.” Tātār Kha‘n was not satisfied with these words, and said, I have such power now that I can attain to the empire of Dehlī. Kingship and empire are not the inheritance of any one: and recited the following couplet:

Couplet:

None can a kingdom and throne acquire,

That does not seize the sword with both his hands.

When A‘zam Humāyūn saw that he (Tātār Kha‘n) was bent on this idea, he relinquished the work of the empire, and made over to him all the army and the paraphernalia of sovereignty.

1 An account of the accession of Tātār Kha‘n, son of A‘zam Humāyūn Zafar Kha‘n.

When Zafar Kha‘n 2 voluntarily gave up the duties of the sovereignty, Tātār Kha‘n arranged on the 1st of Jamā‘ul-‘Āghir 806 A.H.

---

1 The heading is given differently in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. It is what I have in the text in one MS. In the other MS., it is the same, but the word جلب (accession) is omitted. In the lith. ed. it is ذكر. Firishtah has no separate heading.

2 According to Firishtah Zafar Kha‘n who had assumed the title of Muṣaffar Shāh had acquired such power by the conquest of Idar and Sūmnāth,
a grand entertainment in the town of Asāwal and sat on the throne of empire. He raised the umbrella over his head, and assumed the title of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh. He conferred robes of honour on the amirs and the chiefs and leaders of the country. He distributed the gold that had been scattered as thanks-offering on the umbrella of sovereignty among wise and meritorious men. He conferred the office of vazīr on Shams Khān Dandānī who was the younger brother of A'zam Humāyūn. He ordered that in the heading (Tughrā) of the farān the following words should be written. 1 "Al-Muṣaffar wal Wāhiq bi-tā'id-ur-Rahmān, ilterhār-ud-dunyā-wad-din Abul Ghāzi Muḥammad Shāh bin Muṣaffar Shāh."  

After arranging the affairs of the country, he collected a large army, and on the 1st of Shaʿbān of the afore-mentioned year, he moved out of the town of Asāwal with the object of conquering Dehlī. He was informed while on the march, that the Rāja of Nādōt that he formed the idea of seizing Dehlī; and making his son Tātār Khān the emperor, with the title of Ḍhār-ud-daula-wad-din Sultān Muḥammad Shāh. With this object they were marching along, when at Sānūr Muḥammad Shāh suddenly died. 

Firishtah goes on to say that the real facts are, that Tātār Khān rebelled against his father who had become old and weak, at Asāwal; and kept him imprisoned in the fort there. He made his uncle Shams Khān, the vakil-ud-sulṭanat, and gave himself the title of Nāsir-ud-din Muḥammad Shāh; and then having collected troops advanced to conquer Dehlī. Sultān Muṣaffar sent one of his trusted men, and insisted on his brother's arranging for his release, and for the assassination of Muḥammad Shāh. Shams Khān attempted to dissuade him, having no other alternative killed Muḥammad Shāh by giving him poison. Bayley (pages 81, 82) says "It is commonly believed, among the best-informed of the people of Gujarāt, ...... that Tātār Khān conspired with certain discontented men, his friends outwardly, his enemies in reality, and placed his father in confinement. He then seated himself on the throne, with the title of Muḥammad Shāh and won over all the officials and army. Afterwards he waged war against the infidels of Nādōt, and subdued them. Then he directed his course towards Dehlī, but drank the draught of death, and went to the city of non-existence. The cause of his death was this. In his ambition for the things of this life he threw aside the respect due to a father, a respect which is a lasting blessing to him who pays it; and God Almighty then sowed the seed of vengeance in the heart of his father. Whereupon some of those who were in attendance upon Tātār Khān, but who were personally inclined to Zafar Khān gave him poison."

1 only instead of في المتن الوثيق والوثائق in the text-edition.
had placed his feet of pride outside the bounds of obedience and allegiance. He turned his bridle of might from the road, advanced full gallop into the country of Nādōt, and sacked and ravaged villages and towns. He then halted in the town of 1 Saniūr. At this time which was the spring tide of his greatness he suddenly passed away owing to excessive drinking.

Couplet:

To the dust was cast, that flower of greatness, that the garden of empire,

With a hundred thousand caresses had in its bosom nourished.

The period of his reign was two years and two months and some days. When the dreadful news reached A'ẓam Ḥumāyūn in the country of Bahrūj he grieved 2 sorely. He arrived very quickly at the camp, and sent Muḥammad Shāh’s body to Pattan; and had his title recognised in the farman as Khudā-i-gān Shahīd (the martyred Lord). He showed favour to Shams Khān Dandānī, and transferring Malik Jalāl Kōkhar, made over to him the government and defence of the territory of Nāgūr. Then as there was no help for it he, with a heart broken into a hundred pieces and dazed and stunned mind, occupied himself with the affairs of state. He laid aside the royal umbrella and the throne; and did not assume any of the insignia of greatness. At last, however, acceding to the prayer of the nobles, and of the pillars of state he again sat on the throne of empire in the year 810 a.h. It has, however, come to (my) notice in various histories that Shams Khān Dandānī gave poison to Muḥammad Shāh in his wine.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF ZAFAR KHĀN WHO HAD THE TITLE OF MUʿAZZAFAR SHĀH.

When the period of disturbance as regards the imperial power in the country of Gujrāt, which had extended over a period of three

---

1 The name is سانور in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; and also in the lith. ed. of Firastāh; but Col. Briggs calls the place Suntpoor. The invasion of Nādōt and the name of the place where the death took place are not mentioned by Bayley. According to him, Muhammad Shāh died on the march to Dehil.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have عظماندوهناناک شد; but the other MS. omits the word عظمان.
years and four months was ended, A'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān in accordance with the prayer of the nobles and the suggestion of the great and the wise sat on the jewelled throne, in the manner of Sultāns, in the town of 1 Bīrpūr, at the moment which was selected by the astrologers who knew all the stars; and assumed the title of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh. He was described in the Khutba and fərmān as Almāthiq bālla-al-mannān Shams-ud-duniā-wad-din Abul Muẓāhid Muẓaffar Shāh. The gold that was showered in thanks-offering over his umbrella was distributed among meritorious persons. He conferred robes of honour on nobles, and men possessing the knowledge of God and the heads of various groups. He then advanced by successive marches to the country of Mālwa. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Dhār, Sultān Hūshang advanced to give battle, but as he had not the strength to withstand the onset of Muẓaffar Shāh's (army), 2 he fled, and took shelter in the fort of Dhār (but) in the end he came out and saw the Sultān. It had however come to the knowledge of Muẓaffar Shāh that Sultān Hūshang had given poison to his father Dilāwar Khān. As there

1 The name is Bīrpūr in the MSS., and in Bayley. In the lith. ed. it is Bīrpūr, Furmūr. It does not appear to be mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah or in Col. Briggs.

2 Firishtah however says that a great battle was fought between the armies of Gujrat and Mālwa, of which the Rustams and heroes of the world have spoken with the tongue of praise; but the army of Mālwa being defeated Sultān Hūshang was taken prisoner. Col. Briggs also says that Sultān Hūshang was taken prisoner "after a severe action". According to Bayley (page 84) "the brave warriors of Muẓaffar Shāh soon scattered his ranks, as a whirlwind scatters clouds, and he was obliged to fly into the fortress of Dhār".

3 Bayley quotes the Tabaqāt-i-Akbari as given in "Muhammadan Historians", vol. IV, p. 36, which agrees mainly with the text; and then says that Firishtah's version (which is probably impartial) is one of "Not proven". I have examined the passages about the death of Dilāwar Khān in Firishtah in both the Gujrat and Mālwa sections, but I do not find anything that justifies the statement that Firishtah's version or verdict is one of not proven. In the section about Gujrat Firishtah says in the section about Mālwa he says مندینان خبر اوردند که بیانش متفق که جراحی جدید خبر رسد که الپ خان بدر خود داور خان غوری را با وصیت حکم دنیوی زمر داده خود را
had been affection and fraternal feeling between Dilāwar Khān and Muẓaffar Shāh, (when they were both) in the service of Sultān Muḥammad Firūz Shāh, Muẓaffar Shāh put Sultān Hūshang and some of his adherents into prison; and installed his brother 1 Naṣrat Khān in the government of Mālwa.

Intelligence came at this time, that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqi had come out of Jaunpūr with the idea of seizing Dehil. On hearing this Muẓaffar Shāh started towards Dehil. When Sultān Ibrāhīm knew that Sultān Muẓaffar was coming with the intention of giving battle, he turned back from the way and returned to Jaunpūr; as the pen has narrated in the section about Jaunpūr. Sultān Muẓaffar on hearing this returned from the way and came back to Gujrāt.

He took 2 Sultān Hūshang with him in a state of captivity. (But) after a time the raʾiyats and soldiers of Mālwa (aggrieved)

---

1. So far as I know Firishtah nowhere adjudicates on the rumour in the one place, or on what he had seen in certain books, in the other.

2. He had been previously called Shams Khān Dandānī. Bayley appears to me to be unnecessarily puzzled about the identity of Naṣrat Khān. According to the Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī, Zafar Khān had only one brother, who was called Shams Khān, till the time when he was left as the governor of Mālwa; but at that time he was called Naṣrat Khān without any explanation of the change in his name. Firishtah says the same. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 10) identifies the two names as belonging to one person, where he says “Shams Khan, entitled Noorāt Khan”. Bayley spells the name Dandānī as Dindānī and says in a note on p. 95, called “Dindānī from dandān teeth”. It appears from the text that the man had this name, because some of his front teeth had grown long and projected. If Dandānī is derived from Dandān, I do not see why it should be spelt Dindānī.

2. Firishtah says that Muẓaffar Shāh made over Sultān Hūshang to the custody of his grandson Ahmad Shāh, with the order to keep him imprisoned in a fort. Sultān Hūshang wrote a very humble supplication which Ahmad Shāh showed to his grandfather with a suggestion that Hūshang might be released. As at this time there was a disturbance in Mālwa, Sultān Hūshang was released and after a time the territory of Mālwa with the insignia of royalty was given to him and he was sent with Ahmad Shāh so that the latter might reinstate him in the government. Bayley’s version is slightly different. According to him, Alp Khān sent his petition direct to Sultān Muẓaffar and told him that Mūsā Khān who had been his lieutenant at Mandū had recovered a portion of Mālwa; but if he was released and sent there he would remain his obedient servant all his life. Sultan Muẓaffar then sent him with Ahmad Khān and a large army to expel Mūsā Khān from Mandū. Mūsā Khān fled and Sultān Hūshang was then installed in Mandū (p. 85).
at the harsh treatment (accorded to them) by Naṣrat Shāh rebelled against the latter. The 1 Khwājahdār rescued him from Dhār, and sent him to Gujrāt. Such of his adherents, as were left behind, were treated with harshness and suffered hardship. The people of Mālwa for fear of offending Sultān Muẓaffar made Mūsa Kān, who was a relation of Sultān Hūshang their leader and they selected the fort of Mandū for their residence. Sultān Muẓaffar on receiving this news released Sultān Hūshang from imprisonment and sent Shāhzāda Aḥmad Kān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, that he might recover possession of Mālwa, and deliver it over to him. Shāhzāda Aḥmad Kān arrived at Dhār, and taking possession of the country, made it over to Sultān Hūshang; and returned by way of 2 Dahār to Gujrāt; as the pen forming letters black and fragrant as musk has narrated this clearly and explicitly in the section about Mālwa.

In short, in the year 812, intelligence came to Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh, that the 3 Rājpūts of Kuhnakōt, one of the dependencies of Kach, had raised the dust of rebellion. Immediately on hearing this news, he detached a large force for their punishment. It is said, that he sent Khudāwand Kān to attend on Shaikh Muḥammad Qāsim Budhū, (asking the latter) to pray that the army of Islām might return with victory and triumph. His reverence the Shaikh on examining the muster roll of the men who had been sent as

1 I do not know the exact meaning of Khwājahdār which is in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. He might have been some kind of a palace official. Neither Bayley nor Firishtah gives any help, for although the former refers to the Tabaqāt-i-Akbar in this connection, neither says anything as to the way in which Naṣrat Kān retired from Dhār. Khwājahwār in the text-edition.

2 The name may be dekor or dekor in one MS., and dekor in the other and in the lith. ed. The place is not mentioned by Firishtah or Bayley.

3 The name of the place is Kuhnakōt in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and Kunnatok in the other MS. I cannot find any mention of the expedition in Firishtah or in Col. Briggs. It is mentioned in Bayley’s History, which is based on the Mirāt-i-Iskandari, but he places it in 810 A.H., the same year as the expedition to Mālwa; and he calls the place Kambh-kōt, which is very likely the correct name, but he adds a note that the Tārikh-i-Alfi calls the place Kanth-kōt; and he says that Khudāwand Kān was sent in command of the expedition (p. 86).
members of the army, drew his pen across certain names. It so happened that when the army returned under the wing of triumph and victory, every person across whose names the Shaikh had drawn his pen was found to have attained to martyrdom.

In the year 1813 A.H., Sultan Muazzafar became ill in the city of Nahrawâl Pattan. He placed Shâhzâda Ahmad Khân on the throne of the empire in the presence of the nobles and chief men of the country; and conferred on him the title of Nasir-ud-dîn Ahmad Shâh. According to his orders, the Khutba was read in the prince's name on the pulpits of Islam. Three years and eight months and sixteen days had elapsed on that day since 2 the commencement of his rule. Five months and thirteen days after the accession of Sultan Ahmad Shâh, he redeemed the pledge of life; and in the month of Safar 814 A.H., he passed from the old caravansarai of the world, to the happy land of a future life. He is buried in the country of Pattan, and he has been styled Khudâ-i-gân Kabir.

1 Bayley (pp. 86, 87) says that according to the Mirat-i-Ahmadî, Sultan Muazzafar reigned for eighteen years, eight months and fourteen days. He also quotes the Tabaqat-i-Akbarî about the period of his reign and the date of his death; and also quotes the Tarikh-i-Alfi, in explanation of the statement made in the Tabaqat-i-Akbarî, though an explanation was scarcely necessary. He also quotes a story from the Tarikh-i-Bahadur Shâhi according to which Ahmad Khân imprisoned Sultan Muazzafar and gave poison to him, after obtaining an opinion from some learned men, that a son would be justified in killing a man who had killed his father. Sultan Muazzafar asked him why he was in such a hurry. Ahmad Khân answered him in words of the Kurân, "All men have their times appointed, and when the hour is come, they cannot delay or advance it a moment". Bayley after considering the facts given in the Tabaqat-i-Akbarî and the Tarikh-i-Alfi, says that although the story told by the Tarikh-i-Bahadur Shâhi is not absolutely irreconcilable with them, they are at least prima facie in conflict with it, and at any rate seem to dispose of the alleged motive of the crime. This is correct, if the haste to grasp the sovereignty be considered to be the motive, but not correct if the desire was to avenge his father's death.

Firishtah says nothing about these things. He says that Sultan Muazzafar became ill at the end of Safar 814 A.H., and died on the 8th of Rajab-ul-Akbar, i.e., after a month and a few days, and he appointed Ahmad Khân to be his successor, as he considered him to be able than his own surviving son. He was 71 years of age at the time of his death.

2 Since his second accession, after the death of Muhammad Shâh.
AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÂN AHMAD ŞÂH, SON OF SULTÂN MUHAMMAD, SON OF SULTÂN MUZAFFAR.

When Sultân Ahmad Şâh reclined on the pillow on the throne of empire and the seat of greatness, he conferred honours on the nobles and the chief men of the kingdom, the great men of the city and the chiefs of various groups; and gave a share of his gifts to all sections of the people. He kept the officers and writers charged with matters connected with the revenue in their former positions; and made great exertions in the matter of increasing the cultivation, and in the building up of the country and the administration of justice.

When the news of the accession of Sultân Ahmad Şâh reached Firūz Khân, son of Sultân Muẓaffar Şâh in the town of Barôda, he owing to his envy and jealousy, raised the standard of revolt and hostility. He conferred the position of vazîr on Jîvan Dás Khattrî. Amir Mahmûd 2 Barḵî who was the governor of Kanbâyât also joined Firūz Khân. Other amîrs, who were wicked by nature, considering Firūz Khân to be a source of profit and success for themselves united with him. They took Firūz Khân to Kanbâyât; and in that town Haibat Khân, son of Sultân Muẓaffar had an interview with him. After a few days Saʾdat Khân and Şêr Khân, sons of Sultân Muẓaffar, came and united with them. Firūz Khân gained strength and power from the union of his brothers, and advanced towards the town of Bahrôj. From that place they wrote a letter to Sultân Hūshang Ghûrî and requested him that he should help them with his spirit and courage; and agreed to pay him a certain number of

---

1 According to Bayley (p. 88) it was Mûdûl, the son of Firûz Khân, who was governor of Barodah, who raised the rebellion. Firishtah like Niẓâm-ud-dîn says that it was Firûz Khân himself. Bayley says in a note that the Tahâqât and Firishtah have Firûz, but the Muntakhab-ut-Tawârikh has Muʿîd-ud-dîn; and this confirms the Mirâšt-i-Sikandarî. Among the rebel's adherents Firishtah has Col. Briggs has two names Jeevundas and Vinaikdas Kauhtry, while Bayley has Jiwan Dás and Payâg Dás. The name is in the M88., and in the lith. ed.

2 Firishtah calls him Amir Mahmûd Turk. Barḵî seems to be incorrect, though it is found in several places further on, but Turk is also found in a few places.
lakhas of tankās at each stage, as contribution to his expenses. They also sent to every zamindār that was in the country of Gujrāt, a horse and a robe of honour, to induce him to join them.

When this news reached Aḥmad Shāh, he collected his troops, and advanced rapidly towards Bahrōj. When he arrived there, he, in order to extinguish the flames of the disturbance, sent an emissary to the amirs, with the following message:—

Couplet:

"Whom God had exalted, fate will not see abased,
Who to Him is dear, the world will not see him lowered.

As Khudā-i-gān Kabir (the great Lord), Muẓaffar Shāh took me by the hand, and placed me on the throne of empire, and the foundation of the high mansion, and the strong palace of my empire has been strengthened by the allegiance of the amirs and the well-known men of the country, and of all sections of the people, it is right and proper that you should not place your foot outside the line of loyalty and obedience; for the result of rebellion is destruction. Each one should be contented with the fiefs, which Khudā-i-gān Kabir Muẓaffar Shāh allotted to him, and should hope for other favours."

When the emissary delivered this message, the amirs consulted among themselves, and sent Haibat Khān who was the uncle of Aḥmad Shāh, with him. As Aḥmad Shāh lavished great favours on Haibat Khān, Firūz Khān and the other Khāns, becoming assured of safety and favour, hastened to attend on him. The latter cheered each one of them with fresh favours and tried to draw their hearts towards him. He confirmed their old jāgirs; and after arranging the affairs of that part of the country in the best possible way, arranged to return towards Pattan. At this time news was brought to him that Sultān Hūshang was advancing in that direction from Dhār, with the object of helping Firūz Khān.

Sultān Aḥmad immediately on hearing this news left the fort of Bahroj, and advanced by successive marches to the village of 1 Wantaj. At that place 2 Bhīkan Ādām Khān Afghān who during

---

1 The name is Šāh and Nāf in the two MSS., and Šāhī in the lith.
ed. I have not been able to find the name in Firīshṭāh, in Bayley or in the Rās Mālā.

2 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, page 88), the rebels headed by Mōdūd (or Firūz Khān) "defeated Bhīkan and Ādām Afghān, the king's men"
the reign of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh was the feudatory of Barōda, and at present on account of his hostility (to Sultān Aḥmad), was wandering about, came and attended on Aḥmad Shāh and was received with favour by the latter. As he had now completely settled the matter connected with Firūz Khān, he with perfect calmness, physical and mental, turned to the conflict and warfare with Sultān Hūshang, and sent 'Imād-ul-mulk in advance of himself to engage him. Hūshang in shame and humiliation returned to his own country. 'Imād-ul-mulk pursued him for several stages; and seizing the zamīndārs who had joined him brought them with himself to attend on the Sultān.

When Sultān Aḥmad Shāh at the time of his return arrived at the town of Asāwal and the air (climate) of that place appeared to be congenial to him, he after consulting the omens, and taking the advice of the asylum of all truth, Shaikh Aḥmad Kanbū, may his tomb be sanctified! laid on the ground the first brick for building the great city of Aḥmadābād, which has no equal among the cities of Hindūstān, on the bank of the Sābarmati, in the month of Dhīqa'dah 813 A.H. He laid the foundation of a fort and a Jāma' mosque and many markets; and he built 360 pūras outside the fortifications, each of which contained a mosque and a bāzār and was surrounded by a wall. If, during the time when Aḥmadābād was in a most flourishing condition, some one had said that there was no other city in the whole world which was so grand, and which was so beautifully arranged and decorated, he would not have been guilty of any exaggeration.

Bayley (p. 88) says in a note, "the Tab.-i-Akbari makes these the name of one man, but the probabilities are in favour of the text. Bikan Afghān escaped and rejoined the Sultān." According to the context of the Tabaqāt the name appears to be that of one man.

In the lith. ed. of Firāsṭāh ʿĀdam Bhankar is said to have been ordered to fight the rebels, and to have been defeated by them, but this is not mentioned by Col. Briggs.

1 دو قلعہ two forts in the text-edition appears to be a mistake.
Fīrūz Khān and Haibat Khān again revolted in the year 840 A.H., at the instigation of 1 Malik Badr ‘Alā’, who was a very near 2 relation of Muẓaffar Shāh, and again took the path of violence and rebellion; and leaving the central part of the kingdom, took shelter in the hills of Īdar. Sultān Aḥmad Shāh on hearing this news advanced to destroy them; and when he arrived in the town of Wantaj, he sent Fath Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar in advance of himself. (But) he also at the instigation of 3 Saiyid Ibrāhīm Niẓām the feudatory of the town of Mahrāsā joined his brothers. Sultān Aḥmad on hearing this advanced towards Mahrāsā. Malik Badr ‘Alā and Saiyid Ibrāhīm entitled Rukn Khān had a ditch dug around the fort of Mahrāsā; and began to make the necessary arrangements for defending it. Fīrūz Khān and Haibat Khān summoned Rāmal, the Rāja of Īdar, to help them; and they brought him to a place called Ankhūr, which is five karāhs from the town of Mahrāsā.

When Sultān Aḥmad arrived in the vicinity of the town, he first of all sent a body of learned men to Badr ‘Alā and Rukn Khān, that they might remove the veil of neglect from before their eyes, and might reveal to them what was right. When the emissaries did not receive such a reply as they had wished for, they came back. The Sultān out of his great mercy sent some other men and by their mouths sent the following messages: “I am giving you assurances of safety, you may go wherever you like.” Malik Badr ‘Alā and Rukn Khān sent the following reply: “If Niẓām-ul-mulk, who is the

1 Col. Briggs calls him Mullik Dear, but he does not say that he instigated the revolt. It is not clear how he was related to Muẓaffar Shāh. He is described as puzzle-headed in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī. Bayley (p. 93, footnote †) speculates about his relationship with Muẓaffar Shāh but cannot say anything definite about it.

2 See note 1 above.

3 Firiştah calls him Saiyid Ibrāhīm, who bore the title of Rukn Khān, and was the jāḡirdār of Mahrāsā. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 15) says as regards the name of the place, that Firiştah always spells it ḫūṣrāw, and so he has also called it Mahrāsā, but the correct name is Mowrass. The name is spelled ḫūṣrāw in the MSS. of the Ţabaqāt, but the lit. ed. has ḫūṣrāw. Bayley has Mūrāsah. As regards the double name Ibrāhīm Niẓām it appears from Bayley, p. 93, that it really means Ibrāhīm the son of Niẓām. He was the jāḡirdār of Mahrāsah under Sultān Ahmad, but was induced to join the rebels.
nā'ib vazīr, and Malik Aḥmad ‘Aziz who is the kārguzār (superintendent) and nā'ib vakīldar (the deputy vakīl in attendance), and Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk, and Saif Khwājah are sent to us, to take us with them, we would be assured of our safety, and come and attend on you.” Sultan Aḥmad gave orders that the noblemen named should go to the gate of the fort, but they should be very careful of the deceit and treachery of Badr ‘Ulā, and they should not go into the fort. The above-named amīrs then proceeded to the gate of the fort of Mahrāsa. Malik Badr ‘Ulā and Rukn Khān kept a body of men in ambuscade; and themselves received the noblemen with courtesy and respect. They then separated Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk from the other amīrs, and engaged them in talk and conversation. At this time the men who were in ambush came out and seized Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk, and carried them into the fort. Nizām-ul-mulk said in a loud voice, “Go and tell the Sultan that he should not allow any delay in seizing the fort. Whatever fate was allotted to us has overtaken us.” Malik Badr ‘Ulā put chains round the feet of both of them, and kept them guarded in a dark dungeon. The real reason for such conduct on their part was this, that Malik Badr ‘Ulā knew that as long as these amīrs should remain in confinement, no injury of any kind would reach the fort.

When Sultan Aḥmad heard what had happened, he gave orders that batteries should be allotted to the different commanders and the fort should be attacked from every side. On the 5th Jamādi-ul-ʾāwwal in the year 814 A.H. (1411 A.D.) the Sultan (in person) attacked the gate of the fort. The brave amīrs seeing this jumped into the ditch, and clambered to the fort and in the twinkling of an eye they mounted on the wall; and commenced to take measures for liberating Malik Nizām-ul-mulk. As the moment of the death of those two beloved noblemen had not yet come, they were both brought out, and the rebels were completely routed and destroyed. Malik Badr ‘Ulā and Rukan Khān, who were the leaders of the traitors and chiefs of the rebels, were executed. ¹ Firūz Khān and the Rāja

¹ There was apparently two Firūz Khāns, (1) Firūz Khān, son of Sultan Muṣaffar, and (2) Firūz Khān, son of Shams Khān. The former led the revolt against Aḥmad Shāh, and fought with him. Finally however, the Rāja of Idar
of Ḫan on hearing of the victory fled and took shelter in the hills of Ḫan.

After some days, Ranmal, the Rāja of Ḫan, wishing to redress and remedy what had happened behaved treacherously towards Fīrūz Ḫan, and having seized his treasures and elephants sent them for the service of Ṣultān Aḥmad. He also commenced with great humility and submissiveness to send tribute. The Ṣultān then returned to Aḥmadābād under the wings of triumph and victory. Fīrūz Ḫān fled with his brothers, and went to the country of Nāgōr. On the day on which Rāna Mūkul fought with Fīrūz Ḫān, the son of Shams Ḫān Dandānī, Fīrūz Ḫān the Shāhzāda attained martyrdom.

In the year 816, 1 Malik Aḥmad Sarkējī, Malik Shāh Malik and Malik Aḥmad son of Shēr Malik, Bhikan Ādām Ḫān Afghān and Malik 'Īsā Sālār again wakened up the disturbance which had fallen asleep, and they united some of the turbulent zamindārs with them, and overran a part of the country; and every wretched man that was there came and joined them. About this time the Rāja of 2 Mandal, the Rāja of Nādōt and Badhūl behaved treacherously towards him, and he fled to the other Fīrūz Ḫān who had succeeded his father at Nāgōr. Here he was killed according to the Tabaqāt in the course of the fight between the other Fīrūz Ḫān and Rāna Mūkul. Niẓām-ud-dīn calls him Shāhzāda, to distinguish him from his namesake, when mentioning his death. According to Firistah he went to Nāgōr, and was killed by the hākīm of that place, i.e., either by his namesake, or by some officer of his. As regards Fīrūz Ḫān No. 2, it will be remembered, that his father Shams Ḫān, after being expelled from Dāār, went to Nāgōr, and became the ruler there. This Fīrūz Ḫān was alive long after the death of the other which took place apparently in 815: for it appears that as late as 820 A.H. he sent a message to Ṣultān Aḥmad, to exculpate himself from all compliance with Ṣultān Hūshang and his partisans.

Col. Briggs is inclined to think that there was only Feroze Khan, and he was the son of his uncle Shams Khan. See footnote 2, page 19 of vol. IV of his work. According to Bayley it was Mūḍūl who fled to Nāgōr, and was killed in a battle between Rānā Mokal, Rāja of Chitīr and Shams Ḫān Dīndānī.

1 According to Firistah, Ṣultān Ahmad invaded Jalwāra in 816 A.H. and it was during his absence that Malik Aḥmad Sark(γ)jangī and Shāh Māli. son of Shāikh Malik and Ādām Bhankar raised the revolt. Col. Briggs (p. 17) has Kutohy instead of Sark(γ)jangī and he calls Ādām Bhankar of the Ādām ed. Adam of Bhukkur. Bayley (p. 95) calls 'Usmān Ahmad Sarkheji. 2 Ḫanji in the text-edition.

2 Probably Mandalgarh.
sent petitions to Sultān Hūshang, and incited and tempted him to come and conquer Gujrāt. Owing to his foolishness, he put his trust on the help of these rebels and advanced towards Gujrāt. Sultān Aḥmad saw that the dust of disturbance had risen from both sides, sent his own brother Latif 1 Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, with Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk the nāʿīb vazīr to punish Malik Shāh Malik, and the other amīrs. He himself with a well-equipped army advanced to crush Sultān Hūshang. When he arrived at 2 Bāndhū which is in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānīr, he sent Malik ʿImād-ul-mulk Samarqandi with a large force, in advance of himself. When Sultān Hūshang heard that a slave of Sultān Aḥmad was coming to give him battle, he considered his grandeur higher than that; and returned to his own country. ʿImād-ul-mulk seized a number of the men who were the prime movers and the cause of the disturbance, and brought them before the Sultān. It can, however, be well understood by intelligent men, who know the niceties of things, that Sultān Hūshang was only seeking a pretext for a retreat. It was quite possible for him to send one of his slaves to meet ʿImād-ul-mulk; and he might also have advanced in person, when Sultān Aḥmad advanced to reinforce his own army.

About the time when the news of the retreat of Sultān Hūshang came, fast-moving couriers brought the news that Malik Shāh Malik and the other amīrs finding that they had not the strength to meet (the Sultān’s army) had fled without waiting to fight. Shāhzāda Latif Khān took up a position after pursuing them for some distance. Shāh Malik in consultation with the other disturbers of the peace, who had combined with him, made a sudden attack in the darkness of the night on the Shāhzāda’s camp: but as the soldiers were all present and alert, they could not effect anything. They left a large number dead, and fled and took shelter with the zamīndār of Karnāl. The Sultān on receiving this news performed the rites of thanking God, and made the people of Aḥmadābād happy, by his gifts and favours.

---

1 According to Bayley (p. 96) Prince Latif Khān had orders to bring Khān to account; and the latter was driven into the country of Sūrath.

2 Bāndhū is called Pāndrū in Bayley, p. 96, and its situation is described as in purana Sānouli, ten miles from the hill of Chāmpānīr.
As the Râja of 1 Karnâl had given shelter in his territory to Shâh Malik and the other rebels, the Sultân, in the year 817 A.H., determined on punishing him and teaching him a lesson. When he arrived at Karnâl, which is celebrated as Jûnagarh, the Râja came out, and engaged him in a battle, but in the end he fled and retired into the citadel of Karnâl, and most of his best men fell, and departed to the city of eternity at the time of the flight. Sultân Ahmad besieged the fort; and sent detachments every day for plundering and ravaging the country of 2 Sûrath. After a few days, in the month of Rajab of that year, he seized the fort by an attack in great force. The Râja, with the others who were concerned in creating disturbance, fled to the top of the hill of Karnâl. Then in great humility and weakness, they came down, and begged for quarter; and again began to pay tribute according to the old custom. Sultân Ahmad left Shâh Abûl 3 Khair and Saiyid Qâsim in order to collect the tribute, and returned to A'hmadâbâd, his capital.

In the year 821, news came that Naşir, son of 'Adil Khân the ruler of Asir and Burhânpûr, feeling very proud of his power and greatness, had overrun some parts of Sultânpûr and Nadarbûr. Immediately on hearing this, (Sultân A'hmad) marched rapidly towards Nadarbûr. At the same time he sent a detachment to seize the fort of 4 Tambîl.

---

1 According to Firishtah Sultân Ahmad invaded Karnâl or Garnâl or Girnâr because he had heard a great deal in praise of the place, and because the Râja had never submitted to any Musalmân prince. When he was returning from Karnâl, he demolished a temple at a place called Saiyidpûr, (it is curious that the place should have such a name) which was adorned with various gems and pictures. It appears however from a quotation from a Muhammadan historian, apparently Firishtah, in Forbes's Rûm Mâla, vol. I, page 329 (1856), that the name of the place where the temple was situated was Somâpûr.

Firishtah also says that Sultân A'hmad sent Malik Tuhfa, on whom he conferred the title of Tâj-ul-mulk on a jehâl all over Gujrat; and the latter slow many, and laid the burden of the jizâya and khiraj on others, and converted many to Islam. In 819 Sultân A'hmad himself went on a similar expedition.

Firishtah mentions one Hadrât Khân Walli of Dehli coming to Gujrat, but it does not appear who he was.

2 سوريت in the text-edition.

3 Firishtah calls them two brothers, Saiyid Abûl Khârâf and Saiyid Abûl Qâsim.

4 According to Col. Briggs (p. 19), "Tambale, a small hill fort in the district of Buglana. The district from its local position naturally belongs to Kandeish, but it had from a very early period rajâs independent of that province."
which is situated on the boundary of the Deccan. When he arrived at Nadarbār, 1 Šāh Abūl Karim fled to Asir. The forces that had been sent to the fort of Tambūl, took possession of it by giving assurances of safety to the commandant. As it was the rainy season, and the chārwā (beasts of burden ?) suffered great hardship in the open plains, Sultan Aḥmad Šāh wanted to return to Aḥmadābād; but very swift couriers brought the news that the Rājas of Īdar and Chāmpānīr and Mandal and Nādōt had sent repeated representations to Sultan Hūshang; and had brought him into Gujrāt; and that he had arrived at the town of Mahrāsa.

At this time a man riding a camel who had come from the country of Nāgor in the course of nine days arrived at Nadarbār, and brought a petition from 2 Firūz Khān, son of Shams Khān Dandāni, the purport of which was that Sultan Hūshang was coming to conquer Gujrāt; and as he had come to know from the letters of Jahān Khān that this faqīr (i.e., he himself) was not honest and pure in his intentions towards Sultan Aḥmād, he had written to the faqīr that the zamindārs of Gujrāt had sent repeated petitions to him, and had begged him to invade Gujrāt, and he was accordingly starting for that country. It would be right and proper that he also should make himself ready quickly and should come; (in which case) after the conquest of Gujrāt the country of Nahrwāla would be conferred on him. As His Majesty is his lord and master, he has thought it right and proper that he should send him notice of this.

Sultan Aḥmad, in spite of the rains, marched rapidly and crossing the Narbada, encamped on the bank of the Mahindri; and when, in the course of a week, he arrived in the vicinity of the town of Mahrāsa, Sultan Hūshang’s spies took the news to him, and he sent for and reproached the zamindārs, and after scratching the back of his head, returned to his own country. As Sultan Aḥmad had come with only a small retinue, he halted there for a few days for collecting his troops. At this time news came that owing to the disturbances the Rāja of Sūrath had again neglected to pay his tribute; and

---

1 It was “Naṣīr son of Šāh Abūl Karim a few lines above but it is Šāh Abūl Karim here. The correct name however is Naṣīr, son of Šāh Abūl Karim” (see p. 196).
2 See note 1, pp. 193, 194.
Naṣīr, son of ʿĀdil Khān the ruler of Asīr, had in concert with Ghaznin Khān, son of Sūṭān Hūshang, besieged the fort of 1 Tālīnīr; and had by fraud and deceit taken possession of it; and with the advice and concurrence of the Rāja of Nādōt had invaded the country of Sūṭān-pūr; and had retired after plundering and ravaging it. Sūṭān Ahmad immediately on hearing this nominated Maḥmūd Khān with a large

1 As regards Tālīnīr or Thālnīr it appears from a note in page 101 of Bayley's Gujarāt that "Thālnīr had been assigned to Iftikhr-ul-mulk (who was Naṣīr Khān's younger brother), by their father, Malik Rāja, the first of the Fārīqī rulers of Khāndēsh, and with it certain territories, as his inheritance. Naṣīr Khān, who seems to have been restless, ambitious, and unscrupulous, seized the fort from Iftikhr-ul-mulk". Firishtah says it was taken by force, but the Tabaqāt Akbarī says by stratagem; any way, he got it, and was assisted in doing so, by Ghaznin Khān, who was his wife's nephew * * * whether their object at first was merely to seize Thālnīr, and the attack on Sūṭān-pūr an after-thought, or whether this was designed from the beginning, the fact was that the two confederates renewed their attempt on those provinces, and, aided by the Rāja of Nādōt (Tabaqāt Akbarī), for a time carried all before them. On the whole it seems likely that the attack by Sūṭān Hūshang, the rising in Sūrath, and the second adventure of Naṣīr Khān in Sūṭān-pūr, were concerted movements, and intended to be simultaneous; and, if it had not been for Sūṭān Ahmad's prompt march to meet Sūṭān Hūshang, and the precipitate flight of that irresolute and treacherous prince, Sūṭān Ahmad would have had a very serious task on his hand.

This is also confirmed by the Cambridge History of India, pp. 296, 297, where however Malik Rāja is called Raja Ahmad, and Iftikhār-ul-mulk is called Hassan. Malik Rāja divided his dominion giving the eastern portion to Naṣīr, and the western to Hassan. Naṣīr founded the city of Būrnānpūr in 1400 A.D. and captured the strong fort of Asīr from a Hindū chieftain; while Hassan established himself at Thālnīr. In 1417 Naṣīr with the help of Hūshang, who had married his sister, captured Thālnīr, and imprisoned Hassan. Then Sūṭān Ahmad sent an army which compelled Naṣīr to retire to Asīr, where he was besieged. Peace was made. Naṣīr swearing fealty to Ahmad and the latter recognising Naṣīr's title of Khān. Hassan retired to Gujarāt, where he and his descendand found a home and intermarried with the royal house.

From the treaty between Sūṭān Ahmad and Naṣīr, an estrangement took place between Khāndēsh and Mālwa. Naṣīr resented Hūshang's failure to support him adequately against Sūṭān Ahmad. In 1429 in spite of the former enmity between his family and the Bahmansīs, he gave his daughter in marriage to ʿĀl-ud-dīn Ahmad, son of Ahmad Shāh, the 9th Bahmansī King; but this union engendered strife, and Khāndēsh after a disastrous war with the Bahmansīs, was at length driven into the arms of Gujarāt.
force to proceed to the country of Sørath; and he went there and recovered tribute from the zamindārs. The Sultān also sent Malik Muḥmūd Barkū, and Mukhliṣ-ul-mulk to go and punish Naṣīr the son of 'Ādīl Khān and to teach him a lesson. Malik Muḥmūd and Mukhliṣ-ul-mulk in the first instance raided Nādūt and a part of that country. The Rāja being too weak to withstand them, paid the tribute which had been agreed upon. Then when they arrived in the vicinity of Sultānpūr Ghaznīn Khān retired to his own country. Naṣīr Khān, son of 'Ādīl Khān, retired to the fort of Tālānfr, and prepared to defend himself there. After the siege had been protracted for a length of time, he prayed for the pardon of his offences, through the intervention of Malik Muḥmūd Barkū. Sultān Aḥmad drew the pen of forgiveness across his offences, and conferred distinction on him, by giving him a robe of honour and the title of Naṣīr Khān.

As Sultān Hūshang had repeatedly invaded Gujrāt, and had soiled and tarnished the brightness of Sultān Aḥmad's heart, which was the seat of peace and happiness, with the dust of pain, the latter in the month Šafar of the afore-mentioned year advanced to conquer the kingdom of Mālwa. On the way the representatives of the Rāja of Īdar and Chāmpānīr and Nādūt and other zamindārs came and did homage to him; and prayed for the pardon of their (master's) offences. They also engaged that they would remit double the annual tribute. Sultān Aḥmad shut his eyes to the offences of these men; and accepted their excuses. As the Rāja of Mandal continued in his pride and rebellion, and did not try to discontinue his offences, Sultān Aḥmad left Malik Nizām-ul-mulk to be the regent of the kingdom during his absence, and left the work of punishing the Rāja in his charge; and in spite of the weather, and the narrowness of the road, himself advanced into Mālwa. When by successive marches he arrived in the neighbourhood of the village of 1 Kāllādah, Sultān Hūshang selected some broken land near it, and strengthened his position by having the river of Kāllādah on one side; and having cut down large trees made a khārband (a sort of zuriba made of trunks and branches of trees) in front of him. Sultān Aḥmad stood mounted

---

1 The name looks like Kāllāwā in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but J. Briggs has Kaliada. According to Bayley (p. 103) Kāllādah is the name of the river on which Ujain is situated.
on an extensive plain. He directed that 1 Amîr Maḥmûd Barki should command the right wing, and Malik Farîd 'Imâd-ul-mulk the left, while Naṣîr-ud-dîn 'Aḍd-ud-daula would be in the centre. It so happened that while seated on his horse he examined the battle-field, his attention fell on the circle fixed for Farîd; and seated there on his horse, he sent a servant to summon him, so that he might confer his father’s title, which was ‘Imâd-ul-mulk, on him. The messenger came back (and said) that the Malik had rubbed oil on his body, and he would arrive after a moment. The Sultân said “This is the day of battle. Farîd will find sorrow and shame on account of this delay”; and without waiting any longer advanced to the battle-field.

When the two bâdshâhs stood in front of each other, and the two armies met in great excitement and clamour, an elephant belonging to Sultân Aḥmad’s army rushed on Sultân Hûshang’s troops, and caused much havoc; and scattered the horsemen in all directions. Ghâznîn Khân, son of Sultân Hûshang, coming within bow shot, shot many arrows on the forehead of the animal and wounded and killed it. From all sides warriors thirsting for battle rushed and fell on Sultân Aḥmad’s army; and there was great distress among the men of Gujrat. At this time Malik Farîd mounted on his horse and followed by his men came towards the battle-field, but although he tried, 2 he could not find his way into it. At last a man told him, “I know a path by which you can get behind the enemy’s army, and can launch an attack on it”. Malik Farîd knowing the finding

1 Amîr Maḥmûd appears here to be called in one MS. as ترک. Turk and not as in previous passages برگي Barkti. Firishtah all along calls him Amîr Maḥmûd Turk. Bayley, however, on page 102 calls him Malik Maḥmûd Barqî. As regards Farîd, although he has been called Malik Farîd ‘Imâd-ul-mulk, he was the son of ‘Imad-ul-mulk, but that title had not yet been conferred on him; and the Sultân wanted to confer it on him there and then, as appears from the next sentence.

2 According to the Mirât-i-Sikandarî (Bayley, p. 103) Farîd “came to the side of a river, where there was a difficult ford”. After a little while a man pointed out a way to him which led to the rear of Sultân Hûshang’s army.

The battle is mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, page 29, as a fiercely contested one, but the name of the place where it took place is not mentioned and no details are given.
of the pathway to be a piece of unhoped for good fortune, advanced along it. At this time when the two armies were contending with each other, the detachment of Malik Farid appeared before Sultan Hushang's army; and he at once, and without hesitation fell on it, and there was a great battle. Although Sultan Hushang was personally bold and courageous, yet not being victorious in the battle he took the road of flight; and fled galloping to the fort of Mandu. Much booty fell into the hands of Sultan Ahmad, and his soldiers; and they went in pursuit till within one karoha of Mandu. Sultan Ahmad also sent detachments in different directions, so that they plundered and ravaged the country, and cut down trees, both those that bore fruit and others that did not, in the vicinity of Mandu. As the rainy season had now arrived, they turned back and returned to Gujrât. They trampled down (the crops, etc.) in the countries of Champânîr and Nâdôt, which lay on their way. After arriving at Ahmadâbâd Sultan Ahmad held many entertainments and festivities in the course of some months; and everyone, who had exerted himself even a little was distinguished by favours and kindnesses and had title conferred on him.

At the beginning of Dhîqa'dah in the year 821 A.H. (the Sultan) determined to punish the Raja of Champânîr; and advancing by successive marches, besieged the hill of Champânîr, which is three karôhs in height, and seven karôhs in circumference. He shut up all entrances and exits, and waited for the blowing of the breezes of victory and conquest. After some days, the Raja in great humility and distress sent a vakil, and submitted that This slave (i.e., he

---

1 The readings are doubtful. One MS. and the lith. ed. have اما فيروز جنگ نبرده اما فيروز خان دیگر نبرده. The former has the former reading is probably correct. The latter certainly is not. فيروز جنگ نبرده in the text-edition.

2 He is called Tirbang Dâs in the Mîrât-i-Sikandarî, Bayley, page 104. Tirbang is a variant of Tribhanga, lit. broken in three; a name given to Krishna, as indicating the posture in which he is shown as standing, in the ordinary pictures.

3 This is absurd, but I cannot get the correct altitude of the hill anywhere. Probably the path to the fort was three karôhs in length.
himself) has all along been a slave of that threshold, and has always caused himself to be written down as a 1 dependant of Aḥmad Shāh. If owing to his innate generosity he would accept the excuses for the offences of this humble one, the latter would send all his expenses for one year into the treasury, and would pay the annual tribute". As Sultān Aḥmad had at this time another achievement in his mind, he accepted the Rāja's excuses and took the tribute.

In the beginning of Safar of 822 A.H. (1419 A.D.) he advanced towards the town of 2 Sŏnkara; and having plundered and ravaged a part of the country round it, he encamped on the 22nd Safar nearer the town; and ordered the erection of a ḽama' Mosque there, and appointed the necessary officers directed by the Shara'. He marched from that place on the 11th Rabī'-ul-āwwal of that year and encamped at 3 Mānkī, and ordered that a strong fort should be built there as a military post. On the 12th Rabī'-ul-āwwal, he started towards Mandū, and having punished the 4 inhabitants and infidels of the hill of Kāntū, he proceeded along the way by rapid marches. On the way Maulānā Mūsa and 5 'Alī Ḥāmid came as emissaries from Sultān

---

1 The word is نرسکهداف or نرسکهداد in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. I suppose it means a dependant or protegé; or is it only a variant of his name Tirbang Dās.

2 The name is سونکر in the MSS., and Sŏngar in the lith. ed. Bayley (p. 104) calls it Sŏnkherah Bahadurpur. Firishtah's account differs from that in that he says at the end of that year (821 A.H.) Aḥmad Shāh caused the fort of Sŏnkara (or Sŏngar) to be repaired and built a mosque there; and then marching towards Andarun (Idar ?), and gave orders for plundering and ravaging Mālwa. Col. Briggs's (p. 22) account is similar, but he does not mention the building of the mosque; and he says that Ahmad Shah proceeded in person to Idur, and then sent a detachment into Malwa to lay waste that country. The place is called Songarh in the Cambridge History of India, page 298; and is said in a note to be at 20°, 11° North and 73°, 36° East.

3 The name is مانکی in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. According to Bayley (p. 105) the name of the village is Mānkī and it is a dependency of Sŏnkherah. It is not mentioned by Firishtah. In the text-edition it is مانکتی.

4 They are called the infidels of the hill of Kanthur in Bayley; and are referred to in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, as the "infidels, of the Šātpūrās".

5 The name is 'Ali Ḥāmid in one MS., and علی جمادار, 'Ali Jamādār in the other. It is 'Ali Jamādār in the lith. ed. Firishtah
Hūshang, and prayed, through the intervention of Malik Niẓām-ul-
mulk the ṇā'īb vazīr and Malik Maḥmūd Turk and Malik Ḥisām-ud-
din with great submission and humility, that it was not right that a
bādshāḥ professing the İslāmic faith should cause injury to the
Musalmāns and the helpless people of Mālwa. The Sultān, noble
spirited and generous of heart accepted their prayers; and wrote an
affectionate letter to Sultān Hūshang. He then turned back, and
camped in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānīr on the 17th Rabī'
ul-aww-līth-thānī. He levelled to the ground, wherever there was an idol
temple; and then went back to Aḥmadābād.

In the year 823 A.H., he moved out with the intention of
building some forts. First of all he laid the foundations of a strong
fort in Jinnūr on the bank of the Mahindrī. After that, he built a
line of fortifications round the town of Dhāmōd, and tried to in-
crease its population and cultivation. After that when he arrived
in the town of Kāritha he ordered that the old fort which had been

---

1 One MS. has بَسْمَ 20th, but the other and the lith. ed. have هَفْقَم 7th.
2 Firishtah does not mention the building of these forts; but I find the
following in Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 348. The passage is within inverted commas,
but the work from which it is quoted is not mentioned. "Having also founded
forts in such places, he left garrisons in them, among which may be mentioned
the fort at the town of Jincor in the Pargūnah of Bara, and that of Shīva-
poor. After this he established the market town of Dāhmud, among the
mountains, where he erected a fortification. After this the fort of Karīch
(Kaira or Kuree?) built in A.D. 1304 by order of Alp Khān who governed the
country for Allah-ood-deen Khilijy, was repaired, and named Sultanabad." It
would be seen that the statements made in the quotation agree closely with
those in the text. There are differences in the spelling of the names of the
places where the forts were built in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but I do not
consider it necessary to mention them. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandarl, Bayley,
page 105, the first fort is said to have been built at Janūr in the pargāna of
Bārā Sanwāl. After that the Sultān built the town of Dhāmōd, in the hills,
and he erected a fort there. He repaired the fort at Kāreth which was founded
in the time of Sultān 'Alī-ud-dīn by Alp Khān Sanjar, in 704 A.H. (1304 A.D.),
but had fallen into decay, and he gave it the name of Sultānābād.
erected in the year 1 704 A.H. by Alp Khan Sanjar, the Deputy of Sultan Ala-ud-din Khalji should be entirely re-built; and having endeavoured to increase the cultivation and the population of the district, gave it the name of Sultanaabad. He again marched in the direction of Champañir at the end of the year 824 A.H., 1421 A.D. He besieged it and extorted tribute; and on the 19th of Safar, 825, he advanced towards Sonkhera. He arrived there on the 22nd Safar, and laid the foundation of another Jama’ masjid.

At this time, news came that sometime ago Sultan Hushang had left Malwa, and had gone away elsewhere; and had completely

1 The dates vary in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but as the year of the Christian era in the passage quoted in the preceding note is 1304 A.D., 704 appears to be the correct A.H. year.

2 As to Sultan Hushang’s disappearance Firishtah’s account is, that as he knew that the fort of Mandu was so strong that Sultan Ahmad would not be able to capture it, and he wanted to achieve a feat that people would remember for a long time, he left it in charge of one of his chief officers, and went out himself with six thousand selected horsemen and left it by the Nagor gate, while Sultan Ahmad was encamped in front of the Sarrangpur gate with the object of capturing some fine mast elephants in Jajnagar; and coming back with them. According to Firishtah Sultan Ahmad did not know anything about Sultan Hushang’s departure, or his return, till he heard joy drums beaten, and saw flags hung out from the turrets of the fort of Mandu after he had returned. Apparently the siege was not at all a close one. Firishtah also gives another version from the Tarikh-i-Alfi. According to this, Sultan Hushang assumed the dress of a horse merchant, and went to Jajnagar in order to procure elephants. Ahmad Shah of Gujerat, having heard that he had left his kingdom, and that his officers had divided it among themselves invaded Malwa. In the first place he reduced the fort of Mahesar and then marched to Mandu. I do not consider it necessary to give this version at greater length but I may point out that it agrees generally with the text.

The names of the jagirs, and of the amirs on whom they were conferred, are not mentioned in the quotation from the Tabaqats-Akbari, but the collection of the kharij revenue is. According to Bayley, page 106, Sultan Hoshang is said to have gone to Jajnagar elephant hunting; and the people in the fort of Mahesar having no hope of relief surrendered the keys to Sultan Ahmad.

Bayley discusses at some little length, in a note on page 106, the reason and motives of Sultan Ahmad’s attack on Mandu. He thinks that Sultan Ahmad is not likely to have been induced to attack Mandu, a Musalmân country, merely by the absence of Hoshang, with whom he was at peace. He comes to the conclusion that Sultan Ahmad might have been led to believe that Sultan
disappeared. The amirs and the chiefs of the different sections of the people had taken possession of the country, and had divided it among themselves. On hearing this news, the Sulṭān marched towards Mandū, and advancing by successive marches he laid siege to 1 Mahisara. The thānādār prayed for quarter, and entered the service of Ahmad Shāh. The latter encamped on the 12th Rabī’-ul-ākhir at the foot of the fort of Mandū; and sent many detachments to ravage the country. Then when the rainy season approached, he marched from the fort towards Ujjain. He divided the country among his amirs, giving Dīpālpūr Banharīa in fief to Malik Mukhlīs-umlulk, and 2 Kānṭhā to Malik Farīd ‘Imād-ul-mlulk, and Mahindpur which is now celebrated as Muḥammadpur to Malik Iftikhr-ul-mlulk. The amirs sent their officers to the parganas; and realised the installment of the kharif (rainy season crops) revenue.

Sulṭān Hūshang returned at this time from his journey to 3 Jājnagar, where he had gone to buy elephants, a detailed account of this matter is given in the section about Mālwa, and entered the fort of Mandū. After the end of the rains, Sulṭān Ahmad went from

1 The name is Ġasir in one MS., and in the lith. ed., but Ḡāzpūr in the other MS. Firista calls it the fort of Ḡāzpūr. In the quotation from the Tārikh-i-Alfi it is called Mahaswar. It is called Chola Mahāsārar in Bayley, page 108.

2 In the text-edition it is Māhir.

3 Col. Briggs (p. 22) says that Jajnugur “is a city situated on the Mahananda river which empties itself into the sea in the province of Orissa. The forests of which have always been famous for wild elephants.” There is no city of the name of Jajnagar at present in Orissa; there is a town called Jajpur, but it is not on the Mahānādi. Probably the name of Jajnagar was given to the province of Orissa. According to Riqa’u-s-Salṭān (1902), p. 15, Northern Orissa was known as Jajnagar.
Ujjain to Mandū on the 20th Ramadān; and sat down in front of the Dehli gate. He distributed the batteries and laid siege to the 1 hill. He sent a farmān to Aḥmadābād, to summon 2 Malik Aḥmad Ayāz; so that he might bring with him treasure and some appliances. The Malik came on the 12th of Shawwāl; and waited on the Sultān. The latter conferred a robe of honour on him, and made over to him the duty of working the Tārāpūr battery. As on the return of Hūshang, Sultān Aḥmad’s troops, which had taken possession of the country of Mālwa, and were engaged in managing the parganas had again collected together, Sultān Aḥmad thought it advisable that he should take up a position in the centre of the country and send the amīrs to the towns and parganas. According to this decision he marched away from the foot of the fort, and advanced to Sārangpūr. Sultān Hūshang also betook himself to Sārangpūr by a different route. When the Gujrat army arrived in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, Sultān Hūshang sent an emissary, and behaving with great humility and submissiveness agreed to pay tribute. When Sultān Aḥmad saw the humility and the weakness of the emissary, he became 3 sure of his safety, and neglected to dig the ditch and to erect the zariba round his camp.

The same night, which was the 12th Muḥarram in the year 826 A.H., Sultān Hūshang made a night attack on the camp. As the men were negligent a large number was slain; among them 4 Sāmat Rāy, Rāja of the country of Dandwāna, who was killed with five

---

1 It is کوه, hill, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Probably the entire hill on which Mandū was built was besieged.

2 He is called Muqarrab in the Tārikh-i-Allī. He brought battering rams and engines with him; and he was detached to secure the passage by the Tārāpūr gate, which according to a note by Col. Briggs (p. 24) was the southern entrance.

3 According to Firishtah the emissaries spoke with such flattery and urgency that Aḥmad Shāh neglected not only to dig the ditch and make the thorn fence but kept no night sentries.

4 He does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. Sāmat Rāy may be a corrupt form of Sāmant Rāy. He is called Sāmant Rājpūt Grāsia of the district of Dundān who held the advanced post, in Bayley, page 198. The night attack is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, but may be one of the “desultory and inconclusive hostilities” mentioned on page 298. In the text-edition the name is سامت رامب راجہ ولايت دندان.
hundred Rājpūts around him. When 1 Sultān Aḥmad woke up he did not find a single person in his pavilion. There were two post horses there. He mounted 2 Malik Jūnā, his rikābdār (stirrup holder) on one, and himself mounted the other. Coming out of his suite of tents, he saw the whole camp being destroyed; and not knowing what to do, went away towards the open country. After a little time, he sent Malik Jūnā back to the camp, so that he might make enquiry. When Malik Jūnā again got into the camp, he found that Malik Muqarrab Aḥmad Ayāz, and Malik Farīd had got their men together, and were going towards the royal pavilion. They asked him news of the Sultān. Malik Jūnā after ascertaining the real state of things, took the other two with him and went and waited on the Sultān. As the Sultān was “naked” (i.e., probably he had only some kind of night-dress on him), Malik Muqarrab taking off his own arms put them on him. He also asked for leave to attack the enemy. The Sultān ordered “Wait a little while, so that the light of the morning may appear”. Malik Jūnā was again sent to the camp, so that he might make further enquiry, and ascertain where Sultān Hūshang was, and how he was occupied.

Malik Jūnā returned, and said, that Sultān Hūshang’s troops were busy plundering the camp, and he himself was standing with a few others, with all the royal horses and elephants collected round them. Sultān Aḥmad advanced with the thousand horsemen, who had come with Malik Muqarrab and Malik Farīd, at the approach of the dawn, which indeed was a dawn of good fortune, to effect the destruction of Hūshang. When the two forces met face to face, the Sultān with his followers attacked the enemy; and doing all that was demanded of him in the way of activity and bravery, inflicted wounds on Hūshang, and also received a wound himself. Sultān Hūshang also in spite of the wound exerted himself with great bravery. About this time the 3 filbāns attached to the Gujrat army, recognised Sultān

---

1 He is said to have been awakened by Malik Munnīr in Bayley, page 108; but we hear nothing more of this man.

2 The name of the rikābdār is transliterated as Malik Jaunān in Bayley, page 108.

3 According to Fīrīštāḥ they were seated on their elephants, which had been seized by Sultān Hūshang.
Ahmad; and drove Sultan Hushang before them; and although the latter tried to maintain his position, he was unable to do so, and in the end had to flee towards Sārangpūr. The tables were turned now, and the men who had been engaged in looting the Gujrāt camp, became food for the sword; and all the elephants and horses and camels and war material that had been seized were recovered; and seven famous elephants, out of those brought from Jānjagar, which Sultan Hushang had acquired with such great hardship and trouble were obtained as booty. Sultan Ahmad then with victory and triumph betook himself to his pavilion, and bound up his wound. He then arranged a great public audience; and did everything to please and encourage the amirs and the heads of groups, and the brave warriors. On the next day, he sent Iftikhar-ul-mulk and Malik Safdar Khan Sultanī, with a well-equipped detachment into the adjoining country, that they might guard the animals belonging to the camp which had been sent out to collect fodder. It so happened that a detachment of the enemy’s army had come out of their camp to attack and harass the men who were collecting fodder. The two bodies met and attacked each other, and did everything to slay and be slain. In the end, Sultan Hushang’s detachment fled and retired to Sārangpūr and Malik Iftikhar-ul-mulk and Safdar Khan Sultanī returned crowned with success and victory, and received favours from the Sultan.

Sultan Ahmad for reasons of state now started for Gujrāt on the 24th of Rabī‘-ul-akhir of that year. Sultan Hushang immediately sailed out of the fort of Sārangpūr, and started in pursuit. Sultan Ahmād turned back, and stood his ground; and the flames of battle blazed up between the two armies. Sultan Ahmād exerted himself with great gallantry. After much fighting and great struggle, Sultan Hushang turned his back on the field of battle, and fled, and entered the fort. On this occasion also some of the Jānjagar elephants fell into the hands of the Gujrāt army. Sultan Ahmad halted that day at that place, and on the next day he again advanced in the direction of Ahmādābād. He arrived there on the 4th Jamā‘ī-ul-

1 One MS. has, سلمه, chain, after هفت, seven; but the other and the lith.-ed. do not have it. Ordinarily an elephant is described as بطْبْنَىْ بِنْ. I suppose يك سلمه لَبْل also means an elephant.
ākhir of that year; and held great festive assemblies; 1 and conferred distinctions on the amirs and the soldiers in the form of reward and robes of honour and increase of emoluments; and as during this expedition the troops had lost much of their accoutrements, he directed that they should not move for three years. The Sultān took up his residence in Aḥmadābād; and spent most of his time, in inquiring into the cases of seekers of justice, and regulating the administration of the kingdom and increasing the cultivation.

While he was so engaged the vazirs represented to him that 2 Pūnjā, son of Ranmal, the Rāja of Īdar, had shortened his hand (i.e., had delayed) in remitting the tribute, during the time when the Sultān was engaged in waging war in Mālwa; and having sent petitions to Sultān Hūshang had tried to combine with him. Accordingly in the year 829 A.H., Sultān Ahmad sent a well-equipped army to attack Pūnjā. When the army arrived in the country of Īdar, and began to plunder and ravage it, Pūnjā met it with hostility, and placed the shield of resistance before himself. When the struggle was protracted, the Sultān advanced into Īdar in person, and planning the building of the city of Aḥmadnagar, on the bank of the river 3 Hātmāti, at a distance of ten karōhs from Īdar, laid the foundation

1 There are different readings here. The reading in one MS. which I have accepted is āma ʿs pārachāyīna ra bānām wa ḥlames wa zabāni ʿulwana ʿamtiya存在着 wa ḥorin āma ʿs pārachāyīna in sībar bi sāmanī shēde būndūn; the other MS. has āma ʿs pārachāyīna in sībar bi sāmanī shēde būndūn wa ḥorin āma ʿs pārachāyīna in sībar bi sāmanī shēde būndūn ḥlames wa zabāni ʿulwana ʿamtiya exists. The reading in the lth. ed. is manifestly incorrect; it has āma ʿs pārachāyīna ra ʿs pārachāyīna bi sāmanī shēde būndūn.

2 The name is written in the MSS. as بِرَنْجَا وَلْد رَنْمِل and in the lth. ed. as بِرَنْجَا بِن رَوْ ه مَانِ. He is called Row Poonjā in Rās Mālā, vol. 1, page 349. It is difficult to ascertain the derivation or correct Sanskrit form of Pūnjā. It may be Puiya the worshipped, the honoured. Ranmal appears to be Rānā Malla, a native in war.

3 The name of the river is Sābarmati in the MSS., in the lth. ed. Firishtah and in the text-edition; but it is Hātmāti in the lth. ed. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 26) says, “Firishta writes Hatmutty; it should evidently be Sabarmutty, the same river that flows to Ahmedabad”. In the map before Ahmādīnagar is not on the Sābarmati, but on a stream which flows into some distance to the south near a place which is called Carah in the map. 5 I have retained Hātmāti.
of a fort there. He made very great exertions in completing the building of it. He sent out detachments from Ahmadnagar, in different directions, all round Idar; so that they might burn tar o khushk or wet and dry, i.e., growing crops, houses, etc.; and slay all that fell into their hands. Punnah, although he saw all this, was determined to carry on the war. He sometimes appeared suddenly from a distance before a detachment which went to escort the men who went for fodder; and in the meantime, whenever he accidentally got a chance, he launched an attack.

In the end, when he found that he could effect nothing, and could not endure any longer the on slaughts of Ahmad Shах’s armies, he sent representatives, and with sincerity offered to pay a large tribute. But as he had (before this) several times broken his engagements, the Sultan did not accept his offer. He advanced in person against Idar, and on the first day he seized three forts. Punnah fled and took shelter in the hills of 1 Visnagar. The next day the Sultan sacked the city of Idar and returned to Ahmadnagar. 2 As the construction of Ahmadnagar was now completed, the Sultan in the following year, namely 830 A.H., again turned the bridle of his spirit to the conquest of the territory of Idar, and sent his troops in all directions, so that they might plunder and ravage the country; and he himself also gave his attention to the work. Punnah in a state of great humility and distress sent emissaries and knocked at the door of peace; and agreed to pay a heavy tribute. As the Sultan had now formed a kingly determination to destroy him completely, he showed no favour to the words of the emissaries. Punnah, now utterly despondent, hovered moth-like round his territory; and wherever he could, made an onslaught. On a Thursday 2 in the month of Jamadi-ul-akhir in the year 831 A.H., he came upon a detachment, which had gone to the jungle to escort a body of men who had gone to bring grass. After exerting himself a great deal against them, he fled; but when

---

1 It is Bijnagar in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but the correct name appears to me to be Visnagar, but I find that the Mirat-i-Sikandari also calls it Bijnagar. The reading in the MSS. is followed in the text-edition.

2 So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah who has copied the sentence from the text verbatim has بّنجم, 5th, instead of پنجشنبه, Thursday, and this is apparently correct.
he was galloping away, an elephant which had become separated from the detachment came into his view. He immediately turned round, and wounding the animal with his spear, drove it before him. As some brave men pursued him, he betook himself into some uneven ground where there were caverns and ravines; and by an accident, his horse shied at the elephant and 1 threw him into a cavern. Aḥmad Shāh's soldiers came up and turned the elephant back; but they did not know that Pūnjā had been thrown by his horse. About this time a poor man entered the cavern in order to collect fire-wood. He saw a well-dressed man lying dead; and from his appearance concluded that it must be the corpse of a great man. He cut off his head and waited with it upon the Sultān; and many people recognised it to be the head of Pūnjā. They say that a man at that time saluted the head and showed great respect towards it. When people asked him the reason of this, he said, "I served him for a long time". Sultān Aḥmad was pleased with the man's good manners, and rewarded him.

Couplet:

Neglect not good manners, and their results great;
For in the end, they will your fortune make.

The next day the Sultān advanced to Idar, and sending troops gave them orders to devastate Idar and Visālnagar. 2 Har Rāy, the son of Pūnjā, having through the intervention of 3 Khān Jahān Sultānī begged for the pardon of his offences; and engaged to pay an annual tribute of three lakhs of silver tankas. Sultān Aḥmad, on account of his great generosity and humanity, drew the pen of

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have انداد, but the other MS. has اندادخت.
2 I have accepted the latter reading, for it does not appear that the dead horse was found near Pūnjā's corpse. The circumstances under which Pūnjā was killed are given somewhat differently by Firishtah. Col. Briggs does not say anything about the manner of his death. According to Rās Mālā, vol. I, p. 349, Pūnjā fell under his horse and was killed.
3 So in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah (lith. ed.) has ضیرو, Pirāū. Col. Briggs does not give his name; while the Rās Mālā has Naron Das. Bayley (p. 112) calls him Bir Rāi; but says he is called Har Rāo in some MSS. He is called Hari Rāi in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, and is said to have been reduced to vassalage by Sultān Ahmad in 1428.
4 One MS. has Khān Jahān Sultānī, and this is followed.
forgiveness across his offences; and took him into the circle of his loyal adherents. He conferred the title of Šafdar-ul-mulk on Malik Hasan and left him with a large body of troops in charge of the military post of Aḥmadnagar. He then trampled over and plundered the country of Kilwarā, and went to Aḥmadabad. He made the citizens fortunate with rewards and favours. After some days, Malik Muqarrab gave letters, addressed to Har Rāy, to some of his personal adherents, for the payment of their wages. When these men arrived at Idar Har Rāy made delays in the payment of the money and passed the time making evasions. He then got the news that the Sultān had come out of the city, and was engaged in collecting troops. In great fear he fled and took shelter in an out-of-the-way place. When this news reached the Sultān he advanced on the wings of speed on the 4th Ṣafar, 832 A.H.; and on the 6th Ṣafar, he took up his residence in the fort, and after performing the rites of offering thanks to God, planned the erection of a jāma' masjid, and leaving a large force there went to Aḥmadnagar.

3 In 833 A.H., when Rāja Kānhā, the Rāja of Jhālāwār, knew that Sultān Aḥmad had nearly finished the matter of Idar; and that

1 So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah (lith. ed.) has Kankwārā. Col. Briggs has Gilwarā and Rās Mālā has Gudwārā.

2 Instead of the peaceful march to, and entry into Idar, described in the text, Firishtah says, يکی از قلم معتبر آید مفتون ساخندی بقلمه درآمد, and Rās Mālā, vol. I, p. 350, follows him and says “he carried by storm one of the principal forts in that province, wherein he built a magnificent mosque”.

3 Bayley says (page 114), that for some reason, the Mīrāt-i-Sikandār gives only a brief summary of the latter years of Sultān Ahmad’s reign; and he has supplied the deficiency by extracts from the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī. As regards the war between Sultān Ahmad of Gujarāt and Sultān Ahmad Bahmani no additional information can be obtained from the Mīrāt-i-Sikandār.

4 So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith ed. of Firishtah he is changed to two Rājas Rāja Kānhā and Rāja of Jālwārah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 26) has Kanha Ray, the Raja of Jhalode. According to the Mīrāt-i-Sikandār his proper name was Kānhā Satara, Rāja of Jhālāwār. He had joined the rebellion of 1413 and had therefore good reason for being afraid of Sultān Ahmad’s displeasure towards him. The rebellion of Kānhā is also mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, page 296, where it is said that it called “Ahmad into Kāthiāwār”.

---

1 So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah (lith. ed.) has Kankwārā. Col. Briggs has Gilwarā and Rās Mālā has Gudwārā.

2 Instead of the peaceful march to, and entry into Idar, described in the text, Firishtah says, يکی از قلم معتبر آید مفتون ساخندی بقلمه درآمد, and Rās Mālā, vol. I, p. 350, follows him and says “he carried by storm one of the principal forts in that province, wherein he built a magnificent mosque”.

3 Bayley says (page 114), that for some reason, the Mīrāt-i-Sikandār gives only a brief summary of the latter years of Sultān Ahmad’s reign; and he has supplied the deficiency by extracts from the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī. As regards the war between Sultān Ahmad of Gujarāt and Sultān Ahmad Bahmani no additional information can be obtained from the Mīrāt-i-Sikandār.

4 So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith ed. of Firishtah he is changed to two Rājas Rāja Kānhā and Rāja of Jālwārah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 26) has Kanha Ray, the Raja of Jhalode. According to the Mīrāt-i-Sikandār his proper name was Kānhā Satara, Rāja of Jhālāwār. He had joined the rebellion of 1413 and had therefore good reason for being afraid of Sultān Ahmad’s displeasure towards him. The rebellion of Kānhā is also mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, page 296, where it is said that it called “Ahmad into Kāthiāwār”.
as soon as he would be free, he would attack other zamindārs, he considered that it would be most advantageous for him to leave his own country; and he accordingly fled. The force, which was deputed to punish him, went in pursuit of him into the territory of Asīr and Būhrānpūr. Naṣīr Kānān, the ruler of Asīr, on account of the fact that Kānha had presented 1 two worn-out elephants as tribute to him, and 2 exchanging the rights for benefits conferred, for injuries, gave him a place (i.e., an asylum) in his kingdom. After some days, Kānha went to Gulbarga 3 and brought a force from Sultān Aḥmad Bahmani to assist and help him; after which he plundered and ravaged parts of Nadarbār.

When this news reached Sultān Aḥmad, he appointed his eldest son, Shāhzāda Muḥammad Kānān to inquire into and redress this matter; and sent great sardārs, such as Saiyid Abūl Khaīr, and Saiyid Qāsim, son of Saiyid Ālam, and Malik Muqarrab Aḥmad Ayāz, and Malik Iftikhar-ul-mulk with him. Shāhzāda Muḥammad Kānān fought a battle with the Dakhinī troops, and gained the victory; and a large number of the Dakhinis were slain, and others were taken prisoners. The remainder who escaped the sword fled to Daulatābād. When this intelligence reached Sultān Aḥmad Bahmani, he sent his eldest son, Sultān Ālā-ud-dīn, and his second son, Kānān Jahān, to carry on the war with Shāhzāda Muḥammad. He also entrusted the

1 One MS. has 19 Nil Laka Matkak. The lith. ed. has 19 Nil Laka Matkak. Firishtah has 19 Nil Laka Matkak. Col. Briggs says (vol. IV, pp. 26, 27) Kanha presented two elephants which he had succeeded in bringing with him, when he escaped from a detachment, which was sent in pursuit of him. Bayley (p. 116) in his translation of the Tabakāt has two large elephants, but says in a note, some MSS. have “one”.

2 The sentence in the text حفره تربیت بعقره مدل سالخته is obscure and cryptic. Firishtah is more intelligible. He says أو باستعمال قرة ب단هانه ؛ ذکی حفره تربیت سلطان گچرات بعقره مدل سالخته, i.e., and he (i.e., Naṣīr Kānān) relying on the strength (he felt) from the fact of his relationship with the ādāhās of the Dakhin, exchanged the rights, which the Sultān of Gujrat had on him for benefits he had conferred, for injuries.

3 Firishtah says specially that it was a small detachment.

4 The names are somewhat different in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Saiyid Qāsim is called Saiyid Abūl Qāsim. Saiyid Ālam is not mentioned as the father of Saiyid Qāsim, but as a separate chief.
affairs of the army to the judgment of Qadr Khān, who was one of the
great amirs of the Deccan. Sultān 'Alā-ud-din, in consultation with
Qadr Khān, arrived by successive marches at Daulatābād; and took
up his residence there. At this station, Naṣīr Khān, the ruler of Asir
and Burhānpūr, and Kānhā Rāja of Jhālāwār also joined the camp of
Sultān 'Alā-ud-din; and he was much strengthened by them. Muḥammad
Khān also advanced towards Daulatābād with the intention of
giving battle. When the two armies approached each other closely,
Muḥammad Khān arrayed his ranks, and the fire of 1 battle flamed
up from both sides. At this juncture Malik Muqarrab Aḥmad Ayāz
and Qadr Khān, both of whom were commanders, fought hand to hand.
Qadr Khān fell from the back of his horse on the dust of destruction.
Malik Iftikhār-ūl-mulk seized a large elephant as booty. Sultān
'Alā-ud-din fled and took shelter in the fort of Daulatābād. Naṣīr
Khān, the ruler of Asir, also fled, and went to the hills of 2 Kaland,
which are situated in the country of Asir. Muḥammad Khān carried
out the customs of offering thanks to God, and as he knew that it
would be impossible to capture the fort of Daulatābād, he returned
from there; and having trampled down a part of the territory of
Asir and Burhānpūr, took up his quarters in the town of Nadarbār.
From that place he notified the true state of things to his father.
Sultān Aḥmad wrote in reply that he should continue for a few days
longer at Nadarbār, in order to arrange and regulate the affairs of
that quarter.

In the year 834 A.H. 3 Quṭb, the officer-in-charge of the island
of Mahāim, and other sufferers (mehnat zadhā) sent a petition to

---

1 This battle is said, in the Cambridge History of India, page 299, to have
taken place at Māníkpur about 38 miles N.-W. of Daulatābād.

2 One MS. has کلند, Golkund, which is clearly a mistake. The other
has کلند, Kaland. The lith. ed. has کلند, Kālīd. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has
Kaland. Col. Briggs simplifies matters by saying (vol. II, p. 28) “took refuge
in the hills of Kandieh”.

3 He is called Quṭb without any addition, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.,
and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs, however, calls him Kootb Khān.
Firishtah’s account, however, differs from that in the text inasmuch as he says
that it was after the death of Quṭb, that Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, who was always
thinking of retaliating for his previous defeat, sent the Malik-ut-tujjār, and the
latter took possession of the island. In the Tārīkh-i-Alfi Quṭb is called Rā
Sultān Āhmād that Malik 1 Ḥasan, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār and was one of the amirs of Sultān Āhmād Bahmani, had come from the country of the Deccan, and had seized the island of Mahām, and neighbouring country with great violence and ferocity; and had ravaged a Musalmān country, and had carried Musalmāns away in bondage. Sultān Āhmād sent Shāhzāda Zafar Khān to destroy Malik-ut-tujjār; and he appointed some great amirs, who had previously done (great) deeds to serve under him. He also wrote to Mukhlīṣ-ul-mulk, the kotwāl of Dīb (Dīū), that he should get the ships belonging to the different ports, and should proceed to attend on Zafar Khān. Malik Mukhlīṣ-ul-mulk fitted out 2 seven hundred ships, large and small, from the town of Pattan, and 3 the Port of Dīb and the district of 4 Kambāyat. He came and waited upon Zafar Khān in the neighbourhood of the country of Mahām. It was decided in consultation with the amirs, 5 that the ships should be sent to the country of Thāna and he should himself remain with Zafar Khān.

When they arrived near Thāna, Zafar Khān sent Iftikhār-ul-mulk and Malik Suhrāb Sultānī, in advance, to surround that country. At the same time, the ships filled with armed men arrived by sea; and closed the approach (by sea). When Zafar Khān began to conquer that district, the governor of Thāna sallied out of the fort, and fought with bravery. He was, however, unable to withstand the onslaughts of the Gujrat army, and fled. The Shāhzāda, with the advice of the amirs, left a body of troops there, and advanced on Mahām. Malik-

---

1 Quṭb. and Bayley thinks that "He was the Rāi of Mahām, whose daughter Prince Fath Khān is said, in the sequel, to have married". He was probably one of the petty local princes. It is said in Rās Mālā, page 350, vol. I, that he was "a tributary Hindoo prince with the title of Rāc, who afterwards gave a daughter to the harem of the son of Shah Āḥmed".

2 For an account of him, see the history of the reign of Ahmad Shāh Bahmani, p. 49 onwards.

3 According to Firāstah and Col. Briggs and Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 352) there were only seventeen ships.

4 One MS. has بندر گھوگا instead of Bandar Dīp; but Bayley, 117, has both Dīū, and the port of Ghōgah.

5 Col. Briggs's translation is slightly different. It is that the ships with part of the army should go to Tanna, and the remainder should go by land.
ut-tujjār had cut down large trees, and had built a barricade with the branches along the shore of Mahāim. When the Gujrat army came up, Malik-ut-tujjār came outside the barricade and fought with gallantry. From the approach of the light of dawn to the setting of the sun, the brave men of the two armies showed no deficiency in courage and hardihood. But in the end, Malik-ut-tujjār fled and got within the barricade. When the ships arrived, and the Gujrat army had the command both by sea and land, Malik-ut-tujjār sent a petition to Sultān Ahmad Bahmant and prayed for help. The Sultān sent ten thousand horsemen, and 1 sixty and odd mast elephants with two of his sons from Daulatābād, and sent his vazīr Khān Jahān with them, so that they might act according to his advice and counsel. When the Deccan army arrived near Mahāim, Malik-ut-tujjār being assured of the safety of the island and of the barricades of trees, had the honour of waiting on the two Shāhzādas. After much discussion, it was decided, that they should in the first instance endeavour to recover possession of the district of Thāna; and they started in the direction of that place.

Shāhzāda Zafar Khān also made necessary preparations, and started to re-inforce the men at Thāna. After the two armies had met (near Thāna), they fought with each other from morning till sun-set; and in the end, defeat fell on the Deccan army. Malik-ut-tujjār fled to 2 Jālnā; and his troops, for fear of their lives, abandoned the island of Mahāim. Zafar Khān crowned with success and victory landed there; and sent out ships, and seized some of the officers of Malik-ut-tujjār, who had fled by way of the sea. He despatched some boats after 3 filling them with various kinds of rich fabrics and

1 Both MSS. have ṣamṭ 60 and odd. The lith. ed. has ṣamṭ 60 sixty. Bayley, p. 117, has sixty odd, but Firishtah has ṣamṭ 60 sixty and odd, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 29) has sixty.

2 The MSS., the lith. ed. have جالن. Bayley, p. 118, has Jālnah. Firishtah has جالن (which does not differ very much from جالن) but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 30) says, he fled to Chakun.

3 The passage is somewhat obscure. The MSS. and the lith. ed. have از اقسام البهم و تنگهایی بر چند کشتی بزرگه. Bayley, p. 118, has translated the passage, "Several ships were loaded with stuffs and clothes and precious stones." Firishtah has رشته و زز سرخ. Col. Briggs has "Some beautiful gold and silver-embroidered muslins." Rās Mālā has the words as Col. Briggs, and puts them
tankas, as offerings to Sulṭān Aḥmad. He took possession of the entire
district of Mahāim and divided it among the amirs, and the heads of
different groups of people.

When all these facts reached the ear of Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmani,
he was extremely depressed; and equipped his army in order to
revenge himself; and marched against the country of 1 Baglāna, which
is near the port of Sūrat. Shāhzāda Muḥammad Kháń, who was in
the country of Nadarbār and Sulṭānpūr sent a representation to his
father to the effect, that he had been deprived of the honour of serving
His Majesty for a period of four years and some months; and on account
of this long residence of his in a distant land, the retainers of the amirs
and Kháńś had gone away to their own countries; and a large force
had not been left there. He also said that he had heard that Sulṭān
Aḥmad Bahmani had marched into the country of Baglāna; and
intended to advance in the direction of Nadarbār.

When this representation reached the Sulṭān, he postponed the
seige of Chāmpānir to some other time; and advanced towards Nādōṭ,
and after plundering and ravaging that country, advanced by succes-
sive marches, and encamped in the vicinity of the town of Nadarbār.
Shāhzāda Muḥammad Kháń and the amirs who were with him had the
honour of offering their services; and each one of them received a
special favour in accordance with his rank and position. The spies
brought the news at that station in the year 835 A.H., that Sulṭān
Ahmad Bahmani, on receiving the information of the arrival of the
Sulṭān (Aḥmad Gujṛāī), had left a detachment on the boundary of
his kingdom, and had gone back to Gulbarga. The Sulṭān was pleased
and delighted on hearing this news, and turned back towards Aḥma-
dābād. He had crossed the 2 Tiptī after successive marches, when

---

*between inverted commas, which shows that they have been taken from Col.
Briggs’s History. The difficulty in the passage lies in the words تملكی, which
I am inclined to translate as tankas but which Bayley has translated as precious
stones. The word does not occur in Firishtah, so he can be left out of account.
As between tankas and precious stones, I have never seen the latter called سنگ
They are always called جواهر. Firishtah’s red gold may mean gold and red
tankas.

1 بگلانہ instead of بگلانہ in the text-edition.
2 بنی Patnī in the text-edition.
news arrived that Sultân Aḥmad Bahmani had again besieged the fort of Tambol; and Malik Saʿādat Sultânī was leaving nothing undone in bravely defending it. Immediately on receipt of this news, he turned back, and advanced on wings of speed towards Tambol. When Sultân Aḥmad Bahmani became aware of this fact, he cheered and encouraged a body of pāiks, with robes of honour and great rewards; and told them, “Reinforcements are coming to the garrison. If to-night you will play a great game, so that the hand of my hope should reach the skirts of success, I shall give you such rewards, that you will never again be in want.” When a part of the night had passed, the pāiks went to the foot of the fort, and slowly and silently under the shelter of the rocks, climbed to the top of the rampart and dropped into the fort. They wanted to open the gates; but Malik Saʿādat Sultânī, being on the alert, fell upon them; and slew most of them. Those who escaped the sword threw themselves from the ramparts and perished. Malik Saʿādat Sultânī did not consider this sufficient; but opening the gate, he made a sudden attack on a battery which was in front of it. The men in the battery, who were asleep, were most of them wounded.

At this time the Sultân of Gujrat approached near; and Sultân Aḥmad Bahmani leaving the foot of the fort, advanced to meet him. He summoned his amirs and the commanders of his army and told them, “The armies of Gujrat have several times defeated the armies of the Deccan; and they have also taken possession of Mahāim. If this time also, I show inactivity and am defeated, I shall lose the Deccan altogether”. He then arrayed the ranks of his army, and took up a position on the battlefield. Sultân Aḥmad Gujratī also came, and met him with his armies arranged for battle; and there was a

---

1 Called Batnol in the Cambridge History of India, page 290.
2 The words are somewhat obscure. The MSS. have نقشي بالنذيد, and the lith. ed. has نقشي بالنذيد. The lith. ed. of Firishtah in the corresponding passage also has نقشي بالنذيد. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 31) calls the pāiks “Naigs”, but he does not translate the Shah’s words to them. Bayley has pāiks; and he says immediate action is necessary; but it is not clear what meaning he has given to the words in question. I have adopted نقشي بالنذيد, while the text-edition has نقشي بالنذيد.
terrible conflict. 1 Dāūd Khān, who was one of the great amīrs of the Deccan, having challenged the Gujrātī amīrs, was taken prisoner by 'Aḍ'd-ul-mulk. The two armies fought together and showed great gallantry. When evening came, both sounded the drum of return, and turned back to their respective encamping grounds. As large numbers of the Dakini army had been slain, Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmani, in great distress, took the path of flight.

The next day Sulṭān Aḥmad entered the fort of Tambōl, and showed great favour to Malik Saʿādat Sulṭānī, and leaving a detachment to reinforce him started towards 2 Tālnīr; and having rebuilt the fort there, 3 plundered and ravaged the towns and villages. He conferred the title of Muʿīn-ul-mulk on Malik Tāj-ud-dīn and 4 directed that he should remain there. He then returned to Aḥmadābād by Sultaṇpur and Nadarbār. After a few days, he brought the daughter of the Rāy of Mahāim into the bond of wedlock with Shāhzāda Fath Khān.

(It appears in my mind) that in the Tārikh-i-Bahmani the story of the siege of the fort of Tambōl has been narrated in a different way, from what my double-tongued pen has described, in the section about the Dakin. (It may be said here) in brief that as the period of the siege was protracted to two years Sulṭān Aḥmad Shāh Gujrātī,

1 The name is Dāūd in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in Bayley's translation; but Firishtah says that it was Azhdār Khān, who challenged the Gujrātī amīrs, and Col. Briggs calls him "Ajdur Khan, a young Deccany nobleman" (vol. IV, p. 31).

2 The MSS. have instead of تالثیر تالثیر.

3 The MSS. have but the lith. ed. has دهدت ان بلاد را ناراج کرد Firishtah who copies the Tabaqāṭ frequently word for word has in the corresponding passage نادرت و امنت و ناراج نموده. This last version appears to me to be the best, but I have retained the words of the MSS. without conjunction and in the text-edition.

4 The reading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. which is مظاہر الدين را مظاہر الدين را ناراج appears to me to be incomplete. I would insert some words like between and ترجا ماند ترجا ماند.

5 The word is قصید in the two MSS., and in the lith. قصید in the two MSS., and in the text-edition.

6 Firishtah has قصید in the corresponding passage and this is followed in
in the way of kindness and friendship, sent an ambassador to wait upon Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmanī; and made a request through him, that this fort might be left in his possession. Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmanī did not accept this proposal. In the end, Sulṭān Aḥmad Gujratī marched straight from the boundary of his kingdom and invaded the Deccan, in order to have his revenge; and commenced to plunder and ravage it; and Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmanī had no further opportunity for besieging it. It appears to my mind, that the author of the Tārīḵ-i-Bahmani has not narrated the facts in a plain, straightforward manner; and what is narrated in the history of Gujrat is nearer the truth.

In the month of Rajab in the year 836 A.H. (1432 A.D.), the Sulṭān advanced to conquer the countries of Mewār and Nāgōr; and when he arrived in the town of Harpūr, he sent his troops and plundered the towns and villages; and he levelled to the dust any temple that came anywhere into his view. After some days, he encamped in the town of Dāṅgarpūr; and Ganēsā, the Rāja of the place fled; but later feeling ashamed and repentant, came and waited on the Sulṭān; and becoming enlisted in the band of his defendants, paid a suitable tribute. Sulṭān Aḥmad Shāh then trampled down and ravaged the country of Kilwāra; and then invaded Dilwāra, and having rased to the dark ground the palaces and other structures of Rānā Mūkul, the Rāja of Dilwāra, which had lifted up their

1 In the translation of this part of the Tabakât, given in Bayley, p. 120, the name of Kōlivārah is inserted after Mewār and Nāgōr. Firishtah in the lith. ed. has میرات و ناگور; and Col. Briggs also has towards Nagoor and Mewat. Mewār seems to be a mistake for Mēwār. Rās Māliā says, he marched into Rajpootana.

2 The MSS. have هر بور Harpūr; the lith. ed. has بور Harpūr; and Bayley, p. 120, has Sidhpur. Firishtah does not mention the place, and at once takes Sulṭān Aḥmad to Dāṅgarpūr.

3 The name is in the MSS., and كنیسایی in the lith. ed. Bayley has Ganēsā. Firishtah does not mention any name, but says the Sulṭān extorted tribute from the zamindār of the place. Col. Briggs has Raja, and Rās Māliā has Rāwul. كنی in the text-edition.

4 With reference to Rānā Mūkul the lith. ed. of Firishtah has دولت کیلواڑہ و دیلوڑہ کہ تعلق برثا رکے دشت. Col. Briggs paraphrases Kilwāra and Dilwāra as the country of the Kories and Bheels. Rās Māliā has “the country of the Bheels”.
heads to the sky (with pride), demolished the temples and destroyed the idols. He also had some turbulent men who had fallen into his hands, executed, by throwing them under the feet of elephants. He left Malik Mir Sultānī in those places for the purpose of collecting khiraj (tribute); and turned to the country of the Rāthōrs. The Rāthōr chiefs offered him allegiance, and paid tribute, and behaved with loyalty. Firūz Khān, the son of Shams Khān Dundānī, and the nephew of Sultān Muṣaffar, who was the ruler of Nāgor came and waited upon the Sultān, and brought some lakhs of tankas as tribute. Sultān Aḥmad gave back the tribute; and leaving a body of troops in certain mahāls of Mawās, in the way of a military outpost, returned to Aḥmadābād. As on every occasion when the Sultān returned from journeys and wars, he held grand festive assemblies, and conferred distinctions on each of the amirs and other soldiers, who had performed commendable services, by the grant of rewards and favours and increase in their stipends and promotions in their ranks, and also granted kingly favours on all the inhabitants of the country of Gujrat, both great and small, and Shaikhs and deserving persons, on this occasion also he arranged a similar festive assembly; and conferred new favours on every deserving person.

In the year 839 A.H., news came from the country of Mālwa, that Mahmūd Khān, the son of Malik Majhīth, who had been the vazīr of Sultan Hūshang, had murdered Ghazni Khān, the Shāhzāda, who had, after the death of Sultān Hūshang, succeeded him, by giving poison to him; and having raised the standard of his own rule had taken the name

---

1 I do not exactly understand the words which I have translated by throwing them, etc. They are بی سیر فیلائی گردنائید in the MSS. and بی سیر فیلائی گردنائید in the lith. ed. Firishtah has no corresponding passage.

2 Instead of Rāthōr chiefs, Firishtah in the lith. ed. has میروین بولائیت و لفه و بڑی و باز اباد و لانئی رفن و از ما رایان بچ و خواج گردنیت.

3 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p.32) has “the rays of Kota, Boondi and Nowlaya”, and Kān Mālā (p. 351) has the Rows of Kota Boondi and Nudolaye.

4 This is also mentioned by Firishtah and also by Col. Briggs; but neither of them says anything about the leaving of the military outpost in certain Mahāls of Mawās.

4 The Cambridge History of India, page 299, mentions the question of an indemnity from Firūz Khān, but does not say that it was given back to him.
of Sultan Mahmud. At the same time, Masa‘ud Khan, the Shâhzâda of Mâlwa, fled from his own country, and came (to Sultan Ahmad) for protection. The Sultan advanced with a well-equipped army, and took possession of the greater part of the country of Mâlwa; and intended to place Shâhzâda Masa‘ud Khan on the throne of his great ancestors. At this time, by a strange mischance, a great pestilence made its appearance in Sultan Ahmad’s army, so that people had no time for placing the dead into shrouds, and for burying them. In the course of two days some thousands of people died; and the Sultan himself having been attacked, had against his wishes to return to Gujrat. He gave hopes of being able to help Masa‘ud Khan in the course of the next year. The particulars of this brief statement have been narrated in greater detail in the section about Mâlwa.

Fate did not give a further lease of life to Sultan Ahmad; and he passed away on the 2 4th of Rabî‘-ul-akhir in the year 846 A.H. (4th July 1443 A.D.). He was born in the metropolitan city of Dehli on the night of Friday the 19th of Dhi-hijjah in the year 793 A.H., and this has been referred to on a preceding page. They say that from the time of his attaining to majority, till the time of his death, he had never omitted to perform the prescribed religious duties. He

---

1 Firishtah narrates the different operations of the campaign, and it appears from what he says that Sultan Ahmad was not so successful as Nizâm-ud-dîn wants to make out. In fact according to Firishtah, Sultan Mahmud (the usurper) was well able to withstand the Gujrat forces, as well as those raised by ‘Umar Khan, a son of Sultan Husyang. It appears from Firishtah that there was famine in the Gujrat camp before the plague broke out, while Sultan Mahmud was well provided with food and ammunition. As to the plague (wâna kâh dhr Hândûstân kâmer bâshd) Firishtah says that it rarely occurs in India. Col. Briggs has a note about this (p. 34, vol. IV), the meaning of which is not quite clear to me. The Cambridge History of India, page 299, calls Mahmud Kuhlji a cousin of Ghazni Khan.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 300, gives August 16th, 1442, the date of his death.

3 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. has after the sentence from筑牢 to دهشة بسندهدة, اور فضا نشد. The other MS. omits the sentence from دهشة to نشديد. The lith. ed. has after دهشة بسندهدة و نشديد بود: I have adopted the reading of the first MS.
was a bādshāh of agreeable manners, just and god-fearing. He attained to sovereignty in his 22nd year and he ruled his kingdom for 32 years and six months and twenty days. He was buried in the centre of Aḥmadābād. After his death he has been mentioned in letters and farmāns, as Khudāiqān Maḥfūr (the pardoned Lord).

A N ACCOUNT OF GHIYAS-U D-DUNIYĀ-WAD-DIN MUḤAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF AḤMAD SHĀH.

When 1 two or three days' mourning was over, the amīrs and the vazīrs, and the great men of the city, and the well-known men of the kingdom placed Shāhzāda Muḥammad Kāhan on the throne of the empire 2 on the 7th of Rabī‘-ul-Ādhir, in the year 846 A.H. (7th July 1443 A.D.); and gave him the title of Ghiyās-ud-duniyā-wad-din Muḥammad Shāh. The ceremonies of offering presents and thank offerings were carried out. The gold that was showered over the royal umbrella was distributed among the meritorious people. The Sultān conferred distinctions on the amīrs, and the great men of the kingdom, by conferring titles and high appointments on them. From the time of his accession the kingdom gained a new grandeur and greater splendour. He opened his hands with such liberality, that the common people gave him the name of Muḥammad Shāh 3 Zar- bakhsh, i.e., the giver of gold. On the 20th Ramadān, in the year 849 A.H., Muḥammad Shāh had a son born to him, and the prince

---

1 In the text-edition 3 jīrā three days only is adopted.

2 The Mirāṭ-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 125) gives 845 A.H., as the year of the accession of Muḥammad Shāh; but his coin (see Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Dehli, page 353) gives the name and title as it is given in the text; and the date of the accession as the 3rd Rabī‘-ul-Ādhir, 846. The Mirāṭ-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 129) gives credit for his liberality, but says he gave himself up to pleasure and ease, but the capacity of his understanding did not attain to the lofty heights of the concerns of the state.

3 There is a very great difference between the accounts of this reign as given by Nizām-ud-din and by Firīštah respectively. According to the latter, it was in the year of the accession, and not after three years, that Muḥammad Shāh invaded Idar, and espoused the Rāy’s daughter. According to Bayley (p. 129) the version in the Tabakāt is probably correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 300, says, Muḥammad Shāh was surnamed karīm or the generous. This is scarcely correct. He was popularly called Zarbakhsh, and after his death he was called Khudāiqān Karīm.
received the name of Ṣahīḥ Muḥammad Khān. The Sultān gave grand entertainments, and conferred rewards and favours on the amīrs and the great men of the kingdom.

After the time of the entertainments was over, in the same year he advanced to the country of Īdar, in order to devastate it; and he did not omit a single minutū in the practices of plunder and rapine. 1 Rāy Har, son of Pūnjā, Rāja of Īdar, came forward in great distress, and brought his daughter in the shape of tribute. That lady owing to her great beauty kept Muḥammad Shāh bound to her by her personal charm. After some days she prayed that the fort of Īdar might be bestowed on her father. The Sultān gave the fort of Īdar to Har Rāy; and advanced towards the country of 2 Bākur; and Ganēsā, the Rāja of Dūngarpūr, fled and concealed himself in the caverns in the 3 hilly country. When he saw that the country was suffering from the ravages of calamities, he came out; and through the intervention of 4 Malik Mīr Sultānī, who had the title of Khān Jahān did homage to the Sultān, and having paid tribute kept his kingdom in safety. From that place Sultān Muḥammad Shāh returned to Aḥmadabād. 5 He advanced in the year 853 A.H., (1449 A.D.), to

---

1 The Cambridge History of India here calls the son of Pūnjā, Raja Bīr, though on page 298 it had called him Hari Rāy. Earlier, Har Rāy (vide p. 211).
2 It is written as بākur in the MSS., and is so printed in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not mention the place. Bayley (p. 130) has Bāgar. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 300, "Muḥammad next attacked at Bāgor, Rānā Kūmbha of Mewār, who fled and took refuge with the Rāwal of Dūngarpur, the chief of his house, but afterwards appeared before the invaders, and purchased peace with a heavy indemnity". This does not agree with the text, according to which it was Ganēsā of Dūngarpūr, (and not Kūmbhā of Mewār) who paid the tribute. In the text-edition the name of the King is جنگل.
3 One MS. inserts كرگستان after جنگل.
4 Malik Munīr in the text-edition.
5 I have already noted that there is considerable difference between the accounts of this reign as given by Nizām-ud-din and by Firishtah. According to the latter the expedition to Chāmpānīr took place in 954 A.H. and not in 953 A.H. The Rāja of Chāmpānīr is called Kankdās, Kandās in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Gangadās by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 35). The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls him Gangadās, but the name can only be transliterated a- Kankdās, Kandās, or Gangdās and not as Gangdās. He is said after the
conquer the fort of Chāmpānir; and when by successive marches he arrived in its neighbourhood, Rāy Kank Dās, the Rāja, sallied out of the fort with his men; and fought bravely; but in the end, he fled and re-entered the fort. Sultān Muḥammad blockaded the fort from all sides; and employed all his energy in capturing it. Rāy Kank Dās sought the intervention of Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji and asking him to his aid, agreed to pay a lakh of tankas, at every stage, as a contribution towards his expenses. Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji being tempted by the money, advanced to help and support him. When he arrived in the town of Dahūd Sultān Muḥammad, rising from the foot of the fort

battle to have been driven into the hill fortress of Pāvagarh (?) Pāvangar, the fort of the winds. Then as regards the invasion of Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji, Firishtah says that as soon as Sultān Muḥammad heard of it, he set fire to his surplus tents and other equipages, because many of the beasts of burden in his camp had perished on account of hard work; and there was also a certain amount of faint-heartedness; and commenced to retire. And although his amīrs incited him to carry on the war, he did not agree, and retired with precipitation towards Ahmadābād. Then when the Sultān of Mālwa again advanced with a hundred thousand men to conquer Gujrat, Sultān Muḥammad could not be induced by his amīrs to fight against him; and in fact wanted to flee to Dīlp. Then the amīrs went to his wife, and asked her whether she wanted that her husband should live or that Gujrat should be lost to the dynasty. The queen had to agree; and the amīrs gave him poison in his food; and he was killed on the 7th of Muḥarram 855 A.H.

His reign, according to Firishtah extended to eight years and nine months, and fourteen days. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 38) reduces the period of his reign by ten days; and says in a note that according to the Moontukhūb-ot-Towareckh, he died on the 10th Muḥarram A.H. 855, 12th February, 1451.

Bayley (p. 132) says that the Sultān asked the advice of a bakāl or grain dealer; and the latter advised him to place his treasures and family on board ships; and amuse himself with fishing. The Sultān accepted this advice and commenced secretly to make his preparations; but Sāid 'Alā-ul-lah, one of the great nobles came to know of this, and asked the bakāl why he gave such advice. The man replied that as the Sultān did not ask the advice of the amīrs, but a man like him, he gave him such advice as he considered best. Then Sāid 'Alā-ul-lah told the King's son, what his father intended to do; and asked him what he would do if he was in his father's place. The prince said, he would fight for his kingdom and if necessary die on the battlefield. Then poison was given to Sultān Muhamad (pp. 133, 134).

The Cambridge History of India, page 301, says nothing about poison being given to the Sultān; and says he died on the 10th February 1451.
retired towards Aḥmadābad. He halted in the village of Kothrah, and busied himself with the mustering of troops, and the collection of materials of war and of the arms and weapons of offence. Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī also stopped at the place where he had arrived, and did not advance any further.

In the month of Muḥaram 855 A.H., Sultān Muḥammad Shāh accepted the summons of the just God. After his death in formal matters people have written of him as Khudāīgān Karim (the merciful Lord). The period of his rule was seven years and nine months and four days.

2 An account of the reign of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Aḥmad Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Muẓaffar Shāh.

The amirs and the great men carried out the rites of mourning for three days; and then on the 4th day, which was the 11th of Muḥarram in the year 855 A.H., they placed the eldest son of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, who was in his twentieth year, on the throne of empire; and they gave him the title of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh. His name is Aḥmad but he is celebrated by his title. At the time of his accession, they carried out the rite of Nīthar, wave offering; and they distributed the gold to the deserving men of the country of Gujrat, and made them happy and contented. He made the amirs and the great men of the kingdom happy by royal gifts, and titles and high appointments.

---

1 The place is called Godhra in the Cambridge History of India, page 301, and it is said there, that Muḥammad in spite of his illness advanced as far as Godhra to meet Sultan Maḥmūd Khaljī and the latter on hearing this retired to Māndū.

2 The headings in the MSS., and in the lith. ed., all give the whole genealogy. Firishtah has a shorter heading درک سلطنت سلطان قطب الدین بن محمد شاہ کرائی.

3 Firishtah does not mention the date of the accession, but Col. Brigs. (vol. IV, p. 37) says indirectly that he was born on the 8th of Jumād-ʿoos-Samat 855 A.H.; and he ascended the throne in the 49th year of his age. As a matter of fact he was born on the 12th Jumādī-ul-ʿĀhir, 835 A.H. and ascended the throne in his 20th year.
It so happened that when Sultan Muhammad Shāh died, and Sultan Quṭb-ud-din took his place. Sultan Maḥmūd Khālji, who had come to aid the Rāy of Chāmpānir, and was still on the boundary of Gujrat, thinking that (the conquest of the country) would be within his power advanced into the country with great rapidity. On the day on which he arrived in the neighbourhood of Bāroda, a māsī elephant belonging to his army entered the village of Barmāma. The zunnārdārs (Brahmans) of Barmāma killed the elephant and the driver. The Sultan was amazed at the boldness of the raʿīyat; and ordered, that in revenge the town of Barmāma should be destroyed.

As it was yet the beginning of the reign of Quṭb-ud-din, and Sultan Maḥmūd had invaded the country with great strength and violence, Sultan Quṭb-ud-din consulted with a baqāl (grain dealer), who held a position of great proximity (to his person) in his service. The baqāl said, “The best course would be that the Sultan should withdraw into the country of Sūrath. When Sultan Maḥmūd should go back to his own country, after leaving an army in Gujrat, the Sultan would be able to drive away those troops with ease.” Sultan Quṭb-ud-din made inquiries of the truth of this, and wanted to act accordingly. The amirs, however, did not allow him to do so, but took him along to carry on the war. When they gained the victory,

---

1 Contrary to what is stated in the text, the Cambridge History of India, page 301, says Sultan Maḥmūd Khālji advanced from Mandū with an army of one hundred thousand horse and five hundred elephants.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ببرو, Bāroda, while the other MS. has ببرو Bāroda. I have adopted Bāroda, which is the name by which the place is known; though I have heard that Bāroda is the correct ancient name.

3 The story of the baqāl is mentioned by Firishtah in much the same language as in the text. Col. Briggs gives a slightly different version, in which he says that the Sultan “was advised by some of his courtiers to retreat to Sorut (in a note, Western Guzerat called also Kattywar) and allow the king of Mālwa to occupy for the present the eastern provinces”, etc. It will be remembered (see note, page 225) that in the Mīrāt-i-Sikandari, a bakāl is said to have given somewhat similar advice to Sultan Muhammad the father of Sultan Kuth-ud-din. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandari does not say that Sultan Quṭb-ud-din sought the advice of the baqāl; but apparently a baqāl was consulted either by the father, or by the son.
they were angry with the baqāl; and questioned him. He said, “If the Sultān had the wish to fight, he would have consulted you. As he wanted to flee he asked me.”

In short Sultān Quṭb-ud-din met Sultān Mahmūd in the village of 1 Kaparbanj which is twenty karōhs from Aḥmadābād. At this place 2 Malik ‘Alā’-ud-din Suhrāb, who was the thānādār of Sultānpūr, and who had been compelled to join Sultān Mahmūd, fled from him, and waited on Sultān Quṭb-ud-din. He was honoured by having seven robes of honour conferred on him in the course of a day, and received the title of ‘Alā’-ul-mulk. As there was now a distance of three karōhs between the two armies, Sultān Mahmūd wrote this couplet, and sent it to Sultān Quṭb-ud-din.

---

1 The name is كپربنخ and كپربنخ in the MSS. and كپربنخ in the lith. ed. The correct name appears to be كپربنخ Kaparbanj. The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls it Kapadvanj. كپرباگ in the text-edition.

2 Bayley (p. 135) quoting from the Ṭārikh-i-Bahādur Shāhī says that ‘Alā-ud-din “shut the gate of the fort (of Sultānpūr) in his face and opened fire both with guns and musketry. Mahmūd Khilji besieged the place for seven days. After that through the mediation of Mubārak Khān, son of Ahmad Shāh and uncle of Kutb-ud-din, who had gone to Sultān Mahmūd at Mandū during the previous reign, and had joined his court”, he surrendered the fort, and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khilji’s service. When asked to swear allegiance to the latter, he swore it in an evasive language. The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls the fort Nadarbār (or Nandurbār and not Sultānpūr); and says that ‘Alā-ud-din Suhrāb made no attempt to hold it, but surrendered it at once; and sought his own safety by swearing allegiance to the invader, and entering his service. It goes on to say that after this, Sultān Mahmūd Khalji marched on Broach, and summoned Marjān, the governor to surrender it. Marjān refused; and Mahmūd was about to besiege the town when, by the advice of ‘Alā-ud-din Suhrāb, he decided, instead to attack the capital at once, and marched to Baroda, where he was joined by Gangādās of Chāmpāner and other chiefs. Crossing the Māhī river he advanced to Kapadvanj, where ‘Alā-ud-din deserted him and joined his old master. Nothing of this appears in the Ṭabaqāt or in Firishta. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari has a long account of Kutb-ud-din’s going to a faqīr or saint to intercede for him. At last we come to the fact that ‘Alā-ud-din returned to his old master, and was received with favour. He told Kutb-ud-din, that Sultān Mahmūd was advancing by Kaparbanj, and advised him to proceed thither (p. 143).
Couplet:
1 I hear you play the ball without a chaugan, in your house,
   If you wish to challenge, come; this is the ball, and this the field.

Sultan Quṭb-ud-din ordered Ṣadr Jahān to write a reply to the couplet. Ṣadr Jahān wrote in reply.

Couplet:
   If a chaugan I take in my hand, thy head like a ball shall I hurl;
   But I am ashamed to torment my prisoner in this way.

In this couplet there is a hint to the fact, that Sultan Hūshang, who was the master and patron of Sultan Maḥmūd, had been captured and had been kept as a prisoner by Sultan Muẓaffar Shāh, who had, however, afterwards treated him with favour and had given back to him the kingdom of Mālwa; as the pen has conveyed this meaning in the account of the reign of Muẓaffar Shāh. After this, after some days on the night of the 2 3rd Ṣafar, Sultan Maḥmūd mounted with the intention of making a surprise night attack; 3 but being defeated went away to Mālwa, as has been described in detail in the section about Mālwa. On the way the Kōlls and Bhils greatly harassed (Sultan Maḥmūd’s army). Sultan Quṭb-ud-din returned to Aḥmadābād, his capital, crowned with victory and triumph.

After a time the vazīrs said that 4 Firūz Khān, son of Shams Khān Dandānī, who was the ruler of Nāgōr, had died. His brother Mujāhid Khān took possession of Nāgōr; and Shams Khān, his son, for fear of his 5 uncle had fled, and sought the protection of Rānā Kūmbhā, son

---

1 There are some verbal differences in the couplet as given in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have adopted the version which appeared to me to be the best.

2 Firishtah has در سبيل مفر “towards the end of Ṣafar”; and the Cambridge History of India, page 301, says that the abortive night attack was made on the night of the 1st April, 1451.

3 Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India, page 301, give somewhat detailed account of the abortive night attack, and the battle which took place on the following morning.

4 Firūz Khān died in 860 A.H., 1453 A.D.

5 Both MSS., and the lith. ed. have برادر, brother, which is of course incorrect. Firishtah has عم uncle. برادر in the text-edition.
of Rānā Mūkul. Rānā Kumbhā determined that he would recover Nāgōr from the possession of Mujāhid Khān, and make it over to Shams Khān, but on the condition that the latter would demolish three of the turrets of the citadel of Nāgōr. His reason for this was that before this Rānā Mūkul had fled in great distress and disgrace from Firūz Khān, and in that battle three thousand Rājpūts had been slain; and if now his son demolished three of the bastions of the fort, the people of the world would say that, although Rānā Mūkul had fled, yet he having acquired power over the fort had had his revenge. Shams Khān, who was helpless, accepted this condition in his great distress. After some days Rānā Kumbhā having collected troops marched against Nāgōr; and Mujāhid Khān being unable to meet him, went and begged for help from Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī. Shams Khān then went and took possession of the fort of Nāgōr. Rānā Kumbhā sent him a message, that he should now carry out his promise. Shams Khān summoned the amīrs and the heads of the clans and brought up the matter for discussion. Some of them said that it was a matter of pity that Firūz Khān had not begotten a daughter, so that she might have saved the honour of the family. Shams Khān replied in a spirit of shame and self depreciation and anger and said that it was not possible that any part of the fort should be demolished, till many heads should have been cut off. Rānā Kumbhā on hearing this news went back to his own country, and having collected a large army again advanced on Nāgōr. Shams Khān having repaired the ruined parts of the fort, left all his army and the heads of the clans in it, and himself went on wings of speed to Aḥmadābād to seek for help. Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh conferred many favours on him, and married his daughter in the nikāḥ form. After the marriage festivities were finished, he sent 1 Rāy Rām Chand Nāilk, and Malik Gadāī and some other amīrs to re-inforce the men of Nāgōr; and kept Shams Khān in attendance on himself till the day, when it was reported to him, that Rānā Kumbhā had fought with the men of Nāgōr, and had slain a large number of them; and had devastated wherever there was any cultivation and people outside the fort.

1 راى امین چند پایک in the text-edition.
On hearing this news, the spirit of anger and daring of Sultān Quṭb-ud-din was excited, and he advanced against the fort of Kūmbhālmīr in the year 860 A.H. When he arrived in the vicinity of the fort of Ābū, Gitā Deorah, the Rāja of the fort came out and did homage, and represented that Rānā Kūmbhā had taken the fort from him by force, and had left his own thānadār there. Sultān Quṭb-ud-din appointed Malik Sha'bān Sultānī, who had the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk in charge of the fort of Ābū, and himself advanced towards his original destination. Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk, who was inexperienced, immediately commenced a battle, and had a large number of his men slain. When this news reached the Sultān, he declared, that he would, at the time of his return capture the fort of Ābū, and make it over to Gitā Deorah. He sent a messenger to summon 'Imād-ul-mulk; and himself advanced to seize the fort of Sirōhī. When he arrived in its neighbourhood, the Rāja engaged him in a battle and was defeated.

From that place, the Sultān invaded the country of Rānā Kūmbhā; and sent troops in all directions, so that they might ravage the country, and destroy the temples. When he arrived at the fort of Kūmbhālmīr, Rānā Kūmbhā sallied out of the fort, set the fire of warfare ablaze; and having had a large number of his followers slain,

---

1 Called Kumbhalgarh in the Cambridge History of India, page 302. Bayley, page 149, calls it Kumbhalmir and says in a note, quoting Tod's Rājasthān, Chapter VIII, that it was one of the 32 fortresses erected by Rānā Kūmbhā. In Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 352) it is called Komulmer and it is said to be the greatest of the 32 fortresses attributed to Koombho. Altogether there are 84 fortresses erected for the defence of Mewār. The correct name of Rānā Koombho appears, according to an inscription in a temple, which stands at the village called Rānpur, about five miles from the town of Sādeo or Sāduree in Mewār, to have been Rānā Shree Koombh Kurn, or according to correct transliteration Rānā Sri Kumbhakarna (note on page 353).

2 The Cambridge History of India makes no mention of the incidents, which took place at the fort of Ābū. Firishtah does, but he says nothing about the Rāja rendering homage to the Sultān. The name of the Rāja of Ābū is given in the MSS. as गिता देओरा and in the lith. ed. as किता दिउरा. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 149) he is called Khatīā Deorah, Rājah of Sirōhī. This can scarcely be correct, as the Rāja of Sirōhī appears to have fought with Quṭb-ud-din, and to have been defeated by him.
again retired into the fort. He, however, sent out parties every day; and fought battles; and each time defeat fell on him. In the end, Kūmhbā came forward in distress and humility, and offered suitable tribute. The Sultān then returned to Aḥmadābād.

1 At the end of the year, Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī sent 2 Tāj Khān who was one of his great amirs, to the boundary of Gujrāt, to knock at the door of peace. The amirs and the chief men of Gujrāt induced Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn for the benefit of the people, to agree to the treaty. 3 Shiṅkh Niẓām-ud-dīn and the prince of the learned men Sādr Jahān came to Chāmpānīr from the side of Sultān Mahmūd, and Qāḍī Ḥisām-ud-dīn and some others went from Aḥmadābād. They drew up the treaty in this way, that the armies of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn should plunder and ravage such parts of the territories of Rānā Kūmhbā as were contiguous to Gujrāt; and Sultān Mahmūd should seize 4 the country of Mēwār and Amhār, and the neighbouring country. (It was also agreed that) whenever necessary they should not fail to give help and assistance to each other. 1 Letters of peace

---

1 According to the Cambridge History of India, page 302, Ghiyās-ud-dīn, son of Mahmūd Khaljī, led a raid into his dominions as far as Sūrat, but retired hurriedly on hearing of Quṭb-ud-dīn’s return; and it was after this that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī sent the mission to propose a treaty of peace. The raid led by Ghiyās-ud-dīn is not mentioned in the text or in Firishtah or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī or in Rās Mālā.

2 Firishtah says Tāj Khān was the Wazīr, minister in-charge of all departments of Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī. Neither the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the ambassador.

3 The names of the men sent to draft the treaty do not appear to be mentioned in any other history.

4 The lith. ed. of Firishtah has: ‘‘بلاد و تراثي الفيروزاء و امهد’’, and Col. Bruce gives the districts of Mewar and Aheerwara. The other histories do not give the names of the districts which were to be ravaged respectively by the Gujrāt and Mālwa armies. The Cambridge History of India, page 302, says, that the western part of the Rānā’s dominion were allotted to Gujrāt, and the eastern parts to Mālwa. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, page 150) is less definite. According to it, Sultān Mahmūd Khiljī would assail the Rānā from one side and Sultān Kutb-ud-dīn from the other. 1 Rās Mālā (vol. i, p. 333) says that the treaty was to the effect that Rānā Koombhā’s dominion should be partitioned: “‘between the two Mohammedan powers’.”
containing these terms were written, and made over to the great men
of the age.

In the year 861 A.H. (1451 A.D.) Sultān Quṭb-ud-din again
marched to invade Kumhalmir, and on the way he took the fortress
of Abū, and according to his promise, delivered it over to Gītā Deōrah.
From Abū he advanced towards Kumhalmir; and Rānā Kumbhā
declared from that place and retired to the fort of Chitōr. On the way he saw an
uneven and difficult place, and halted there. After the two armies had
met, the fire of war blazed up; but when night came, they retired to
their respective places. On the next day, the battle began again, and
Sultān Quṭb-ud-din himself fought like Rustam. Rānā Kumbhā then
hid himself in the hills; and sent emissaries, and begged for pardon.
He sent 1 four maunds of gold and some elephants, and other tribute,
and entered into an engagement, that he would after that never
again cause any injury to the country of Nāgōr. Sultān Quṭb-ud-din
returned with victory and triumph, and went back to Āḥmadābād.

But three months had not yet elapsed, when news came that
Rānā Kumbhā was again attempting, with an army of fifty thousand
horsemen, to devastate Nāgōr. The same day that the news came,
2 the Sultān came out of Āḥmadābād, and halted for a month outside
the city, for the purpose of mustering his troops. Rānā Kumbhā,
hearing the news of the Sultān’s preparations, retired to his own station
and took up his position there. Sultān Quṭb-ud-din also on hearing
the news returned, and entered the city, and spent his time in pleasure
and enjoyment.

1 Firishtah makes it fourteen mans of gold and two large elephants and
other fine things. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 42) says that 14 maunds of solid gold
and two elephants which carried it were paid to Kooth Shah; and a seasonable
donation was also made to Sooltan Mahmood Khiljy; but that was after the
latter had advanced on Chitor.

2 Firishtah is more explicit about the Sultān’s promptitude in starting.
He says that the messenger bearing the report came to Āḥmadābād at
night, when the Sultan /hash" size="1" style="background-color:transparent; color:rgb(75,75,75);"> سلطان وبس شرب مشغول بود . He went to the vazir, who
went the same night to the Sultān, but found him drunk and senseless. He
could not wait, but put the Sultān in a mibaffah (a litter), and took him
to the stage the next day; and then they halted for one month for the
استعداد لشكر or mustering of the troops.
In the beginning of the year 1 862 A.H., the Sultān made a strong resolution to punish the zamindārs; and marched to Sirōhī. The 2 Rāja who was a relation of Rānā Kūmbhā fled to the hills, and took shelter there; and for the third time Sirōhī was burnt down; and the other towns were raided and ravaged. Then (the Sultān) sent detachments to ravage the dominions of Rānā Kūmbhā; and himself advanced to the fort of Kūmbhalmīr. At this time intelligence came that Sultān Mahmūd Khalji had advanced towards the fort of Chitōr, by way of Mandsūr; and seized all the parganas near the last-named place. Sultān Quṭb-ud-din now besieged the Rānā in the fort of Kūmbhalmīr with a firm determination; but as a considerable time elapsed, and he knew that it would be difficult to seize it, he gave up the siege, and advanced towards the fortress of Chitōr; and after plundering and ravaging the country around it, 3 went back to Aḥmadābād.

To everyone of the soldiers whose horses had become disabled during the campaigns, the Sultān gave the price of one from the treasury: and thought it proper, in this way, to show kindness to them. Rānā Kūmbhā sent ambassadors after the Sultān and in great humility and distress prayed to be excused for his offences; and the Sultān again drew the pen of forgiveness across his guilt; and sent back the ambassadors, pleased and happy.

And again in the year 863 A.H., the Sultān wanted to march with his army; but he happened to fall ill. He then went one day to see Saiyid Muḥammad, who was celebrated as Quṭb-i-Ālam, who lived in peace and contentment in the town of Batūh; and resolved in his mind, how nice it were if the holy and high God should bestow on him a

---

1 The year is given in both MSS. (one of which also gives it in figures, 872), and in the lith. ed., but this is incorrect; the correct year being 862 A.H. or perhaps 861 A.H. Firishtah has 861; Col. Briggs 861 A.H., 1457 A.D., and the Cambridge History of India, 1456 as the year of the destruction of Sirōhī. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley) has 862 A.H., 1456 as the year. It will be seen that later on the MSS. and the lith. ed. give the correct year 863 A.H.

2 He is called Sāms Māl in the Cambridge History of India, page 301. I cannot find his name anywhere else.

3 Firishtah says that Sultān Quṭb-ud-din returned to his capital with kilmāt ṣaqās, i.e., plunder that could not be conceived; but contrary to the Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 42) says that the Rānā gave fourteen mounds of solid gold and two elephants. See note 1, page 233.
worthy son. His Holiness the Saiyid, the beloved of God, may God sanctify his tomb! knew what was in the Sultan’s mind by his spiritual illumination; and said “Your younger brother, who is like your son will keep the dynasty of Mu’azzar Shâh alive”. The Sultan rose in despondence; and day by day his illness increased. He died on the 23rd Rajab of the afore-mentioned year, and was buried in the enclosure of Sultan Muhammad Shâh’s tomb. In proclamations and farmâns they styled him Sultan Ghâzi. The period of his reign was 27 years and six months and thirteen days. He was a badshâh noted for his bravery and high spirits; but at the times when the fire of his wrath flamed up, and specially when he was intoxicated with wine, he did many evil deeds and was greedy and reckless in killing and shedding blood.

When Sultan Qutb-ud-din died, his amirs put Shams Khan son of Firuz Khân to death, on the suspicion that his daughter, who was a nikah wife of the Sultan, had given him poison; and the mother of the Sultan made her over to the slave girls, who tore her to pieces, and thus killed her with torment.

1 An account of Sultan Dâd Shâh, son of Ahmad Shâh, son of Muhammad Shâh, son of Mu’azzar Shâh.

When the amirs, and the pillars of the state, and the great men of the kingdom had carried out the ceremonies of mourning for the Sultan's death, one MS. The other MS omits the word Sultan; and the 16th. ed. substitutes Sultan for Sultan.
Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, they placed Shāhzhāda Dādū Khān, son of Aḥmad Shāh, who was the uncle of the deceased Sultān on the throne of empire. As the recorder of destiny and fate had not written the order of sultanat against his name, he began to commit unworthy deeds and to perpetrate wicked acts. Some acts, which bore the suspicion of meanness of spirit were perpetrated by him from time to time and became the cause of the abhorrence of the people. For instance, he made the promise of conferring the title of ‘Imād-ul-mulk on a farrāsh who was his neighbour at the time when he was a Shāhzhāda; and the amirs and great men seeing such ill-regulated acts of his, became annoyed with him; and they directed, that he should be excused from the work of government. They sent Malik ʿAlā-ul-

---

1 There is a difference in the readings. Both the MSS. have أبضأ يكي بذ نشانو, but the lith. ed. has أبضأ نشانو.  
2 The man was a farrāsh. A farrāsh is a kind of cotton cloth which is spread on the ground for people to sit upon; and the farrāsh, strictly speaking, is a man who spreads such cloth and keeps it in his charge; and generally, a man who keeps the house, and the furniture in it, swept and garnished. He is, however, different from an ordinary sweeper; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 45) is wrong in calling him “one of the common sweepers of the household”. Bayley (p. 159) calls him more correctly a carpet-spreadcer; and unlike Firishtah, who says that Sultān Dādū conferred the title of ‘Imād-ul-mulk on the man, and made him one of the great amirs, agrees with Niẓām-ul-mulk, and says he only held out the hope of granting the title to him. The Cambridge History of India is indefinite, and says that the new Sultān conferred high honours on unworthy favourites. Sultān Dādū’s act was unconventional, and must have given umbrage to the amirs as a body, but it did not, I think, involve any moral turpitude.  
3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have منظفون, but the other MS. املایم. I have adopted the former.  
4 Malik ʿAlā-ul-mulk in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but Malik ʿImād-ul-mulk in the other MS. There is a good deal of confusion about this. Firishtah lith. ed., says nothing about anybody being sent to the mother of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn; but says that by the advice of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, they raised Mahmūd Khān, the younger brother of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, who was in his fourteenth year to the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, says that the amirs raised his (which would mean Dādū’s, which is certainly incorrect) younger brother Abu-l-Fath Mahmūd on the throne. Bayley (p. 160) says that the amirs deputed ʿAlā-ul-Mulk bin Suhrāb to the mother of Fath Khān. I have adopted ʿAlā-ul-mulk.  

عمر الاملك has been adopted in the text-edition.
mulk bin Suhrāb to the palace of Makhduma-i-Jahān, the widow of Sultān Muḥammad, who was a daughter of one of the Sultāns of Hind, so that he might bring Shāhzāda Fath Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh; and all of them combined together to place him on the throne. Makhduma-i-Jahān said in reply, "Please keep your hands off my son; for he has not the strength to bear this heavy burden." It so happened, however, that Malik 'Alā-ul-mulk went privately to wait on Shāhzāda Fath Khān, and made him mount a horse, and took him to the royal palace. The other amīrs hastened to wait on him; and carried out the ceremony of congratulating him; and on that very day, which was Sunday, the first of Sha'bān of that year placed him on the throne of empire; and gave him the title of Sultān Maḥmūd.

The period of the reign of Dāūd Shāh was three seven days.

4 An account of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh.

When Sultān Maḥmūd ascended the throne of Gujrat on Sunday, the first day of Sha'bān 863 A.H., according to the advice and counsel

1 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 160, she was Bibī Mughalī, who appears to have been a daughter of one of the Jāms of Sind.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have فرندان sons; but the other MS. has فرند son.

3 The period of the reign of Dāūd Shāh is not mentioned by Firishtah or by Col. Briggs. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley (p. 160), agrees with Nizām-ud-din, and has seven days. Rās Mālā says indefinitely, only a few days; but the Cambridge History of India, page 303, gives him a reign of "no more than 27 days". This is incorrect; and is contradicted by the fact that the date of the death of Qutb-ud-din is said in the same page to have been May 18th, 1458, and that of the accession of Sultān Maḥmūd, also in the same page, May 25th. Unlike others Dāūd Shāh does not appear to have come at once to a violent end. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley (p. 160), says "Sultān Dāūd got out of a window facing the river Sābar, and went in to hiding. He reigned only seven days. It is related, that he entered as an inquirer into the monastery of Shēkh Adhan Rūmī, and became one of his attendants; in a short time he obtained advancement (in spiritual rank). He soon afterwards died."

4 That is the heading in both MSS. The lith. ed. has ذكرسلطنةفتح خان.

المخاطب محمود شاه بن محمد شاه بن أحمد شاه.

Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs gives the date of the accession. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī gives the same day and date as in the text; and the corresponding A.D. date as 18th June, 1459. Rās Mālā does not give the date.
of the amirs, and sat in the place of his father, he made the various sections of the people happy by his universal benefactions in accordance with their respective ranks. They say, that on that day, in addition to Arab, Iraqi and Turki horses, and valuable robes of honour, and jewelled-belts and swords, and daggers embossed with gold, a karor of tankas was given away.

When six months had passed, 1 Malik Kabir Sulthan, who had the title of 'Add-ul-mulk, Maulana Khidr, who had that of Saft-ul-mulk, Piara Ismail, who bore that of Burhan-ul-mulk, and Hajji Muhammed, who had that of Hisam-ul-mulk, from the wickedness of their natures and the refractoriness of their dispositions, prepared to create turmoil and disturbance. They resolved amongst themselves, that they would cause Malik Sha'bann 2 'Imad-ul-mulk, in whose grasp of power the reins of the vazirat were, to be removed (from his office), so that this wicked intention and dishonest determination of theirs might gain currency and success. In order to carry out this resolution, they represented (to the Sultan) in private, that 'Imad-ul-mulk wanted to place 3 his own son, Shahab-ud-din, on the throne; and like Malik Mughith Khalji has determined that the rule of the empire should be

---

1 The names and titles of the conspirators are the same in the MSS. and the lith. ed., except that the last name which is جهان محمد in the MSS. appears to be منجل محمد Manjih Muhammad in the lith. ed.

2 This عداد الملك appears to be the same person who is designated the الملك earlier on. See note 4 on p. 236.

3 Firishta and Col. Briggs and the Mirat-i-Sikandari (Bayley) all agree that the conspirators accused 'Imad-ul-mulk with the intention of raising his own son Shahab-ud-din, on the throne; and Nizam-ud-din's reference to Malik Mughith Khalji confirms this; but the Cambridge History of India, page 303, says quite incorrectly, that the conspirators accused 'Imad-ul-mulk of the determination of placing Sultan Mahmud's own son, whom it gives the name of Shihab-ud-din, and describes as an infant, on the throne, so that he might be able to govern the country as regent.
transferred to his own family. Maḥmūd Shāh told them, that he had also inferred the same thing from 'Imād-ul-mulk's behaviour. He gave orders for the latter being arrested, and placed in confinement. He was kept under guard on the upper floor of the gate of 'Aḥmadābād. The Sultān placed five hundred of the men whom he trusted to guard him. 'Aḍd-ul-mulk and the other conspirators, (thinking that they were quite) successful, went to their own houses.

It so happened, however, that Malik 'Abd-ul-lah, the superintendent of the elephants, who was one of the men, in whom the Sultān reposed confidence, asked for a private audience, and having reported the deceit and treachery of that deceitful crew, stated that they had taken 1 Shāhzāda Ḥasan Khān to the house of one of themselves, and having made asseverations and taking oaths, had made the imprisonment of 'Imād-ul-mulk, a means for attaining their own objects. Sultān Maḥmūd made enquiries, and having impressed the true state of things on his mind, and keeping some of his old and faithful adherents, such as 2 Ḥājī and Malik Bahā-ud-dīn and Malik Kālū and Malik 'Ayn-ud-dīn with him, said to Malik 'Abd-ul-lah, that he should get all the elephants ready and bring them to the darbār, so that he might throw 'Imād-ul-mulk under the feet of an elephant. He also ordered Malik Sharf-ul-mulk, that he should bring the wicked and ungrateful Sha'bān to the darbār, so that the superintendent of the elephants may throw him under the feet of an elephant. When Malik Sharf-ul-mulk went to bring 'Imād-ul-mulk, the guards said, that they could not hand him over without the permission of Malik 'Aḍd-ul-mulk. He came back, and reported what the guards had said, to the Sultān. Sultān Maḥmūd then ascended to the top of the bastion, and said in

---

1 Firishtah also says that the conspirators wanted to raise prince Ḥasan Khān on the throne, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 48) has changed the name to Hoossein. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 164), however, says that the conspirators wanted to raise Ḥabīb Khān on the masnad; and Bayley says in a note, that according to Firishtah and the Tārīkh-i-Ālī, the accession of Ḥabīb Khān was the real object of the plot. The statement as far as Firishtah is concerned appears to be incorrect. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, agrees with Nāṣīm-ud-dīn and Firishtah, that it was Ḥasan Khān, whom the conspirators wanted to place on the throne.

2 The name is Ḥājī without any prefix or suffix in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī both call him Malik Ḥājī.
a loud voice; "Bring Sha‘bān quickly, and throw him under the feet of an elephant". When the men heard these words from the Sulture himself, a large number of people went and brought him. When the Sulture's eye fell on him, he ordered "bring that wicked man here, so that I may ask him some questions". When they brought him up, (the Sulture was evidently standing on a platform), he ordered that the chain should be removed from the hands and neck of this faithful servant, so that he might inquire into the conduct of, and punish the wicked wretches. Some of the connected amirs (i.e., apparently those who were connected with the conspirators), who were occupied with the duty of guarding him, on seeing this threw themselves down from the top (of the bastion, or some platform some way up), and some of them raised a cry of mercy.

When this news reached ‘Aḍd-ul-mulk and the other conspirators, they were amazed at the result of their action, and commenced to collect their retainers. At the approach of the true dawn, Sulture Māhmūd came to the window of the darbār-hall, and saluted the people. He placed the fly-whisk in the hand of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, so that he might drive away the flies. Malik ‘Abd-ul-lah, the superintendent, had all the elephants there. About three hundred (thirty hundred ?), men including both free men and slaves attended to perform the kūrnish (royal salute). 2 At this time, the rebel amirs came towards

1 The Sulture who was up to this time calling ‘Imād-ul-mulk a harrām khwār (lit. one who eats forbidden foods, a wicked wretch) now calls him according to the MSS. habāl khwār (lit. one who eats unforbidden food, an honest man). The behaviour of the Sulture is somewhat enigmatical. If as Firishtah says he had understood the deceit of the conspirators from the beginning, he acted with a good deal of dissimulation and astuteness for a lad of fifteen; and there is no other explanation. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 47) says, "He had sufficient discretion to see the matter in its true light and at the same time too much prudence openly to avow his sentiments." Rās Mālī (vol. I, p. 335) says, that though only fourteen years of age he evinced a determination to protect a faithful minister against his enemies. On the other hand, the Cambridge History of India, page 393, says that new to political intrigues, he believed the conspirators, but later on after consulting his mother and a few of his immediate attendants he determined on a course of action.

2 Somewhat contrary to this, Firishtah on the authority of Ḥāji Muḥammad Qundahārī, says that the rebels came with thirty thousand horse and foot ready for battle; and that at that time there were not more than thirty
the darbār-hall attended by the riff-raff of the city, and their own retainers. When they came near Ṭimād-ul-mulk and Malik Ḥāfi and the other sardārs, with the immediate servants (of the Sultān) placed the elephants before them, and made an attack on the rebels; and Ṭadd-ul-mulk and the other traitors fled. Their soldiers threw away their arms in the lanes of the city, and hid themselves. Out of the rebel amirs, Ḥisām-ud-dīn went to his brother, Rukn-ud-dīn, who was the kōtwāl of Pattan; and from that place they both went away to Mālwa; Ṭadd-ul-mulk, with a single retainer went among the grāssias; and as his retainers had slain some of the grāssias of that neighbourhood, they recognised him and slew him; and they sent his head, 1 filled with turbulence, to Aḥmadābād. As Burhān-ul-mulk was a man of big size, he could not run away, and concealed himself hundred or three thousand men including free men and slaves with the Sultān; and they all washed their hands of their lives, and became thoroughly frightened. Some said let us go into such and such a mansion and shut the doors and defend ourselves. Others said, let us collect as much of the jewels and treasure as we can, and make our escape. The Sultān did not approve of either of these counsels, but armed himself, and bound his quiver round his waist; and with the thirty (three) hundred followers, and the elephants which did not exceed two hundred in number came out of the palace to meet the rebels. He posted the elephants at the heads of the various approaches so that the enemy might not attack from different sides, and advanced with the greatest calmness and composure. The people on seeing this immediately deserted the rebels, and some joined the Sultān, and others hid themselves. Col. Briggs’s account (vol. IV, p. 48) agrees with the above but he makes the number of the rebels thirty thousand and that of the Sultān’s followers, 300; although in the Persian text the one is سی مدرک مور و البته and the other سی یکه سرار و بید. It must be said, however, that the number of the Sultān’s followers is also given in the Ţabaqāt as سی مدرک مور.

Bayley (p. 165) also says that the Sultān’s followers amounted only to three hundred in number; and some of them suggested that they should get out of the palace by the windows on the side of the Sābar (matl), and collect men and then return; but the Sultān did not listen to these cowards.

1 There is some difference in the readings. The MSS. have سر برکشر اور سر برکشر, head filled with turbulence, and سر برکشر, head placed on an arrow; and the lith. has سر برکشر, which is not intelligible. None of the readings is quite satisfactory, but I have adopted the first. Firishtah has سر اورا برکده, having cut off his head.
near the town of Sarkhéj, in the uneven ground near the Sābarmatī. It so happened that one of the eunuchs went to circumambulate the tomb of Shiāq Ḥāmid Khatū, may his soul be sanctified! He saw Burhān-ul-mulk seated there, and immediately seized him, and brought him to the darbār, where by order of the Sultān he was 1 executed. Maulānā Khiḍr, Ṣaṭī-ul-mulk, 2 was seized and sent to Dīp in imprisonment. As this disturbance was suppressed in this way, and friend was discriminated from foe, 3 Imād-ul-mulk threw the skirt of his spirit over the grandeur of the vazārat; and like men freed (of the cares of the world) he held his hand from all worldly affairs; and took kindly to the nook of contentment and 4 seclusion; and relinquishing his jāġīr became a beadsman. 5 Sultān Maḥmūd began to show favour to his soldiers, granted 6 favours to fifty-two of his own servants, so that in the course of a short time, the number of his soldiers became double that of Sultān Ḏāḥi-ul-dīn and of the former Sultāns. He conferred titles on all his own slaves; Malik Ḥājī was honoured with the title of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and the office of the paymaster of the forces. Malik Bahā’-ul-dīn was made Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, Malik Tughān Farḥat-ul-mulk, Malik ‘Ain-ul-dīn Nuṣār-ul-mulk, and Malik Șa’ād Bākht Burhān-ul-mulk.

1 Firishtah says, بزبل پایی فبل مست انداخته با خاک پکان ساختند, i.e., he was trodden to death under the feet of a mast elephant.
2 Firishtah says he was not executed as کهون چندان گنا ندایشت, i.e., as he was not so guilty as the others.
3 According to Firishtah the Sultān did not forget ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s services. He says و سلطان معبد نیز حقوق خدمات شایسته ای منظر داشته اورا معدود داشت و سر برک او شاه شویدن احتمال را خطاب ملك الشرف داده از امریک کالان برداید.
4 The lith. ed. has کزه, before میراث, but as both the MSS. omit it, I have also omitted it.
5 Some of these matters are mentioned with some variation in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 166).
6 It is not clear who these fifty-two servants or slaves were; and why the favours shown to them led to the increase in the number of troops. As to the increase the actual words are بست بست ۵۵ in the MSS. and بست ۵۵ in the lith. ed. I have adopted the readings of the MSS., and think that it means in the proportion of twenty to ten, i.e., double. Some of these events are mentioned in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 167).
1 In the year 864 A.H. he marched in the direction of Kaparbanj; and having gone hunting as far as the boundary of Mâlwa returned. In the course of this expedition he regulated the administration of the thanas, and of the parganas; and attended with care to the condition of the oppressed. In the year 2 866 A.H., he started from the capital city of Ahmadâbâd with the object of seeing the country and hunting; and encamped on the bank of the river Khârâ, which is fifteen karâhs from Ahmadâbâd. At this time he received a letter from 3 Nizâm Shâh, son of Humâyûn Shâh, the ruler of the Deccan in which after complaining (of the injuries he had received) at the hand of Sultan Mahmûd Khaljî, he asked for assistance and reinforcement. 4 Mahmûd Shâh with a very large army and five hundred elephants advanced to help Nizâm Shâh. When he arrived at Nadarbâr and Sulţânpur, another letter came (to the effect) that Sulţân Maḥmûd Kâljî, in his pride of his large army, had advanced against the faqir (i.e., he himself) by rapid marches; and after the two armies had met, in the first instance he was defeated; and the soldiers of the writer plundered his camp, and seized fifty elephants. But Sulţân Maḥmûd came out of ambush with twelve thousand horsemen, when his (i.e., Nizâm Shâh’s) men were engaged in plundering. Sikandar Khân Bukbârî and Khvâjah Jahân Turk (who were commanders of Nizâm Shâh’s army) exerted themselves, as much as they could; (but) Sulţân Maḥmûd

1 This excursion is not mentioned by Firishtah or any other historian except the author of the Mirât-i-Sikandarî (Bayley, p. 175).

2 The year is 866 in the MSS., but 865 in the lith. ed. Firishtah also has 866 and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 49) 866 A.H., 1462 A.D. Bayley (p. 175) also gives the same year, and he calls the river Kahârî, and says, on the authority of the Tabakât-i-Akbarî, it is eleven kâs from Ahmadâbâd.

3 He was a mere child at this time, and the government was carried on by his mother and the prime minister, and there was a certain amount of jealousy and intrigue (see pp. 87, 88 in the history of his reign).

4 Firishtah says that the amirs and the chief men of the city attempted to dissuade Maḥmûd Shâh from going away on a distant expedition, so soon after his accession, specially as Dâûd Khân was attempting to recover the throne, which he had occupied for a week; but he did not agree with them, and advanced arguments based on philosophical and humanitarian grounds in support of his determination. This is referred to by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 49), but it does not appear to be mentioned in the Mirât-i-Sikandarî or in the Cambridge History of India.
himself advancing within bowshot, shot an arrow, which hit the forehead of Sikandar Khan's elephant. The animal turned round, and caused much havoc to the Deccan army; and Sikandar Khan and Khwajah Jahān Turk seized the bridle of the faqir's horse, and started for Bīdar. The faqir is at present at Fīrūzābād; and Sultān Mahmūd is besieging the city of Bīdar. As His Majesty has advanced in this direction, with the object of helping the faqir, it is hoped that he would come with all rapidity.

Mahmūd Shāh directed his attention to the Deccan. He heard on the way that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had turned back, and was going towards Mālwa. Mahmūd Shāh advanced into the country of Asir and Burhānpūr, that he might close the path of his flight; and encamped in the neighbourhood of Tālnīr, which is in the country of Asir. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī leaving the well-known road travelled by way of Göndwānā; and owing to the difficulty of the road, and want of water, his men suffered great hardship. They say that more than thousand men perished for want of water. Mahmūd Shāh wrote and sent a letter to the effect, that "Whenever that pupil of the

1 One MS. inserts between برو and كوريز مصود. I think this is correct and have inserted it, though it is not found in the other MS. and in the lith. ed.

2 The Cambridge History of India (p. 304) instead of saying that Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī travelled through Göndwānā like the other histories, says that he was compelled to retire through the Mahādeo hills into Northern Berar, where his army suffered severely both from want of water and from the attacks of the Korkūs. I have nowhere else come across the name of the Mahādeo hills or of the Korkūs. In the Persian text of Munṭakhab-al-labāb, edited by Sir W. Haig, the editor of the Cambridge History of India, the retreat of Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī (vol. III, p. 98), is said to have been through Göndwānā, and it is said that there was no sign of water along the route anywhere, and the troops are said to have suffered from thirst and at the hands of robbers roaming over the hills. In the Index of the Cambridge History of India the Mahādeo hills are mentioned only once in this particular place, and the Korkūs are mentioned only thrice. From one of these references (p. 358), it would appear that the "Korkūs" is only another name for the Gönds.

3 One MS. adds راه تناگی and the narrowing or difficulty of the road.

4 Both MSS. have فرزنده سلطنت, but the lith. ed. has قریه العين سلطنت. I have retained the latter, as it is the common form of the word, which means lit. the pupil of the eye, but is applied figuratively to some one who is very dear, such as one's son or daughter.
eye of empire shall have need for help and assistance, he should notify the fact to the writer; and there will be no neglect in according such help". He then returned to Aḥmadābād.

1. It is recorded by tradition, that in this army there were seventy thousand well armed and picked horsemen with Ṭāḥṣūd Shāh; and that he had given away the whole of the country of Gujrāt in jāgīr (sefs) to the soldiers; and there was not a single village as ḥālṣā or royal land; and that in the course of four years, he had disbursed a 2 tenth part of the treasures left behind by his ancestors.

In the year 867 A.H., another letter from Nizām Shāh arrived, to the effect that Sulṭān Ṭāḥṣūd Khāljī had invaded the Deccan with ninety thousand horsemen; and as the promise of help and assistance had been inscribed with the tongue of the pen, the writer hoped that he would direct his great spirit to the fulfilment of that promise. Ṭāḥṣūd Shāh with a well-equipped army marched towards the Deccan. When he arrived at Sultānpūr and Nādirbār, Sulṭān Ṭāḥṣūd Khāljī having raided and ravaged the neighbourhood of Daulatābād had gone back to his own country. 3 An epistle containing his excuses (?) thanks came from Nizām Shāh, with presents and offerings to the Sulṭān; and he turned back and went to Aḥmadābād. He wrote to Sulṭān Ṭāḥṣūd Khāljī, that it appeared to be contrary to the law of Islām and against humanity, to invade without any reason, a country inhabited by Musalmāns; and to return without fighting after such an invasion is reprehensible. If after this he again attempts to injure and harass the inhabitants of the country of Deccan, he should know for a certainty, that the writer would invade the country of Mālwa. Sulṭān Ṭāḥṣūd replied, that as he (the Sulṭān of Gujrāt) had directed his noble spirit to the aid of the Deccan, no injury would after this happen 4 from him to the inhabitants of that country.

1. These facts with some variations are also mentioned in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarl (Bayley, pp. 176, 177).

2. In the text edition.

3. This is also mentioned by Firūstah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarl (Bayley, p. 177) and the Cambridge History of India (p. 305).

4. There is a little variation in the readings. The M.S. have از مرنیب, while the lith. ed. has از صن. There is not much difference, and I have retained the reading in the lith. ed.
In the year 869 A.H. (1465 A.D.) it was reported to the Sultān that the zamindārs of 1 Bāwar and of the fort of Dūn had for two years been causing damage to the ships; and as they had never received any punishment from the Sultāns of Gujrat, they had got into a habit of refractoriness and revolt. Although his loyal advisers did not consider it advisable that he should march to attack them, owing to the difficulty of the route and the strength of the fortress, he determined to conquer that tract, and punish the rebellious chiefs. When after enduring a thousand hardships and difficulties, he advanced to the vicinity of the fort, the commandant came out to give battle; and made gallant efforts. (But) when night came, he again took shelter in the fort; and for some days, he fought battles every day, and fulfilled the duty of making war-like and gallant exertions. It happened, however, that one day the Sultān went to the top of the hill of Bāwar with his retinue and soldiers. When the men of the fort 2 saw the royal umbrella, and became aware of the large number of soldiers, they with humility put their hands 3 on the skirt of peace; and 4 the

1 The MSS. have ِ zamindārs ِ and the lith. ed. has zamindār. I have adopted the reading of the second MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has قلمه مارا تونگ بندارون. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 51) calls Bāwar, Bavur “an extraordinary hill fort”. The Shirāz-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 178) has the mountain of Bāwar, and Bayley says in a note that the best accounts of the expedition are to be found in the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī, Firishtah and the Ta'rikh-i-Alfi; and he quotes from the first two, which both have Bāwar. As to Dūn he says there is a small port marked Dunnu near to a spot where a spur of the ghats runs into the sea. He gives the various variants of Bāwar in the different MSS. and the MS. of the Ta'rikh-i-Alfi; and they all have some resemblance to Bāwar; yet the Cambridge History of India, without a single word of explanation or a single reference to any authority, transforms the zamindārs of Bāwar and of the port of Dūn to “the Hindu chief of Pardī near Damān” (see page 305). The conjunction in the text edition, and as a result باور reads باور,

2 It would appear that the men in the fort were not up to that time aware of the presence of the Sultān in the camp.

3 Both the MSS. have بدل مسلم; but the lith. ed. has بدائم مسلم. I have retained the last reading, as it has the correct oriental metaphor.

4 Both MSS. have only ذو صدر, but the lith. ed. has ذو سردار. Here I have adopted the reading in the MSS.
commandant came in all haste to wait on the Sultān, and prayed for quarter. Sultān Maḥmūd on account of his great mercy, drew the pen of forgiveness over their guilt; and gave assurances of safety to all of them. When the commandant of the fort and the chiefs of the neighbouring country came and waited on the Sultān, he distinguished them all by bestowing robes of honour and favours on them. He then mounted his horse and went to inspect the fort. After he had finished the inspection, the commandant presented a large tribute. The Sultān bestowed the amount of the tribute on him in the same majlis; and also conferred on him a special robe of honour and a golden belt. He also fixed the amount of the annual tribute, and entrusted the defence and government of the country to the commandant. He then returned, with success and prosperity, and took up his abode in Aḥmadābād.

In the year 870 A.H., 1466 A.D., the Sultān went out hunting towards Aḥmadnagar. On the way Bahā'ul-mulk, son of Alf Khān, killed Ādam Silāḥdār (trooper) without any apparent cause; and fled into the country of Īdar. 1 Sultan Maḥmūd sent Malik Ḥājī and Malik Kālū 'Aḍul-mulk; and these men having gone a part of the way, allowed a falsehood to enter their minds; and 2 they induced two

---

1 The readings are different here. One MS. has با جامع تعمین نمود آنها دو شخص بیگناه را اوردند و بانها قرار دادند که بگرند که کالح سالاحداز ما بودن دو کس از نوکران بهای الملكا... The other MS. has که کالح سالاحداز ما بودن را اوردند و بانها قرار دادند که بگرند ملک حاجی و ملک کالح فضد الملكا را فرستاد و آنها چه باین راه رفتند تزودنی بی‌خاطر رسیدنی دو کس از نوکران را ببرن اوردند که کالح ادم سالاحداز ما بودن.

2 I have after comparing the three readings and that in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, which contains more details, adopted the reading which appeared to me to be the best. In the text edition is ملک کالح فضد الملكا instead of عمد الملكا. According to Firishtah, they induced the two men by giving them some money با جریه مال فریفند. They also told them that the bāḏshāh was merciful, and would pardon them; and besides, he would not pass a sentence of death, without consulting them. The poor men, tempted by the money, and also actuated by good feeling towards their master, said as they had been taught. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 179) has a similar account, but it says that the men sent in pursuit of Bahā'ul-mulk actually found him, but apparently let him go.
of the servants of Bahā’-ul-mulk, to say that they were the murderers of Ādam Silāḥdār; and returning from the way, they reported to the Sultān, that they had seized and brought the murderers of Ādam Silāḥdār, and they were confessing their guilt; and 1 Bahā’-ul-mulk had fled into the country of Īdar. Sultān Maḥmūd ordered that those two innocent men should be executed. After some days when the veil was raised from the face of the matter, and it was known for certain, that those two poor men were not the murderers of the Silāḥdār; and ‘Imād-ul-mulk had by fraud and deceit induced them to confess, the Sultān ordered that ‘Imād-ul-mulk and ‘Adād-ul-mulk should also be executed; and all the property and villages left behind by them should be escheated to the khālaṣa (the Sultān's treasury). Malik Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk was made ‘Imād-ul-mulk; and the appointment of nāʿib ghaibat (regent in the Sultān’s absence) was conferred on him; and all the soldiers of ‘Imād-ul-mulk were made over to him.

2 The Sultān marched out in the year 871 A.H. (1467 A.D.) to conquer the fort of Karnāl which is now known as Jūnāgarh. They

Bayley says in a note that every copy of the Mirāt-i-Sikandārī says that the men sent in pursuit of Bahā’-ul-mulk actually found him; but he also quotes the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī to say that they returned after going a part of the way towards Īdar. According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandārī, the two men were induced to confess, as they were told that the Sultān would sentence them to short terms of imprisonments, and they would be soon released at the intercession of those who asked them to confess. Rās Mālā and the Cambridge History of India do not mention the incident. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 51) refers to the incident “As an instance of the impartial justice of Mahmood Shah”. It was impartial, as even great amirs were not spared; but it is also an instance of a great miscarriage of justice. In the text-edition the reading adopted is

1 This sentence, which occurs in both MSS. and in the lith. ed., appears to be redundant, unless it is taken as part of the false report.

2 Firishtah says that in 871 A.H. the Sultān saw the Prophet Muhammad in a dream, and that the latter bestowed on him two dishes of delicious viands. This was interpreted to mean that he would have two great gifts, πίσ., the conquest of the country of Diu, and the forthcoming conquest of Karnāl. There is no mention of it in the Tabaqāt and I cannot find any mention in the Mirāt-i-Sikandārī also. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 355) has a slightly different version, and refers only to an invitation “to the conquest of infidels, by spreading before him, in a vision, a magnificent banquet of the most delicious viands.”
say, that for nearly two thousand years, this country had been in the possession of the ancestors of Rāy 1 Mandalk. After Sultān Muḥammad Tughlaq Shāh and Sultān Aḥmad Shāh Gujrātī, the hand of the possession of no one else had reached this country. Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh advanced towards it, placing his trust in divine help and support, and in the course of the march he ravaged the country of Sōrath. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the hill of Karnāl, the inhabitants of the district placed their property and their families in distant places, and in hills filled with trees, and themselves took shelter in a strong place. Tughlaq Khān, who was descended from the Sultāns of Sind, and was the maternal uncle of the Sultān, informed the latter of this. On the following day the Sultān proceeded in that direction, as if hunting along the way. 2 In spite of the

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 53) says in a note that the Manduliks, as he writes the name, are "like desais, natgows, reddywards, zamindars and poligars so called in other parts of India". Mandalka is from Mandala, a circle or a part of a country, and means the lord of the Mandala. In the same note Col. Briggs on the authority of the Moontukhib-ool-Towareekh says that the name of this Mandalik was Humbur Ray. I cannot find his name anywhere else but the Cambridge History of India, page 305, calls him Mandalak Chūdāsama, but does not quote any authority; and Mandalak is certainly incorrect. It appears from a note in Bayley, page 183, that according to the Tārkīh-i-Sōrath, Mandalik was also used as a proper name by the Raos of Girmār (Karnāl).

2 The meaning is not very clear, but it appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 184), that the Karnāl people, or the infidels of the country round, "gathered together their women and children and provisions, and went into the defile of Mahābala, which is an exceedingly strong position" (mahābula means very strong). The Sultān "resolved to carry the place". Prince Tughlak (the Tughlaq Khān of the text) told the Sultān that it would be very difficult to seize the place. But the Sultān replied, "Please God, I will conquer it." "One day the Sultān mounted his horse to go hunting, and went in the direction of the Mahābala defile. When the Hindūs saw the small party, they took no heed to it. Suddenly the Sultān attacked them, and the infidels after a little fighting, fled into the jungle" (p. 185). Firishtah gives a somewhat different account. According to him, the Sultān, guided by Shāhzāda Tughlaq Khān, went with a selected body of warriors to the darra or defile of Mahābala, without the Hindūs knowing anything. The Rājpūta, who were left to guard the place, and who were called Barīs, on becoming aware of the Sultān’s approach fought bravely, but being unprepared and unarmed were all killed. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 356) gives another version, according to which, the Sultān sent
difficulties of the paths and the entrances (probably passes), he succeeded in reaching that place; and after much effort and endeavour, the Rājpūts fled, and threw themselves into the fort of Karnāl, by way of the hills and jungles. 1 Many prisoners and much property fell into the hands of the army. From that place the Sultān went towards the temple of the people. A body of Rājpūts who are called Par- dhāns (Pradhānas or chiefmen), determining to die, placed their hands on their swords and lances inside the temple; and in the twinkling of an eye became food for the sword. The next day (the Sultān) started from that place, and encamped at the foot of the fort of Karnāl; and sent detachments to plunder and ravage the surrounding country. The Rāy Mandalik, in great humility and helplessness, asked for pardon of his offences; and sent a large tribute. 2 Sultān Maḥmūd, on account of the exigencies of the times, deferred the conquest of the fort to the next year, and treating the Mandalik with gentleness went back to Aḥmadābād.

In the year 872 A.H. (1468 A.D.), it was reported to the Sultān that the Rāy Mandalik on account of his haughtiness and pride had an umbrella held over his head; and placing valuable ornaments, on his 3 arms and neck sat in public. Immediately on hearing this news (the Sultān) appointed forty thousand horsemen with famous elephants to punish him. At the time of bidding adieu to them, a detachment under Toghluk Khān "to occupy two outworks called Mohabilla. The Rājpoots who were entrusted with the post were surprised and cut off". The Cambridge History of India makes no reference to the matter.

1 According to Firishtah they comprised the زنان و پسران درَما مہالہ, i.e., the women and children of the men who had been left to defend the Mahābala delile.

2 Firishtah says that the Sultān agreed to receive tribute and to defer the conquest for another year, because immense quantities of valuable jewellery and other booty had fallen into the hands of the soldiers; and the weather having become very hot, it was impossible to continue longer in that hilly country.

3 The MSS. have كردن و دست in one, and كردن و دست in the other. The lith. ed. has simply پرخود. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has دست و کردن, leaving out the middle word. Firishtah says plainly, that the Sultān was simply waiting for a pretext, and this report enabled him to undertake another expedition.
The Sultāns of Gujrat

he told the amirs and the heads of clans, that if the Mandalik came forward in the way of submission and fealty, and delivered up the umbrella and the valuable jewels, which on the days of idol worship he puts on his person, and pays the tribute which had already been fixed, they should not interfere in any way with his country. When the army of Gujrat arrived near the country of the Mandalik, the commandant sent a body of men to him, and communicated to him (through them), what the Sultān had said. The Rāy Mandalik came forward to meet the emissaries with all respect; and sent to the amirs, the umbrella and the jewels and valuable ornaments which on the days of worshipping the idols and on other auspicious days, he used to put on his person, together with a large tribute; and having tried to win their heart turned them back. When the amirs (after their return) waited on the Sultān, and placed before him all the things which they had brought, the latter in his festive assembly and convivial meetings, 1 gave the things away to story-tellers and readers.

2 In the year 873 A.H., 1469 A.D., the news of the death of Sultān Mahmūd Khalji, the ruler of Mālwa, came. The amirs represented

---

1 Firishtah quoting Nizām-ud-din, says the same thing in identical words; but because such prodigality appeared to him, as it certainly appears to me, to be somewhat incredible, ends with the pious ejaculation, "و الله اعلم بالصرف من المعن" i.e., God alone knows the truth. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55) says in his translation, the Sultān distributed the money produced by this expedition, in one night, among a set of female dancers. He may be right, but "کرندگان و خوانندگان" means story-tellers and readers, and not female dancers. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 186) modifies the story a little, and says the Sultān distributed the garments among his musicians. Bayley in a note finds some kind of fault with Firishtah, and says the latter places this expedition in 872 A.H. It appears to me that Firishtah does nothing of the kind; he places this expedition before the occurrences of 873 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55) however places this expedition in 874 A.H., which might have led to Bayley's mistake.

2 This matter about the death of Sultān Mahmūd Khalji does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India, p. 305, mentions it, giving the 31st May, 1469, as the date of Sultān Mahmūd Khalji's death. It also refers to the discussion about the invasion of the country, and Sultān Mahmūd's refusal to undertake it; and then says that the Sultān "committed an act as wanton, by leading into Soreth a large army against the Mandalak of Gîrnār".
to Sultān Maḥmūd that at the time, when Sultān Muḥammad, the son of Aḥmad Shāh had accepted the summons of the just God, Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī arrived at the town of 1 Kaparbanj, intending to attempt the conquest of the country of Gujrat. If the Lord of the world (meaning the Sultān) at this time, when the appliances for the conquest of the country are all at hand and ready, advances towards Mālwa, that country would come into his possession with very little effort. Sultān Maḥmūd declared, that it was not right in Islām and Musalmānī, that Musalmāns should fall out amongst themselves, and that people should be trampled down in the calamities which would occur. Besides, at this time, when the Sultān has died, and the affairs of the state have not been arranged, it would be removed from the rules of humanity and the customs of generosity to invade his country. He then left Aḥmadābād with the object of hunting, and having spent some days in the jungle, again took up his abode in Aḥmadābād.

In the year 874 A.H., he again sent armies to plunder and ransack the country of Sūrath; and within a short time, they returned after devastation the country, and bringing an enormous quantity of plunder. Among the great incidents of the year, one was this that Sultān Maḥmūd, mounted on an elephant, went towards 2 Ḥāgh-i-Irtam. On the way 3 another mast elephant, having broken his chain turned on the Sultān's 4 retinue. The other elephants seeing it, turned their faces in flight, and it advanced on the elephant which the Sultān was riding. The latter after bearing two or three onsets, also fled; and when it was running away, the other elephants rushing forward, struck it (apparently with their tusks) on the shoulder; and the Sultān's leg was injured by its tusks and blood began to flow from it. At this

1 Kāryanj in the text-edition.
2 Apparently some beautiful park or garden, called the garden of Paradise. Firishtah's account agrees with that in the text, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55) gives a somewhat different account. He says that the Sultan was on a hunting excursion, and when he was attacked by the mast elephant, all his companions fled, etc.
3 This word shows that the Sultān was also riding a mast elephant; and Firishtah says so, but neither the MSS. nor the lth. ed. of the Tabaqat say that the Sultān was on a mast elephant.
4 The word is fauj, apparently the Sultān's retinue or followers.
time, the Sultān with great bravery hurled a spear on the elephant’s forehead. The blood was now flowing, but the elephant made another onset, and had another spear hurled at it. The blood now bubbled out of its forehead as from a fountain. The animal now trumpeted and gave another blow to the Sultān’s elephant; but it received another spear with such force, that it had to turn tail and run away. The Sultān went to the palace with safety; and made all deserving persons happy by the distribution of votive offerings and 1 charities.

After a few days he summoned the amīrs of the marches, and with a well-equipped army advanced to conquer the fort of Jūnāgarh and the hill of Karnāl. He distributed five krors of gold in the course of a night and day among his soldiers; and included amongst these were two thousand and five Turki and ‘Iraqi and ‘Arab horses, the prices of some of which amounted to as much as twelve thousand tankas each, which were bestowed on the men. He also distributed five thousand jewelled swords and seven hundred jewelled belts and one thousand and five daggers with gold and embossed scabbards. When he arrived in the country of Sōrat by successive rapid marches, he sent detachments in every direction to plunder and devastate (the country). Rāy Mandalik in a state of extreme humility and helplessness waited on him; and represented that this slave (he himself) had lived a whole life-time within the bounds of allegiance and fealty; and no act which might have the least suspicion of any breach of engagement or promise had been committed by him. He was also at the present moment prepared to pay any tribute which His Majesty might order. The Sultān said, “All my energies are at present directed to raise the standards of Islām in this country, after bringing it into my possession, so that the institutions of Islām might be established here. I have no other object in view, except the introduction of Islām and the capture of the fort.”

2 When Rāy Mandalik understood from the purport of these words, that this army with other armies was ready to conquer the

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have خیزات, charity, but the other MS. has شکرا, thanks offering.

2 The meaning of the sentence, این لیکن با لشکری ای جگ کن نیست, is not clear. The sentence is the same in both MSS. and in the lith. ed., except that
country, he waited for an opportunity; and fled at night and retired into the fort of Jünāgarh. The next day the Sultān moved forward, and encamped close to the citadel of Jünāgarh. One detachment separated from the army, and advanced on the fort. A body of Rājpūts sallied out, and after fighting fled. The next day also there was some fighting; and on the third day the Sultān himself attacked the fort, and there was severe fighting from morning to evening. On the 4th day the Sultan’s pavilion was raised near the gate, and the fort was closely besieged; and covered passages were laid down from all sides. The Rājpūts at all times sallied out of the fort, and made violent attacks; and many good men were slain. For instance, they fell on a particular day on the battery of ’Ālām Khān Fārūqi, and made a martyr of him. Sultān Maḥmūd made the siege such a close one, that the stones thrown by the ballistas sometimes fell in front of the Sultān’s throne. Although Rāy Mandalik made proposals of peace and of the payment of tribute, they had no effect whatever as the Sultān had determined on the conquest of the fort.

In the end, Rāy Mandalik, in his extreme humility and distress, prayed for mercy; and after surrendering the fort, took shelter with all his Rājpūts in the hill of Karnāl. Sultān Maḥmūd performed the rite of offering thanks, and occupied himself with settling the affairs of the country. After some days, he laid siege to the hill of Karnāl. In the end, Rāy Mandalik, having no other alternative,

the lth. ed. has by mistake Manād instead of Manād. The lth. ed. of Firishtah has exactly the same words, except that it has instead لشکا لشکریہ پادریگر.

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 305, says, Rāy Mandalak retired to his citadel Uparkot. Uparkot of course means upper citadel; but I have not seen the place, to which Rāy Mandalak retired, called Uparkot in any other history. It is called Jünāgarh in the other histories.

2 Firishtah calls it the fort of Karnāl, and he adds شروت در دری و راموئی کردن. This is however not mentioned in any other history, not even in Col. Briggs’s translation. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari however (Bayley, page 188) says that every day they sallied out and fought; and although Firishtah says that the Sultān became very angry, and himself led an attack on Karnāl, and seized it, his subsequent treatment of Rāo Mandalak does not make it very probable that the latter had committed theft and robbery.
joined the service of the Sultān; and having prayed for the safety of his men, surrendered the hill of Karnāl also. After this, as he for several days went every day and waited on the Sultān, and observed his pleasant manners and his praise-worthy morals, he submitted one day, that from the auspicious effect of the society of Shāh Shams-ud-din Darvish, the love of Islām and of Musalmāns had had a great effect on his mind; and now that he had been attending on the Sultān, and had become cognizant of the truth of the faith of Islām, he wished that he should join the Musalmān community. Sultān Maḥmūd with great eagerness taught him the creed of the unity of God, and conferred the title of Khān Jahān on him. And in order that the institutions of Islām should be current in that country, he laid the (first) brick for building the city of Muṣṭafā-ābād in the ground; and he ordered all the amīrs that they should lay the foundations of mansions for their residence there. In a short time, the city of Muṣṭafā-ābād became a model of Aḥmadābād.

When the amīrs and the soldiers took up their residence in Muṣṭafā-ābād, everywhere where there were thieves and disturbers of the peace round about Aḥmadābād, they raised their heads and began to commit thefts and highway robberies; and the roads, by which people went about from place to place, became closed. When this news reached Sultān Maḥmūd, he conferred the title of Muḥāfīz Khān on Malik Jamāl-ud-din, son of Shaikh Malik, who was the kātwāl of the camp (provost-marshal), and who was entrusted with

1 The Mīrāt-i-Sikandar (Bayley, p. 190) gives another version of the story of the conversion of Rāo Mandalik. According to this, he went in attendance on the Sultān to Ahmādābād. One day he went to Rasūlābād, where his Holiness Shāh 'Alam lived, and is buried. He saw many horses and elephants and men assembled there, and inquired what amīr lived there. He was told that His Holiness Shāh 'Alam resided there. He went and saw him, and was converted by him. It may be mentioned here as an extremely curious fact that according to Rās Mālā, Row Munduleek, who was throughout his life so unremittingly persecuted by the Musalmāns, was as Khān Jehān worshipped under the guise of a Muslim saint, by the descendants of the men who had persecuted him, at his tomb in Ahmadabad, up to the time, when Rās Mālā was published in 1856, and may be worshipped up to the present day. (See Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 357.)

2 The word گنوان appears to me to be incorrect, although it is found in the MSS., and also in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I would either insert the word مده before گنوان, or change گنوان to گنوان. 
the supervision of the silāh khāna (stores of arms and ammunition) and gave him a standard and a 1 trumpet; and sent him to Aḥmadābād after investing him with the post of shāhna and kotwāl (Superintendent of manners and morals and of police) of that place.

Malik Jamāl-ud-din, Muḥāfīz Khān put the city of Aḥmadābād into such order as the heart could wish for, within a short time; and had five hundred thieves hanged. As this work of his met with the approbation of the Sultān, he had other appointments conferred on him; and the office of the īstīfa'i-mumālik was added to his other offices; and 2 gradually his affairs reached to such a position, that one thousand and seven hundred horses were collected in his stables;

1 The word is خلاس in both MSS., and طرطاس in the lith. ed. Firistah has خلاق in both MSS., and طرطاس in the lith. ed. Firistah has خلاق instead.

2 The whole of the passage about the appointment of Malik Jamāl-ud-din, and the increase of his power down to the end of the paragraph is copied almost verbatim by Firistah; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 57) in his translation makes certain changes. Instead of the 1,700 horses in his stable he mentions 1,700 "bargeer-khase", or persons equipped by him, and riding his own stable horses. He also says that his powers were so little under control, that his son, "in the absence of the king, marched without orders, and obliged the Rays of Idur, Wagur and Serohy, to pay him tribute". This might have been correct; but neither Nizām-ud-din nor Firistah explicitly says so. According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, page 192), "His son exacted tribute from the rebellious chiefs who had never paid it before". It appears also from a note on the same page that there is probably some MS. of Firistah, which contains statements identical with those made by Col. Briggs. Bayley however quotes from Col. Briggs, and attributes the statement of Firistah (see the note *, page 194). The Cambridge History of India (page 306) says something quite different. According to it, while Mahmūd "was besieging Girmār, Jai Singh, the son of Gangādās of Chamānīr had been committing systematic brigandage and highway robbery in the country between his strongholds and Ahmadābād. He therefore sent Jamāl-ud-din Muhammad, conferring on him the title of Muḥāfīz Khān to govern this tract, and he put down thefever and highway robbery with such a firm hand, that the inhabitants, we are told slept with open doors". This is not quite correct, Malik Jamāl-ud-din, or Muḥāfīz Khān was appointed kotwāl and shāhna of the city of Ahmadābād, and not governor of the country between that city and Chāmānīr. There is nothing said in any of the histories of any connection between Jai Singh and the thieves and robbers, except that he allowed the rebels of Baroda and Dabhol to pass through his territory; and Malik Jamāl-ud-din is not said to have had anything to do with him except that he waited on the Sultān, when the latter was marching against Jai Singh, and was appointed the vazir.
and wherever there was a good soldier, he was included among his retainers. His power and splendour reached such a height, that his son Malik Khiḍr extorted tribute from the Rājas of Bākar and Īdar and Sirohi.

In the beginning of 876 A.H., 1471 A.D., it was reported to the Sultān that Jai Singh, the son of Gangdās Rāja of Chāmpānīr, having become proud by the help and patronage of Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-din of Mālwa, had allowed the rebels of Barōda and Dabōli, a passage through his territory, and had the disposition of raising a rebellion. The Sultān marched from Muṣṭafā-ābād, and advanced to punish him. On the way, Muḥāfiz Khān had the honour of waiting upon him; and the appointment of vazīr was added to that of kōtvāl. He left his deputies to perform the duties of the kōtvāl, and occupied himself with the affairs of the vazārat.

When the Sultān heard of the disturbances created by the zamindārs of Kach (Cutch); and their persecution of the Musalmāns was reported to him, the Sultān gave up the determination to conquer Chāmpānīr, and marched against that country with a large army. When he arrived 1 on the edge of the saline country, which is known as the Ran, he made a very rapid march and in the course of one day traversed a distance of 2 sixty karōhs. Out of his total army, not more than 3 six hundred horsemen were with him at the end of the

1 Firishtah has instead of موسوم است بشر which Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 80) has translated as "came suddenly upon the enemy's encampment at Sheevur". It appears from Firishtah that this part of Cutch was contiguous to Sind, and was inhabited by people whom he calls ماجنیان. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 306, the place is what is now known as the Thār and Parkār district.

2 There is some doubt as to the possibility of a march of this length, in the course of one day, as in the text, or a night and a day as in Firishtah, though Bayley, quoting Col. Briggs, makes it "without a halt", in a note on page 193; and comes to the conclusion, that it is impossible to cover the distance in one day, but it is possible though hardly likely to do so in one day and night. I should note here also that both MSS. have sixty karōhs as the length of the march, but the lith. ed. has sixty-one karōhs; and it appears from the note in Bayley that the MS. which he had had sixty-one karōhs.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. has six hundred horsemen, but the other MS. has three hundred. Firishtah lith. ed. has six hundred, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV,
march. When he reached the other side of that dangerous country, the enemy could be seen before them. They say that there were twenty-four thousand archers. The Sultān, in spite of the fact that he had such a small number of men, and the enemy were in such large numbers, dismounted and armed himself. When the enemy saw the boldness and gallantry of the Sultān, they came forward with sincerity; and made excuses for their offences. The Sultān drew the pen of forgiveness across their offences, and made peace with them, after taking a large subsidy. He also took some of their chiefs with him to Muṣṭafa-ābād, and taught them the tenets of Islām and Musālmani; and making everyone of them happy with largesses and favours gave them permission to go back. He granted a suitable jāġīr to each one of them, and retained those in his service who of their own free will chose to remain with him.

In the year 877 A.H. (1472 A.D.), it was reported to the Sultān, that forty thousand turbulent and refractory archers had collected together in the neighbourhood of the country of Sind, and were harassing (the inhabitants of) the towns and villages on the border. He equipped an army and again turned in that direction. When he

p. 58) has "only three hundred cavalry". He makes the enemy consist of four thousand archers, though Firishtah like Nizām-ud-dīn has twenty-four thousand. The Cambridge History of India, page 306, gives the correct number, but makes them horse (horsemen) instead of archers.

1 Firishtah's account of what happened, when the Sultān with his six hundred horsemen met the archers, agrees generally with that in the text, but he says that the hostile men became confused and frightened and the chiefs came forward with swords and shrouds hanging from their necks. Col. Briggs has a somewhat different account. He says they were defeated, and numbers of them were slain, after which the remainder came forward with their weapons slung round their necks to implore for mercy. The accounts in the Mirāt-ī-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 194) and the Cambridge History of India (p. 306) agree generally with that in the text; but Bayley quotes in a note Col. Briggs's account and attributes it to Firishtah.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 306, has forty thousand "rebels had risen against Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, the ruler of Sind", but neither the Tabaqāt nor Firishtah nor the Mirāt-ī-Sikandari mentions Jām Nizām-ud-dīn. On the contrary they say that 40,000 men were harassing the residents of the parts of Gujrat adjacent to their country.
arrived in the salt country, he ordered that each horseman should take two horses with him, and take with him water and food for seven days. Then relying on divine help, he entered into that dangerous country, and traversed a distance of sixty karūhs each day. When he arrived in the country of Sind, the rebels became scattered and dispersed and there was no sign or vestige left of them. The country of Sind now came into his possession without any hindrance. Some of the amirs submitted, that they had traversed all that distance with very great trouble and it was right that a ruler (ḥākim) and a superintendent (dārogha) should be left in the country. The Sultān replied: as the Makhduma-i-Jahān was descended from the Sultāns of Sind in the line of chieftainship and royalty, the consideration of the rights of relationship was incumbent on him; and it appeared very far from kindliness and humanity to seize their territory. He hunted as far as the bank of the Indus, and returned to Muṣṭaʿfa-ābād.

After a time, the resolution to conquer the port of Jagat, which is a place of worship of the Brahmans, entered the Sultān's mind. But owing to the narrowness and the difficulty of the road, he deferred carrying it out. It happened, however, that one day a learned man (fāḍil) of the name of Maulānā Muḥammad Samarqandi,

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have هزار سوار, each horseman, but the other MS. has هزار سوار, one thousand horsemen. Firishtah also has ١٠٠ هزار سوار چالاک, one thousand active horsemen.

2 The account of what happened is more circumstantial, and somewhat different in Firishtah, but it does not add very much to our information. According to Firishtah the inhabitants were Balūchis, they concealed themselves, but some of them were dragged out and killed, and their camp was plundered. The Cambridge History of India, page 306, says that before the Sultān returned, he received gifts and a letter of thanks from the Jām, who also sent his daughter, who was married to Qaisar Khān, grandson of Hasan Khān, Iftikhār-ul-Mulk of Khāndesh, who had taken refuge in Gujarāt. For the account given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, see Bayley, page 195.

3 Jagat appears to be identical with Dwārkā. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari the name is associated with Sānkhdhār and in Rās Mālā with Beyt. The country, according to a note in Bayley, page 195, was called Okāmandal, "and the Rajpūts, as they are to-day, were Pāghars and Wāghars, a poor but brave and hardy race, much given to piracy and robbery".

4 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 60) describes him as "one of the most learned philosophers of his age"; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 195, describes
some with his two sons with their heads and feet bare and waited on the Sultān; and submitted that they had embarked in a ship to go from the Deccan to Samarkand; and were sailing towards Hormuz (Ormuz); that when they arrived opposite to Jagat, a body of men came out in boats filled with weapons of war, blocked their way, plundered them, and carried away the women and children of the Musalmāns into imprisonment. 1 Among them he and his sons had also been imprisoned. Sultān Maḥmūd showed kindness to the Moulānā, and sent him to Aḥmadābād, and fixed an allowance on him. At the time of bidding him farewell, he told him, "You rest assured, that whatever has been taken from you will be returned to you in its original condition; and those men will receive condign punishment". Then incited by his sense of shame, and his desire to help (Musalmāns), he sent for the amirs and the chiefs of the different sections to attend on him; and said to them, "If on the day on which inquest will be made of our actions, they ask me, ‘In your neighbourhood the kāfirs committed such oppression, and in spite of your having the power to stop it, you procrastinated’, what reply shall I give?". The amirs opened their lips for prayer and praise; and 2 said, "These slaves have nothing to do except to carry out your orders; and the destruction of these people is incumbent and due on our spirits".

The Sultān being confirmed in his determination, moved out on the 16th Dhu-hijjah of that year towards 3 Jagat; and when with very great hardship on account of the narrowness of the way, and the dense jungle, they arrived at Jagat, the infidels fled to the island

1 According to Firishtah the Moulānā told the Sultān that his wife was still in the custody of the Kāfirs. According to Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley page 196, "the pirates turned the Mullā (as he is called there) and his two sons adrift, but kept his women, his property and the ship". As the boys were of tender age, the Mullā had to carry them by turns, and in this way he traversed the distance of seventy kōs, and came to the Sultān.

2 According to Firishtah the amirs were tired of the annual expedition undertaken by the Sultān.

3 One MS. inserts بندر, port, before Jagat. چکت Jakat in the text-edition
1 of Beyt. Many snakes appeared there. At the place where the Sultān’s pavilion had been put up, seven hundred snakes were killed in the space of one pahar. 2 Many tigers and lions and wolves caused much loss to the men in the island; and many of the wild animals were also killed. They ravaged the temple of Jagat, and pulled it down. Sultān Māhmuḍ had to wait there for four months at this place; and during this time many boats were prepared to carry the soldiers and the artillery; and then they started for the island of Beyt. The men in the island embarked in boats, and advanced to fight; but in the end, they retreated to the island. The brave warriors (of the Sultān’s army) drove the ships, and threw themselves into the island; and having captured the citadel of Beyt, slew a vast number of Rājpūts. The Rāja of the place, who had the name of Rāy Bhīm, got into a boat, and fled to some place. The Sultān embarked a number of his men in boats, and sent them in pursuit of him. He himself entered the city of Beyt, and released all the Musalmāns who were imprisoned there. He got much plunder and an enormous number of prisoners of war. He left Malik Tūghlān, who had the title of Farhat-ul-mulk, as the thānadar of the place, and crowned with success and victory 3 returned to Muṣṭafā-ābād. On Friday the 13th of

1 Both MSS, and the lth. ed. of Firishtah have بیت, but the lth. ed. of the Ẓabaqūṭ has شکوندهار. The two appear to be names of the same island.

2 The MSS., as well as the lth. ed. have شیر و دبود و یلگ. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 61) has lions, leopards and wolves. As to the number of snakes killed, Firishtah (lth. ed.) also says that seven hundred were killed in the course of one pahar. Col. Briggs, however, has seventy killed in a day; and says in a note that the number would not appear to be exaggerated to any one who has been in India. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī also says that seven hundred snakes were killed in one night within the royal enclosure. According to the Cambridge History of India (p. 307) the Sultān moved from Jagat or Dwārkā to Aramara, at the extreme N.W. point of the peninsula, and it was here, that the army was troubled by lions and venomous snakes and insects. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 196) mentions the village of Arāmrah; and Bayley says in a note that the name is variously spelt in the different MSS.

3 According to Firishtah, Rāy Bhīm was seized and brought before the Sultān before the latter left for Muṣṭafā-ābād; and he was taken to that place Āt Muṣṭafā-ābād the Sultān ordered that a letter be written to the Maulānā; but while the letter was being written he arrived; and his wife and children were
Jamādī-ul-āwal of the aforementioned year, the men who had gone in pursuit of Rāy Bhīm brought him under arrest and in fetters, and made him stand in front of the Sulṭān's hall of audience. The Sulṭān sent for Maulānā Muḥammad Samarkandi from Aḥmadābād, and sent the wretched and miserable Bhīm Rāy to Muḥāfīz Khān, so that he might cut him up into four strips, and hang them up at the four sides of the city of Aḥmadābād, so that other turbulent men might be terrified by the sight.

1 In the month of Rajab of that year (874 a.h.), the Sulṭān left a number of his officers at Muṣṭafa-ābād, and started towards the fort of Chāmpānīr. On the way he received the news that a body made over to him. Rāy Bhīm was also made over to him, to do what he liked with him; and the Maulānā asked the Sulṭān, that he should be made over to Muḥāfīz Khān, and should be taken round the city and killed with torture. Col. Briggs's account is slightly different. The Cambridge History of India does not say that the Maulānā's wife and children were returned to him; but he was asked to identify his property out of the immense quantity of plunder and he was given all that he identified, besides some big presents. Raja Bhīm was also made over to him but he returned the raja, and he was sent to Ahmadābād, and impaled (p. 307).

1 The account of this incident as given in Firishtah (lith. ed.) does not differ materially from the text. The date is 877 a.h. in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, which is defective as in the words, the word for the tens is omitted. In figures the year is 887, and in Col. Briggs's translation the year is 887 a.h. and 1482 a.d. In the Cambridge History of India, page 307, the attack on the Malabar pirates is said to have taken place between October 1473 and January 1474, i.e., about 8 years before the date given by Col. Briggs. The correct year would be 877 a.h., as given in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. There are some details in Firishtah not mentioned by Nizām-ul-dīn such as the fact that the Sulṭān's men were armed with bow and arrow, and Col. Briggs's account (vol. IV, p. 65) differs greatly. He calls the Malabarians Bular pirates, and he says that they had gained such an ascendency at sea, as to threaten the invasion of his dominions; and had already intercepted the trade. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari's (Bayley, p. 199) account is different, as it does not appear from it that the Sulṭān himself embarked on board his ships, and a battle was fought with the pirates; but Bayley in a note quotes the Tabakāt about the Sulṭān having commanded the fleet and fought a battle. He also says that according to Firishtah the pirates were of Bular. The Cambridge History of India, page 307, says that the Malabar pirates made a descent on his coasts.
of Malābāris had collected a large number of boats and were harassing people travelling by sea. Immediately on hearing this news, (the Sultān) arranged some ships, and himself, with a body of brave warriors, embarked in them; and relying on divine help and victory lifted the anchors. When they arrived near the ships of the Malābāris, the latter fled, and some of their boats fell into his hands. He then sailed to the port of Kanbāyat, and disembarked there. He returned to the capital city of Aḥmadābād in the month of Sha'bān. 2 At the end of Ramaḍān, he raided a part of the country of Chāmpānir, and again returned to Aḥmadābād.

3 In the year 875 Ḍ. the Sultān sent Malik Bahā' ud-dīn Ḥmād-ul-mulk to the thāna in the town of Sonkhir, and Qawām-ul-mulk to that in the town Kodhrā, Farḥat-i-mulk to the thāna at fort Beyt, and Jagat, and Malik Nizām-ul-mulk to the thāna at Kīz; and

1 traders in the text-edition.

2 This sentence is to be found in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but is omitted from the other MS. The Sultān is said to have returned to Aḥmadābād according to both the MSS. and the lith. ed., but it is more likely that he went to Muṣṭafā-ābād.

3 Nizām-ul-dīn does not give the reasons of these appointments. It appears from Firishtah that the people (amīrs?) were tired of the continual expeditions of the Sultān; and with the order to change their residence from Aḥmadābād to Muṣṭafā-ābād; and were in a mood to rebel. So the Sultān made these appointments so that the amīrs might keep their thānas in order, and he himself might have the leisure to organise the administration of the newly acquired territory of Karnāl or Sūrath. Col. Briggs says briefly that the Shah conceived his dominions to be too extensive for his own immediate management. The Cambridge History of India also refers to the tireless energy and ceaseless activity of the Sultān which had become wearisome to his soldiers and officers. I may point out here that the Cambridge History of India, page 307, suddenly jumps, in the course of about half a dozen lines, from January 1474 to December 1480.

4 In the text-edition.

5 This name is illegible in one MS., is illegible in the other, and Kanir in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Mārz. According to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 62), Nizam-ool-Moolk was sent to Tanna. The Cambridge History of India does not give the names of the governors and of their stations.
appointed 1 Khudawand Khan to be the vaizir of the kingdom, and left him in attendance on Shâhzâda Ahmad Khan at Ahmadâbâd. He occupied himself with the administration of Jûnâgarh and the surrounding country.

One day Khudawand Khan, owing to his sincere attachment and intimacy with the Rây 2 Râyân, told him in private "I am much aggrived at the many activities of Sultân Mahmûd. Not a single year or a month passes, that he does not take up an enterprise and does not march the army about. If with your own men, and taking five hundred of my soldiers with you, you go to the house of 'Imâd-ul-mulk and get him out of the way, we can to-morrow raise Shâhzâda

---

1 Firistah says Khudawand Khan, who was the vaizir, was made the aâldîq or guardian of Shâhzâda Muzaflâr Khan, and was left at Ahmadâbâd. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 62) calls him Khoozbunda Khan "preceptor of the Prince Mozaffur Khan". The Mirât-i-Sikandari agrees with the Tabaqât; and Bayley in a note says that the Tabakât and the Mirât-i-Sikandari are correct to the name of the prince; but he says that Firistah says that Khudâbandah Khan was made governor of Ahmadâbâd, which is certainly not correct. But Bayley always means Col. Briggs when he says Firistah. According to the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Khudâwând Khan was induced by some designing men to acquiesce in the conspiracy (Bayley, p. 201).

2 His name does not appear, but as his title implies, and as the Cambridge History of India (p. 308) says, he was the chief Hindu noble.

3 Firistah does not give the conversation between Khudâwand Khan and the Rây Râyân, but goes on at once to say that they sent for 'Imâd-ul-mulk and other nobles to Ahmadâbâd, and after swearing 'Imâd-ul-mulk on the Qurân made them join the conspiracy. 'Imâd-ul-mulk joined it, as he did not have his soldiers with him. The Mirât-i-Sikandari's account is very brief; and Bayley considered the account in the Tabakât had such details, and the matter was of such importance, as explaining the reasons why Prince Ahmad was passed over, that he has incorporated a translation of it in his book. I find, however, that his translation is not quite correct, if he made it from a text which was identical with mine; for instance he says that Khudâwand Khan told Rây Râyân, if I were to take my own followers and five hundred soldiers to 'Imâd-ul-mulk's house, I could easily get him out of the way.

The account of the conspiracy as given in the Cambridge History of India, page 308, agrees with that in the text, except that it says that the Rây Râyân refused to be a party to 'Imâd-ul-mulk's death. I do not know whether he would have actually refused; but all that the text says is that he believed that he would be able to gain him over, and that the conspirators would be all the stronger by his joining them.
Ahmad Khan to the saltanat. For killing 'Imad-ul-mulk, we will not have a better time (than this), when all his retainers have gone to his thana. I have submitted this matter to Shahzada Ahmad Khan; and he agrees with me, and is willing to join us'. The Ray Rayan said, "'Imad-ul-mulk is sincerely attached to me, and tells me all his private matters. As he is also aggrieved with the Sultan, and has complaints against him, it is extremely likely that he would join with us in this matter, and by his union with us, our plans will acquire a new strength. Although Khudawand Khan forbade the Ray Rayan to communicate with 'Imad-ul-mulk, it was of no avail. The Ray Rayan, relying on the friendship and affection of 'Imad-ul-mulk, at first swore him in private on the Qur'an, that he would not disclose this secret, and later brought the matter into discussion. As 'Imad-ul-mulk saw that his men had gone to his jaggir, on the spur of the moment he signified his consent, and said, "In this matter I am at one with Khudawand Khan; but it appears to me that as Ramadhan is drawing to a close, we should attempt to carry out our intention after it is over". The Ray Rayan was pleased (with this suggestion); and communicated the message to Khudawand Khan.

After the Ray Rayan had gone away, 'Imad-ul-mulk sent for Malik Miyani to come to him in private; and said to him, "In Sultan Qutb-ud-din's time, I used to desire that I might have a second horse, and I could not have it; and now owing to the greatness of Sultan Mahmuud, there is not a greater man than myself in his service". He immediately wrote a letter to Malik Farhat-ul-mulk, who had encamped in the town of Sarkhej, and asked him to come and meet him. He also sent a letter to Malik Qayam-ul-mulk at Rakhal, that he should not march from that place for some days. Early the next morning, Malik Farhat-ul-mulk arrived at 'Imad-ul-mulk's house with five hundred horsemen. They had an interview for a little while; and then Malik Farhat-ul-mulk was sent to his own house. After a time 'Imad-ul-mulk sent for Muhaiz Khan the kotedal of the city, and said to him, "As there is relationship between us it is right

---

1 فورندیان in the text-edition.
2 Contrary to this, Firishta says he sent for his own troops.
3 The name of the place is printed as Rakhiyal by Bayley also, but he has (?) after it (p. 203). رکھیال in the text-edition.
that we should endeavour to do good to each other. Your loyalty consists in your being present to attend to the affairs of the city, lest a disturbance should be created. On the day of the 'Id, you should be ready with your followers and retainers, and attend on Prince Ahmad Khān at the maqṣūl; and till midday you should make every endeavour to guard the city'.

Khudawand Khān on hearing the words (the news?) became anxious in his mind. He sent for Rāy Rāyān to his presence, and said (to him), "Did I not tell you, that 'Imād-ul-mulk would not agree with us in this matter. Now things have come to such a pass, that all our houses (families) would be ruined". When the 'Id passed off, and 'Imād-ul-mulk's retainers all arrived, Khudawand Khān did not for fear (or consequences) disclose (his intentions); and his resolution remained in this way unaccomplished. It so happened, however, that after some days, a popular rumour reached Muṣṭafā-ābād that Khudawand Khān had killed 'Imād-ul-mulk on the day of the 'Id, and all the amirs had joined with him, and they had placed Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān on the throne. One of the (amirs), who were with the Sultān, went with some audacity, and without any hesitation repeated the rumour to him.

1 The translation in Bayley, page 203, is "we must rival each other in loyalty". This does not appear to me to be correct.

Khurāzī does not mean loyalty (to the Sultān); but in the next sentence apparently means loyalty to him.

2 I do not know what the meaning of مصل is. The translation in Bayley, page 203, does not say where he was to go in attendance on prince Ahmad Khān.

3 The sentence بکی از مقریان کسانی رنه بن تحاشی این خبر سلطان محمد کفت is somewhat cryptic; but the corresponding sentence in Firishtah which is قیصر خان که از امرای مقرب سلطان بود و در مصطفی آباد خبر از انجیف شدیده بانی سلطان ربانی makes the meaning clear.

4 According to Firishtah the rumour reached Muṣṭafā-ābād; and Qaissar Khān secretly communicated it to the Sultān, and the latter determined on making a secret investigation. The Cambridge History of India, page 308, says "Qaissar Khān Fāruq, who was at Ahmadābād, privately informed the king of the affair, so that it came to naught". It does not appear, however, that Qaissar Khān was at Ahmadābād, or that he knew the real facts; and the Sultān did not know them till some time afterwards, when he got 'Imād-ul-mulk to divulge them.
Immediately on hearing this news, the Sultān sent for Qaisar Khān and Firūz Khān to his private chamber and said, "The news of the illness of the Shāhzāda had come before this, and to-day my mind is very sad as to what has happened to him. Go out a distance of two karōhs, and come back with correct and detailed news from anyone (when you may meet), who should be coming from Ahmadābād. When Malik Sa'id-ul-mulk had gone a part of the way, he saw one of his own relations, who was coming from Ahmadābād. He asked him how things were there. He said I was in Ahmadābād on the day of the 3 'Īd-i-Fiṭr. The Shāhzāda came to make his namāz, and Khudāwand Khān and Muhāfiz Khān were in attendance at the darbār. When the Shāhzāda went back to the palace, Muhāfiz Khān was present at the darbār, till two pahars of the day had passed. But the men of the city say that 'Imād-ul-mulk does not give his permission that the amirs should go to their thānas; and they are all at their houses. Malik Sa'id-ul-mulk came back, and reported all that he heard. The Sultān said, "A man had told me a falsehood, to the effect that the Shāhzāda had been ill". After two or three days he sent for Qaisar Khān and Firūz Khān into his private chamber, and having told them the whole 4 story, said, "I will tell people that I intend to go on a pilgrimage to the Hijāz. Whoever approves of this determination of mine, I shall know that he does not want me". After some days he gave orders that ships should be made ready, and he gave some lakhs of tankas to the superintendent of the ship, so that he might buy things that would be required in Mecca for devotional offerings. He then went from Mustafā-ābād to the port.

---

1 The account in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 205) agrees with the text; but Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India, page 308, without giving any of the intermediate incidents, at once go on to say that the Sultān wanted to give vut that he was going on a pilgrimage to Mecca.

2 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 204, the Sultān told Kaisar Khān and Fīroz Khān to send Malik Sa'id-ul-Mulk to find out the true facts. The name is Sa'id-ul-mulk in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt in one place, and Sa'id-ul-mulk in another, but it is Sa'id-ul-mulk in both MSS.

3 The 'Īd of the opening or breaking of the fast of Ramādān, which takes place on the 1st Shawwāl.

4 It is not clear how he got hold of it, or how much he knew.
of 1 Ghōgha, embarked in the boats; and disembarked at the port of Kanbāyat.

When this news reached Aḥmadābād, all the amīrs 2 hastened to wait on the Sulṭān. The latter said that the Shāhzāda had come to a good age (buzurg shudah); and the amīrs have been trained as the heart might desire. "My mind is composed about the welfare of the kingdom, and it has occurred to me that I should now obtain the happiness of the Ḥajj". ʿImād-ul-mulk said, "Your Majesty should go once to Aḥmadābād, and then do whatever may appear to be proper". The Sulṭān knew that the 3 cup is only half filled; and proceeded towards Aḥmadābād. When he arrived in the city, he sent one day for all the amīrs, and said, "Please give me permission that I might come back after performing the Ḥajj; as long as you do not give a reply, 4 I shall not have any desire for food". The amīrs knew that the Sulṭān was testing them. All of them placed the seal of silence on their mouths. When the great luminary reached the meridian, ʿImād-ul-mulk said to the amīrs, "The Sulṭān is hungry, some reply should be given to him". 5 Nizām-ul-mulk went and waited

---

1 The name is كموجک in the text-edition.
2 Firishtah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari agree; but the Cambridge History of India, page 308, says that the nobles were summoned from Ahmadābād to Cambay to consider this proposal, i.e., the proposal of the Sulṭān that he should go on a pilgrimage.
3 The sentence in both MSS., and the lith. ed. is مکا زبر کاہ نم کاہم کاہم ہست. Firishtah has a slightly different sentence مکا زبر کاہ نم کاہم کاہم ہست.
4 This is a curious and very early instance of a hunger strike.
5 Both the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India make Nizām-ul-mulk the spokesman of the amīrs, and attribute the speech to him, but Firishtah assigns it to ʿImād-ul-mulk. Nizām-ul-mulk is called in the Cambridge History of India (p. 308) Nizām-ul-Mulk Aisan; and is described as the oldest courtier. It would appear, however, that Firishtah is right, and the others are wrong. The fact that ʿImād-ul-mulk suggested to Nizām-ul-mulk later that as he was the oldest, he should go to the Sulṭān confirms it. This also appears from Firishtah. If Nizām-ul-mulk had first gone to the Sulṭān there would be no necessity to ask him to go a second time on the ground that he was the oldest of the amīrs. Besides it is not likely that the Sulṭān would have said to Nizām-ul-mulk, that the government of the country could not go on in his absence. He could have only said this to ʿImād-ul-mulk. As to the name of Nizām-ul-mulk I have not seen it with the suffix Aisan anywhere else; but in
on the Sultān and submitted, "As the Shāhzāda has reached the stage of perfection, and the son of this slave, Malik Badeh, has acquired much experience, and knows how to endure the heat and cold of the times, this slave hopes that the *thāna* of this slave should be made over to the slave's son; and that Your Majesty would not leave this slave behind him, when he goes on the auspicious pilgrimage". 1 The Sultān said, "It is a great good fortune, if it can be secured; but the government of the country cannot go on without you, and bring a plain answer from the *amīrs*". Nizām-ul-mulk went back to the *amīrs* and repeated what had happened; but no one attempted to give a reply. When ʿImād-ul-mulk saw that no one would give an answer, and the Sultān was starving, he said to Nizām-ul-mulk, "As you are the most senior in age among all of us friends, it would be better if you would go on behalf of all of us; and would submit, that the Lord of the world should first conquer the fort of Chāmpānir, where he might leave his treasures and the inmates of his harem behind in safety; and then he could turn his attention to the acquisition

the lith. ed. of Firishtah, in the passage in which the illness and death of ʿImād-ul-mulk are mentioned, he is called عين عماد البلک, ʿAin ʿImād-ul-mulk. Is the Aisan of the Cambridge History of India a mistake for ʿAin, and has it been given to Nizām-ul-mulk by mistake instead of to ʿImād-ul-mulk?

The name of the *amīr*’s son is given in the MSS. of the Ṭabaqāt as Malik Badeh. The lith. ed. has Malik, but omits Badeh. It is not given in any other history in this place, but it is given as Buda on page 309 of the Cambridge History of India, and as Malik Badn in Bayley, page 209. The word which I have translated as "experience" is تجارب, merchandise or trade in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. This is so clearly a mistake that I have had no hesitation in inserting the correct word. Apparently there was the same mistake in the Mirāt-i-Sikandar; and it puzzled the translator, who has rendered it "I have acquired wealth by trading, and am well acquainted with the seasons"; and then adds in a note "this sentence is doubtful" (Bayley, p. 205).

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 308, says, "it was now Mahmūd’s turn to be at a loss". I do not think he was very much at a loss.

2 The reading in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. is بی وجود یا تر. I think بی وجود تر is more correct; and Firishtah has بی وجود تر. So I have taken the liberty to correct the text and this is followed in the text-edition.

3 The word ہد go, is not in the MSS., but is in the lith. ed.
of the good fortune of circumambulating (the sacred places)”. (The Sultan) said, “If God, so wills, it comes to pass”. He then sent for his food, and partook of it. But he summoned Qaisar Khan into his private chamber, and said, “Imad-ul-mulk does not tell me the truth. I have determined that I shall not speak to him till he discloses the truth”.

When a few days passed in this way, one day ‘Imad-ul-mulk said to the Sultan in private, “This slave does not know what offence he has committed”. The Sultan replied, “Until you tell the truth I shall not speak to you”. He replied, “They made me swear on the Qur'an”. The Sultan said, “If in the discharge of your loyal duties, your life goes, you should say: let it go”. ‘Imad-ul-mulk then having no other alternative reported the whole of the truth. Sultan Mahmud acted with great forbearance; the only penalty which he inflicted on Khudawand Khan was this, that he gave the name of Khudawand Khan to one of his pigeons. After a time he went to Nahrwala; and from that place he sent ‘Imad-ul-mulk to conquer Jalor and Sajor; and he sent Qaisar Khan with him. ‘Imad-ul-mulk on receiving leave to go, encamped near the tomb of Shaikh Hajj Rajab, may his soul be sanctified! In the night Mujahid Khan, son of Khudawand Khan, in concert with Sahib Khan his cousin, came out of his house, and entered the pavilion of Qaisar Khan, and murdered

1 The word نوکران, pigeons, is printed كیورتان, servants, in the lith. ed.; and Col. Briggs apparently having نوکران in the MSS., from which he made his translation, has turned the humourous and whimsical punishment of Khudawand Khan, whom, by the way, he always calls Khodabunda Khan into a matter of disgrace to the latter, by causing the person employed in the meanest office of his household to be called by his name. Bayley on page 205 says that the Sultan called one of his pigeons Khudawand Khan; but, as usual, in a note he attributes Col. Briggs's statement to Firishtah.

2 The name is written ساجر in both MSS., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but it is سانچور in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 64) has Julwara and Abooogur in place of Jalor and Sajor. Bayley (p. 206) has Jalor and Sajor; but the Cambridge History of India, page 309, has “Sanchoor and Jalor in Marwar”.

3 Firishtah agrees that the murder was committed by a son and a nephew of Khudawand Khan; but the Cambridge History of India, page 309, says that it was committed by his two sons.
him. Early in the morning, 'Imād-ul-mulk went to wait on the Sultān and disclosed the truth to him. Another man, however, reported (to the Sultān) that Azdar Khān, son of Alū Khān, had committed this heinous act. The Sultān immediately, on hearing this, sent Firūz Khān that he should arrest and bring Azdar Khān. When night came, Mujāhid Khān and Sāhib Khān fled with their family and children. In the morning, when it became known that Azdar Khān was innocent, and Mujāhid Khān and Sāhib Khān had murdered Qāṣār Khān, the Sultān ordered that Khudwānd Khān should be put in chains, and should be made over to Muhāfīz Khān; and Azdar Khān should be set at liberty. After some days the Sultān returned to Ahmadābād; and about this time the poor 'Imād-ul-mulk bound up the goods of existence (died). The Sultān took pity on his family, and gave his eldest son, who had the name of 1 Malik Badeh, the title of Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk; and he transferred the duty of the vazārat to Muhāfīz Khān.

In the 2 year 880 A.H., the people of Gujrat suffered the privations of a failure of the rains and a famine. It so happened, that 3 Malik

1 See note 1, pp. 269, 270. The name is written in the MSS. here as سنة; and بنی is printed in the lith. ed. as سنة. I have retained the name previously given to him. According to Firishtah on 'Imād-ul-mulk's death, his son Itbat-ul-mulk obtained his father's place, and became very near (to the Sultān), and having attained to the post of vazir his affairs reached such a high position, that he became the person to whom the high and low all looked up. Col. Briggs, so far as I can see, omits all reference to this matter. Bayley quotes the Ṭabakāt. The Cambridge History of India, pavo 309, agrees partially with Ṭabaqāt, and partially with Firishtah. According to it, on the death of 'Imād-ul-Mulk, he was succeeded by his son Buda 'Imād-ul-Mulk'.

2 This is the year in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. According to Firishtah it was 887 A.H., and according to Col. Briggs 887 A.H., 1482 A.D. Bayley gives the same year; while the Cambridge History of India briefly refers to a failure of rains and famine.

3 He is called "Malik Sīdā Khāssia Khāl Sultānī who was posted at Moremi otherwise called Rasūlābād", in the Mirāt-i-Sikandar, Bayley, page 207; and Bayley says in a note that he is called Malik Sādā in the Ṭabakāt-i-Ākbarī. The Cambridge History of India, page 309, calls him Malik Sūdha, surnamed of Rasūlābād; which is said there to be 14 miles S.E. of Chāmpānīr. Firishtah apparently does not mention him, though he says that the Rājpūtas of Chāmpānīr harried the Musalmāns of Rasūlābād.
Sadāh had raided certain villages in Chāmpānīr; and 1 Rāy Batāį, the son of Rāy Udaī Singh, Rāja of Chāmpānīr, collected troops and attacked him; and in the battle Malik Sadāh and a body of his followers attained to the rank of martyrdom. Rāy Batāį plundered and carried away two elephants and all goods and equipments belonging to Malik Sadāh and his men. When this news reached the Sultān, he set out on a march to Chāmpānīr, on the first of the month of Dhi-qa’dah of the aforementioned year; and when by successive marches, he arrived at the town of Baroda, Rāy Batāį, becoming ashamed and repentant of the reprehensible act and wicked deed he had perpetrated sent ambassadors to wait on the Sultān, and petitioned for the pardon of his offences. He also submitted that both the elephants, which had been wounded, had become disabled; but he was willing to send two other elephants loaded with gold. The Sultān replied, “The answer to this message will be given to-morrow by the sword, which cuts like a diamond”; and he turned the ambassadors back. He sent in advance of himself Tāj Khān and ʿĀḍī-ul-mulk and Bāhrām Khān and Ikhtiyār Khān. They arrived at the foot of the fort on the 2 7th of Șafar. The Rājpūts sallied out of the fort every day; and fought from morning to evening with great gallantry.

The Sultān also advanced from the town of Baroda, and passing Chāmpānīr, encamped in the village of 3 Karnārī. He appointed

---

1 The name is رابی بنالی, Rāy Basāį in the MSS., and Rāy Batāį in the lith. ed. It appears to be رابی بنالی, Rāy Banāhī in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs calls him Bany Ray. The Mirāt-i-Sikandar has Rāwal Patāį. According to Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 371) his real name was “Jye Singh”, or as it should be correctly transiterated Jaya Sinha, which undoubtedly is the right name for the son of Udaya Sinha “and by Firishta” (or rather by Col. Briggs) “entitled Beny Ray, and widely known in Hindu tradition under the name of Phutāee Rāwul”. In the Cambridge History of India, page 309, he is called Patāį, and it is also stated that he sacked and destroyed Rasūlabād, but I cannot find this anywhere else. Firishtah has been followed in the text-edition.

2 It is مهفطم, 7th in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and مهفطم, 17th in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. also has 7th متوفهم in the text-edition.

3 Both MSS. have کرنالی, while the lith. ed. has كرنالی. Firishtah lith. ed. has کرنالی, Karnāį; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67) has “Girnary on the Malwa road”.
Saiyid 1 Badr Alangdār for guarding the road and for the bringing in of provisions. It so happened, that one day when the Saiyid was escorting a convoy of provisions, the Rājpūts fell on them from an ambush; and they slew a body of the troops, and carried away all the provisions. The Sultān, on hearing this news, became very depressed and sad; and he sat down at the foot of the fort of Chāmpānīr, till the end of Safar of that year; and did everything to carry on the siege with great vigour. Muḥafiz Khān mounted every morning, and inspected all the batteries till midday, and then returning made report of the state of things to the Sultān. When the siege had progressed in a satisfactory and perfect manner, he ordered that covered ways should be laid down from (all) four directions. They say that for every plank that they carried to the top of the hill, the wages of the men carrying it amounted to one lakh tankas. Rāy Batāl, seeing this state of things, and owing to great weakness and exhaustion, again sent ambassadors and submitted, that he would send a tribute of nine manas of gold and of grain which would suffice for feeding the army for two years. The Sultān said “It is impossible that I should rise from the place, till this fort should have been conquered”.

When the ambassadors returned despondent, Rāy Batāl in the year 888 A.H. sent his experienced vākil 3 Sūrā to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din Khaljī, and asked for help; and undertook to pay one lakh of tankas for every stage in the march of his army, as a contribution to his expenses. Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din mustered his troops, and advanced to and encamped in the town of 4 Na’lcha. When this news reached the Sultān, he left his amirs at the different stations, and marched himself.

---

1 The name of this man appears to be سید بدر al-takdar in the MSS. It is سید بدر in the lith. ed. He is called Saiyid Badr in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Syud Mudun Lung by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67).

2 Both MSS. have ازین سر زمین برخاستن ممکن نیست; but the lith. ed. has ازین سر زمین ممکن نیست که برخزم.

3 He is called سورا in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has سورا; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67) has Shew Ray; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandar (Bayley, p. 208) has Sahūrā; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309) Sūrī.

4 The name is written لمجله in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is لمجله Lalja. Firishtah, lith. ed., has لمجله Nalha. The Mirāt-i-Sikandar (Bayley) Na’lcha.
as far as the town of 1 Dahūd to meet him. At this place the news reached him, that 2 Sulțān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn had sent for the learned men one day, and asked for an expression of their opinion on the following point: "a bādahā of the Musalmāns has besieged a hill of the infidels, is it right according to the Shara‘ that I should reinforce and go to help the latter". The learned men said, "it is not right". Sulțān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn immediately went back to Mandū. The Sulțān on hearing this tune (of joyfulness) was delighted; came back to Chāmpānīr; and laid the foundation of a 3 Jāma‘ mosque.

The amīrs and the sardārs now knew for certain, that the Sulțān would not leave the place until the fort should be conquered, and made a very great effort in planning the conquest. When the construction of the covered ways was completed, the soldiers in the Sulțān's own battery saw one day from the covered way, that most of the Rājpūts went away in the morning for cleaning their teeth and for their ablutions, and only a few remained on the bastions. When they reported this to the Sulțān he ordered that Qawām-ul-mulk on the following 4 day in the year 889 A.H., at the true dawn should

1 The name of the town should be transliterated as Dahūd. Firishtah, lith. ed., has Dḥād, apparently a mistake; Col. Briggs has D’hār; Bayley (p. 208) has Dāhūd; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309) Dohad.

2 Firishtah agrees with this; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 68) says that the Soolṭān "on being reproached by his nobles and officers, for entertaining an intention of marching to the assistance of an infidel" disbanded his army, and returned to Mandū.

3 The Cambridge History of India, p. 309, says that the mosque, which still adorns the ruins of the city, was built before Sulțān Ghiyās-ud-dīn’s offer to aid the Rāja. This does not agree with the other histories, according to which the foundations of the mosque were laid after the Sulțān’s return from Dahūd. The author of the Mirāt-i-Sikandari laments the ruin which had overwhelmed Chāmpānīr during his time. He says (Bayley, p. 212) "Now thanks be to God, Chāmpānīr is not still the same. The buildings are in ruins, it is inhabited by the tiger, and the gardens are for the most part jungle, nor is there any sandal wood produced: its very name is unknown."

4 There is, however, no mention of the mosque.

6 No date is given in either the MSS. or the lith. ed. Only the year is mentioned at this place, but it appears a few sentences further on, that the date was the first of Dhul-qadāḥ. Firishtah in the corresponding passage gives neither date nor year. Bayley after giving the account of the capture of Chāmpānīr, says
take the Sultān's own troops with him, and should advance his sābāt (covered way) into the fort. There was every hope that the flag of victory should be unfurled from the flag-staff of hope. On the following morning which was the 1st of Dhi-qa'dah, Malik Qawām-ul-mulk with the Sultān's own troops hurled himself from the covered way into the fort and slew a large number of the garrison, and a great fight took place. They drove the Rājpūts to the gate of the citadel. Rāy Batāī and other Rājpūts then prepared for jauhar and Qawām-ul-mulk and the other leaders having the great good fortune of martyrdom before the eyes of their noble spirit lavished all efforts and made every endeavour.

It so happened that a few days before this, they had shot a cannon ball on the rampart of the fort from the western side; and several cracks and fissures had appeared in the rampart of the great citadel. Malik Āyyāz Sultānī availing himself of an opportunity went to the crack in the rampart; with a body of soldiers from that crack, which was in truth, the crack by which the angel of the death of the garrison made his entrance, they rushed into the great citadel and by way of the 1 bārah ascended to the top of the great gate. At this time Sultān Maḥmūd came to the top of the sābāt and placing his face of humility in the dust offered prayers, and, as victory and triumph still delayed, he sent reinforcements. The Rājpūts being harassed and discomfited threw bombs filled with gun-powder on the roof of the gate. It so happened, however, that from the seat of divine mercy the breeze of success and victory blew, (the men on the top of the gate) seized those very bombs and threw them into the courtyard of the palace of Rāy Batāī. When the Rājpūts found that things had come to this condition, at every place where they had arranged a jauhar

---

1 that the Tabakat and Firishtah give a fuller account of how it was seized; and
2 proceeds to quote from them. It would appear from his account, page 210, 3 that the attack of Kiwām-ul-Mulk was made on the 1st Zil-ka'dah, 889 A.H. The
4 umbridge History of India does not specially mention this particular incident.

1 The word is bāra, bārū in both MSS., but it is bāra, bārah in the lith. ed., 2 and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have retained bārah, as it occurs in Imām-
3 bārah, etc. The translation in Bayley gives no help. It says: from that breach 4 they fought their way to the roof of the principal gate”. M. Hidayat Hossain 5 has bārah in the text-edition.
they set fire to them, and burnt all their dependents and children. The whole of that day and night and the next day the entire (Muṣal-mān) army remained under arms and fought. On the second day which was the 2nd of Dhī-qa‘dah, 889 A.H., they forced open the door and got into (the citadel) and slew a large number. Sultān Muḥam-mad also advanced as far as the door. A body of the Rājpūts then threw down their arms and assembled round a reservoir. They all got into the water and washed their bodies, and coming out of the water seized their swords, and stood up. As the body of the Sultān's troops went near the reservoir, seven hundred Rājpūts at once rushed on them and a very large number on both sides were slain, but Rāy Batai and Dungarsi and a number of others were captured and brought (before the Sultān).

The Sultān performed the ceremony of offering thanks to God and made over Rāy Batai and Dungarsi to Muḥāfīz Khān, so that he might have their wounds medically attended to. The same day the Sultān gave the name of Muḥammadābād to Chāmpānīr, and made an entry into it. A number of the Rājpūts fled, and entered the third citadel. They were brought down the same day in distress and wretchedness. When Muḥāfīz Khān reported that Rāy Batai's wounds had healed, the Sultān urged him to accept Islām. He did not agree. After he had been in prison for five months; and as he did not still accept Islām; he and Dungarsi were, by order of the learned men, executed. This occurred in the year 890 A.H. In the same year he passed orders for the erection of a special citadel of citadels, Jahān Panāh, and of palaces and gardens; and placed the work in the charge of Muḥāfīz Khān. In the year 892 A.H., he bestowed the country

---

1 Both Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 310) say that Rāy Batai and Dungarsi were both invited to accept Islām; and both refused.

2 According to Firishtah he was in chains during the whole of the five months; and was every day threatened with death.

3 The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says, that the minister Sūrī was executed at the same time; but this does not appear to be mentioned in the Taḥaqāt or in Firishtah; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 211) says that the Sultān ordered the execution of the Rāy, and of his minister; but whether this refers to Dungarsi or to Sūrī is not clear.
of Sūrath and the forts of Jūnāgarh and Karnāl on Shāhzāda 1 Khalīl Khān.

In the year 892 A.H. (the Christian year is given as 1486 A.D.), some merchants coming from Dehī arrived in 2 Muhammadābād and complained that they were bringing 3 four hundred and three horses.

---

1 Fīrisṭah calls him the Sultān’s پسر کچھ or younger son, but he is not mentioned by Col. Briggs. In the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī he is mentioned on page 216; and it is said in a note that he afterwards became Muzaffar II. It appears from the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī, page 239, that he was the Sultān’s fourth son by Rānī Harbā, daughter of the Tāh Rānah, a Rājpūt zamīndar on the bank of Mahindrī. The Rānī died the fourth or fifth day after the prince’s birth. It is said that immediately after his birth the prince was taken by the Sultān to Hāns Bāī (the swan-like lady, as Bayley takes the trouble to explain that her name signifies), the widow of Sultān Muḥamad, and Sultān Mahmūd’s step-mother. She educated the prince with more than a mother’s care; and Sultān Muḥamad (sic) used to say, whenever he saw him, “The line of my kingly ancestors will be carried on by this boy and his descendants”.

It is curious that at least three of Sultān Mahmūd’s four sons were born of Hindū mothers, viz. (1) Muḥammad Kālā, whose mother was Rānī Rūp Manjārī, who had previously been married to Sultān Kutb-ud-dīn, and after his death came to Sultān Mahmūd. The prince and his mother both predeceased the Sultān; (2) Abā Khān, whose mother was Rānī Pirāt. He was poisoned by his father’s order because he had gone to some one’s house who found him there and thrashed him; (3) Ahmad Khān, who was nick-named Khudāwānd Khān’s Ahmad Shāh, as Khudāwānd Khān had conspired to place him on the throne, as had already been mentioned. His mother’s name is not mentioned. The fourth son was Khalīl Khān.

2 There is some difference as to the place where the merchants complained to the Sultān. Both the Tabaqāt and Fīrisṭah say that they came to Muḥammadābād, and made their complaint there. In the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 216, it is said, “he then went to Ahmadābād. A party of merchants came to him complaining”, etc. from which one would infer that the complaint was made at Ahmadābād. The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says, that the complaint was made when he was “hunting at Hālīl near Chāmpānēr”.

3 He is called رازی قلمعہ آبڑ, in the lith. ed. of Fīrisṭah, and the number of horses is said to be four hundred there. Col. Briggs says that the name and the country of the chief is omitted in the original, and he does not give the number of the horses. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī says that the merchants complained that “they were bringing four hundred Persian and Turkī horses from ‘Irāk and Khurāsān, and some rolls of Hindustānī fabrics”. But on reaching the foot of mount Abū, the Rājah of Sirōhī had seized them all (Bayley, pp. 216, 217).
The Rāja of the hill of Ābū had taken them all by force and had looted the whole caravan. (The Sultān) on hearing their words immediately ordered that the price of the horses might be paid to the merchants from the treasury, and having conferred robes of honour on them, commenced to muster his troops and after some days advanced to devastate that country. He sent a farmān addressed to the Rāja of Ābū, by the hands of the merchants, in advance of himself. The purport of the farmān was this that as the merchants were bringing the horses and other merchandise for the Sultān, and he (the Rāja) had taken them with violence, he should at once give back to the merchants exactly what he had taken from them; otherwise he should be prepared to meet the anger and wrath of the Sultān. When the merchants took the farmān the Rāja of Ābū, in great alarm, made over to them three hundred and seventy horses, which he had in their original condition, and gave them the price of thirty-three horses, which had become disabled; and also sent a heavy tribute (to the Sultān) by their hand. The merchants came and waited on the Sultān, informed him of the true state of things, and also placed the tribute of the Rāja before him, upon which he turned back and came to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr.

In the year 2896 A.H. (1491 A.D.) news came that Bahādur Gīlānī, servant (کاشندہ) of Khwājah Maḥmūd Gīlānī, had turned his head from the obedience due to his master Sultān Maḥmūd 3 Lashkari.

Cambridge History of India (p. 310) makes the number of horses four hundred and three and the name of the chief who had seized them, the Raja of Ābū.

1 Firishtah says that the Raja sent an ambassador with the merchants; and placed himself in the band of the Sultān’s servants. The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says that the Sultān “permitted the merchants to retain the horses, as well as their price”. I have not seen this anywhere else; and it does not appear reasonable, that the merchants who had come from great distance to sell the horses, should have them returned to them.


3 The MSS. have مخصوص but the ed. has لکوری. Sultān Muḥammad Lashkari had, however, died some time before this; and his son Sultān Maḥmūd was the nominal ruler, though much of the power was in the hands of Qāsim Bard. It appears from other histories that Sultān Maḥmūd was in command of the troops that were sent against Bahādur Gīlānī. I have therefore substituted Sultān Maḥmūd for Sultān Muḥammad Lashkari.
the ruler of the Deccan; and having taken unlawful and forcible possession of the part of Dābul, was causing harassment to ships passing over the sea; and the passage of coming to and going from Gujrāt had become closed and he had also forcibly carried away the Sultan's own ships. Immediately, on hearing this news, the Sultan mustered his troops and sent an army under Malik Qawām-ul-mulk by land route, and he also despatched many ships. When this news reached Sultan Mahmūd Bahmani, he summoned the amirs and said, "On several occasions help has come to us from his ancestors; and the greatness and grandeur of Sultan Mahmūd is known to all; and the consideration of the rights of this great dynasty is obligatory and incumbent on our spirit and energy. It is, therefore, right and proper that we should turn our attention to his (Bahādur Gīlānī's) destruction". The amirs and vazirs applauded the opinion and acknowledged the truth of the statement and began to collect troops. (At the same time) a letter couched in terms of sincerity was sent to Sultan Mahmūd; and preparations were made for the punishment of Bahādur Gīlānī, and of teaching him a lesson. At the moment which the astrologers declared to be auspicious to Sultan Mahmūd, he marched from the city of Bidar to affect the destruction of Bahādur; and after fighting slew him. The particulars of this occurrence have been narrated in the section about the Deccan.

In the year 897 A.H., (1474 A.D.), Sultan Mahmūd marched towards the Mahrāsa; and on the day, spies reported to him that Alf Khān, son of Ulugh Khān, had fled as he had spent stipends (due to his retainers) for his own purposes, and was afraid that they might apply to the Sultan for redress, and indignities might be inflicted on him. ¹ The Sultan sent Sharif-i-Jahān to reassure him, and although

¹ Firishtah and Col. Briggs say that Alf Khān revolted in 904 A.H., 1498 A.D.; and their account is briefer than, and somewhat different from that in the Tabaqāt. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandarl, Hayley, page 220, the Sultan is said to have marched to Morāsah on account of Alaf Khān's rebellion. In a note Bayley gives the version in the Tabaqāt. The account given in the Cambridge History of India, page 311, differs from the others. The year of the revolt is said there to be 1492; and the name of the rebel is Bahā-ud-din Ulugh Khān, son of Ulugh Khān Suhrāb. He is said to have fled because the people rose against him, on account of his oppressing them, and of appropriating the pay of the troops.
the emissary preached sermons and advices to him, they had no effect whatever.

He sent some elephants, which he had with him in charge of Sharf-i-Jahān, and entered the country of Mandū; but as his father had acted towards Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, Sultān Qhiyāt-ud-dīn gave him no place in his dominions and showed no favour to him at all. Alī Khān in distress and at a loss what to do came towards Sultānpūr. Sultān Maḥmūd sent 1 Qādī Pir Ištāq to reinforce 2 Malik Shaikhā. When Qādī Pir Ištāq arrived in the vicinity of 3 Sultānpūr, Alī Khān fought with him, and son of the Qādī Malik-ul-Mashāikh and some other men were slain in the skirmish in the end. After much wandering Alī Khān sent a petition to the Sultān, containing an account of his great suffering and distress and praying for the pardon of his offences. 4 As he was a khānahzād (one brought up in the family, a hereditary servant) of the Sultān the latter drew the pen of forgiveness over his offences. He came and waited on the Sultān in the year 901 A.H., had the honour of rendering homage; and had favours and kindness bestowed on him. But as the star of his fortune was on the decline, after three months he murdered his wāhib-i-ʻurād (officer in-charge of petitions) without any cause, and was put into prison, and died in prison.

The name of his father according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari was ʻAlā-ud-dīn bin Subhrāb.

1 Firishtah’s account is entirely different. According to him Qādī Bīr was sent against the rebel and pursued him through hills and jungles, till he at last fled by way of Sultānpūr to Mālwa. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 72) says that, “Sheikh Burra Decanny the Kazy-ool-Koozat of Ahmedabad” was sent in pursuit of him. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari says that Alī Khan fled from place to place, and at last went to Sultān Ghiās-ud-dīn Khiljī. The account in the Cambridge History of India agrees generally with that in the text, but it does not say that Alī Khān fought with the force under the Qādī. On the other hand, it says that when the relieving force arrived, he fled into Baglāna.

2 This is apparently the Qādī mentioned by Firishtah.

3 He appears to have been the governor of Sultānpūr. He does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari. The Cambridge History of India, page 311, calls him ʻAziz-ul-Mulk Shaikhān.

4 The latter part of his history is narrated very briefly by Firishtah and the other historians.
As 1 'Ādil Khān Fārūqī, governor of Asīr, had not for a long time remitted the tribute which had been fixed and was walking in the path of pride and haughtiness, the Sūltān collected his troops and in the year 906 A.H. (1149 A.D.), advanced to punish him and teach him a lesson. When he arrived on the bank of the river Tāptī 'Ādil Khān sent a large tribute; and prayed to be excused. Sūltān generously accepted his excuses, returned to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr.

In the course of the same year, i.e., 906 A.H. (1499 or 1500 A.D.), news came that 2 Sūltān Nāṣir-ud-din 'Abd-ul-Qādir having acted with ingratitude had taken the kingdom from Sūltān Ghiyāth-ud-din, and assumed the title of Sūltān. Sūltān Mahmūd wanted to advance to Mālwa to punish him and teach him a lesson. At this time a subsidy came from Sūltān Nāṣir-ud-din, with a petition expressive of his humility and submission. He also stated in the petition that whatever he had done had been done with the consent of his lord, master and father, but as Shujā' Khān and Rāni Khurshid had ac-

1 Firishtah says that Qāḍī Bīr with some other amīrs first invaded Khāndesh in 905 A.H. 'Ādil Khān was unable to meet them, and asked 'Imād-uldīn, the ruler of Berār for help, but as he received none, he sent the tribute which was in arrears and asked for pardon. Firishtah adds that according to some historians, Sūltān Mahmūd himself advanced as far as the bank of the Tāptī, when 'Ādil Khān sent the tribute. Col. Briggs in a note in vol. IV, page 73, calls the demand of tribute by the King of Guzerat from Adil Khan, an unimaginably wanton exercise of power; but as Bayley has pointed out in a note on page 221, the Fārūkī rulers "were more or less in a kind of feudal duty to the Gujarāt kings". The Cambridge History of India (p. 313) describes 'Ādil Khān II, as one of the most energetic and most powerful rulers of Khāndesh, and he had scorned to pay tribute in his career of victory, yet a mere demonstration of force by Sūltān Mahmūd was enough to bring him to his senses.

2 This sentence requires explanation. Nāṣir-ud-din was the son of Sūltān Ghiyāth-ud-din of Mālwa. He was suspected of having poisoned his father. I have not been able to find any reference to this in Firishtah or in Col. Briggs, but Firishtah says in one place that he was accused of it, but he stoutly denied it. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 221) says that Nāṣir-ud-din poisoned his father and seized the kingdom. Bayley says in a note that there is no positive evidence of the poisoning. The Tārīkh-i-Alfi, though hostile in tone, merely says that there was a suspicion. The Cambridge History of India (p. 311) says Ghiyāsh-ud-din was deposed on November 20th, 1500, and died in February 1501, not without suspicion of poison.
quired influence over (the mind of) Sultān Ghiyāth-ūd-dīn, they exerted themselves in concealing the facts. The Sultān having taken pity on his humility and distress, gave up the intention of marching there.

1 In the same year, as the Firangīs (apparently the Portuguese) created disturbances in Musalmān ports, the Sultān proceeded to the port of Mahāim, and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of 2 Dūn, news was brought to him, that Āyāz one of his slaves had prepared some of the Sultān’s ships, and ten of the Turkish ships at the port of Dīp and had fought with the Firangīs of the port of 3 Chaul. In the action many Firangīs and four hundred Turks were slain. The Firangīs fled; and 4 one of their large ships, the cargo in which was valued at one krūr, having had its mast struck and broken off by a cannon ball was sunk. Sultān Maḥmūd after carrying out the rites of offering thanks to God, returned to Muḥammadābad Chāmpānir.

In the year 914 A.H. 5 ʿĀdil Khān, son of Ḥasan Khān, made a representation to Sultān Maḥmūd, through his mother, who was the

---

1 Firishtah’s account is somewhat different. He says that the Firangīs wanted to build forts on the coast. The Sultān of Rūm, who was their enemy had, on hearing this, sent many ships to carry on a war of religion, and to prevent their carrying out their objects. Some of these ships had arrived in the Gujrat ports. Sultān Maḥmūd also intending to carry on religious war there, started towards the ports of Dīs and Daman and Mahāim; and when he arrived at Daman he sent his special slave Āyāz Sultānī, who was the Amīr-ul-umrā and Satarāl from the port of Dīp. Col. Briggs’s account (vol. IV, p. 74) is similar but he says that the Turkish fleet was under “Amir Hoossein” whom the Portuguese called Meer Hashim. The account given in the Cambridge History of India, page 312, is long and comprehensive, but it is unnecessary to refer to it here in detail.

2 See note 1, page 246.

3 The name is written in Persian as جبريل, but is written in English as Chaul or Chaul.

4 This was their flag-ship, and probably had on board Don Laurence, the son of Vasco da Gama, who was killed.

5 He is called عادل خان in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and by Firishtah and Col. Briggs and also in the Muntakhab-al-labāb, vol. III. page 155; but is called ‘Ālam Khān in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and in the Cambridge History of India. He is called ʿĀdil Khān bin Ḥasan Khān, but whether he was the son of Ḥasan Khān, or he was the great grandson of Ḥasan Khān, as stated in the Cambridge History of India in respect of ‘Ālam Khān, is not
Sultān’s daughter, that ʿĀdil Khān, the son of Mubāarak Khān, the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr had died, seven years and some months ago, leaving no son; and he hoped that the Sultān would bestow the place of his ancestors on the faqir (i.e., himself). The Sultān accepted the request and prayer of his daughter, and collected an army in the month of Rajab of that year. In Sha’bān he marched towards Asir and Burhānpūr, and having passed Ramaḍān on the bank of the Narbada, in the village of Sīlī, he marched towards Nadarbār in Shawwāl. When he arrived at that place, he learnt that Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Mughūl, who was in possession of half the country of Asir and Burhānpūr, had, in concert with Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī, the ruler of Kawāl, placed Khānzuḍa ʿĀlam Khān, who was a clear. ʿĀdil Khān was probably the son of Qaṣar Khān Fārūqī. Ḥasan Khān was the younger son of Malik Rāja of Khāndēsh, who died in 1399. He was deprived of his share of the patrimony by his elder brother Nāṣir Khān in 1417; and took up his residence in Gujrat, where his descendents intermarried with the royal family.

1 It is written as سبلي in the MSS., and printed as سبلي in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It does not appear to be mentioned in any history.

2 Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Mughūl is called Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Hissam-ood-Deen of Kandeish by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 76). He is called Hisām-ud-dīn Mughal by Bayley (p. 223) and Malik Husain the Mughul in the Cambridge History of India (p. 314).

3 Firishtah says ملك حسام الدين مغول زادة عالم خانرا. It is not clear whether the word Mughal is part of the name Hisām-ud-dīn or whether, as is more likely Mughalzāda is a description of ʿĀlam Khān. In any case this does not explain the exact connection of ʿĀlam Khān to the family. According to a note by Bayley Khānzuḍa may signify that though he was not a prince; he might have belonged to a collateral branch of the family of Asir. It appears also from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page, 223, that Hisām-ud-dīn had previously written to ʿĀlam (ʿĀdil) Khān that if he would join him, he would raise him on the throne of his ancestors; but finding later that Sultān Mahmūd was also interested in him, retracted his promise; and with the help of Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī placed the other ʿĀlam Khān on the throne.

The Cambridge History of India, page 313, says that Sultān Mahmūd induced ʿĀdil Khān II, to nominate his youthful kinsman, as his heir, to the exclusion of his brother Dāūd; but is 1501 A.D., Mahmūd was not in a position to press his grandson’s claim; and Dāūd succeeded ʿĀdil Khān II without any opposition. Dāūd died in August, 1508 A.D. He was succeeded by his son.
descendant of the rulers of Asir and Burhānpur on the throne of that kingdom; and Malik Lādan Khalji, who was in possession of (the other) half of the country of Asir had taken up an attitude hostile to Malik Ḥisām-ud-din Maghūl, and had taken up a fortified position on the hill of Asir. Sultān Maḥmūd, on hearing of these happenings, advanced to 1 Thālnīr. Malik ‘Ālam Shah, the thānādār of Thālnīr, came and waited upon him, through the intervention of ‘Aziz-ul-mulk Sultānī, thānādār of Sultānpur; and evacuating his thāna, 2 surrendered it to the Sultān.

On hearing this news, Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī left four thousand horsemen with ‘Ālam Kān and Malik Ḥisām-ud-din and himself went to Kāwil. As Sultān Maḥmūd felt slightly indisposed in Thālnīr, he remained there for some time; and sent Aṣaf Kān, and Malik ‘Aziz-ul-mulk, with a well-equipped army to punish Malik Ḥisām-ud-din and ‘Ālam Kān. When these officers advanced towards Burhānpur, the troops left behind by Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī turned their faces to their own country, without (obtaining) the permission of Ḥisām-ud-din. Malik Lādan Khalji came forward to welcome Aṣaf Kān, and had an interview with him. Aṣaf Kān took him with himself to wait upon the Sultān. Malik Ḥisām-ud-din also, ashamed and repentant, came and joined the Sultān’s camp; and both were honoured with kindness and favour. After the ‘Īd-ud-ʿAllāh, at an auspicious moment, the Sultān conferred the tile of Aʿzam Humāyūn on ‘Ādil Kān, and bestowed on him four elephants and 3 thirty lakhs of tankas as a contribution towards his expenses; and entrusted to him the reins of the government and defence of Asir and Burhānpur. He conferred the title of Kān Jahan on Malik Lādan, and gave him permission to go back with Aʿzam Humāyūn ‘Ādil Kān. As

Ghazni Kān, who was poisoned after a reign of ten days. Ahmad Nizām Shāh now invaded Khāndesh with the object of placing another scion of the Fārūqi house, also named ‘Ālam Kān, who had taken refuge in his court.

1 This incident does not appear to be mentioned anywhere else.

2 It is is thirty lakhs in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah, however, on page 204 of the lith. ed. (vol. II) has & three lakhs. Col. Briggs has not mentioned the various gifts. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 225, has thirteen lakhs. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the gifts.
Malik Lādan had been born in the village of 1 Banās, that mouḏah was granted to him as a reward. The Sultān also conferred the title of Ghaźi Khān on 2 Malik Muḥammad Bākhā, son of ʻImād-ul-mulk Asrī, and that of Qutb Khān on Malik ʻAlam Shāh thānadār of Thānī, that of Muḥāfīz Khān on Malik Ḥāfiz, and that of Saif Khān on his brother Malik Yūsuf, and sent them back in attendance on Aẓam Humāyūn. 3 He left Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Mujāhid-ul-mulk Gujrātī in the service of Aẓam Humāyūn, after giving them money to defray their expenses. On the 17th Dhi-ḥijjah, he marched from that station and proceeded towards Sultānpūr Nadarbār. At the first station (in the march), he conferred the title of Shahryār on Malik Ḥisām-ud-din Maghūl, and having bestowed the mouḏah of 4 Dhanūra, which is one of the dependencies of Sultānpūr, and two elephants, gave him permission to go back. He himself then by successive marches arrived at Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr on the 16th of the sacred month of Muḥarram in the year 916 A.H. (1510 A.D.).

'Ādil Khān, after his arrival at Burhānpūr, (found that) 5 Malik Ḥisām-ud-din Shahryār, Malik Bākhā and Ghaźi Khān had, on account

---

1 The name is बानस in the MSS., and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 76) makes it the district of Ahwas. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 225, has "The village of Banās in the paragana Sultānpūr". In the text-edition نباس is apparently a typographical error.

2 The name is as I have it in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah lith. ed. has وملک تالا Malik Nālḥā, son of ʻImād-ul-mulk Khān-dēshī; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 225, has Muhammad Mākḥā.

3 The sentence from در خدمت اعظم همبورن گراشت to وملک حسам الدين, is not to be found in one MS., but is in the other and in the lith. ed.

4 The name is رهترو in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is Dhanūrah also in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 225; but Col. Briggs has (vol. IV, p. 76) "the town of Dhoor".

5 There are variations in the readings. The MSS. have the reading which I have adopted. The reading in the lith. ed. is different. The other histories do not give the details of the way in which Ḥisām-ud-din was murdered. Firishtah merely says سلطان اعظم همبورن ملك حسام الدين شهير را كشته اموران او را قتل مام نود. And the Cambridge History of India, page 314, says "one of his (ʻAdil Khān III's) first acts was to cause Malik Husain, who was again plotting with the king of Ahmadnagar, to be assassinated".
of an ill-feeling which they had with Malik Lādan Khaljī Khān Jahān, left Burhānpūr; and had taken up their residence in Thālnīr. After some days, news was brought to Aẓam Humāyūn, that Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Shahryār had combined with Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahrī, and wanted to raise the dust of disturbance. Having become cognisant of this treachery on his part, Aẓam Humāyūn sent a message to summon him. Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn knowing the state of things came towards Burhānpūr with four thousand horsemen. When he arrived in the vicinity of the city, Aẓam Humāyūn went forward to receive him with 1 three thousand Gujrātī horsemen, took him to his palace, and after conferring on him a robe of honour, gave him permission to go back to his camp. On the following day he arranged with the men in his confidence, that when Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn would come to the hall of audience, he should be taken by the hand to the private chamber; and when he would be bidding farewell, Daryā Shāh Gujrātī, who would be carrying the sword of Aẓam Humāyūn Ādīl Khān, should deal him a fatal wound. After he is murdered, his men should also be murdered at the various places (where they happen to be). According to this agreement, a man was sent to summon Ḥisām-ud-dīn. The latter, in his great pride and conceit, came with all his followers. After they had met, (Aẓam Humāyūn) in the way of consulting him took him by the hand into the private chamber. They had a short conversation, after which Aẓam Humāyūn handed him pān (betel), and bade him farewell. At this time Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn straightened himself up, and 2 Daryā Khān struck him on the head with the sword with such force, that it was cloven in two.

When Malik Burhān ‘Atā’-ul-lah, who was the vāzīr of Aẓam Humāyūn, became aware of what had happened, he ordered a number of Gujrātīs, who were with him, to smite the wretches. When those men drew their swords from the scabbards, Malik Muḥammad Bākhā

---

1 The number is سیصد thirty hundred or three thousand in both MSS.: سیصد هزار it is سیصد three hundred thousand, which is of course incorrect. In the lith. ed., Firishtah has مائی صد three hundred, which is more probable; and in the Persian text of Muntakhab-al-labāb, vol. III, page 443, has دو صد two hundred three hundred.

2 The same man is called Daryā Shāh a few lines earlier.
and the other sardārs, who had accompanied Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn turned their faces in flight. Four hundred Ḥabshīs, who were present at the darbār, cut them all down, and Malik Muḥammad Bākhā and the other leaders were thrown wallowing in the dust and blood. The half of the country, which was in his possession, came without further dispute into Aʿẓam Humāyūn’s possession. When the account of these events in great detail and clearness reached Sultān Maḥmūd in the month of Rabī‘-ul-āwwal of the afore-mentioned year, 1 he declared that whoever did not regard the rights of the salt, fell in the end into the place of destruction.

2In the year 916 a.h., 1510 A.D., a petition from Aʿẓam Humāyūn reached (Sultān Maḥmūd), to the effect, that he had, on one occasion, gone to the fort of Asīr; and that he had found Shēr Kūhan and Saif Kūhan who were in charge of it, full of mischief and hostility; and now that Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn had been slain, these two wretches had combined together in their enmity and malice; and they had written a letter to Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī, and had summoned Kūhanzāda ‘Alam Kūhan. This slave (i.e., he himself) in concert with Malik Lādan Kūhan Jahān and Mujāhid-ul-mulk and other amīrs had advanced to the fort, and is besieging it. Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī has brought ‘Alam Kūhan with him, and has come with his army, and is stationed near the border. It is true, if he should enter this slave’s territory, he would have to raise the siege, and would have to go and fight with him. The Sultān bestowed five lakhs of tankas

---

1 This is also mentioned by Firishtah.
2 This also is mentioned by Firishtah; but he says that Nizām-ul-mulk had come to his border bringing with him ‘Alam Kūhan, and with the Rāja of Kālna. It may be mentioned also that he says that the five lakhs of tankas were سفید or silver tankas. Col. Briggs after mentioning Mahmood Shah’s return to Sooltanpoor says (vol. IV, p. 76) “Notwithstanding these arrangements, internal commotions occurred at Ascer during the following year, which were uneasily adjusted through the agency of Mahmood Shah, who sent his own man to carry into effect his orders, and to confirm the authority of Adil Khan” this is scarcely correct. The adjustment was anything but amicable, so far as Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn and Malik Muḥammad Bākhā, etc., who accompanied Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn, were concerned; and not even so far as Shēr Kūhan and Kūhanzāda ‘Alam Kūhan were concerned. It does not also appear that any son of Sultān Maḥmūd was sent to Khāndēsh to settle matters there.
as a contribution to his expenses, and sent Dilāwar Khān, Saifdar Khān and other amirs to help and reinforce him. He also wrote in reply, “let my (grand)son’s mind remain assured, that whenever there should be any necessity, I shall myself go to his aid. How can Niẓām-ul-mulk Baḥri, who is a slave of one of the Sultāns of the Deccan, have such power that he should cause any damage to the territory of my (grand)son”. The amirs mentioned above had not yet marched from outside the city, when 1 Shāhzāda Muṣaffar Khān, an account of whom will before long be narrated, came from the town of Barōda, and having obtained the honour of kissing his father’s feet prayed for and obtained a further sum of seven lakhs of tankas towards A’ẓam Humāyūn’s expenses.

After some days, an emissary of Niẓām-ul-mulk Baḥri came and waited on the Sultān and presented a petition (of his master) to the following effect. “As ʿĀlam Khānzāda came as a suppliant to me; I hope that he (the Sultān) will be pleased to bestow a part of the

---

1 It appears from the Cambridge History of India, page 314, that A’ẓam Humāyūn or ʿĀdil Khān 111 cemented his alliance with Gujrat by marrying a daughter of Sultān Muṣaffar. I have not seen this mentioned anywhere else, except in the Muntakhab-al-labāb, vol. III, page 445; but it is stated there that Sultān Maḥmūd gave a daughter of Sultān Muṣaffar in marriage to him at the same time that he conferred the title of A’ẓam Humāyūn on him, and confirmed him in the government of Khāndēsh. So that it was more the act of Sultān Maḥmūd than of A’ẓam Humāyūn. Besides it was scarcely necessary for A’ẓam Humāyūn to cement his alliance with Gujrat by marriage. He was the grandson (daughter’s son) of Sultān Maḥmūd; and was being treated with great affection and kindness by the Sultān himself, and by his son Shāhzāda Muṣaffar, (who is somewhat loosely and incorrectly called Sultān Muṣaffar, while his father was still alive, both in the Cambridge History of India and in the Muntakhab-al-labāb). It appears from FIRISHTAH that the Shāhzāda prayed for the additional grant, not for his son-in-law, but for his nephew (khwāḥi-zāda), so that the earlier relation had greater force and validity with Sultān Maḥmūd and Shāhzāda Muṣaffar than the later one. The Muntakhab-al-labāb, vol. III, page 444, has a somewhat different account. It says Sultān Maḥmūd, immediately on becoming acquainted with the purport of the letter, sent twelve lakhs of Maḥmūdis, which amount to six lakhs of rupees current at that time, and various articles, such as vessels of gold and silver, etc. The twelve lakhs may include the five lakhs originally given, and the seven lakhs given at the request of Shāhzāda Muṣaffar. He also made an assignment of eight lakhs of tankas out of the revenues (maḥsūl) of pargana Sultānpūr.
country of Asir and Burhanpur on him." The Sultan sent for the emissary, and told him, "Since he (i.e., Nizam-ul-mulk) places his foot further than his blanket, he will soon receive his merited punishment". In short, when the amirs mentioned above (Dilawar Khan, etc.) arrived at the town of Nadarbahr, Sher Khan and Saif Khan, being now aware of the disastrous end of their affairs, carried their application to Malik Mujahid-ul-mulk, and prayed for protection. Azam Humayun, finding this to be an unhoped for boon, gave them promise and engagement. Sher Khan and Saif Khan, relying on his promise, came out of the fort, and went away to the territory of Kaware. After the arrival of Dilawar Khan and the other amirs, Adil Khan determined on raiding the country of Kylna. After he had harried a few of the villages and hamlets, the Raj of Kylna sent tribute, and prayed for forgiveness of his offences. Adil Khan then gave the Gujrath amirs leave to go back to their country, and returned to Burhanpur.

It was in this year that Sultan Sikandar Lodi, the Badsheh of Dehlı, sent, as a matter of special friendship, some nice things as presents to the Sultan. Before this no Badsheh of Dehlı had sent any presents to any Badsheh of Gujrath. It was also in Dhil-hijjah of the year 916 A.H. (1510 A.D.) that Sultan Mahmud travelled towards Nahrwala, and made the learned and pious men and the faqirs, living there, happy by granting largesses and favours to them. He told (them), that the object of his coming there was this, that he should bid adieu to the sainted ones there; perhaps the angel of death would not give him further respite. The learned and great men all offered prayers for him, each in his particular way. He then

---

1. The word ً is omitted from the MSS. According to Firishtah, the Sultan’s words to the emissary were a good deal sterner and more emphatic.

2. ‘Adil Khan, whom Nizam-ud-din has been calling Azam Humayun, is here again called by his proper name.

3. A sentence, which occurs in the lith. ed. at this place, but is omitted from both MSS. is retained between the lines.

4. One MS. inserts a sentence which appears to be illegible and unintelligible.
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mounted and proceeded to circumambulate the tombs of the Shaikhs of Pattan, may the mercy of God be on them all! On the 4th day, he started on the journey to Aḥmadābād; and having circumambulated the holy tomb of 1 Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified! turned towards Muḥammadābād. As at this time he felt very ill and weak, he summoned Shāhzāda Muẓaffār Khān from the town of Barōda, and gave him pleasant advice. After four days, when he saw some signs of improvements in his health, he granted leave to the Shāhzāda to return to Barōda. But after a few days the illness increased and he became extremely infirm and weak.

At this time, one day, Farḥat-ul-mulk reported to him, that Shāh Ismāʿīl, the Bādshāh of Irān, had sent Yādgār Bēg Qāzībāsh, with a body of other Qazībāshes with elegant presents, in the way of an embassy. He said 2 "May the great God not show me the face of a Qazībāsh, who is (a follower of) the enemies of the companions of the Prophet of God, may the benediction of God and salutation be on him! and of the perpetrators of oppression; and as a matter of

---

1 This was at Sarkhāj. Firisṭah also says that it was the tomb of Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, that he visited here; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 77) makes it the tomb of "Sheikh Ahmud Geesoo-Duraz".

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 315, says that "Yādgār Bēg Qāzībāsh was commissioned to invite Mahmūd to embrace the Shiā faith". This may be correct, but I have not seen it stated in any work of a Muḥammadan historian. Elphinstone on page 765 of his History of India (edition 1889) says "the reign of Moẓaffār opened with a splendid embassy from Shāh Ismāʿīl king of Persia". This is not strictly correct; the embassy had been sent to Sultān Mahmūd, but it only arrived after his death, and the accession of Sultān Muẓaffār. Elphinstone concludes the paragraph by saying that the embassy "was probably designed to conciliate their favour to the Shiā religion". If this is the foundation of the statement in the Cambridge History of India, it scarcely justifies the positive assertion that is made there. It also adds somewhat picturesquely that Mahmūd sent a message to "the heretics bidding them begone". This is also not mentioned anywhere as far as I have seen. On the other hand, it is said both in the Taḥqāqat and by Firisṭah that he expressed a pious wish, that God might not show him the face of a Qazībāsh; and this actually happened for he died before Yādgār Bēg could reach Muḥammadābād. It would, in fact, appear that he could not be approaching Muḥammadābād, if the Sultān had bade him begone.

3 Firisṭah says more precisely or the three companions, namely Abū Bakr and ʿUmr and ʿUthmān.
fact it happened so. He then ordered that Şahhzāda Mużaffar Khān should be quickly summoned; and Yādgār Beg Qazibāsh had not yet arrived, when at the time of evening prayer, on Monday the 2nd of Ramāḍān in the year 971 A.H. (23rd November, 1511 A.D.) he bound up the goods of existence (i.e., died).

He lived for 1 69 years and 11 days; and he reigned for 55 years and one month and 2 days. He is described in farmāns (manāshir) as Khudāīgān Ḥalīm (the patient or calm Lord). He is also called Maḥmūd 2 Bēgarah; and Bēgarah means a cow whose horns turn upwards and then curl round. His moustaches were of this shape, and on this account he has been named 3 Bēgarah. He was a Ḍādshāh, calm or patient, merciful, brave, liberal and God-fearing.

---

1 Firishtah makes it sixty-nine years and eleven months.
2 The word is written as Bēgra or Bē Gurra by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 77), Begurra by the translator of Rās Mālā, Begara by Elphinstone, Bēgarah by Bayley, and Begarha in the Cambridge History of India; but it is written in the MSS. of the Tabaqāt and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and in the Persian ed. of the Muntakhab-al-labāb. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted بیگار in the text-edition. So that it was always written with a G in English and with a K in Persian. I do not know sufficient Gujrātī to say which is correct.
3 Firishtah gives another etymology of the word, on the authority of Shāh Jamāl-ud-dīn Anjū, who says that as he captured two renowned forts, he was called بیگار; and Firishtah adds that this is nearer the correct etymology. Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 379, says be means two, and gurh means a fort. If this etymology be correct then the correct Persian spelling would be بیگار, and the correct English spelling would be Bēgarah. The meaning of the two curled cows' horns may, if I may venture a guess, be correct if the word is changed to بیگار, Bēgirah (be meaning two and girah meaning a knot or curl).
4 The Cambridge History of India, page 315, says that he had made himself immune from the effects of poisons by gradually absorbing poisons into his system; and quotes Hudibras, Part II, Canto I, where it is said that

The prince of Cambay's daily food
Is asp and basilisk and toad.

He goes on to say that "his voracious appetite demanded large supplies of more wholesome food. His daily allowance was between twenty and thirty pounds' weight, and before going to sleep he placed two pounds or more of boiled rice on either side of his couch, so that he might find something to eat on whichever side he awoke". I was at first inclined to think that the author of the
An account of Sulṭān Muẓaffar Shāh, son of Maḥmūd Shāh.

As on Monday, the 2nd of Ramaḍān in the year 917 a.h., Maḥmūd Shāh son of Muḥammad Shāh passed away from the narrowness of bodily existence to the wide spaces of the spiritual world, Shāhzāda Muẓaffar Khān arrived after two hours (ṣā‘at) of the night of Tuesday the 3rd of Ramaḍān (had passed); and by the exertions of the amirs and the men learned in divine knowledge, sat on the throne of sovereignty. The people performed the ceremony of the offering of service and of wave offerings. On the same night, he sent the body of his father to the tomb,—which is the resting place of light, of the chief of Shaikhs, Shaikh Aḥmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified! He made over two lakhs of tankas to ‘Azīz-ul-mulk so that he might distribute it, among deserving people in the town of Sarkēj. He bestowed robes of honour on the amirs, and the great men of the kingdom; and honoured some of them with suitable titles. On the same day, khutba was read in his name on the pulpits of Islām. Among his khāṣa khail (men of his own household), he conferred the title of

Cambridge History of India had either made a mistake or had exaggerated what he had found in some Persian history; but I find that he has if anything greatly diminished the quantity of Sulṭān Maḥmūd’s food. According to the author of “The coins of the Gujrat Saltanat” published in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. XXI, page 290, his daily allowance was one Gujratī man in weight, i.e., forty-one pounds. His little breakfast consisted of 150 plantains, a cup of honey and another of butter; but it is not stated whether this was included in the one Gujratī man, or was in addition to it. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 162, also gives him a similar quantity.

I find that the fact of his having made himself immune from the effect of poisons is based on the account of two European travellers, Bartema, as Elphinstonecalls him (or more correctly Di Verthema) and Barbosa, mentioned by Elphinstonestone on page 764 of his History of India, 7th edition. I should be inclined to doubt the statement about the quantity of food. It is curious that the European travellers say nothing about it, and the Indian historians are equally silent about his being able to absorb abnormal quantities of poisons. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Danes, the editor of the book of Barbosa for the Hakluyt Society, page 122, that probably out of the stories about the enormous quantities of food eaten by him, arose the stories about the abnormal things he ate.

1 The lith. ed. has مالطفر شاه before Sulṭān; but both MSS. omit it.

2 in the text-edition.
'Imād-ul-mulk on Malik Khush-Qadam, and of Khudāwand Khān on Malik Rashid-ul-mulk and placed the reins of the vazārat in the latter's powerful hands.

In the month of Shawwāl of the afore-mentioned year, Yādgār Bēg Qazlāsh, the ambassador of Shāh Ismā'īl arrived from 'Irāq to the neighbourhood of Muḥammadābād. The Sultān sent all the amirs and vazirs to welcome him, and 1 met him on his arrival with pleasure and gratitude. Yādgār Bēg placed the beautiful presents which he had brought for Maḥmūd Shāh, at the service of Muẓaffar Shāh. The latter conferred kingly robes on Yādgār Bēg and all the Qazlbāshes and selected a special mansion for their residence.

After some days he went from Muḥammadābād to the town of Barōda, and he gave the name of Daulatābād to that town. At this time news came that 2 Sāhib Khān son of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn Khaljī, who had revolted with the help of Khwājah Jahān the eunuch of Sultān Maḥmūd, and had seized Mandū and assumed the title of Sultān Muḥammad, and had made most of the nobles take his side, as the pen has attempted to narrate these events in the section about Mālwa, now fled from Mandū, and came praying for help. Sultān Muẓaffar sent Muḥāfiz Khān to receive and welcome Sāhib Khān, so that he

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have تلقت but the other MS. has تلقت. It appears that the embassy from the Shāh of Persia in respect of which Sultān Maḥmūd had expressed a pious wish that he might not have to show his face to them, and whom in the forcible language of the Cambridge History of India he ordered to be begone was received with much favour by Sultān Muẓaffar. Firūshthāh goes a little further than Nizām-ud-dīn. He says و در شرایط تعظیم و تکرم دقیقه فروگذاشت نشد, i.e., in the observation of respect and honour no minūția was omitted.

2 There is some slight difference in the readings here; both MSS. read خراجه سرا بر سلطان معدود but the lith. ed. has خراجه سرا بر سلطان معدود. I have adopted the former reading. The sentence requires some explanation. Sāhib Khān was the elder brother of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn, but the latter deposed him and became the Sultān, and took the title of Sultān Maḥmūd (11). Afterwards Sāhib Khān rebelled against him; and having seized Mandū assumed the title of Sultān Muḥammad, but on being defeated afterwards, came to Sultān Muẓaffar for help.

3 The correct title Sultān Muḥammad is given in one MS. but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Maḥmūd.
might carry out the rites of hospitality and try to please his heart. After an interview (Sultân Mużaffar) remained for some days at Baróda in order to entertain Šāhib Kháñ; and then went away to Muḥammad-ábd. He sent Qaisar Kháñ to the town of Dahúd, that he might report a correct and detailed account of Sultân Maḥmúd Khálij, and of the condition of the country of Málwa and of the behaviour of the amirs. As the rains (now) commenced, the people halted at the various places where they happened to be. Šāhib Kháñ sent a message one day to the effect that a long time ¹ had elapsed since the coming of the faqir, but he does not see that there has been any progress in his affairs. The Sultân replied, “If the great God so wills, I shall at the end of the rains, either amicably or by force recover half the kingdom of Málwa from the possession of Sultân Maḥmúd and shall make it over to you”. But as the star of the fortune of Šāhib Kháñ was on the decline, it so happened, that he became friendly with Yādgár Bēg Qazīlbash, who had become known to the people of Gujrát by the name of Surkh kulâh, i.e., red cap, owing to their living near each other. ² One day there was a quarrel between the servants (of the

1 One MS. has بندة instead of نقير in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah about Šāhib Kháñ’s complaint about Qaisar Kháñ having done nothing to carry out the work which he had been deputed to perform, the Cambridge History of India, page 316, says, that Qaisar Kháñ returned with a report favourable to Šāhib Kháñ’s claim. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 245, gives a somewhat different account of the work which Kaisar Kháñ was to do, but it says nothing about his return, or his submitting any report.

2 This incident is variously stated in the different histories. Firishtah’s account is similar to that in the text; but he adds that the Qazīlbāshes wounded some of Šāhib Kháñ’s men. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 80, 81) says that the Kuzīlbāshes wounded several persons wholly unconnected with the affair. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, pages 245, 246, begins with the altercation between the servants, but goes on to say that there was some trouble between Šāhib Kháñ, who is called Sháhrzâda Muḥammad, and the Persian envoy, who is called quite incorrectly Mirza Ibrāhīm. Šāhib Kháñ went in the evening to some old servant of his who lived in the same serai as the Persian envoy. Some strife monger told the latter that Šāhib Kháñ wanted to rob him; and he shut the door of the serai, and afterwards took Šāhib Kháñ to his own apartment. In the morning Šāhib Kháñ escaped, and spread a report, that an order had been issued to plunder the Kazīlbāshes. A great crowd collected and a fight took place. Many
two households); and it ended in a fight, and the house of Yādghār Bēg
was looted. A report spread among the Gujrat soldiers, that the
Turkmāns had seized Sāhib Khān. The latter being ashamed at
such a report, left without taking leave of Sultān Muṣaffār. The
details of this brief statement have been mentioned in the section
about Mālwa.

As, after the departure of Sāhib Khān, news came to Sultān
Muṣaffār about the power and violence of the 1 Rājpūts and of the
weakness of Sultān Mahmūd Khalji, his high spirit induced him to
undertake the punishment of the former. In order to carry out this
resolution, he went to Aḥmadābād, so that he might be sure of the safety
of the thānas of his own dominions; and he might advance into Mālwa,

of the Kāzīlbāshes were slain and the house was set on fire and plundered. After-
wards Sultān Muṣaffār paid six lakhs of tankahs to the envoy; and sent him back
to Iṛāq with many presents. The Sultān was annoyed with Sāhib Khān;
and he, having received invitations from some amīrs of repute in Mālwa, went
away without taking leave of the Sultān. The Cambridge History of India,
page 317, has an entirely different story. It says that before Sultān Muṣaffār
could redeem his promise to help him, Sāhib Khān left Gujarāt, owing to
"the gross misconduct of the Persian ambassador, who invited him to dinner
and assaulted him. The prince's servants attacked the ambassador's suite,
and plundered his lodging, but the affair was noised about, and Sāhib Khān
was so overcome with shame, that he fled from Gujarāt". I do not know what
the authority for this version is, but the fact that the Persian ambassador was
paid a large sum by Sultān Muṣaffār as compensation, and was sent off with
presents and all marks of honour; and Sāhib Khān was overcome with shame
and fled from Gujarāt show that the statement about the gross misconduct of
the Persian ambassador is very improbable.

1 They are called "Poorby Rajpoos" by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 81).
According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 247, they were an army of
Hindūs, collected at the instance of Sultān Mahmūd himself, who gave their leader
the title of Mēdīnī Rāo. According to a note by Bayley in the same page, he
"must have been a man of very remarkable, and in many respects, a very
doble and generous character". According to Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 381,
"Mednee Rāce, the Hindu minister of that prince, had, it was represented,
acquired such authority, that nothing but the name of king was left to the
sultan, and infidelity was, therefore, rapidly regaining its dominion". The
Cambridge History of India, page 317, does not mention Mēdīnī Rāy, but
says that "Nāsir-ud-dīn of Mālwa had employed in his army a large number
of Rājpūts from eastern Hindustan, who had become so powerful in the
kingdom, that Mahmūd II, was a puppet in their hands".
after asking for the help of the great ones there, both dead and living. He remained in Ahmadâbâd for a week; and then proceeded to Kôdhrah (Gôdhrâh). He halted there for some days to collect his troops. In the course of these days news was brought to him, that Malik ‘Ain-ul-mulk, the governor of Pattan, was coming with his retainers to wait on him, i.e., the Sultân; but on the way, he received information that the Râja of Ídar, taking advantage of such an opportunity, had raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion in that locality; and had raided the country as far as the borders of the Sâbarmati. Malik ‘Ain-ul-mulk, therefore, on account of his loyalty and devotion wanted that he should come, and attend on the Sultân after punishing him. He had therefore gone, and attacked the town of Mahrâsa. But in the meantime, the Râja of Ídar, having collected a large force, came forward to meet him; and a great battle took place between the two armies. As Malik ‘Abd-ul-mulk with two hundred men attained to martyrdom, and an elephant which he had with him was cut to pieces, ‘Ain-ul-mulk being unable to stand firm fled.

On hearing this news Sultân Mu’azzafar advanced towards Ídar; and when he arrived at the town of Mahrâsa, he sent an army to plunder and devastate the country. The Râja evacuated the fort, and concealed himself in the hills of Bijânar. When the Sultân arrived at Ídar, there were only ten Râjpûts, who stood there deliberately, with the intention of immolating themselves and were barbarously and cruelly slain. They left no vestige of any building

---

1 His name according to Firishtah was Bhîm Rây. He also describes ‘Abu-ul-mulk as a sardâr, and Col. Briggs calls him an officer of distinction. According to the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 249, Abd-ul-Mulk was the brother of ‘Ain-ul-Mulk. Bayley says, in a note on page 249, that according, to the Tabakât, ‘Ain-ul-Mulk lost forty men. This is not correct according to the MSS. or the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât or the lith. ed. of Firishtah or Col. Briggs, according to all of whom 200 men were slain. The Cambridge History of India, page 317, agrees with the text.

2 So called in both MSS. and in lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 81) has “Beesulnuggur”. The Mirât-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India and Râs Mâlâ all say went to the hills or hill country.

3 The words are بذILT رخوBEKZ KANNE شداد I am not quite sure that my translation is quite correct. It sounds rather offensive.
or temple or garden or trees. The Rāja came forward with great humility; and sending 1 Malik Köbi Zunnārdār (Brahman), to wait on the Sultān; and prayed for pardon. He sent a message to the effect that Malik ‘Ain-ul-mulk, owing to the great enmity which he had against this slave, had come and plundered his country; and owing to his distress this helpless one had committed certain acts. If he has committed any offence, he was deserving of the anger and wrath of the Sultān. He was sending 2 twenty lakhs of tankas and a hundred horses by the hand of the vakils. As the conquest of Mālwa was in the forefront of the Sultān’s spirit, he accepted the Rāja’s excuses, and returned to Kōdhrah. He bestowed the twenty lakhs of tankas and the hundred horses on ‘Ain-ul-mulk, so that he might equip his men.

He sent Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān from Kōdhrah to act as the governor of Muḥammadābād. When he arrived in the town of Dahūd he ordered Qaisar Khān, that he should take possession of the country as far as the village of 3 Dēvla, which was in the possession of Sultān

---

1 The name is Köpā in both MSS. and Malik Köpl in the lith. ed. It is Malik Gōpāl in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Mudun Gopal in Col. Briggs’s (vol. IV, p. 82). The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 249, has Malik Koblak Brahman and a minister of the Sultān in the text, and this is corroborated by Bayley who says in a note, that he was really a minister of Muzafrar Khān and “he will be found often mentioned in the sequel”. He is not mentioned at all in the Cambridge History of India. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ملک کورنا in the text edition.

2 It is twenty lakhs and eight lakhs of tankas respectively in the two MSS., and eight lakhs of rupees in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has twenty lakhs of tankas which is equivalent to two thousand tumāns. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī does not give the amount; but Bayley says in a note that the Tārikh-i-Alfit says that it was twenty lakhs of tankas (equivalent to two thousand tumāns). Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 82) has “two hundred thousand tankas”; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 317) has eight hundred thousand rupees.

3 The place is دیولا in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the lith. ed. of the Tābaqāt it is دیولا. Col. Briggs has “the town of Dydla”. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 250, has “the pass of Dōloah which is very difficult”. The Cambridge History of India, page 317, has Dōlo near the Māhl and in a note in 22° 57’ North and 74° 58’ East. The Cambridge History of India goes on to say that the Sultān had now changed his intention of aiding Mahmūd by crushing the Rājputs, and had formed
Maḥmūd Khalji's men. After that he advanced towards Dārsāgarh. On the way the son of Harkhūkhā, who was a resident of Dār, came and waited on the Sultan; and begged for quarter for the people of the city. The Sultan gave him assurances of safety; and sent Qawām-ul-mulk (son of Qawām-ul-mulk) and Iḵtiyār-ul-mulk, son of Imād-ul-mulk, in advance of himself, to reassure and encourage the citizens of Dār. At this time intelligence came that Sultan Maḥmūd Khalji had been left alone; and the amīrs of Chandērī had risen against him; and he had gone towards that place. Sultan Muẓaffār summoned back his amīrs, and told them, “My object in undertaking this expedition was really that I should drive away the Pūrabī Čāfīr; and divide the kingdom equally between Sultan Maḥmūd and Šāhib Khān, the sons of Sultan Nasir-ud-dīn. Now that Sultan Maḥmūd has gone to put down the amīrs of Chandērī, and has taken away the tyrannical Rājpūts with him, it would be removed from the rules of humanity, and the customs of brave men, to enter his country”.

Qawām-ul-mulk, who had now joined the Sultan, reported to the latter something of the beauties of the deer-park of Dār; and made him desirous and anxious to see the place, and to enjoy the pleasures of the chase. Sultan Muẓaffār left Qawām-ul-mulk, to guard the

the design of conquering and annexing Mālwa. I have nowhere found any evidence of such a change of mind. All his acts culminating in the restoration of Mandū to Sultan Maḥmūd, after it had been recovered from the Rājpūts in 924 A.H. (1518 A.D.), show that there was no such change. It is true that Sultan Maḥmūd Khalji had great fear about Sultan Muẓaffār's intentions, but Mandū was restored to him; and Sultan Muẓaffār returned to Gujrāt.

1 Firishtah says, and does not name anyone as the spokesman of the people of Dār. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 250, says the son of the head man of Dār came.

2 The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are the meaning of which is not clear. There are no similar words in Firishtah, who says that Sultan Maḥmūd Khalji had gone to crush the amīrs of Chandērī, who had risen against him. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 250, also says that Sultan Maḥmūd Khalji and Mēdīnī Rāō had gone towards Chandērī.

3 The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 251, says "gave such a glowing description of the buildings of the deer-park, which had been formed there under the orders of Sultan Ghūlās-ud-dīn", etc.
camp; and with 1 two thousand horsemen and one hundred and fifty elephants proceeded to Dhar. When he arrived there, he mounted the same afternoon, to go on a pilgrimage to the tombs of Shaikh 'Abd-ul-lah Jangal and Shaikh Kamal-ud-din Malwi. It is said that in the time of Raja Bhuj Shaikh 'Abd-ul-lah had the name of Pandey Brij, and was his vazir; and because of inclination having accepted Islam, attained to spiritual greatness by pious exertions and exercises. In short the Sultan, 2 having in the neighbourhood of Dhar given leave to Nizam-ul-mulk so that he might hunt in the neighbourhood of Dilawara. Nizam-ul-mulk passed through Dilawara, and went to Na'lcha; and when he was returning, a 3 body of Parabia Rajputs came on and obstructed him, and they obtained their deserts; as is mentioned in the section about Malwa. Sultan Muzaaffar on being apprised of this occurrence, was very angry with, and reproved Nizam-ul-mulk, for it was his only object, that this year he should simply see the country and return; and acts like these which had been committed by Nizam-ul-mulk 4 caused him much thought. The Sultan then turned back, and marched towards Gujrat, and took up his quarters at Muhammadabad Champanir.

In the month of Shawwal in the year 921 A.H. (1515 A.D.), as after the death of 5 Ray Bhim, Raja of Idar, Rana Sank had come to

---

1 It is two thousand in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firistah, and in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 82); but the Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 251, has "twelve thousand light horse".
2 According to the Mirat-i-Sikandari, the Sultan did not give Nizam-ul-Mulk permission to return, but he told him and some others to go and see the deer park. They did not return; and the Sultan was informed later on, that Nizam-ul-Mulk had probably gone to Na'lcha to see his brother, (who apparently was a Hind and named Raja Singh) who dwelt there. It appears from the Cambridge History of India, page 318, that Nizam-ul-Mulk was a son of Raja Patal (or Raja Batal of Champanir).
3 According to the Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 252, they "came from Mandu and pursued him. Nizam-ul-Mulk faced about, and fought. Forty of the infidels were killed, and the rest fled back to Mandu".
4 The actual words are بامع مشققل خاطر میگشت.
5 It appears that Ray Bhim was the younger son of Ray Bham, and he had dispossessed his elder brother. Ray Mal was the son of the latter, and having now grown to man's estate claimed the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 318, calls Rai Mal the brother-in-law of Rana Sankh. The
the aid of Rāy Mal, son of Sūraj Mal, who was his son-in-law, and had invaded the country and having taken it and the fort of Īdar, from the possession of Bihār Mal, son of Rāy Bhīm, had made it over to Rāy Mal, Sulṭān Muẓaffar appointed Niẓām-ul-mulk, that he should recover the country from Rāy Mal and make it over to Bihār Mal. He himself proceeded towards Ahmadnagar. On the way, when Bihār Mal joined Niẓām-ul-mulk, the latter brought him to have the honour of waiting upon the Sulṭān. From that station, the Sulṭān left Ḋawand Khān and Niẓām-ul-mulk to guard the camp; and went to Pattan. He conferred favours on the residents of the city in general and on the wise and learned men in special; and coming back joined the camp. He then sent Bihār Mal with Niẓām-ul-mulk and granted leave to the latter to go and recover possession of Īdar from Rāy Mal and make it over to Bihār Mal. After Niẓām-ul-mulk had made over possession of Īdar to Bihār Mal, Rāy Mal retired for protection to the hills of Bījānagar. Niẓām-ul-mulk pursued him, and fought with him; and many people were slain on both sides. When this news reached Sulṭān Muẓaffar he sent an order (to the effect) that, as the country of Īdar had been recovered, the act of going to Bījānagar, and fighting a battle there was the cause of a number of soldiers being slain without any necessity; and it was right that he (Niẓām-ul-mulk) should return that very day.

After the return of Niẓām-ul-mulk the Sulṭān came from Ahmadnagar to Aḥmadābād. He arranged a great entertainment, and cele-

---

1 It is Bījānagar in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs has the Beesulnuggar territory; and the Cambridge History of India, page 318, has the Bichhbera hills. The Mirāt-i-Sikandar does not mention the incidents; but Bayley quotes from the Tārikh-i-Alfi and the Tabakât; but the hills are not mentioned in the quotations. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 382) says "the hills". It mentions Beesulnugger later in connection with the Sulṭān’s order to Malik Noosrut-ul-Moolk to plunder and lay waste the country, which is described as the "receptacle of renegadoes and the asylum of rebels" (p. 383).
brated the marriages of 1 Shâhzâdas Sikandar Khân, Bahâdur Khân and Latâf Khân. He bestowed favours on the amîrs and the well-known men of the city, giving them horses and robes of honour. After the rains he advanced towards Ídar to see the country, and to hunt there. As Nizâm-ul-mulk was ill, he left physicians to attend to him; and in the early part of 923 A.H., he went to Muḥammadâbâd Châmpânîr. From that place he sent Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk to Ídar, and summoned Nizâm-ul-mulk to his presence. Before the arrival of Naṣrat-ul-mulk, Nizâm-ul-mulk left Zahîr-ul-mulk at Ídar with a hundred horsemen; and on wings of speed and 2 steps of eagerness came to Muḥammadâbâd. Naṣrat-ul-mulk was still in the neighbourhood, when Rây Mal, seizing the opportunity, advanced on Ídar. 3 Zahîr-ul-mulk, in spite of the small number of his friends and the vast number of his enemies, advanced to meet him, and was slain with twenty-seven of his men. When this news reached Sultân Muẓaffar he sent a farmân to Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk, to invade and devastate as far as 4 Bijânagar, which had become an asylum of the disturbers of the peace, and the shelter of rebels.

About this time His Holiness 5 Shaikh Jalîldah, who was the first man of his time (in learning, etc.), and 6 Ḥabib Khân the

---

1 Firishtah lith. ed. says the Sultân celebrated the marriage of Shâhzâda Sikandar Khân, but does not mention the other two; and the marriages do not appear to be mentioned anywhere else.

2 The words أقامت شير are left out in one MS., but are to be found in the other and in the lith. ed.

3 The other histories agree; but Col. Briggs has a totally incorrect account. He says (vol. IV, p. 83) “Zeheer-ul-Moolk marched against him, but was killed at the head of the cavalry; on which occasion two hundred and seven men fell, and the Guzeratties were defeated”.

4 See note 1, page 300. The Cambridge History of India (p. 319), which had a few lines before called the Bijânagar or Visânagar hills, the Bichâbhera hills now gives them an entirely different name, viz., the Vajinagar hills.

5 The name is written in one MS. as جالندما, and in the lith. ed. as جالندا. Firishtah lith. ed. has شیخ حامد, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 84) has “Sheikh Humeed of Bhilsa”. The Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 253, has Shekh Jâbulandah. Neither Râs Mâlâ nor the Cambridge History of India mentions him. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has used جالندما.

6 There is no doubt about his name; but the name of his sfef is اشتند نگر in the MSS., and داشته انت نگر in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls him حبيب خان.
feudatory of Ashtanagar fled from Mandū on account of the violence of the Puraba Rājpūts and waited on the Sulṭān, and ¹ complained of the great power which they had acquired. ² A few days later, a representation came from the ādara of Dahūd that Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khālij had become alarmed at the great power of the Puraba Rājpūts, and had come praying for help. As he had arrived at the village of Bhakōr, which was situated on the boundary of Gujrat, this slave (i.e., he himself) had waited on him, and as far as lay in his power, had left nothing undone in rendering service to him. Sulṭān Muẓaffar was pleased on hearing of these incidents; and he sent tents and a red pavilion with necessary equipages and many beautiful gifts and presents and all that is specially reserved for bādshāhs by the hand of Qaisar Khān; and he himself advanced to welcome Sulṭān Maḥmūd. They met in the village of ³ Dēvla. Sulṭān Muẓaffar did everything to please his guest, and exhorted him not to be much distressed owing to the separation from his children and his kingdom, as before long

¹ The purport of the complaints is given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 253.
² The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, pages 254, 255, describes at some length the way in which Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khālij escaped with his favourite wife Rāni Kanākrā (Bayley says in a note Kanākrā means golden) on two horses provided by Kishnā, a Rājpūt zamīndār, who was also one of his guards. The village to which Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khālij came is called Bhakōrah in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī.
³ What follows is copied almost word for word by Firishtah, but the name of the village where the two sovereigns met is दिल्ली in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The account given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 255, is similar, but it appears from it that the name of the ādara or governor, as he is called by Bayley, was Kaisar Khān. The presents mentioned in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī are also different. They consisted of horses and elephants and male and female attendants. The account in the Cambridge History of India, page 319, is similar, but Kaisar Khān is described as a Gujratī noble, and the presents are somewhat different, and the village to which Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khālij came is called Bhāgor.
with divine help he would be able to destroy the Purabias, and purify the kingdom of all disturbances and rebellions, and restore it to his servants (euphemism for himself). He halted at the place, and gave orders for the mustering of his troops, and in a short time an immense army advanced into Malwa.

When Medini Ray received information of the advance of Sultan Muzafer, he left 1 Ray Pithora with a body of Rajputs in the fort of Mandu; and himself with two thousand Rajput horsemen and the elephants belonging to Sultan Mahmud proceeded to Dhar. From that place he went to Rana Sankar to bring him to his aid. Sultan Muzafer advanced to Mandu with the object of laying siege to it. When the army arrived near Mandu, the Rajputs sallied out, and fought with great bravery; but in the end, they fled and took shelter in the fort. The next day also the Rajputs came out and fought a great battle. Qawam-ul-mulk exerted himself in a notable way and slew many Rajputs. That day Sultan Muzafer divided the different sides of the fort, and entrusted them to the amirs, and made the siege closer. At this time Medini Ray sent a letter to Ray Pithora, and informed him, “I have come to Rana Sankar, and I am bringing him with all the Rajputs of Marwar and the neighbouring country. You should keep Sultan Muzafer inactive for the period of one month by tales and excuses”. Ray Pithora with great deceit and trickery sent 2 emissaries with the following message, “As the fort of Mandu has for a long time been in the possession of the Rajputs, and they have got their families and dependants in it, they would be able to remove them and vacate the fort in the course of a month, and would then make it over to him; and they would also hasten to his service and become his loyal adherents, if he would go back, and take up a station

---

1 The name is spelt in different ways in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but the correct spelling appears to be what I have adopted in the text. Pithora, as the reader will remember, was the name given by the Musalmans historians to the celebrated Prithi Ray of Dehli. The Ray Pithora in the present case appears to have been a son of Medini Ray. According to the Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 256, Medini Rao sent Shadi Khan, Pithora and three other Hindoos to hold the fort of Mandu, but according to most historians the command was confided to Ray Pithora. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 84) calls him Bheu Ray.

2 According to the Mirat-i-Sikandari, the emissaries went to Khudawand Khan the vazir, and he took them to the Sultan.
one stage behind his present position”. Although Sultān Muṣaffar knew that these people were merely temporizing and were waiting for reinforcements, still as the sons and other relations of Sultān Maḥmūd were in the fort, he had no other alternative, except to agree to their prayer; and he went and took up a position three kārohs further back.

At this station, 1 `Ādil Khān, the ruler of Āsir and Burhānpūr, arrived with a fresh army and joined the Sultān. At this time news came to the latter, that Mūdīn Rāy had given 2 some elephants and much gold to Rānā Sānkā, and had brought him to aid and reinforce his men; and they had arrived in the neighbourhood of Ujjain. The noble spirit of Sultān Muṣaffar was now aroused, and he sent `Ādil Khān Fārūqī, the ruler of Āsir and Burhānpūr and Qawām-ul-mulk Sultānī to attack Rānā Sānkā; and himself began anew the siege of the fort of Mandū. He devoted all his energy to it, so that the fort might be taken before the battle with Rānā Sānkā took place; and 3 he stationed the amīrs and the leaders of the different bodies, at the various stations round the fort. On the morning following the night of the 14th Shāfīr, 924 A.H., (the Musalmāns) came in crowds from all sides of the fort, and attacked it; and placing ladders (against the wall) entered the fort. The Rājpūts performed jauhar and set fire to their houses, and killed their families and children, and burnt some of them, and then commenced fighting, and fought as long as they had any life left in them. Sultān Muṣaffar entered the fort and ordered a general massacre. It has been stated correctly that on that day

---

1 He was Sultān Muṣaffar’s nephew and son-in-law.
2 These were some of the elephants belonging to Sultān Maḥmūd which Mūdīn Rāy took with him.
3 The operations are differently described by Firishtah, who says that for four days continuous attacks were made, so that the garrison had no sleep or rest. On the 5th night there was a cessation of assaults, and the garrison became careless. Then when midnight came, the soldiers went with ladders; and as they found the men in the citadel asleep, they mounted to the top of the ramparts and slew the guards at the gate. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 85) says that false attacks were made on the first four nights; and the garrison being worn out with fatigue, on the fifth night ladders were applied and Māndū fell. The Cambridge History of India, page 310, says, “On February 23rd, 1518, the day of the Hindu festival of the Holt, Māndū was carried by escalade”.

19,000 Rājpūts were slain. The particulars of this brief statement have been mentioned in the section about Mālwa.

In short, when he had finished the massacre of the Pūrabā Rājpūts, Sultān Mahmūd waited on him, and offered congratulations and felicitations, and inquired in great anxiety, "What does Your Majesty say to this slave?" Sultān Muẓaffar said, "May the great God make you happy with the fort of Mandū and the kingdom of Mālwa." He then turned back, and went to his camp. The next day he advanced towards Rānā Sānkā. One of the notable men among the Rājpūts, who had been wounded, and who had fled from the fort, had gone to the Rānā; and had described to him the great power of, and the ferocity of the massacre by Sultān Muẓaffar in such a way, that the Rānā was thoroughly frightened, and he fled incontinently towards Chitūr; and that Rājpūt died in the same majlis (assembly). As Sultān Mahmūd came from Mandū to Dhār, and prayed that "The Sultān is in the place of my father and uncle, I hope that he would add fresh kindness to his former favours; and would make the hovel of this insignificant one bright with the grandeur of his pleasant advent." Sultān Muẓaffar accepted his prayer and went to Mandū, taking Shāhzādas Sikandar Khān and Latif Khān and 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Āsīr and Burhānpūr with him. They stayed that night at Na'īcha, and in the morning, mounted on elephants, entered the fort, and dismounted at Sultān Mahmūd's palace. Sultān Mahmūd endeavoured, to the best of his power, to perform the rites of hospitality, and himself standing before Sultān Muẓaffar

---

1 One MS. has جنكي before Rānā Sānkā, but neither the other MS. nor the lith. ed. has it. مترجمة جنكي رانا سانكا in the text-edition.

2 The actual words are زهرة رانا بندادخت, lit. the Rānā's liver melted. Pirishtah's account does not differ materially from the text, but he says that the Rānā fled towards Jaipūr, and 'Ādil Khan pursued him, plundering and slaying those who fell behind.

3 It would appear that he was so excited that his wounds burst open, and he bled to death.

4 One MS. has a reading different from that in the other MS., and in the lith. ed., and the one which I have adopted. That reading is بجاي پدر و جم عموري مي هوزند, which would mean: Be thou in the place of the father and the uncle of this faqīr.
waited on him. After they had finished eating, he placed presents of all kinds before Sultān Muẕaffar and the Shāhzādas; and again made his excuses. Sultān Muẕaffar then saw all the palaces and other buildings of the former Sultāns of Mālwa; and afterwards went back to Dhār. There he bade adieu to Sultān Maḥmūd, and leaving Āṣaf Khān Gujratī with ten thousand horsemen to reinforce him, started for Gujrat. Sultān Maḥmūd owing to his great affection accompanied him as far as maula Dēvla, although Sultān Muẕaffar had already said farewell to him; and there, after again taking leave of him, returned to Mandū.

On his arrival in Gujrat, Sultān Muẕaffar remained for some days in Muḥammadābād Chāmpānîr; and the great and noble men of the country of Gujrat hastened to wait on him, with their felicitation and congratulations; and were made happy with his largesses and favours. At this time, one day one of his courtiers reported to him, that at the time, when the shadow of his conquest had been spread over the kindgom of Mālwa, Rāy Mal, Rāja of Idar had come out of the hills of Bijānagar, and had raided a part of the country of Pattan and the town of 1 Gilwārā; but as Naṣrat-ul-mulk left Idar, and advanced to give him battle, he fled and concealed himself in the caves of Bijānagar. The Sultān declared, “God willing, I will, after the rains, determine what to do in this matter”. After the rains in the year 926 A.H., 1519 A.D., he advanced towards Idar to chastise and punish Rāy Mal, and other disturbers of peace. As 2 Rāja Māl was the protector and the asylum of Rāy Mal, the Sultān thought that the chastisement of the former should be undertaken first; and he levelled his territory to the dust; and after halting at Idar for a few days, he came back to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānîr and stayed there.

1 The name of the town is and in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Frishtakah lith. ed. has without giving any name. Col. Brigg's (vol. IV, p. 87) has the town of Gilwara. I cannot find any mention of it in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India, but Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 383) agrees with Col. Briggs and calls it Gilwārā.

2 The name is Rāja Māl in both MSS., but it is Rāja Māl Dēv in the lith. ed. Frishtah calls him Rāja Mal. I cannot find him or his territory mentioned anywhere else.
After a few days, news came that Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī had, in concert with Āsaf Khān marched against 1 Bhīm Karan Pūrabā, with the object of seizing 2 Kākrūn, when Mēdini Rāy brought Rānā Sānkā to aid him, and a great battle took place. Most of the amirs of Mālwa were slain; and Āsaf Khān’s son and a number of other warriors were also killed. Sultan Mahmūd received many wounds, and was taken prisoner. Rānā Sānkā, however, treated him with kindness; and sent him with a body of troops to Mandū. Sultan Muẓaffar hearing this news became depressed and sad; and sent some other sadārs to Sultan Mahmūd’s aid, and wrote an affectionate letter inquiring about him. About this time, Sultan Muẓaffar went to Īdar to see the country and to enjoy the pleasures of the chase; and commenced erecting some buildings there. On his return, he brought Naṣrat-ul-mulk to Aḥmadābād with him; and entrusted the government of Īdar to Malik Mubāriz-ul-mulk.

It so happened, that one day a bard or wandering minstrel waited on Mubāriz-ul-mulk, and said something about the bravery of Rānā Sānkā. Mubāriz-ul-mulk, on account of his great arrogance and pride, spoke to him in improper language; and giving 3 a dog the name of Rānā Sānkā, kept him tied up at the gate of Īdar. The bard went back, and told this story to Rānā Sānkā. The Rānā owing to his pride and 4 boorishness turned towards Īdar, and advanced and

---

1 There is no mention of Bhīm Karan or Kākrūn in any other history, except the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 263) where it is said that Sultan Mahmūd marched to sarkār Gāgrūn, where he attacked Bhīm Karan; and it is said in a note “that Bhīm Karan is said to have been a deputy of Mēdini Rāō, and was holding Gāgrūn (?) for him. He was certainly one of his chief officers and very probably a relative”. Evidently some lines have been left out in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs, the Cambridge History of India and Kās Māла, all say that Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī had attacked the combined forces of Mēdini Rāy and Rānā Sānkā, and had been defeated by them.

2 One MS. has قبل before Kākrūn, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have it.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 320, says that Mubāriz-ul-Mulk called the dog Sangrama. I am afraid Sangrama, or the more correct Sangrāmā would have been Greek to Mubāriz-ul-Mulk. I doubt whether Rānā Sangrāmā Singh’s parents or he himself ever called himself Sangrama or Sangrāma. Sangrāmā was quite sufficient for them.

4 The word used is جاملت, but it appears to me to be extremely inappropriate and unjust.
ravaged the country to the boundary of Sirōhī. About this time Sultān Muẓaffar went to Chāmpānīr, leaving Qiwām-ul-mulk, son of Qiwām-ul-mulk, in Aḥmadābād, for the control of the 1 Grāsias. 2 When Rānā Sānkā arrived in the country of Bākar, the Rāja, although he was obedient and submissive to Sultān Muẓaffar, in his fear and distress joined Rānā Sānkā. The latter then came to Dūngarpūr. Mubāriz-ul-mulk wrote an account of what had happened to the Sultān. As the Sultān's vazīrs were not friendly to Mubāriz-ul-mulk they told the Sultān that it was not 4 right for him to give the Rānā's name to a dog, and thus bring him into contempt; and afterwards being afraid of him, to ask for reinforcement; otherwise the Rānā would not have dared to put his foot into the Sultān's territories. It so happened, however, that at that time, the army which had been left to protect Īdar had, on account of the 5 excessive rains gone to their own homes at Aḥmadābād and only a small number had remained with Mubāriz-ul-mulk.

1 Grās according to a note on page 98 of the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī comprises (1) blackmail paid to powerful local chiefs for protection and immunity from plunder, or rather land held in lieu of such blackmail; (2) lands or allowances allotted by government, or allowed to be retained by them to land-holders, both as a politic measure to keep them quiet, and as a retainer for military and other services. Here apparently the word is used to mean the holders of such land.

2 Firshtāh's account agrees generally with the text; but he says that Rānā Sānkā plundered and ravaged Mubāriz-ul-mulk's sīf before coming to Bākar; and he also says that the Sultān on hearing what his vazīrs told him delayed sending in reinforcements. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 264) gives a detailed account of Nizām-ul-Mulk's talk with the bard, Rānā Sānkā's march against Īdar and the former's prayer for reinforcement, and the action of the Sultān's minister about it, down to the battle of Aḥmadābād and the sack of that city. Its version of the story of the dog is somewhat different from that in the other histories. It is said, that in the talk with the bard, Nizām-ul-Mulk repeatedly called the Rānā a dog, and finally he called for a dog, and having had it tied up at the door of the darbār, he said, "If the Rānā does not come he will be like this dog".

3 Called Bāgar in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 266, and Bagry by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 88).

4 The word is لابق in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but مناسب in the other MS.

5 One MS. inserts برسات before پارستان و.
Rānā Sānkā becoming cognizant of all these things, advanced against Īdar. When he arrived near, Mubāriz-ul-mulk with the other sardārs prepared for battle, and went out to meet him; but before the two armies should come together, they turned back and returned to Īdar. The sardārs said that the small number of their friends and the vast host of their enemies were patent to all. It was advisable that they should go to Aḥmadnagar and fortify themselves there, till the arrival of the reinforcements; and on this decision they went to the fort of Aḥmadnagar, taking Mubāriz-ul-mulk with them, whether he liked it or not. On the following morning Rānā Sānkā arrived at Īdar, and enquired about Mubāriz-ul-mulk. The grāssias, who had fled from Qawām-ul-mulk, and had joined the Rānā told him that Mubāriz-ul-mulk was not a man that would run away, but the amīrs had taken him away to Aḥmadnagar; and they were waiting for reinforcements. Rānā Sānkā then advanced against Aḥmadnagar with a large force. The bard who had praised Rānā Sānkā in the presence of Mubāriz-ul-mulk again went to the latter; and said, "Rānā Sānkā has come with a large army. It would be a great pity that men like you should be killed for nothing. It is advisable that you should remain in the fort of Aḥmadnagar. The Rānā ¹ would return after giving his horse a drink of water below the fort, and he would not do anything more". Mubāriz-ul-mulk said in reply, "It is impossible that I should allow him to give water to his horse in this river." He thereupon with great bravery crossed the river with the few men that were with him; and who were not a tenth part of the number of the Rānā's army. When the Rānā arrived there, there was a great battle. Asad Khān who was one of the commanders was killed with a number of other horsemen. Šafdar Khān was wounded; and Mubāriz-ul-mulk, after making several attacks on the Rānā's troops, received many wounds; and ² most of the Gujrātīs

¹ To show, I suppose, that he had come as far as the fort and Mubāriz-ul-mulk had not dared to come out. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 89) says, "till his horse drank out of the ditch of Ahmadnuggur"; but I suppose, and the next sentence shows, that he meant the river which flows below the city and the fort.

² The clause is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but it appears to be redundant. Fīrāsthā inserts /gif before ɣar and omits the ɬ after ɬ. This improves the clause a great deal. The meaning of the
were slain. Mubāriz-ul-mulk and Şafdar Khān now retired to Aḥmadābād. The Rānā ravaged Aḥmadnagar, and halted there for one day. The next morning he marched towards Badnagar. When he arrived near it, most of the inhabitants came to him and said, "We are zunnārdaṛs (men with the sacred thread, Brahmans) and your forefathers have always respected and honoured us". Rānā Sāṅkā desisted from attacking and plundering Badnagar and advanced to Bēsālnagar. Malik Ḥātim the thānadār of the place came out with the resolution of becoming a martyr; and gave him battle; and attained his object. Rānā Sāṅkā after ravaging Bēsālnagar returned to his own country.

amended clause is, as most of the Gujrātīs were slain Mubāriz-ul-mulk and Şafdar Khan retired to Aḥmadābād.

1 The readings are different. One MS. has متوجه بدنگر جرید, marched towards Badnagar. The other has عاظم بدنگر جرید. The lith. ed. has متوجه بدنگر جرید and مسلاجکر جرید. Firishtah has متوجه بدنگر جرید. I have adopted this, as it agrees with the reading in the first MS. The place is called Bārnagar in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and Vadnagar in the Cambridge History of India, page 320. I do not know why and how Bēsālnagar has been transformed into Vadnagar. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 269, says that the grāssiahs incited the Rānā to plunder Bārnagar, as the inhabitants of the place were merchants, and who were very rich; but the Rānā did not on the representation of the inhabitants, as stated in the text, allow the place to be plundered.

2 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India say that Rānā Sāṅkā accepted tribute from the people; but neither the Ṭabaqāt nor Firishtah says so. A Brahman who has always called himself a mendicant is not likely to have paid much tribute.

3 The place is written like بیسالنگار in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it looks like Bēnagar. Col. Briggs has Beesalnuggur. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 269, has Bīsālnagar. The Cambridge History of India, page 320, has Visnagar. I think Bēsālnagar is identical with the hills of Bījānāgar, to which the Rājās of Idar used to escape whenever hard pressed by the Sultāns of Gujrāt; and which the Cambridge History of India had in previous pages called Bichabbers (page 318) and Vajinagar hills (page 319) and now gives it the entirely new name of Visnagar (see notes 1, page 300 and 3, page 301). بیسلنکر Bēnagar in the text-edition.

4 Contrary to what is stated here, and in Firishtah, the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 269, says, he shut himself in the fort and it was beleaguered till the hour of evening prayer, and in the fighting and confusion the town was plundered.
Malik Qawām-ul-mulk sent a detachment with Mubāriz-ul-mulk and Ṣafdar Khān to Aḥmadnagar that they might bury the dead. Mubāriz-ul-mulk arrived at Aḥmadnagar, and buried the martyrs. About this time the 2 kolīs and grāssias from the neighbourhood of Īdar, seeing the small force under Mubāriz-ul-mulk’s command, attacked him. Mubāriz-ul-mulk came out of the fort and fought with them; and after slaying sixty-one of the leaders of the grāssias, returned victorious and triumphant to Aḥmadnagar. As Aḥmadnagar, however, was in ruin, 3 and the people suffered privations for want of grain and all other necessaries, they started from there; and came to the 4 town of Parāntēj.

When news of all these events reached Sultān Muẓaffar, the latter appointed 5 Ḳimād-ul-mulk and Qaisar Khān with an enormous army and one hundred elephants to crush Rānā Sānkā. Ḳimād-ul-mulk and Qaisar Khān arrived at Aḥmadābād, and taking Qawām-ul-mulk with them went to Parāntēj. From that place, they wrote to the Sultān, that Rānā Sānkā had returned to his own country, and asked

1 The Mirāṭ-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 270, gives a fairly detailed account of how Kiwām-ul-Mulk started to reinforce Mubāriz-ul-Mulk, how he heard of the latter’s defeat, and sent for him with the object of going in pursuit, but hearing that this was impossible, sent Mubāriz-ul-Mulk to bury the dead, and this was done sixteen days after the battle.

2 Firishtah agrees with the text; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 90) says that the Kolīs and Girasias attacked Moobariz-ool-Moolk on the march to Ahmudnuggur, but were defeated. Rās Mālā also says so. The Mirāṭ-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 270, says that the Kolīs of Kanth came to carry off grain from Aḥmadnagar.

3 There is no 3 in this place in the MS. or in the lith. ed.; but I have inserted it as it is required to complete the sense.

4 The name appears to be ٤ وحن, Wahinj, and ٤ ده, Dahēj in the MS., and ٤ هچ, Hēch in the lith. ed. and ٤ راه, Rahēj in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs has Puranty. The Mirāṭ-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 270, has Parāntj and Rās Mālā has Poorāntej. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matter. I have adopted Parāntēj. M. Hidayat Ḥosain, however, has ٨ ده، Dahēj in the text-edition.

5 There are slight variations in the readings. The lith. ed. has زحیب before نیل but the MSS. omit the words; and one MS. and the lith. ed. have ٤ برسر رانا سانکا, but the other MS. has ٤ برسر رانا سانکا ه.
for permission to march to Chitōr. The Sultan wrote in reply, that as the rains had commenced they should wait in Aḥmadnagar; and after the rains should advance towards Chitōr. The amirs, in accordance with this order remained at Aḥmadnagar. Sultan Muẓaffar paid the soldiers a year’s wages from the treasury; and ¹ went to Aḥmadābād. He intended to march to Chitōr himself to chastise Rānā Sānkal.

At this time ² Malik Ayāz Sulṭānī came from Sōrath with a large army; and after rendering homage represented that the ³ imperial grandeur of the Sultan is higher and more exalted, than that he should go in person to punish and chastise Rānā Sānkal. The training of slaves like myself is for the purpose, that if a work like this has to be done, the Sultan should not have to take the trouble to do it. In the month of Muḥarram in the year 927 A.H. (December, 1520 A.D.) Sultan Muẓaffar arrived at Aḥmadnagar. When the army had all collected Malik Ayāz ⁴ again prayed (that he should be employed)

---
¹ Finishtah lith. ed. agrees with the text, but the place where the amirs remained is called سرکی سرکاش, or Sarkhāj; and calls the Rānā’s capital Jaipūr instead of Chitōr. He also says that the Sultan ordered the payment of one year’s wages to the soldiers. Col. Briggs has a different account. He says Imād-ul-Moolk and Keisur Khan retreated from Ahmudnuggur, but the Sultan ordered them to remain there during the rains; and he intended to advance to Chittoor in person after the rains. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 271, says that the allowances of the whole army were increased from ten to twenty per cent., and a year’s pay was issued from the treasury, so that every man might provide himself with all that was requisite for the campaign.

² According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 233, Malik Alīz “was originally a purchased slave, yet he attained to the rule of provinces, and to unlimited wealth”. Bayley also says in a note that some authorities declare he was a renegade Portuguese, but this assertion seems opposed to such an origin. He was possibly a slave brought from the southern provinces of Europe or Asia Minor or Armenia by the Turks. But contrary to this Finishtah says Lionel Brown, “originally a slave born in the king’s family” (vol. IV, p. 90).

³ In the corresponding passage, Finishtah has a و between سلطاتین که جانم یخیم یدریم. 

⁴ This would be somewhat impertinent on his part, but Finishtah says that when he made the request on the previous occasion, the Sultan did not give any reply.
to chastise Rānā Sānkā. The Sultān sent him for that purpose with one lakh horsemen, and a hundred elephants. He also sent 1 Qawām-ul-mulk with twenty thousand horsemen, a little later to join Malik Ayāz. When the two commanders encamped at Mahrāsa, the Sultān with great caution and farsight sent Tāj Khān and Niẓām-ul-mulk Sultānī also to that place (to join them). Malik Ayāz sent a representation to the Sultān, in which he submitted, that the act of sending so many great amirs for the punishment of Rānā Sānkā would be a reason for his pride and glorification. He also reported that so many elephants were not at all necessary; and that this slave (i.e., he himself), owing to the grandeur of His Majesty, was quite sufficient for this service; and after sending back most of the elephants, he marched from Mahrāsa, and encamped at the village of 3 Dhōl. From that place many detachments were sent out to plunder and ravage the country. Safdar Khān was sent from here, to chastise the Rājpūts of 4 Lakiākot. He marched to this place, which was in a rough and uneven country, and ravaged it, and slew many Rājpūts, and taking those who escaped the sword, with him as prisoners of war, re-joined Malik Ayāz. They marched from that place, and having burnt down, and rased to the ground Dūngarpūr and Bānswāla, advanced

1 The Mirāt-i-Sikandari says, on the authority of the Tarikh-i-Bahādur Shāhī, Bayley, page 272, that he had a hundred elephants in addition to one hundred thousand horsemen.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. agrees; but Col. Briggs says that he left behind him nearly all the elephants, and the greater part of the cavalry which had lately joined (vol. IV, p. 91).

3 The village is called Dhōl in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Dadūd in the other MS. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or by Col. Briggs; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 272, calls it Dhamūlah in the district of Bāgar, but in a note which purports to be a translation of a passage of the Tabakāt Bayley calls it Dābāl.

4 The name is Lakiākot in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is not mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari; but Bayley translating a part of the Tabakāt in a note calls it Lakiā Köt. The Cambridge History of India (p. 320) mentions Gāliākot and Bānswāra among the five places, which were ravaged and gives the lat. and long. of each. Apparently the author had a map on a very large scale in which all these places were marked and from which their lat. and long. could be calculated. Gāliākot is probably identical with Lakiākot and Bānswāra with Bānswāla.
towards Chitőr. It so happened that at this station, a man came and
gave information to 1 Malik Ashja'-ul-mulk and Șafdar Khan, that
Udaya Singh, Rāja of Māl, had, with a body of Rājpūts soldiers of Rānā
Sāṅkā and Ugar Sēṅ Pūrabīa, come and were lying in ambush behind
a hill; and they wanted to make a night attack. Ashja'-ul-mulk
and Șafdar Khan without sending any information to Malik Ayāž
Sultānī, galloped to that place, taking two hundred horsemen with
them. There was a great battle. Ugar Sēṅ was wounded, and fifty
Rājpūts fell on the battlefield; and the other Rājpūts fled. When
Ayāž Sultānī came to know of these happenings, he advanced with
his army fully equipped to reinforce and help Șafdar Khan. When
he reached the battlefield, he was amazed at the (gallant) efforts of
Șafdar Khan; and applied the ointment of kindness on the wounds
of the ghāzis (victorious heroes of Islām).

On the following morning, Malik Qawām-ul-mulk Sultānī pene-
trated into the hill of Bānswāla in pursuit of the men (i.e., those who
had fled); and did not leave a vestige of men and habitation there.
Ugar Sēṅ, wounded as he was, went to the Rānā, and told him all
that had happened. When Malik Ayāž arrived at Mandisōr, and
besieged it, Rānā Sāṅkā came to the aid of his thānadār; and halting
at a distance of twelve karōhs from Mandisōr sent 2 the following

---

1 One MS. calls him Malik Shīkh Shujā’-ul-mulk but the other and the lith. ed.
omit Shīkh. Firishtah calls him Malik Ashja’-ul-mulk, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV,
p. 91), apparently following the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, calls him Shooja-ool-Moolk.
Bayley, of course, calls him Shujā’-ul-Mulk.

2 The name of the place is Māl, and Nal in the MSS. and Paḷal in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Māl; but Col. Briggs calls the Rāja the Ray of Poloh. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not give the name of the Rāja, but calls him the Rājah of Bānsbālah. Firishtah’s account of the information of the intended night attack, and the skirmish with the men who were in ambush, agrees word for word with the text. The account in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari is somewhat different. Ugar Sēṅ is not named, but is probably included in “some relatives of Mēdini Rāo”. It is also said that the Musulmāns were greatly outnumbered, but they fought bravely and defeated the Rājpūts (Bayley, p. 272).

3 The lith. ed. of Firishtah gives the same version of the message as the text; but Col. Briggs says that “there were certain conditions so extravagant that Mullik Eiaz determined to continue the siege”. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari.
message to Malik Ayāz, “I am sending ambassadors to wait on the Sultan; and I shall be enlisted among his adherents. Do you abandon the siege.” Malik Ayāz made some polite speeches, which had really no meaning, to the messengers; and devoted all his energy to the capture of the fort; and carried the mines so far, that it became a matter of to-day or to-morrow.

At this time Sharzah Khān Sharwānī came from Sultan Maḥmūd Khalji, and delivered a message to Malik Ayāz, to the effect, that if there was any necessity for help and reinforcement, he would at once come to render it. Malik Ayāz was delighted, and asked him to come. As Sultan Maḥmūd was bound by ties of gratitude to Muẓaffar Shāh, he came to Mandisor bringing Silāhādī Fūrābā ḍ with him. Rānā Sāṅkā was frightened at the coming of Sultan Maḥmūd; and sent Mēdīnī Rāy to Silāhādī with the following message, “It is right that one should favour one’s own community. It is right, therefore, that he should not hold himself excused from rendering his duty to his community; and at present he should exert himself in bringing about a treaty of peace”.

After some days things came to such a pass, that the garrison was reduced to the greatest straits. Qawām-ul-mulk advanced his battery

Bayley, page 273, gives the terms of the message in some detail, but I do not find anything extravagant in them.

1 The name is mentioned only in the Tabaqāt and in Firishta. It is Sharzah in the MS. of the Tabaqāt, and in the lith. ed. of Firishta. In the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt it is Shēr. The MS. of the Tabaqāt has Sarwānī, but the lith. eds. of both the Tabaqāt and Firishta have Sharwānī.

2 The name of Silāhādī is written as سلیح‌دی in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, but in the lith. ed. of Firishta it is سلیهدی. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 273, he is called “Silahdi, a Tuar Rājpūt by tribe”, but Bayley says in a note that the description of Silahadi’s tribe is only in MS. A, and there also doubtful. On an earlier page, I ventured a guess in respect of another Silahadi that the name might be a corruption of Salya Devā but it occurs to me now that it is more probably a corruption of Silādri, the rocky mountain.

The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī tells a different story about Silahadi. It says he was coming from Rājān with one hundred thousand horse to have an interview with Malik Aṭāz, but Mēdēnī Rāy went and met him on the way, and enticed him over to the Rānā.

Firishta adds سلیهدی هرچند سعی کرد مال صلی نشد, i.e., although Silahadi made (every) effort, peace could not be effected.
and wanted to get into the fort. Malik Ayāz, fearing that the victory might be attributed to Qawām-ul-mulk, kept him back that day from engaging the enemy. The amirs of Gujrat, hearing of this intention, were grieved in their hearts against Malik Ayāz. Mubāriz-ul-mulk and some other commanders advanced the next morning to fight with Rānā Sānkā’s troops, without taking his permission. Malik Tughlaq Shāh Fūlādī went and brought them back from the way. There was now a discussion among the amirs; but for fear of the punishment by the Sultān, they could not advance again without the permission of Malik Ayāz. The latter, in spite of the opposition of the amirs, made his soldiers ready, and set fire to the mines. When the bastion was shattered and fell down, it was found, that the Rājpūts having become aware of the state of things, had built another wall opposite to the bastion.

The next day emissaries came from Rānā Sānkā, and said, “The Rānā says that the slave (i.e., he himself) wants to become enlisted among the loyal adherents (of the Sultān), and to send back the elephants which he had seized in the invasion of Ahmadnagar, with his son, for the service of the Sultān. He did not know what was the reason of all this unkindness and harshness on their part”. Malik Ayāz, owing to the opposition of Malik Qawām-ul-mulk, gave his consent to the proposed peace and began to settle the terms. The other amirs refused their consent; and waited upon Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji, and inviting him to carry on the war, determined that they should begin the battle on the following Wednesday. A man who was present at the assembly waited on Malik Ayāz, and informed him of all that has passed. Malik Ayāz sent a man that very moment to wait on Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji; and represented to him that His Majesty the Sultān had entrusted the reins of controlling the army in his hands, so that he may carry into effect everything in which he saw its welfare; and now that he (i.e., Sultān Maḥmūd) at the instigation and incitement of the amirs of Gujrat wanted to carry on the war, this slave could not agree to that, for there was a great probability, that on account of the ill-luck, which always attends on perversity and dissension, the hand of hope will not reach the skirts of our object.

---

1 This was one of the terms of the previous message of Rānā Sānkā given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (see note 3, page 314).
On the morning of Wednesday, which had been selected for the battle, Malik Ayâz moved his camp; and encamped at Khaljipûr; and after bestowing robes of honour on the emissaries of Rânâ Sânkâ, gave them leave to go back. Sultân Maḥmûd Khaljî also marched away in the direction of Mandû. When Malik Ayâz had the honour of waiting on the Sultân at Châmpânîr, he reproved and reprimanded him; and gave him permission to go to the port of Dip, so that after equipping his retainers, he might return, and wait on the Sultân after the rains. It was also settled that after the end of the rains, the Sultân in his own august person, should proceed to chastise the Rânâ.

Malik Ayâz sent one of his trustworthy men to Rânâ Sânkâ and gave him this message, "As friendship has grown up between us, it is proper that we should both do everything that may be beneficial and advantageous to each other; and as on account of the return of the amîrs from that country, the noble heart of the Sultân has become heavy; and he wishes that the shadow of his conquest should be cast over that country, and he should punish the insurgents. This will cause much evil to that country. It is right and proper, that he should send his son on the wings of peace with tribute and much beautiful presents, so that the inhabitants of that country might be preserved from the assaults of the Sultân's wrath." Sultân Mużaffar came from Châmpânîr to Aḥmadâbâd in the month of Muḥarram of 4928 A.H., (December, 1521 A.D.), so that he might advance towards Chitôr, after making the necessary preparations. In the

---

1 Firishtah agrees with the text, but the Mirât-i-Sikandarî and the Cambridge History of India say that Malik Ayâz concluded peace with Rânâ Sânkâ. He could not have done so without the Sultân's express order; and it appears from what happened later that the Sultân intended to carry on the war. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 93) says, "A suspension of hostilities was accordingly agreed on, until communications could be received from the king." But this is not mentioned by Firishtah.

2 The Mirât-i-Sikandarî, Bayley, page 275, says that in consequence of his displeasure, the Sultân did not give Malik Alâz the usual robe of honour at his departure.

3 One MS. has Sânkâ after Rânâ, but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. do not have it.

4 The year is 1522 A.D. in the Cambridge History of India, page 321; and 1529 A.H., 1523 A.D. in the Mirât-i-Sikandarî, Bayley, page 275.
course of some days he collected and equipped an army at Aḥmadābād, and encamped at the reservoir of Kānkriā; and there was a delay of three days at this place for the mustering of the troops. At this time news came that Rānā Sānkā had sent his son with much tribute to wait on the Sultān; and the son had arrived at the town of Mahrāsā. After a few days, when he waited on the Sultān, and presented the beautiful things (which he had brought), the Sultān forgave his father's offences, and presented to him a princely robe of honour; and having cancelled the mustering of the army, he spent some days in the neighbourhood of Jhālāwār in seeing the country and hunting; and then went to Aḥmadābād. There he again bestowed a robe of honour on the son of the Rānā, and bade him farewell. After that he himself went to Kaparbanj.

In this year Malik Ayāz, who was a support of the empire, bound up the goods of existence (i.e., died). Sultān Muḥaffar was pained and grieved on hearing this news; and conferred his jāgīr on his eldest son.

In the year 7930 A.H., 1524 A.D. (the Sultān) rode out from Chāmpānir, in order to chastise some rebels and refractory persons;

---

1 The word نُتُنَفَ delay, is to be found in only one of the MSS., but is not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have, however, inserted it as it appears to be required.

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have فَنَفَ ان لِلْشَّاَرِكِ نُمَوَّد. This is so clearly a mistake that I have had no hesitation in substituting فَنَفَ نُمَوَّد for فَنَفَ ان لِلْشَّاَرِكِ نُمَوَّد. I find the lith. ed. of Firishtah has the correct word. The text-edition has the reading in the MSS.

3 One MS. has لُفَطَ نُمَوَّد instead of لُفَطَ عَطَا نُمَوَّد.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. says he went to Sarkhāj; but no other historian mentions either Kaparbanj or Sarkhāj. مُرْكَب in the text-edition.

5 Firishtah also says so, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 275, says, "When the Sultan heard of Malik Alāz's death, he said, 'The life of Malik Alāz has come to its close. It would have been better, if he had been killed fighting against the Rānā, for then he would have been a martyr.'"

6 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt have بِعْرَ بِرْزَك but Firishtah lith. ed. omits بِعْرَ بِرْزَك. Col. Briggs also has "some" without any qualifying adjective; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī has "to his eldest son Ishāk".

7 Firishtah agrees almost word for word, but Col. Briggs changes the year to 929 A.H., and says, he marched to Champaner and "caused the town of
and halted for some days between the towns of Mahrāsa and Harsūl. He entirely rebuilt the fort of Mahrāsa and then returned towards Aḥmadābād. On the way 1 he heard that the member of the harem (of the Sultān), who was most beloved of him, had died. The Sultān and the Shāhzhāda grieved sorely; and they went to her grave, and performed the mourning rites. After the termination of the period of mourning, they came to Aḥmadābād, with sorrow-stricken hearts and grief-laden minds. 2 The Sultān passed most of his time in indulging in his grief. One day, Khudāwand Khān, who was distinguished among the amīrs and the vazīrs for his intellect and wisdom, waited on the Sultān and represented in clear language the advantage and benefit of patience, and freed him from grief and pain. As the rainy season had commenced, he induced the Sultān to take a trip to Chāmpānīr. The Sultān remembered the breezes of Chāmpānīr and went there.

One day 'Ālam Khān, son of Sultān Sikandar Lūldī Bādshāh of Dehli represented to the Sultān, that 3 "Sultān Ibrāhīm, son of Sultān Sikandar, had, owing to his inexperience, drawn his blood-drinking sword out of the scabbard; and had put the great amīrs to death; and those who had escaped the sword had sent repeated letters and petitions, and had asked this slave (i.e., himself) to come. As this faqīr had

Mahrāsa to be repaired "). The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 276, agrees generally with the text. The Cambridge History of India does not mention these matters at all.

1 Firishtah copies the Ṭabaqāt almost verbatim. Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India do not mention the death. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 276, says, "On the way his chief wife, Bibi Rānī, mother of prince Sikandar Khān died"; which would imply that she was travelling with the Sultān. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī praises her right judgment, her great influence in the affairs of the kingdom, her motherly care of high and low, and the singular firmness of her judgments.

2 The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī says, he fell ill, and after his recovery went to Chāmpānīr, or as Bayley calls the place Muḥammadābād. It does not mention Khudāwand Khān's advice and admonition.

3 This long-winded and highly metaphorical request is copied by Firishtah. 'Ālam Khān was a son of Bahūl Lūldī and not of Sikandar Lūldī, as stated in the text, and he was therefore an uncle of Ibrāhīm. As stated in the text his later career is narrated in the section about Dehli. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 96) calls him Julāl Khān.
attended on Your Majesty for a long time in the hope that by the advantage of the attention of this great family he would arrive at greatness; now that time has come, that the star of his good fortune would ascend from the nādir of defeat, and the image of hope should shine in the mirror of success, he hopes that the wing of (the Sultān’s) generosity and the shadow of his kindness, should be spread over the head of this faqīr, so that his ancestral dominion should come into his possession”. Sultān Muţaffar sent him back with a detachment of troops and gave him some money. He advanced towards Delhi to fight with Sultān Ibrahīm. A full account of his adventures has been given in the section about Delhi.

In the year 931 A.H. 1 (1524 A.D.) the Sultān went through Chāmpānīr to Īdar. On the way Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān complained about his meagre income, and his large expenses, and prayed that his allowance may be made equal to that of Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān. The Sultān delayed in fulfilling his expectations on account of certain objections, and made a promise for a future consideration. Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān was pained and discouraged at this, and went away to Aḥmadābād without obtaining the Sultān’s leave. He went from there to the country of 2 Māl. The Raja of Māl whose name was

1 Bayley (p. 277) gives 1525 as the corresponding year of the Christian era, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 96) has 1524, and the Cambridge History of India, page 321, has, “late in 1524”.

2 As regards Māl see note 2, page 314. M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition has مال for مال. Firishta lith. ed. does not here give the name of the Rāja, but calls him the Rāja of Māl, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandar gives the name as Rāwal Udi Singh (as Bayley transliterates it) and describes him as Rājah of Dūngarpūr. Bayley, however, says in a note that the Tabakat “calls him the Rājah of Fāl”; and goes on to say that “Fāl seems to have been used in those days, as a kind of general name given to a congeries of petty hill states, of which the rulers were Hindūs and probably all or nearly all Rajpūts. They seem to have included Dūngarpūr, Bījanagar, Bānsbālah and others” (Bayley, page 277). Col. Briggs calls the Raja Oody Singh the Raja of Poloh, and the Cambridge History of India (p. 321), apparently following the Mirāt-i-Sikandar, Udi Singh of Dūngarpur. The account of the travels of Bahādur Khān as given by Firishta agrees almost word for word with that in the text and by Col. Briggs; the Mirāt-i-Sikandar and the Cambridge History of India also agree generally, but the last two do not mention the pilgrimage to the tomb of the holy Khwājah at Ajmār.
Udai Singh considered the arrival of the Shāhzāda a very great blessing; and rendered him services of various kinds. Then when the Shāhzāda went to the country of Chitōr, Rānā Śāṅkā came forward to welcome him; and presented him with articles of every kind as tribute. He submitted, "This country belongs to your servants, and whatever you order will be obeyed". The Shāhzāda out of his noble spirit did everything to please him; but after rejecting his prayer, proceeded to go on pilgrimage to the tomb, which is the resting place of illuminating rays, of his Holiness Khwājah Mu'in-ud-din Ḥasan Sanjarī, may his soul be sanctified! After performing the pilgrimage he proceeded to the country of Miwāt, where Ḥasan Khān Miwātī advanced some stages, and carried out the rites of hospitality and entertainment; and from that place he went towards Dehli.

It so happened that at this time, His Majesty Firdūs Makānī, Zahir-ud-din Muḥammand Bābar Bādshāh had come to 1 Hindustān with the desire of conquering the country; and had encamped in the neighbourhood of Dehli. Sultān Ibrāhīm having gained power and help from the arrival of Shāhzāda 2 Bahādur Khān treated him with the greatest respect and honour. One day the Shāhzāda mounted his horse, and with some of the Gujrāt warriors, went to the battlefield; and fought with 3 some Maghūl soldiers, and both parties exerted themselves with great bravery. The Afghān amīrs who were thoroughly disgusted with Sultān Ibrāhīm wanted to do away with him; and place 4 Sultān Bahādur on the throne. Sultān Ibrāhīm hearing

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have हन्दुस्तान, but the other MS. has हन्दुस्तान.
2 The name of the Shāhzāda is omitted in the text-edition.
3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have बहादूर, but the other has बहादूर. This is apparently a mistake. The word मौल is in both MSS. after बहादूर.
4 not in the lith. ed.; but I have inserted it.
5 The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 278) gives a different version of this, according to which Bahādur Khān with some of his own men pursued a party of Moghals who were carrying off some of Sultān Ibrāhīm's men as prisoners. On coming up with them, slew some of them, and returned with the men he had rescued.
6 He is called Sultān in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, in this place, though further on, he is again called Shāhzāda.
this had treacherous thoughts in his mind; and Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān perceiving this started towards Jaunpūr.

When the news that Bahādur Khān had gone to Dehli, and Firdūs Makānī Bābar Bādshāh had arrived in those parts with the Maḥālīl army reached Sulṭān Muẓaffar, he on account of the separation from his son became depressed and sorrowful; and ordered Khudāwand Khān to send letters and petitions to summon the Shāhzāda. At this time there was a great famine in Gujrāt, and the people suffered great distress. Sulṭān Muẓaffar, owing to the love which he had for the people, began a complete recitation of the great book (Qurān) and of the six canonical books of Ḥadīs (صحيح سنده). The great and Holy God taking account of the true and pious intention of the Sulṭān removed the calamity from his people. At the same time, the Sulṭān fell ill, and his illness increased from day to day. One day he in great sorrow spoke of Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān. Someone taking advantage of the opportunity informed him that the army was divided into two factions. One of them wanted the succession

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 321, says that he possibly selected “this town in response to an invitation received from the local nobles, who are said to have offered him the throne”. This is also stated in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 279; but it also appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī that he was about to go to Jōnpūr, when he heard of the death of his father, and went off to Gujrāt.

2 Bayley, page 279, says that Sulṭān Muẓaffar was exceedingly vexed on hearing that Bahādur Khān had gone to Dehli; and then says in a note that according to the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī, “he distinctly stated, as his reason that he was afraid lest Bahādur Khān by fighting against the Moghuls, might involve the country of Gujrāt in hostilities with the latter people”. There is nothing like this in the Tabaqāt as far as I can see.

3 I suppose, as a pious act, which would avert the calamity from his people. The actual words are شروط در خنث مصطف مجيد و خنث مصباح سنه نمرد. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī’s account is different. It says, on the authority of the Ţārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhī, that Sulṭān Muẓaffar lifted up his hands in prayer to God, and said, “Oh Lord, if for any fault of mine my people are afflicted, take me from this world, and leave my people unharmed, and relieve them from the drought”. This reminds one of Bābar’s act of devoting himself for affecting the recovery of Humāyūn from his illness. But in this case Sulṭān Muẓaffar offered himself up, not for the sake of his dear son, but for relieving the distress of his subjects.

4 One MS. inserts اند after شدر.
of Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān; while the other was inclined towards Latif Khān. Sultān Muẓaffar on hearing this said, "Has any news come from Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān?" Intelligent and wise men have inferred from this that he wished to make Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān his heir. He then called Sikandar Khān to his presence, and gave him some advice in the matter of his brothers and then gave him leave to retire. ¹ Then he went to the ḥaram serā, and again came back outside, and rested for a moment. After a moment he heard the call of Friday prayer. He said, "I do not find the strength in me to go to the masjid". He sent the men who were there to the mosque, and said the midday prayer. After he had finished he rested for a moment; and then passed away into the mercy of God. The period of his reign was fourteen years and nine months.

**AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR, SON OF SULTĀN MUẒAFFAR SHĀH.**

As the inevitable happened to Sultān Muẓaffar, Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān, by the exertions of ʿImād-ud-mulk Sultānī and Khudāwand Khān and Fath Khān, son of Fath Khān, sat on the throne of the empire. He sent the body of his father to the town of Sarkhēj, and performed the rites of mourning.

---

¹ This is a very simple, and as it appears to me, a very graphic and impressive word-picture of the passing away of a good man. Firishtah as usual copies the sentences almost word for word, but he adds the day and date, which were Friday the 2nd Jamādi-ul-Awwal, 932 A.H. Firishtah also says that he died in his forty second year, and was a pious Musalmān and a good calligraphist. That he always copied the Qurān, and as the copies were finished sent them to the two sacred places. That many great men from Irān, Turān, Rūm and Arabistān came to Gujrāt in his reign, but he gives the name of only one, namely, Mullā Maḥmūd Siāwash, who was a great calligraphist and came from Shīrāz. Col. Briggs gives the 3rd Jumāl-ul-Ḥul, 932, 17th February, 1525, as the date of his death, and says he died in his 56th year (vol. IV, p. 97).

The Mirāt-i-Sikandari describes the death scene at somewhat greater length, Bayley, page 281; and it also describes his character, giving many anecdotes, extending over many pages. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari says, Bayley, page 281, that Sultān Muẓaffar died on the 2nd Jumādi-ul-akhir, 932 A.H. (1526 A.D.); but places the accession of Sultān Sikandar (page 307) on the 22nd Jumādi-ul-akhir, 932 A.H., 7th April, 1526. The Cambridge History of India (p. 322) has the 7th April, 1526, as the date of Sultān Muẓaffar's death.
On the 3rd day, 1 at the end of those rites, he proceeded to Chāmpānīr. When he arrived in the town of 2 Batūh, he 3 went on a pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy men of the place. He heard that 4 Shāh Shaikh Jiū, who was one of the descendants of Qutb Alam Shaikh Burhān-ud-dīn, had said, that the kingdom would pass to Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān; he attributed false speaking to Shāh Shaikh Jiū; and spoke unseemly words about him. When he arrived at Chāmpānīr, he showed favour 5 to his own servants, and conferred fiefs on them; and did not show any kindness whatever to the amīrs of his father and grandfather. Owing to this reason all the amīrs 6 were sick at heart, and thoroughly vexed, and waited for what might appear from the womb of divine providence. 7 Simā 'Imādul-mulk Sultānī, who was one of the Mużaffar Shāhī slaves, and the slave of the mother of Sikandar Shāh, was very much aggrieved in his heart.

---

1 The text in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. is as I have got it; but Firishtah lith. ed. has روز سیدوم ای تعزیت در خاصه. This makes better sense. Firishtah begins the account of the reign by saying that there were two factions, the larger one in favour of Sultān Khān, and the smaller in that of Latif Khān; but as Sultān Mużaffar had appointed Sultān Sikandar to be his heir, the great nobles took his side; and Latif Khān being unable to assert his claim went away to belof Sultānpūr and Nadarbār.

2 ستة and نتوa in MSS. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted the former in the text-edition.

3 Firishtah agrees; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandārī, Bayley, page 307, says that "he went away without caring to visit the tombs of the holy men at Batūh".

4 The name is سمح حمید کمبر and سمح جمو in the MSS., and سمح حمید کمبر and سمح جمو in two places in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is سمح جمو; and Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 98) has Shah Sheikhjee. The Mirāt-i-Sikandārī, Bayley page 307, has Shēkh Jiū.

5 Firishtah explains كتخون ایام شامِ شاہزادگی بودند, i.e., who were his servants during the time when he was a Shāhzāda.

6 The word كخنة, which I have inserted in the text, is in one MS.; but not in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

7 The prefix سمیا occurs in both MSS., but not in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. calls him 'Imād-ul-mulk Ḥabshī; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandārī, Bayley page 308, calls him "'Imād-ul-mulk Khusk-kadam, who was a king in his own way". The meaning of the last clause is not clear. The Cambridge History of India, page 322, calls him "'Imād-ul-Mulk Khus Kadam".
Some of those who had been honoured by Sultān Sikandar also now began to commit improper acts. The hearts of the soldiers and the ra'iyats now became altogether averse (to Sultān Sikandar); and they prayed to God for his destruction. One day Sultān Sikandar arranged a special darbār; and conferred robes of honour, and seventeen hundred horses on the amīrs and the chief men of the kingdom; but as most of these were bestowed on undeserving persons, the people applied their energies to the coming of Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān, and hoped for his return. Sultān Sikandar, becoming cognizant of what was happening, became anxious and alarmed about his final destiny. At this time also he came to know that Shāhzāda Latif Khān, who was in the neighbourhood of Nadarbār and Sultānpūr, had thoughts about seizing the throne; and was waiting for a suitable opportunity. On hearing this news, he conferred the title of Sharzah Khān on 1 Malik Latif Khān Bāriwāl; and appointed him to attack and put down Latif Khān. 2 Malik Latif Khān went to the border of Nadarbār, and came to know that Latif Khān was in the 3 hilly country of Mūnḳā Baham, and the jungle of Chitōr. Malik Latif, without waiting at all, entered the jungle of Chitōr; and the Rāja of the jungle relying on (the density) of the forest and the roughness of the country, came forward to meet him. Malik Latif with a number of noted chieftains was slain in the battle; and as the road of retreat was closed, the Rājpūts and kōlis attacked the army from behind, and slew seventeen hundred men.

---

1 He is called Malik Latif Khān Bāriwāl in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. Firistah lith. ed. has Malik Latif Khān Bārdār. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 99) has Mullik Luteef without any suffix. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari also calls him Malik Latif, while the Cambridge History of India (p. 322) says that the force against Latif Khān was under Sharza Khān.

2 One MS. omits Khān.

3 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has در کوہستانی مونکا پہن جنگل جہنم. The other has the same except that it has پہن instead of پہن. The lith. ed. has در کوہستانی مونکا پہن جنگل جہنم و جنگل جہنم. Firistah lith. ed. has در کوہستانی مونکا پہن جنگل جہنم و جنگل جہنم. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 99) has had gone to Chittoor”. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 308, has “had set himself up in the hill country of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār with the support of his Rājah of Mūnḳā”; and the Cambridge History of India, page 322, has be retired into Baglāna”. I have adopted the reading in the first MS.
The people of Gujrat, considering this defeat to mean an omen of the downfall of Sultan Sikandar, awaited further results. Sultan Sikandar appointed 1 Qaisar Khan with a large army for the punishment of those wretched people.

While these things were happening, some of the Muazzafar amirs, who were noted for their wickedness, said to 'Imad-ul-mulk, “Sultan Sikandar wants to put you to death; as there are relations of sincere attachments between you and us, we have informed you”. As 'Imad-ul-mulk made himself 2 intoxicated with what those men of evil destiny told him, (he determined) that by any means that might be possible he would remove Sultan Sikandar from the way; and would raise one of the 3 infant sons of Muazzafar Shah on the throne; and himself carry on the political and revenue administration of the country. One day Sikandar rode out on his horse. 'Imad-ul-mulk completely armed his retainers and followed him with the intention of murdering him; but found no opportunity. On the way, some persons disclosed the state of things to Sultan Sikandar; but he, in his simple-mindedness, said in reply, “The people want that I should harass the amirs, and particularly the slaves of Muazzafar Shah. 'Imad-ul-mulk is one of our hereditary slaves. How should he attempt such a wicked act?” In spite of what he said, however, he became grieved and pained at what he had heard. He told one of his intimates and confidants, that it is repeated among the common people from time to time that Bahadur Shah is coming from Delhi to conquer Gujrat; this becomes the cause of worry to their minds.

It so happened, that on that very night, he saw in a 4 dream His Holiness the leader of the wayfarers in the path of the faith, Saiyid

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 322, says that the choice of Qassar Khan shows “either ignorance and folly of the king, or the treachery of the nobles, for Qassar Khan was Latif’s principal adherent”. This may be correct, but I have not seen anything anywhere in support of this statement.

2 The word is مفسر in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah who, as usual, copies a great deal from the Tabaqat has the word مفسر here instead of مفسر.

3 The word is طفل, minor sons, and as a matter of fact only Nasir Khan.

4 In the account of the dream in the Mrat-i-Sikandar (Bayley, p. 308), Shâh 'Alam and Shâkh Jiû are the only two mentioned; and Sultan Muazzafar is
Jalāl Būkhārī and Shāh ‘Ālām and a number of other Shāikhs. Sultan Muẓaffar was also in attendance on them. Sultan Muẓaffar was saying, “Son Sikandar rise from the throne”. Shāikh Jū was also saying, “Rise. It is not your place. Bahādur Shāh is the heir to the throne”. When he awoke Sultan Sikandar immediately sent for a man, and repeated to him what he had seen in the dream. He became very agitated on account of the dream; and in order to keep his mind occupied, mounted to go and play chaqgān. The fact of the dream became known to some people. After a pās or pahar, he went to the palace, and had some food, and went to rest. As the amīrs, and the Sultan’s particular attendants went to their houses, Imād-ul-mulk with some of the men of that group (i.e., those who had told him that the Sultan wanted to put him to death) and two of Sultan Muẓaffar’s slaves and another Ḥabshi slave went to the palace. This was on the 19th Shaba‘ban 932 A.H. (May 30th, O.S. and April 12th N.S., A.D. 1526).

‘Imād-ul-mulk ¹ said to the men, who were with him, “Look at this palace, for it is one of the ² wonders of the age”. When they arrived on the bank of the reservoir, they met Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm, son of Jauhar, who were there. They at once drew their swords from the scabbards and rushed towards them. Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm also placed their hands on their swords; but the wounds inflicted by them were of no avail, and they were both slain. From that place the assassins went to Sultan Sikandar’s bed-chamber. Saiyid ‘Ilm-ud-din was seated before the bed, and was keeping

---

¹ The story has a flavour of unreality. The men had surely seen the palace before; but Firishtah says the same thing, and he agrees generally as to the incidents of the day on which Sultan Sikandar was murdered. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 100) gives the name of Bahā-ul-Moolk, Dar-ul-Moolk and Seif Khan, as the men who accompanied Imād-ul-Moolk, besides the two Turkish slaves and one Abyssinian; and he says that Sikandar Shah, awakened by the noise rushed out to ascertain its cause, when the assassins put him to death. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandar (Bayley, p. 311) has a somewhat different account, but I need not repeat it here. According to it the Sultan was actually murdered by one Bahādur, or Bahādar as Bayley transliterates the name.

² One MS. inserts عجائب غرائب after. 
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guard. When suddenly those men rushed in, the Saiyid on seeing what was happening, became agitated, but placed his hand on his sword and wounded two men; but he himself became a martyr. The assassins then inflicted two or three wounds on Sultan Sikandar, while he was still on the bed. The Sultan, the victim of these attacks, in great fear and alarm jumped up from the bed and stood on the ground, when one of them smote him with the sword of cruelty, and made a martyr of him. His rule lasted for two months and sixteen days.

3 An account of Nasir Khan entitled Sultan Mahmud, son of Sultan Muazzafar.

As Sultan Sikandar became a martyr, ‘Imad-ul-mulk in concert with Bahai-ul-mulk forthwith brought Nasir Khan out of the harem, and placing him on the throne gave him the title of Sultan Mahmud. The amirs of Sultan Sikandar fled (on account of their suspicions and fears) in different directions; and their houses were plundered and sacked. The martyr Sultan’s body was sent to mau’dah Halol, one of the dependencies of Champa unr, and was deposited in the earth. The amirs and the chief men of Gujrat had to come out of necessity to offer their congratulations. ‘Imad-ul-mulk in accordance with the customary law gave royal robes of honour to the amirs and the great men, and comforted them, and also conferred titles. Titles

1 The words appear to be سختکی and in the MS. The second word appears to be سختگی, hardship or cruelty.

2 The MSS. have two months and sixteen days. The lith. ed. has ten months. Firishtah lith. ed. does not mention the period, but Col. Briggs has three months and seventeen days, from Junad-ul-Awul 3rd to Shaban 19th. The Mirat-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 317) makes it only one month and sixteen days from the 28th Jamadi-ul-akhir to Sha'bân 14th; but Bayley says in a note that some MSS. and the Tarikh-i-Alfi make it two months and sixteen days, but it appears that, according to the Mirat-i-Sikandari itself, Bayley, page 281, Sultan Muazzafar died on the 2nd and not on the 28th Jamadi-ul-akhir, and that Sultan Sikandar was assassinated on the 19th Sha'bân; two months and sixteen days was the correct period.

3 The heading I adopted is that in both the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is
were conferred on one hundred and eighty-one persons, but the stipends and emoluments of the amirs were not increased. Most people waited for the arrival of Sultan Bahadur; and made every effort by sending messages and emissaries to summon him. They were angry at the leadership and eminence of 'Imad-ul-mulk, who had been one of the Sultan's slaves, and did not lower their heads in obedience and submission to him. Khudawand Khan and Tāj Khān more specially sought to be ahead of the others in this matter. 'Imad-ul-mulk, on account of his ancient and recent enmity, attempted to injure them. Tāj Khān, having put the girdle of endeavour and energy on his loins, advanced with a well-equipped army, drawn from his own caste and tribesmen, to bring back Sultan Bahadur. 'Imad-ul-mulk in great distress wrote a letter to 2 Niẓām-ul-mulk Dakini, sent him much money and summoned him to come to the boundary of Sultanpur and Nadarbār. He also wrote a letter to the 3 Rāja of Māl, and summoned him to the border of Chāmpānīr; and the Rāja, on account of his being in the vicinity, collected his forces, and came to the neighbourhood of Chāmpānīr. ('Imad-ul-mulk also) owing to his great caution and far-sightedness sent a petition to His Majesty Firdūs Makāni 4 Bābar Bādshāh, to the effect that if he would send one of his many powerful armies, he would present the

---

1 The whole of the sentence from فرود ني و آرزوی is omitted from one of the MSS. It is also omitted in the text-edition.

2 Firishtah says that Niẓām-ul-mulk kept the تحائف, but passed the time with negligence. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 101, 102) has presents consisting of jewels and money. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah, the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 318, says that, 'Imad-ul-Mulk wrote to 'Imad-ul-Mulk Ilichpuri to come to Sultanpur and Nadarbār, and wrote to Rāna Sānkā, and conciliated the neighbouring zamindārs, and also wrote to Bābar.

3 See note 2, page 314.

4 One MS. has Humayün Bādshāh here by mistake; but a few lines further down it has Bābar Bādshāh. Firishtah's account of the petition to Bābar agrees generally with the text, but he says that 'Imad-ul-mulk suggested that if one of Bābar's army would come to Dīū, he ('Imad-ul-mulk) would present a krōr of tankas towards the expenses. Col. Briggs explains this by saying that it was intended that Babur should send the force down the Indus to land at Dīū, and he adds that the letter to Babur never reached its destination, having been intercepted by the ruler of Dongurpoor (vol. IV, p. 102).
fort of Dip, and one krōr of tankas in cash towards the expenses of His Majesty's servants.

The thānadār of Dūngarpūr, having received information that 'Imād-ul-mulk had sent a petition to Bābar Bādshāh, and had asked His Majesty to come to Gujrat, sent a letter to Tāj Khān and KHUDA-
wand Khān; and the amīrs of Gujrat sent a man to Bahādur Shāh and summoned him. ¹ The messenger sent by the amīrs waited upon Sultān Bahādur in the neighbourhood; and presented to him their peti-
tion. Sultān Bahādur was sad and grieved at his father's death, and performed the mourning ceremony. He gave Pāyinda Khān Afghān, who had come from Jāunpūr to take him there, permission to go back; and although the latter dilated (on the splendour) of the empire of the eastern country, and incited him to go there, he turned his face towards Āḥmadābād. They say, that men came at one and the same time from Jāunpūr and Gujrat to summon him. He said, he would leave the choice to his horse, in whichever direction he would take him. The horse started towards Gujrat. When he arrived in the neigh-
bourhood of Chitōr, soldiers arrived one after another from Gujrat; and they brought the news of the assassination of Sultān Sikandar, and the accession of Naṣīr Khān. Sultān Bahādur was pained to hear of it, and starting from there encamped at Chitōr. There Chānd Khān and Ibrāhīm Khān, sons of Sultān Muzaffar, came to him. He was pleased and delighted at meeting his brothers. Chānd Khān took leave of him and remained at Chitōr; but Ibrāhīm Khān chose the service of his brother, and accompanied him. In a short time after passing Chitōr, ² Udaī Singh, Rāja of Mālpūr, and some adherents

¹ The account in Firishtah agrees generally with that in the text, only he calls Pāyinda Khān Afghān Pābind Khān, and says he came from the Afghāns of Jaunpūr. He is also clearer about Bahādur's leaving the choice between Gujrat and Jaunpūr to his horse. According to him Bahādur said, he would ride out, and then let go the reins. As to Chānd Khān and Ibrāhīm Khān, he says they were with Rānā Sānkhā, being probably fugitives from Gujrat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 102) says that Chand Khan and Ibrahim Khan first gave Bahadur the news of the assassination of Sultan Sikandur, and he also says clearly that they had fled to the Rana after that event.

² Firishtah lith. ed. here calls Udaī Singh, Rāja of Mālpūr, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 102) has Raja Oody Sing of Poloh as before.
of Sikandar, such as Malik Sarwar and Malik Yusuf and Latif and others, came and entered Sulțān Bahādur’s service.

Sulțān Bahādur sent Malik Tāj Jamāl with a farman conveying assurances of his favour to Tāj Khān and the other amīrs; and gave them news of his 1 approach. Tāj Khān on seeing the letter advanced from Dandūqā with a great force to join the service of Sulṭān Bahādur; and 2 he bade farewell to Latif Khān, son of Muẓaffar, after giving him a sum of money to pay his expenses; (telling him) now that the heir of Muẓaffar’s and Maḥmūd’s kingdom had arrived, it was not advisable that he should remain there. Latif Khān with a heart which was frying, and with eyes which were shedding tears went as a suppliant to Fath Khān who was a cousin (uncle’s son) of Sulṭān Bahādur. When the Sulṭān arrived at Dūngarpūr, Khurram Khān and other Khāns hastened to welcome him; and the amīrs and sardārs of all the provinces turned their faces towards him. ʿImād-ul-mulk on hearing this news, and being deserted by these adherents began to collect troops. He began to empty the treasury, and sent a number of men with an army ready to fight and fifty elephants, under the command of ʿAḍd-ul-mulk to the town of Mahrāsa; so that they might on their arrival there, close the roads to the coming and going of the people, and 3 permit no one to go to Sulṭān Bahādur. When Sulṭān Bahādur arrived in the town of Maḥmūdābād, the amīrs who had joined Sikan- dar, and who had fled for fear of their lives, came and obtained the honour of the service (of Sulṭān Bahādur). The men who were with ʿAḍd-ul-mulk fled from Mahrāsa. On the following morning when

1 The word خروم is omitted in one MS.
2 It would appear that Shāhzāda Latif Khān was with Tāj Khān, and this is stated expressly by Firishtah, as he says كه بآوأ گن. Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 326, says that when Bahādar came to Dūngarpūr, Tāj Khān left Dhandūkah to wait upon him. Just then prince Latif Khān arrived at Dhandūkah, and solicited the help of Tāj Khān, offering to place the administration of the country to his hands. Tāj Khān told him that he had already promised his support to Sulṭān Bahādar.
3 There is a difference in the readings here. One MS. has كه كسي پيش سلطان بهادر. The other omits the word Sulṭān. The lith. ed. has كه كسي بلزمت سلطان بهادر. I have adopted the first reading, which is also the reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but he substitutes Shāhzāda for Sulṭān.
the Sultān arrived at Mahrāsa, Tāj Khān, with the royal umbrella and the other insignia of royalty, came and saw the Sultān; and the latter with great pomp and power encamped in the city of Nahrwāla

1 Pattan on the 26th of the auspicious month of Ramaḍān in the year 932 A.H., August 15th N.S., 1526 A.D. From that place he advanced towards Aḥmadābād after 2 assuming the insignia of royalty. On the 22nd of the month, he performed the pilgrimage to the tombs of the great Shaikhs and his royal ancestors; and then entered Aḥmadābād.

‘Imād-ul-mulk in his agitation and confusion paid a 3 year’s wages to the soldiers in advance, and incited them to fight. 4 Sultān Bahādur had after three or four days left Aḥmadābād with great pomp and splendour. During this interval most of the amīrs, after taking much money from ‘Imād-ul-mulk, joined the Sultān. 5 Bahā-ul-mulk and Dāwar-ul-mulk who were the actual murderers of Sultān Sikandar sought for a disagreement with ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and joined the Sultān’s service. The latter, considering it desirable in the cir-

1 The word پلت Pattan is left out in one MS.

2 The word is not in both MSS., اعلان in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The 26th of Ramaḍān 932 A.H. corresponds to August 3rd, 1526 A.D., according to Col. Briggs and August (without any date) 1526 A.D. according to Bayley. Col. Briggs’s date is according to the old style. The date of the assumption of the royalty would accordingly be 15th of August (N.S.), 1526 A.D., and the place Nahrwāla. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, gives the 11th July, 1526, and Aḥmadābād as the date and place respectively of the accession.

3 One MS. has زر يكاله , the other has only يكاله . The lith. ed. has مراجع يكاله . Firishtah also has يكاله مراجع . I have, therefore, retained the reading in the lith. ed. Firishtah adds that ‘Imād-ul-mulk also sent an emissary to Shāhzāda Latif Khān, so that he might with the latter’s aid be able to fight with Sultān Bahādur.

4 This sentence is not in the lith. ed. but is in both MSS. There is, however, a slight difference between the two readings. One MS. has بلالحمد اباد while the other has از لحمد اباد . I think the latter is correct. It appears from Firishtah that he went from Aḥmadābād to Muḥammadābād; and پر امد means leaving and not entering.

5 Bahā-ul-Molk and Dar-ul-Mulk were mentioned by Col. Briggs as two of the men who attacked and killed Sikandar Shah. See note 1, page 327.
cumstances of the time, tried to please them, and endeavoured to comfort (their?) hearts. The period of the rule of Sultan Mahmūd Naṣīr Khān did not exceed four months.

1 An account of the accession of Sultan Bahādur Shāh.

As the day of 2 the 'Id-i-Ramaḍān of the year 932 A.H. was according to the selection of astrologers fixed as the time of the accession of Sultan Bahādur he sat on the throne of his great ancestors (on that day) by the exertions of the amīrs and the great men of the country, and raised the standard of empire. The rites of making offerings of loyalty, and of wave offering were carried out; and (the hearts) of the amīrs and of the great 3 men and of the commanders of the army were gladdened by increases in their stipends, and by addition to their titles, and by grants of money and horses and robes of honour.

In the beginning of Shawwāl he moved from that place, and advanced towards Chāmpānir. At the first stage of the journey Muʿāẓm Khān with a number of other respected leaders hastened to wait on him, and received favours and kindness. When he started from that station, on the way he 4 conferred the title of Shams-ul-mulk on Nūh

---

1 The heading I have in the text is the heading in both the MSS., with this difference that one has Shāh at the end, while the other omits it. The heading in the lith. ed. is ذكر سلطان سلطان بهادر سسلطان مظفر. This is more like the heading of other reigns.

2 According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 327, Bahādur Shāh assumed the royal insignia at Nahrwālah on the 25th Ramāzan, 932 A.H., August 1526; and the formal accession took place at Ahmadābād. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 103) says, he was formally crowned at Nehrwalla Puttum on the 26th Ramzan, 932 A.H., August 3rd, 1526 A.H. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says he ascended the throne on July the 11th, 1526, at Ahmadābād.

3 The words و اعتبان are not to be found in one MS.

4 There is a difference of readings here. One MS. has the reading I have accepted. The other MS. and the lith. ed. have نوح بن يوسف ملك و حسين بن صيف الملك را شهش الملك خطاب داد. Apparently there is some mistake, for one title could hardly be conferred on two persons. I have consulted Firishtah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, but have not received any help from either. There is no mention of the fact in either. Firishtah after mentioning the arrival of Muzaffar Khān goes on to say that the बा नरक river Bātrak was in such flood, etc. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 331, at once takes Sultan Bahādur to the
bin Yusuf-ul-mulk; and when news came that the river of Bātrak was in such flood, that it was critical to cross it, Sultān Bahādur halted at the town of 1 Sahvunj; and left Tāj Khān on the bank of the river, that he might send the army over in different bodies one after another. The next day a number of the amirs of Chāmpānīr, who had taken their 2 salaries from the treasury, came and joined him. Sultān Bahādur owing to the nobility of his spirit made a present of that 3 money to them. When Sultān Bahādur arrived at the bank of the river Mahindri, at the fort of Khānpūr, his army commenced to cross over.

‘Imād-ul-mulk sent men towards Baroda and in other directions, so that they might raise the dust of rebellion and keep the Sultān occupied with it. But the latter rapidly crossed the river, and advanced towards Chāmpānīr. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city, Diā-ul-mulk, son of Naṣīr Khān, 4 came and saw him. The

Mahindri. Bayley in a note on that page says that the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī is rather fuller at this place, and makes a quotation from it; but the grant of the title on Nūh bin Yusuf-ul-mulk or on Ḥusain bin Saif-ul-mulk is not mentioned in it. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 105) does not mention the Bātrak, but says that Bahadur Shah was compelled to halt at the Saburmutt on account of the heavy rain, from which one might infer that the Bātrak is probably another name of the Saburmutt. Bayley in the quotation from the Tabakāt calls it the Wātrak.

1 The name is written as سیونه in both MSS. and سیونه in the lith. ed. and سیونه in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

2 The word is مامیانه in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is مالبا in the other MS. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have not before this seen the word مامیانه in respect of the stipends of amirs and soldiers. The word ordinarily in use is علوغ. It is not clear in what way the amirs had taken the mahiūna or māl, but it may be inferred from what he says in the next sentence, that there was something reprehensible or wrong about it.

3 The lith. ed. adds ببر زبان نئاورد but neither the MSS. nor the corresponding sentence in Firishtah have those or any similar words.

4 One MS. has امده دید. The other has امده دید. The word Amer Sulṭān pārdid further to after Sulṭān and has been written امده. The lith. ed. has only امده. The account given in the Mirat-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 331) is different. It does not mention Diā-ul-mulk at all, but says the Sultān crossed the river with four hundred horsemen and some elephants, before the rest of the army; and sent Tāj Khān with three hundred
Sultān told him, "Go in advance, and convey this order to your father, that he should surround the house of 'Imād-ul-mulk and seize him". He also sent Tāj Khān very quickly with some other Khāns to attack 'Imād-ul-mulk; and he also himself mounted to follow him. Tāj Khān went with great quickness, and surrounded 'Imād-ul-mulk's house. The latter threw himself from the wall of the house, and took shelter in the house of Shāh Jī Śādīqī. His house was pillaged and his sons taken prisoner. It so happened that Sultān Bahādur 1 crossed in front of the house of Khudāwand Khān. The latter came out of his house, and rendered homage. After that his slaves 2 seized 'Imād-ul-mulk, and brought him before the Sultān. The latter ordered that 'Imād-ul-mulk and Šaīf-ud-dīn and the other murderers of Sultān Sikandar should be hanged. The title of 'Imād-ul-mulk was conferred on Rāfī-ul-mulk, son of Malik Tuakil, who was one of the Muzaffār Shāhī slaves; and he was made the 'Arid-i-Mumālik (the head-munshi of the kingdom).

4 'Aḍūl-mulk fled from Barōda, but on the way the kōls plundered all his equipage and things. Sultān Bahādur appointed Shamshīr-ul-mulk to seize 'Aḍūl-mulk; and he appointed Nizām-ul-mulk to attack Muḥāfiz Khān. The rebels fled and sought the protec-

---

1 One MS. has 'gīfz kr̲d\(^{1}\), which I think would be better; but as the other MS., the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah all have 'ubrūr kr̲d\(^{2}\), I have retained it.
2 It appears from Firishtah that he was seized in the house of Shāh Jīnā, who, according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 332, was not the man that had cursed Sultān Sikandar, but was the head keeper of the divān.
3 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 105) says that Imād-ool-Moolk's son was also executed, but this does not appear anywhere else. The actual words about the mode of punishment in Firishtah are سرضا ناخن جای زندگی پوست کنند. As regards 'Imād-ul-mulk, however, Mīr Abū Tūrāb says, on page 3 of his Tarikh-i-Gujārāt, that در میدان دربار در میان بایار سرضا ناخن جای زندگی پوست کنند, i.e., in the plain of the darbār, in the bāzār his skin was flayed, while he was still living, from his head to the nails of his toes.
4 Firishtah lith. ed. agrees generally with the text; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106) says that the fugitives "sought refuge with Ooly Sing, Raja of Poloh". This partly agrees with the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, which says that 'Ard-ul-mulk and Muḥāfiz Khān fled to the hill country of Pol, Bayley, page 333.
tion of Rāy Singh; and the troops sent against them returned after plundering their goods and chattels. After two or three days news was brought that the son of ‘Arz-ul-mulk and Shāh Jīū Ṣādiqī and a number of the murderers of Sikandar Shāh had been slain in the house of Qadr Khān. Bahā’-ul-mulk taking advantage of an opportunity fled from Chāmpānīr. On the way, the shahna (police superintendent) of Dēhī seized him, and brought him before the Sultān. As he had inflicted a wound on Sultān Sikandar, and the wound which ‘Ilm-ud-din had inflicted on him was still fresh (i.e., unhealed), Sultān Bahādūr ordered that he should be flayed, and then hanged. The three other men, who were among the murderers of Sultān Sikandar, were all (to use the quaint phraseology of the original) placed at the mouth of the cannon and sent into the air, or as one would say in ordinary language blown up at the mouths of cannon. In short, in a little while, all the murderers of Sultān Sikandar were put to death with great torture.

It so happened that on the day on which Sultān Bahādūr entered Chāmpānīr, Latif Khān, son of Muḥaffar Shāh, at the instigation of some amirs, also came to the city and for some days remained concealed there. Qaṣār Khān and Alf Khān and some other amirs sent a message to Latif Khān that it was not fitting that he should remain there any longer; and he should in any case conceal himself in some other corner. He became hopeless and scratching the back of his

---

1 One MS. has مراجعات نموذج instead of مراجعات نموذج.
2 The MSS. have what I have got in the text. The lith. ed. agrees, with this difference that it has بسر عرض الملك instead of بسر عرض الملك. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has بسر عرض الملك. This appears to be correct. No person of the name of عرض الملك is mentioned anywhere else.
3 He was one of the murderers of Sultān Sikandar, whose services Sultān Bahādūr had at first thought it advisable to accept, but who, now according to Firishtah, became doubtful of his safety and fled. See also note 5, page 332.
4 One MS. has عالم الدين.
5 One MS. omits the Khān after Latif.
6 The words are پاک بابر پرساند in one MS. and in the lith. ed. They are پاک بابر پرساند in the other MS. I have accepted the latter, as it is more correct grammatically.
7 The word پس is not to be found in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; but is in the other MS., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have retained it.
head, went to the country of Mál. The Rāja of Mál did not show any favour to him. 'Aḍd-ul-mulk and Muḥāfiz Khān then joined him, and they went from there to Mūnkā; and there they passed the time in wandering about in the hilly country.

In short, Sultaṅ Bahādur now commenced to attend to the welfare of the raʿiyats and of the soldiery; and made all the people, and all sections of the community participants in his boundless largesses. He increased the stipends of the soldiers generally by ten-twenties and ten-forties; and gave them one year's wages, and made them contented and thankful. He also gave to the faqirs, who lived round the tombs in Sarkhēj and Batūh and Rasulābād happy by giving them stipends and allowances.

it is the back of the head that one scratches when in a quandary.

1 Firishtah lith. ed. says that Latif Khān went to the country of Mál, but does not say what happened to him there, or whether he afterwards joined 'Aḍd-ul-mulk and Muḥāfiz Khān. Col. Briggs says he went to Poloh. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 333) does not appear to mention the fact that Latif Khān came to Chāmpānīr, and remained concealed there, but says 'Aḍd-ul-mulk and Muḥāfiz Khān fled to the country of Pāl, and joined Latif Khān. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says he fled to Pālanpur.

2 The name is Mūnkā in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has Mūnkā. Col. Briggs says, vol. IV, page 106, that Aẓd-ul-Mulk and Mohāfiz Khān fled to Mutwar, and in a note on the same page he gives the boundaries of Mutwar as between the Nerbudda and Tapti rivers, N. and S., and Little Oodipoor and Choly Maheswur, E. and W. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī does not give the name of the place, but Bayley in a note on page 334, in which he refers to the Tabakāt, says that Latif Khān fled to the hill country of Bōṅgā.

3 The meaning is not quite clear; it apparently means doubled and quadrupled, but this is not likely. Firishtah lith. ed. inserts a 35 between 35 and 35 . This would be 300 per cent. None of the translations refers to this. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 333, says that "The Sultaṅ now opened the hand of bounty, and like a cloud rained down gold and jewels and allowances and favours all round"; but there is no mention of the proportion by which the wages of the soldiers were increased. It appears from page 334, however, in connection with the allowances to Ghāzi Khān that 35 does mean twofold, and consequently 35 and 35 also mean threefold and fourfold.
And as at that time, the fort of Châmpânîr was the capital of Gujurât, and the Sultâns ascended the throne there, he on the 15th of Dhî-qâ’dah, at the moment chosen by the astrologers, adorned and decorated a jewelled throne, inlaid with gems, in the manner of the old Sultâns near the eastern darbâr, and on the date previously mentioned, which was in the year 932 A.H., he placed the crown on his head, and according to the custom of his ancestors, sat on the throne. The great men and the Shâhîâhs and the amirs and the Khâns spoke words of congratulations, and carried out the ceremonies of making loyal offerings and wave offerings. On that day, a thousand persons had the distinction of robes of honour being conferred on them; and a number of people were honoured by the grant of titles. Ghâzi Khân was then appointed to the government of Nadarbâr and Sultânîpûr; and although his allowances had been increased by ten-twenty (i.e., double) at the accession at Ahmäd âbâd, it was again doubled now.

At this time news came that Latîf Khân had, at the instigation of ‘Aqâ-ul-mulk and Muhâfîz Khân, gone to the hills of Awâs in the vicinity of Sultânîpûr and Nadarbâr, with the intention of creating a disturbance and raising a revolt. Sultân Bahâdur ordered that an army should be sent, which would in co-operation with Ghâzi Khân crush and destroy him. At this time, the date of the accession on

1 This second coronation is mentioned by Firishtah lith. ed. and very briefly by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106). The Mirât-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 334) also mentions it briefly after mentioning the famine.

2 It appears from the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 334, that the Sultân ordered Tâj Khân to command the army against Latîf Khân and his adherents; but Tâj Khân represented that Ghâzi Khân son of Ahmad Khân was the best man for the work, and the latter was then appointed to the sâhâb of Nadarbâr.

3 According to the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 333, the famine occurred before the receipt of the news of Latîf Khân’s revolt, and the appointment of Ghâzi Khân, or at least the famine is mentioned there before the revolt.

4 The place is so named in the MSS., in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106) calls it the Ahwâs hills. They do not appear to be mentioned in the Mirât-i-Sikandari.

5 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have the text as I have it, but in the corresponding passage of Firishtah there is the word ہے after the word ہے. This is, I think, a better reading. The date of the accession on the ‘Id-ul-‘âdha was the anniversary of the accession at Ahmâdâbâd which took place on that day.
the ‘Id-ud-duha arrived. On this day the Sultan arranged a grand festive assembly, and again bestowed on many of the amirs robes and belts and daggers and swords, and in this way made them pleased with him.

It so happened, that at this time a famine took place, and (the Sultan) ordered Hushiyar-ul-mulk, who was the treasurer, to attend at his stirrups, so that at the time when he was riding, he should give a 1 Muzaffari to everyone who should ask for help. The Sultan rode out every day twice to play changan; and in every city many alms houses were established for faqirs and poor people; and the Sultan 2 endeavoured with all his energy to ameliorate the condition of the ra’iyats; so that in a short time a new grandeur and splendour appeared in the country of Gujrat.

A considerable time had not yet elapsed, when the men, who had been creating disturbances, began to move again. Shujah-ul-mulk fled and joined Latif Khan, and Qaisar Khan who was one of the great amirs of Muzaffar Shah sent a number of his retainers with him. As Qaisar Khan and 3 Ulugh Khan had been in agreement with ‘Imad-ul-mulk in the matter of the murder of Sultan Sikandar, and were afraid of suffering the punishments for their acts, they did not abandon their hostile attitude. The loyal amirs having come to know of this informed the Sultan. 4 The latter sent Ulugh Khan with a well

---

1 The Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 333, says, “a gold ashrafi”. The Sultan’s riding out to play changan is mentioned in this connection, I suppose, to indicate that the Muzaffar’s were given away on these occasions.

2 The wording in the MS. and in the lith. ed. which is , appears to be defective. Either there should be the proposition in before or the words should be omitted. These words are omitted in the corresponding sentence in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

3 One MS. and Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Broggs and the Mirat-i-Sikandari have , so I have taken that name, though the other MS. and the lith. ed. have .

4 There is apparently some misstatement in the sequence of events. Apparently Ulugh Khan had already been sent in command of the army sent against Latif Khan, when the loyal amirs made the representation in the matter, but the difficulty is that it is said that Qaisar Khan and Ulugh Khan were put into prison. Probably Ulugh Khan was recalled, or he had not started, although the troops he was to command had. The Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 335,
equipped army against Latif Khan. Some of the loyal adherents of the Sultan represented to him, that as Qaisar Khan and Ulugh Khan had combined with ‘Imad-ul-mulk in the murder of Sultan Sikandar, and now they were again awakening the rebellion, which had fallen asleep, by sending letters, etc., it was not right that they should be in that neighbourhood. The Sultan was considering this matter, when news came to Taj Khan, that Ulugh Khan and Qaisar Khan had summoned Latif Khan to Nadoıt by a road which was not well known and they were about to join him. Taj Khan reported all this to the Sultan in private, and took an oath on the word of God (i.e., the Qur’an) that there was no untruth in what he was saying. The next day, when the amirs, according to daily custom, came to salute (the Sultan), Qaisar Khan and Ulugh Khan were put into prison. 1 Dawai-ul-mulk, who had escaped by means of an excuse, was arrested. Dīā-ul-mulk and Khwājah Bābū who were suspected of associating with the conspirators were also imprisoned; they were brought into the public audience hall, with their heads uncovered and their hands bound. The men of the city assembled in multitudes and plundered their houses. Dīā-ul-mulk placed a robe round his neck, and made humble supplication; and Bābū agreed to pay 2 fifty lakhs of tankas as the ransom of blood. Sultan Bahadur gave up the idea of putting them to death and ordered them to be released. His kingdom was now purified from the weeds of disturbance and rebellion.

In the beginning of the year 933 A.H., 1527 A.D., a body of silahdars (troopers), whose numbers reached 3 ten thousand, made a

---

1 The name is written as دوار الملك in the MS., and دوار الملك in the lith. ed.

2 One MS. has here by mistake helpless, as an adjective to Bābū instead of بجاه.

3 The number is ten thousand in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. But Firishtah lith. ed. has two thousand. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 107) makes it a large party headed by nearly two thousand officers. According to Firishtah they
complaint on a Friday, that they had not received their allowances, and did not allow the _Khuṭba_ to be read. Sūltān Bahādur excused the offence on account of his innate forbearance, and ordered the payment of their allowances. These men had intended to go to Latīf Khān, and they had also instigated others to do so.

At this time a petition came from Gḥāzī Kān to the effect that "Latīf Khān has come to Sūltānpūr with a large force and has raised the standard of hostility. I went and met him, and after the battle, 'Aḍd-ul-mulk and Muhāfīz Khān fled, and Rāy Bhm with his brothers fell on the battlefield, and Latīf Khān was wounded and taken prisoner". Sūltān Bahādur immediately on hearing this news, sent Muhīb-ul-mulk, and a body of other _amirs_, so that they might properly and kindly attend to the condition of Latīf Khān, and bring him to his presence, after placing ointments on his wounds; but as he was mortally wounded he died on the way. He was buried in the village of Hālīl, one of the dependencies of Chāmpānīr, by the side of Sūltān Sikandar. In the course of the same year ¹ Naṣīr Khān, who had received the title of Sūltān Mḥmūd also died. The Sūltān appointed a number of beadsmen (ٌوُقُبُّلَةٌ دَارٌ) at his brothers' tombs, and ordered the daily distribution of cooked and uncooked food there.

In the same year, also, news came that ² Rāy Singh, Rāja of Māl on hearing of the execution of Qaṣīr Khān, sought an opportunity

---

¹ This was a young king who was placed on the throne by 'Imād-ul-mulk after the murder of Sūltān Sikandar. The Cambridge History of Indiá, page 323, says that he was secretly put to death, but I do not know the authority on which this statement is made. Neither the Taḥqīq nor Firīštah nor the Minūt-i-Sikandari says so, though it is quite possible that the young prince was secretly murdered.

² The reason of the hostility of Rāy Singh on hearing the news of the execution of Qaṣīr Khān, and of his invading the Sūltān's dominion, and of sacking the town of Dāhūd is not at all clear, nor is it clear why Rāy Singh should have seized a lot of the properties of Dīā'-ul-mulk, the son of Qaṣīr Khān. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says that it was the murder of the
and sacked the town of 1 Dahūd, and much property belonging to Diā'ul-mulk, son of Qaṣar Khān fell into his hands. The Sultan on hearing this news became anxious, and wanted to advance in person. Tāj Khān, however, submitted to him, that at the beginning of a reign, many occurrences like this take place, and His Majesty should not at all allow any distress or pain to lodge in his heart. If this slave is commanded to undertake this service, he would with the divine favour and the auspiciousness of His Majesty's attention, chastise that turbulent man, the Rāja of Māl, as he deserves. The Sultan immediately conferred a robe of honour on him, and sent one lakh of horsemen with him for the punishment of Rāy Singh, the Rāja of Māl. Tāj Khān

child Mahmūd II, that altercation Udai Singh of Pālānpur, or, as he is described in the text and in Frishtah, of Rāy Singh, Rāja of Māl. But it is not clear why this Hindu chief should have taken the murder of the young Musalmān prince so much to heart as to put his country into such danger by raiding the territory of the powerful Sultan of Gujrat. The text both of the Tabaqāt and of Frishtah make it clear that it was on hearing the execution of Qaṣar Khān, that he sought an opportunity and sacked Dahūd. In respect of Nasir Khān both the Tabaqāt and Frishtah had used the word, death. So that when they speak of the execution of Nasir Khān, the name cannot be a mistake for Nasir Khān. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 335, does not directly connect the raid by Rāy Singh of Pāl, as he is called there, either with the execution of Kaisar Khān or the death of Nasir Khān but it connects it indirectly with the former, and not in any way with the latter. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not mention the fact of the property of Zā'ul-mulk being taken in the text, but Bayley in a note on page 336 quoting from the Tabaqāt says that Rai Singh "made his attack on hearing of the execution of Kaisar Khān, apparently because he supposed that that showed disunion in Bahādur Shāh's camp". This is not a very cogent reason, but I mention it for what it is worth. Later on in the same note Bayley calls Zā'ul-mulk, the son of Nasir Khān; and that Rāy Singh's son afterwards came in and submitted and was honoured with a dress (Khī'at). Both these statements appear to me to be incorrect. The Tabaqāt and Frishtah both calls Diā'ul-mulk, the son of Qaṣar Khān. There is no Nasir Khān mentioned anywhere, about this time except the young prince, who certainly had no sons. As to the visit of Rāy Singh's son to the Sultan, it will be seen from the text that it was Rānā Sānkit's son and not Rāy Singh's, who came and paid a visit to the Sultan. The 1st. ed. of the Tabaqāt, however, says that it was Rāy Singh's son. Probably Bayley had some MS. before him, that also said so.

1 دهم in the text.
invaded the country of Māl and began to devastate it. Rāy Singh then, with great humility and distress, submitted a petition for the pardon of his offences, through the intervention of Sharf-ul-mulk who was one of Sultān Muẓaffar’s amirs. It did not, however, meet with acceptance; and Tāj Khān penetrated into the country and stretched his hands to plunder and ravage it; and did not leave anything undone in devastating it. Rāy Singh chose a difficult position, and prepared to fight there, and Tāj Khān standing firm and strong met him. A large number of active and strong men were killed on the side of Rāy Singh, and only one man was killed on the side of the Musalmāns. Tāj Khān remained one month in the country of Māl, after which he hastened to the service of the Sultān.

In the month of Rabī‘-ul-āwwal of the same year, Sultān Bahādur left his capital with the object of hunting. At this time a number of the ra‘iyats of Kanbāyat came, and made complaint of the acts of the officer in-charge of the town. The Sultān sent Tāj Khān to arrange the affairs of that neighbourhood; and issued an order for the dismissal of the dīrūgta of Kanbāyet. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānir, the son of Rānā Sānkā came to render homage, and after staying there for some days, and after being made happy by favours and kindness, received permission to leave.

In the year 934 A.H., 1528 A.D., the Sultān cast the shadow of conquest over the countries of Idar and Bākār, and having in a short time conquered those countries, returned to Chāmpānir. He then went with a small retinue to rebuild the fort of Bahrūj, and after

---

1 There is a little difference in the readings. One MS. has در امرة بنياد, i.e., having invaded the country began to devastate it. The other has only در امر, i.e., invaded the country. The 3rd ed. has در امر. I have adopted the first reading as it gives reason for Rāy Singh’s humility. Frishtah also has the same reading.

2 This is somewhat curious, but Frishtah also says, i.e., of the Musalmāns more than one man was not killed. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 108) also says the same thing, but he describes it as a remarkable fact; and he says only one man of Tāj Khān’s army is said to have fallen. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī also says the same thing, and says that the man who was killed was named Muḥammad Ḥasan (Bayley, p. 336). M. Ḥusain has adopted in the text-edition.
finishing his work there, went to Kanbāyet. One day, when he was amusing himself on the coast, a ship happened to arrive from the port Dip. The men, who came in it, reported, that a ship belonging to the firangīs had been cast ashore by the wind. Qawām-ul-mulk had seized the property on board the ship, and was causing the firangīs the hardship of being made slaves. On hearing this news after breaking his fast the Sultān travelled to Dip by road. Qawām-ul-mulk hastened to meet him, and produced the firangīs before him. He invited them to accept Islām, and having made a large number of them Musalmāns, raised the standard of return.

In the same year a letter came from ‘Ādil Khān, governor of Āsir, who was a nephew (sister’s son) of Sultan Bahādūr, the purport

---

1 The meaning of the words which are transliterated in the MSS. (though the word is written as in one of them) is not quite clear, but I suppose my translation is correct. Firistahā has the word instead of . Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 109) says the crew had been made prisoners.

2 The word is in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firistahā says the Sultān became very pleased on hearing the news, and agrees generally as to the facts of the incidents; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 109) says in the text that all the Europeans taken on this occasion were circumcised, and became Mahomedans; but in a note he says that “The Portuguese historian states that they resisted being converted and were eventually released. James de Mesquita was the name of the officer; and his whole crew consisted of only sixteen men in a boat. It is certain that James de Mesquita was with Bahadur Shah afterwards, at the siege of Chittoor, and was employed by him as his envoy to Nuno de Cunha in the year that Bahadur Shah lost his life”. This incident does not appear to be mentioned in either the Mirāt-i-Sikandari or the Cambridge History of India.

3 The tenor of the letter is rather vague and disjointed. Firistahā lith. ed. agrees generally but the names of the party are somewhat different. ‘Ādil Khān is called Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri Burhān Nizām Shāh Bahri, Barīd Biddār Qāsim Barīd, and ‘Imād-ul-mulk, ‘Alā-ud-din ‘Imād Shāh; and instead of the three hundred elephants mentioned in the Tabaqāt, Firistahā says some elephants, , were carried away as plunder. Col. Briggs’s account is similar to Firistahā; but he calls Mirān Muḥammad Shāh “Meeran Mahomed Khan”. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 340, generally agrees; but says that the confederacy against ‘Imād-ul-Mulk Gāwēl or Mirān Muḥammad Khan consisted of besides Nizām-ul-Mulk and Barīd, Khudāwand Khān Pāštīr, and ‘Ain-ul-Mulk and others; but it says nothing of the looting of the elephants and the taking of the fort of Māhūr; but Bayley mentions them
of which was this, "As 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwīlī had prayed with humility for help from this faqīr, and Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahṣī and 1 Malik Barīd of Bidar had forcibly entered into the country Kāwīl, the faqīr went to help and reinforce 'Imād-ul-mulk; and a great battle took place. The faqīr drove away the men in front of him. Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahṣī, who was in ambush, attacked and defeated 'Imād-ul-mulk; and carried away as plunder three hundred elephants belonging to the faqīr. The faqīr has 2 now come, relying on the generosity of Your Majesty. Whatever noble order is issued by you will be entirely for the welfare of all; and he (I suppose, Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahṣī) has violently taken possession of the fort of 3 Māhūr, which is the greatest fort in Kāwīl." An order was issued to the following effect, "Last year a petition came from 'Imād-ul-mulk, and Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk, the governor of Nahrwālā, in accordance with orders, went and amicably settled the matter between the parties. Now that this violence has been perpetrated by Niẓām-ul-mulk; therefore in accordance with the saying—the offender is a tyrant—he is the tyrant and 'Imād-ul-mulk the victim of his oppression; and it is a duty incumbent on the energy of all merciful people to help the oppressed." In the month of Muḥarram in the year 935 A.H., September, 1528 A.D., the Sultān advanced with an immense army with the object of conquering the Deccan, and encamped in the town of Barōda; and a long time elapsed there for the mustering of the troops.

4 About the middle of that year 935 A.H., 1529 A.D., Jām Firūz, the ruler of Thatha, had to leave his country owing to the growing power of the Arghūns, and came and joined Sultān Bahādur.

in a foot-note. The account of the Cambridge History of India, page 324, is somewhat similar; but it says in addition, that the cause of the quarrel was the possession of the town and district of Pāṭhīrī on the Godāvari, which belonged to the ruler of Berar by right but were coveted and had been annexed by that of Ahmadnagar (‘Alā ud-Dīn ‘Imād Shāh).

1 مـدـبـر بـدـرـی in the text-edition.

2 The word is حاـلا in one MS., but حاـلا in the other and in the lith. ed.

3 The word is مکاـهـرـم in one MS.

4 Firishtah’s account agrees, but he does not name the Arghūns, but substitutes Maḥbūls. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 110) calls them Arghoons. Mirāt-i-Sikandarī does not mention the allowance of twelve lakhs of tankas.
The latter showed kindness to him, and fixed a stipend of twelve lakhs of tankas for his personal expenses; and promised that, "God willing I shall give you your hereditary dominion after recovering it from the Maghūls".

As the fame of the grandeur of Bahādur Shāh, and the report of his imperial gifts spread in the inhabited fourth part of the world, the Rāys from near and far turned their faces to his threshold, which was a seat of prosperity. The nephew of the Rāja of Dwāliar with a body of Pārabia Rājpūts came, and were enlisted among his special attendants. Bahrūn, son of Prithi Rāj, nephew of Rānā Sānkā, also came with some notable Rājpūts, and entered his service. Some Dakini sardārs also came and attained to the good fortune of an audience (of the Sultaṅ). All of them, in accordance with their status and position, obtained a share in his favours and gifts.

As a long time elapsed (in the Sultaṅ's) residence in Chāmpānīr, 'Imād-ul-mulk sent his son Ja'far Khān to wait on the Sultaṅ, and represented that, owing to his arrogance and pride, Nizām-ul-mulk Bāhri had no inclination towards a treaty of peace. If the Sultaṅ would once advance into the Deccan, the object of this slave would be attained. The Sultaṅ granted his prayer, and decided to invade the Deccan. About this time, Ja'far Khān submitted, that if the Sultaṅ permitted, he would like to go and see the city of Ahmādābād and the country of Kanbāyet; and would soon come back to attend on the Sultaṅ. His prayer was allowed, and he had arrived in Kanbāyet, when he was informed, that the Sultaṅ had moved out of Ahmādābād to carry out his expedition into the Deccan, and had

---

1 The word خرج is left out from one MS.
2 His name is given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 343, as Nar Sing Dēs brother's son of Mān Singh, Rājah of Dwāliar.
3 The name is بندر or بندر in the MSS., and میس in the lith. ed., and پنیر in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs calls him Sreeputty Ray (evidently mixing up the names of the father and the son), nephew of Rana Sanka. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari says that it was Prithi Rāj, nephew of Rānā Sānkā and not his son who came. Following the Tabaqāt and Firishtah, I have adopted Bahrūn as the name of the Rājpūt chief, son of Prithi Rāj, who came. Of all the names it is the only one which has any similarity to a Hindū name. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has بنسر بن پرتنی راج in the text-edition.
encamped in the town of 1 Daböhi. Ja'far Khān waited on the Sultan there. 2 The Sultan halted there for some time and again returned to 3 Muḥammadābād and passed the rainy season there. 4 He then in the year 937 A.H. marched towards Bākar and Īdar; and he sent Khudawand Khān and ʿImād-ulu-mulk from the village of Khānpūr with a well-equipped army and many elephants to Bākar; and himself proceeded towards Kanbēyet. He spent one day at Kanbēyet, and then embarked in a ship for the Dīp. At the latter place all the stuffs and other merchandise, which were in the ships, that arrived from the various ports round about, were put into various store-houses. Among these things, there were one thousand and six hundred mounds of roses (or rose water) from Damascus. He also showed very great kindness to the body of Rūmīs (Turks) who had 5 come with Mustαfī

---

1 The name of the town is درالوهی in one MS., and درائی in the lith. ed. In the other MS. the name of the town is not mentioned. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 344, that the names of the two stations in the Sultan's march were the town of Dabōī and the village of Dhārūlī. I have adopted the name of Dabōhi. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has درالوهی in the text-edition.

2 Bayley says in a note, on page 343 of his History of Gujarāt, that the Tārīkh-i-Alfi, Firishtah and the Tabakāt-i-Akbari say very little about this campaign. He gives a very brief summary of what the Tārīkh-i-Alfi and Firishtah say, but none of what is said in the Tabakāt. What is said in the Tabakāt is so mixed up with other matters, and with accounts of more or less aimless wanderings, that it is difficult to give any summary. I have not attempted to give a summary of what Firishtah, the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī and the Cambridge History of India say about it, but have confined myself to a translation of the text.

3 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted آباد in the text-edition.

4 Firishtah mentions this, after giving a brief account of the campaign. His account of these journeys agrees generally with that in the text, but he says that instead of buying sixteen hundred mans of roses or rose water of Damascus, he bought sixteen hundred mans of بسته و موبرز, pistachio nuts and dried grapes. Col. Briggs does not mention these purchases, and I cannot find any mention of them anywhere else.

5 Firishtah says that they had come برسم نجارت, i.e., as merchants; and it is not clear why they were in such helpless condition and could not go back to their own country.
Rūmī, and were in a strange country. He arranged residences for them; and returned after recommending them to the favour of Malik Ayāz.

When after travelling over the various stages, he arrived at Chāmpān, 1 Umr Khān and Qutb Khān, and a number of other amirs of Sultān Ibrāhīm, who had, for fear of His Majesty Firdūs Makānī, fled to Gujrat, waited upon the Sultān; and were exalted to high ranks. On the 1st day 2 three thousand robes of honour woven all over with gold thread, and fifty horses, and some lakhs of tankas in cash were bestowed on them; and after pleasing their hearts, the Sultān had the drum beaten for a march to Mahrāṣa. After his arrival there, Khudāwand Khān and the other amirs came and waited upon him. He then penetrated into Bākar by successive marches; and arranged for the perfect government of that territory, and appointed thānadārs at all necessary stations. Pars Rām, the Rājā of Bākar, becoming thoroughly helpless entered the Sultān’s service. His son having attained to the nobility of Islām became a Musalmān in the presence of Sultān Bahādur. But 3 Jagā, Pars Rām’s brother, with a number of insurgents moved about in the hills and forests. Afterwards he went for fear of his life to 4 Ratan Sēn, son of Rānī Ḥosain has 4 4.1 One MS. inserts Qāzi Khān, after Qutb Khān.

2 It is in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but I think or three hundred was the correct number.

3 The name is in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. It is in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 112) calls him Jugut Ray. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the text of the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, but in a note, on pages 347, 348, he is called Chagā or Jagā or Jagat. M. Hidayat

4 The name is Ratan Sī in the MS. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but it is Ratan Sēn in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Col. Briggs has Rana Ruttun. He is called Rānā Ratanī in the text of the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Rayley, page 350, but in a note it is said that he was variously called Ratan Sī, Rānī Ratanī, Ratanī Chand. The Cambridge history of India (p. 326) calls him Ratan Singh, in an unsuccessful attempt to give the Sanskrit form of the name; but just as Sangrāma Singh is not correct Sanskrit so Ratan Singh also is not correct Sanskrit. It should be Ratna Sinha. But the Musalmān historians and even Tod, the author of the Rājaisthān are content with Sanga Rānā or Rānān Sāṅkā, and Rata and Bikramājīt the names of the brother and successor of
Sánkā for protection; and made him the medium for his entering the service (of the Sultān). It so happened that the Sultān had at that time gone to Bānswāla on a hunting expedition. Ratan Šēn sent emissaries there and with great humility and meekness prayed for the pardon of Jagā's offences. The Sultān acceded to his prayer, and sent for Jagā. He then laid the foundation of a noble mosque in the 1 village and ghāţ of Karchī, and gave that town (Karchī) to Prithī Rāj; and divided the rest of the territory of Bākar between 2 Prithī Rāj and Jagā in equal shares.

He remained there for some days with the object of hunting, when scouts brought the information, that Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji,

Ratan Šēn which the author of the Cambridge History of India has correctly transliterated into Vikramāditya.

1 The name of the village is ڈکھات کرچی Dakhāt Karjī in one MS. and ڈکھنڈات کرچی Dakhnāt Karjī and ڈکھنڈات کرچی ڈکھنڈات کرچی in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it looks like لبہات کرچی Lahāt Karjī. (Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 113) says that the king having caused a mosque to be built in the village of Larky G'hat gave it over in perpetuity to Jugut Ray. Whether the mosque or the village was given in perpetuity to him is not clear and in any case the statement differs from that of Firishtah, who says the Sultān gave the town to Prithī Rāj. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 348, that wakīl of Ratanlī Rājah of Chittīr waited upon the Sultān at the pass of Karchī. I think therefore that the correct reading is مرقص وگھت کرچی, the village and ghāţ of Karchī, and I have adopted this. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has در مرقص ڈکھات کرچی in the text-edition.

2 There must be some mistake here. Pars Rām and not Prithī Rāj was the Rāja of Bākar. Prithī Rāj appears to have been Rāja of Dūngarpūr. It is not at all clear why he should have got half of Bākar to the exclusion of Pars Rām and his son, the former of whom had entered the Sultān's service, and the latter had become a Muslām. The Cambridge History of India, page 325, says in a few words what happened to Bāker (as it calls it), and Bānswārā. It says he "led an expedition in to Bāker and Bānswāra. The Rānā, Ratan Singh II, who had succeeded Sangrama after the battle of Sikri interceded for the two chiefs, and Bahādūr stayed his hand". I am afraid this does not give much information of what actually happened, and what information is given is not accurate. There is no mention of the division of Bākar, whether it was between Prithī Rāj and Jagā, or between Pars Rām and the latter. There was also no expedition into Bānsīlah or Bānswārāh. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī says definitely that the Sultān left his army behind, and went to Bānswāla on a hunting excursion and nothing appears to have been done in respect of him or of the Rāja. The names Ratan Singh and Sangrama are also both incorrect.
who had been bound by ties of gratitude to the late Sultan Muzaifar Shâh, and had received many favours from him, had sent Sharzâh Khan, who was the civil and military governor of Mandû, that he might plunder and ravage some of the towns in the territory of Chitôr; and Ratan Sên, son of Rânâ Sânkâ, had with a large force plundered and devastated the villages of Sipla and Balâvat; and was confronting Sultan Mahmûd Khalji at Ujjain. 2 Ratan Sên's ambassadors also came at this time, and represented to the Sultan, that he should forbid Sultan Mahmûd Khalji, so that the latter might not without any reason move the chain of hostility. They also informed him, that Sultan Mahmûd Khalji had gone from Ujjain to Sarângpur; and had taken Silhadi Purabia with him, with the object of putting him to death; and Silhadi having become aware of his intention had in conjunction with Sikandar Khan Satwâl gone to Chitôr, and had sought the protection of Ratan Sên; and Sikandar Khan and Bhûpat, son of Silhadi, were coming from there to wait on His Majesty. Accordingly on the 27th of Jamâdi-âwwal, Sikandar Khan and Bhûpat came and waited on the Sultan. The latter bestowed on them seven hundred robes woven entirely of gold thread and seventy horses; and did everything to please them.

When Sultan Mahmûd received information of the departure of Sikandar Khan and Bhûpat, he sent Daryâ Khan, as an ambassador, with a message that he also intended to have the honour of presenting himself; but the acquisition of that blessing had remained in abeyance owing to certain reasons; but God willing he intended on this occasion to have the great pleasure of meeting His Majesty. Sultan Bahâdur

---

1 The lith. ed. of Firishtah appears to be defective here, as it says that Sharzâh Khan after plundering certain towns in the territory of Chitôr, was confronting Sultan Mahmûd Khalji at Ujjain. Col. Briggs does not say that Ratan Sen plundered any villages in Mâlwa, or was confronting Sultan Mahmûd Khalji at Ujjain. On the other hand, he says that Shirza Khan had passed through Oojin to Sarungpoor. The Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 349, also does not say that Ratan Sen had plundered any villages in Mâlwa; but it does mention that he was confronting Sultan Mahmûd Khalji at Ujjain.

2 Firishtah and Col. Briggs and the Mirât-i-Sikandari generally agree with the text; but Col. Briggs says that Moyin Khan, son of Sikundur Khan Mewaty, and not the latter himself had fled to Chittor. Sikandar Khan is said in the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 349, to have been the governor of Siwâs.
said to Daryā Khān, "On various occasions, the glad tidings of a visit have reached my ears. If Sūltān Maḥmūd comes and meets me, I shall certainly not give an asylum to the fugitives from his courts". He then granted permission to the 1 ambassador of Sūltān Maḥmūd to return, after bestowing favours on him. Then he marched towards Bāṅswāla, and when he arrived at the ghāt or pass of Karchi, Ratan Sēn and Silhādī hastened to wait on him. On the first day the Sūltān bestowed on them thirty elephants and one thousand five hundred robes of honour made of stuff of woven gold thread. After a few days, Ratan Sēn obtained leave to go to Chītōr; but Silhādī having elected to enter the Sūltān's service stayed on.

Sūltān Bahādur depending on the promise of Sūltān Maḥmūd Khaḷji proceeded towards 2 Sambla; and determined, that if Sūltān Maḥmūd came, he would perform the ceremonies of receiving and hospitably entertaining him; and then go as far as Kanbāyat and the pass of Dēvla, and after bidding him farewell there returned to the capital. At this place Muḥammad Khān Āsīrī came and waited upon him. 3 When the latter arrived at Sambla he waited for ten days for Sūltān Maḥmūd. After that Daryā Khān again came from Sūltān Maḥmūd, and informed him that his master had fallen from his horse while hunting, and had broken his right arm; and it was not fit that he should come in his present condition. The Sūltān said,

---

1 The word is فرسناده in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah; but يليلی in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt.

2 The name is سبله Sanbīla in one MS. سنبله Sanbīla in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah; and سنبله Sandīla in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 114) has Tandla, and the Mīrāṭ-i-Sikandarī, Hayley, page 350, has "the village of Sambālih". سنبله Sanbīla in the text is apparently a mistake for Sambla.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 326, gives a very good summary of the matters in dispute at this time between the Sūltān of Gujarāt and Mālwa, but unfortunately ends with a mistake, when it says, "Sūltān Maḥmūd owed his tenure of his throne to the capture of Māndū from rebellious Rājpūts by Maḥmūd Begarha". It needs scarcely be said that it was Sūltān Muẓaffar, and not Sūltān Maḥmūd Begarha, who captured Māndū from the rebellious Rājpūts (see pp. 318, 319 of the Cambridge History of India itself). It may also be mentioned that مندر should be transliterated as Mandū and not as Māndū.
"As he has broken his promise several times, if he does not come I shall go myself". Daryā Khan again said, "Chānd Khan, son of Sultān Muẓaffār is with Sultān Maḥmūd. If the latter comes and Your Majesty demands the surrender of Chānd Khan, it would be very difficult to give him up, and it would be impossible to withhold him. In truth that is the reason why he cannot come". Sultān Bahādur said, "I have relinquished the idea of demanding the surrender of Chānd Khan. Please go and tell Sultān Maḥmūd, that he should come soon". When the emissary of Sultān Maḥmūd received leave to go back, Sultān Bahādur travelled slowly along, and waited for Sultān Maḥmūd's arrival. When he arrived at Dilbālpūr, it became known that Sultān Maḥmūd wanted to confer the title of Sultān Qhiyās-ud-din on his eldest son, and he sent him to the fort of Mandū whilst he himself should leave it and seclude himself somewhere else; and he had no desire to meet Sultān Bahādur. Some of the amirs of Sultān Maḥmūd, who were aggrieved with him on account of his disagreeable behaviour towards them, came and saw Sultān Bahādur; and several of them represented to him, that Sultān Maḥmūd was passing the time with idle excuses; and did not intend voluntarily to come; and Sultān Bahādur's army should without delay begin the siege of the fort (of Mandū).

Sultān Bahādur then started from that place, and encamped at Sūdpūr; and at that station, Sharzat-ul-mulk fled from the fort of Mandū, and hastened to wait on him. The next morning the army moved from that place, and encamped at the village of Dilāwarah. When the Sultān arrived at Na'īcha, he directed the different detachments to take up their position for the siege. Muḥammad Khān Āsīrī

---

1 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has selected بناتي طي منازل مي نومد in the text-edition.
2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 114) says, "the delay which this arrangement involved gave the Guzerat courtiers an opportunity of again misrepresenting the conduct of Sooltan Mahmood Khiljy". This is not quite correct. It was the Māiwa and not the Gujrāt amirs who complained of Sultān Maḥmūd's conduct, and it does not appear that even they misrepresented it.
3 This clause appears in one MS. where the place is called ضور بير ضور بير and in the lit. ed. where it is called ضور بير ضور بير; but not in the other MS. or in Firishtah. Neither Sūdpūr nor Sūrpūr is mentioned in any other history.
was posted to the west at the battery of Shāhpūr, and Ulugh Khān to Bhilpūr. He sent the Fārabā contingent to Pahalwānā; and himself took up his quarters in the mahals (palaces) at Muḥammadpur.

On the 9th Sha'bān, 937 A.H., at the time of the true dawn, the standards of Bahādur Shāh rose above the horizon of the fort of Mandū. At that very moment, Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, got out of the fort and fled. Sultān Maḥmūd armed himself and with the few men that he had, came out to give battle; but as he did not see that he was sufficiently strong to do so, he went into the palace.

1 The name is Shāhpūr in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firistah. It is Shāhpūr in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 351, has "the trenches at Shāhpūr".

2 The name is Ulugh Khān in both MSS. The lith. ed. of Firistah has Luqmān, which is certainly incorrect, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 116) improves it by making it Lokmūn Sing. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqat has Alf Khān and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari has Alaf Khān. As to the name of the place the MSS. have Bhalpur and that of Firistah has Bhalpūr. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqat has Bhalpūr and that of Firistah Bhalpūr. Col. Briggs has Seetulpoor, and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 351, Bahlōlpūr.

3 The MSS. have Pahalwānā, and the lith. ed. has Pahalwānā. The lith. ed. of Firistah has Salhawāna. Col. Briggs has Julwār, and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari has Bahalwānah. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted Pahalwānā, in the text-edition.

4 The MSS. have Muḥammadpur, and the lith. ed. has Muḥammadpur. The lith. ed. of Firistah has Mahmūdpūr, and Col. Briggs has Mahomedpoor, while the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 351, does not state where the Sultān took up his quarters, but says that on the 20th Rajab he advanced his camp to Mahmūdpūr.

5 The date is the 9th Sha'bān in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. and also in Col. Briggs, but the lith. ed. of Firistah has the night of the 29th Sha'bān, and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 351, has the same date. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari describes how Sultān Bahādar himself with some great men effected an entrance into the fort by climbing a steep and high hill on the side of Sangār Chītūrī. The exploit was something like that of Hurmāyūn, who six years later, in 942 A.H., captured Chāmpānhr, by climbing a steep hill, by driving spikes into it. (See translation, vol. II, pages 54, 55.)

6 One MS. has , but the other and the lith. ed. have .
to slay his wife and children. Sultān Bahādur’s soldiers surrounded the 
maḥal (palace), and sent a message that there was full assurance of 
safety to the inmates and to the amirs; and no one would interfere 
with the property or the honour of any single person. Some of Sultān 
Maḥmūd’s loyal adherents made him refrain from the slaughter of his 
family; and told him, whatever unkindness the Bādshah of Gujarāt 
might show to him, his kindness and generosity would be greater than 
those of others. There was also a strong likelihood, that he would 
follow the example of his father and would leave the kingdom of 
Mālwa in the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd’s servants. About this 
time, Sultān Bahādur ascended to the top of La‘l Maḥal, and sent a 
man to wait on Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter came with seven of the 
amirs. 2 Sultān Bahādur received him with respect and courtesy, 
and embraced him; and tried to please him. Then when they began to 
converse with each other, Sultān Maḥmūd showed a little harshness in 
his language. This displeased Sultān Bahādur; and a silence fell 
on the meeting. Then Sultān Maḥmūd and his son were placed under 
arrest, and sent to Chāṃpānīr; and Bahādur Shāh took up his residence

---

1 Wishing apparently to follow the Rājput rite of jauhar, but Fīrishtāh says 

2 Fīrishtāh leaves out the show of courtesy and respect and the embrace; 

but says that Sultān Bahādur was inclined to forgive Sultān Maḥmūd, but 

when he asked the latter, why he had not come to meet him, he gave a harsh 

reply, after which things happened as stated in the Tabaqāt. The Mirāt-i- 

Sikandari’s version (Bayley, pp. 352, 353) is somewhat different. It says that 

Sultān Maḥmūd sought safety by asking for quarter and mercy, and came out 

with seven sons to wait on Sultān Bahādur. He was placed in the custody of 

trustworthy guards, and on the 12th Muharram he was sent to Gujarāt. This 

last date can scarcely be correct, as there is an interval of four months between 

Sha‘bān and Muharram. The account given in the Cambridge History of India, 

page 327, appears to be a brief summary of that in the Tabaqāt.
at Mandū. He gave permission to most of his amirs to go back to Gujrāt, to their own jāgirs.

After the rains, Sultān Bahādūr ¹ went to see Burhānpūr and Asir; and there Nizām-ul-mulk Dakinī joined his service. ² He conferred on him the title of Muḥammad Shāh, and then returned to Mandū. About this time it became known that Silhādī ³ Pūrabba was not inclined to come and wait on the Sultān, for the reason, that he had in the time of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī taken some Musalmān women; and in fact even some of the members of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn’s harem into his own house, and had kept them there. Sultān Bahādūr ordered that whether he came or not, it was incumbent on him (i.e., the Sultān), that he should release the Musalmān women from the disgrace of kufr (heathenism) and the wretchedness of the slavery of Kāfirs, and should give condict punishment to Silhādī. For this purpose he sent ⁴ Muqbal Khān to Chāmpānīr, so that he might go there and guard the fort and send Ikhtiyār Khān, with artillery and troops and treasure. Ikhtiyār Khān came with a large army, and joined the Sultān in the town of Dhār, on the 20th Rabī‘-ul-akhir, 938 A.H. Sultān Bahādūr ⁵ proclaimed that he was going back to Gujrāt;  

1 There is a slight variation in the reading in the MSS. One has بسر آسیر برسر نیزام-والمolk دکنی, while the other has بسر برهانپور و آسر برسر پور و آسر. The lith. ed. has بسر برهمارپور و آسر برهمارپور و آسر, which is incorrect.  

2 Frishtah says that he did so because he wanted that Nizām-ul-mulk Dakinī, or as Frishtah calls him Burhān Nizām Shāh Bāhri would help him in the war with Humāyūn, which he intended to carry on; but as a matter of fact, the opposite of this happened, for Nizām-ul-mulk sent an emissary to Humāyūn, and wanted him to come and attack Gujrāt. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, does not mention this, but it describes the interview between Bahādūr Shāh and Burhān Nizām Shāh.  

3 The suffix Purabba is omitted in one MS. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, does not mention anything about Silhādī having taken Musalmān women into his house, but says that he showed no disposition to fulfill his promise to return.  

4 It appears that Sultān Bahādūr gave out that he was going to Gujrāt, and went away as if on a hunting excursion to Dibālpūr, etc., so that Silhādī might not take fright, and go away to Ratan Sēn, son of Rānā Sāṅkā. This is expressly stated in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari.  

5 He is also called مقرب خان (Maqīrb Khān) in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 356, and is there described as brother of Ikhtiyār Khān.
and went to Mandū, so that after making the necessary preparations there, he might commence his march towards Gujrat. He left Ikhtiyār Khān in charge of the government of Mandū, and encamped at Na'īcha on the 25th of the month of Jamādi-ul-āwal. At this time Bhūpat, son of Silhādi, submitted to the Sultān, "As the sublime standards are advancing towards Gujrat, if this slave obtains permission to go to Ujjain, he would bring Silhādi to wait on Your Majesty after giving him assurances of safety". The Sultān gave him permission, but with great caution himself advanced towards Ujjain by successive marches. On the 15th of that month, he arrived at the town of Dhār and leaving the army there went away to 1 Dibālpūr, Banharā and Sa'dulpūr, as if on a hunting excursion.

Silhādi on hearing this news left Bhūpat at Ujjain; and came and waited on the Sultān. 2 Amin Naṣīr who had been sent to summon him told the Sultān in private, that he had brought Silhādi, by deceiving him with a promise of the grant of Kanbāyet and a 3 krōr in cash.

---

1 About Dibālpūr there is no dispute; it is spelt دیپالپور in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari calls it Dipālpūr. The second name is بناور بنہور کردāther Taharia in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 117) calls it Bensrode. The third place is سدابلپور Sa'dulpūr in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the lith. ed. of the تابق沿途 it is رسنپور Rasulpūr. Col. Briggs calls it Shoojalpoor. It is called 'Adlpūr in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 357, and Bayley says in a note, "The Tab. Akbari calls it Sādulpūr".

2 This man's name is variously given. Both the MSS. call him Amin Naṣīr, while the lith. ed. has Amīr Naṣīr. Firishtah lith. ed. has Amīr Naṣīr, and Col. Briggs has Ameer Nusser. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 356, calls him Malik Amin Nasr, and it is said there, that Nasr was probably a nickname, and means, among other things, one who is beginning to be corpulent. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, calls the man Nasrān Khān, and says that he had been sent to Raizen and brought Silhādi to the court. According to the other historians he was sent, but Silhādi came only on receiving his son's message.

3 One MS. has کروار Kuroar, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have it. Firishtah says the same thing but in a different order. According to him Silhādi had no wish to submit to the Sultān, and would not have if he had not been deceived by the offer of Kanbāyet and a krōr of tankas. The Mirāt-i-
As Silhadi had no thought of remaining in allegiance to the Sultān, and wanted to give up his fort and to go to Mēwār; if he now got permission to leave, it would be difficult to see him again. The Sultān then started from Sa‘dulpūr for Dhār, and talked with the amirs, and his other adherents about seizing Silhadi. When he arrived at the camp, he left the army outside, and took up his residence in the fort of Dhār. He took Silhadi with him. When the Sultān got inside the fort, the men who had been directed to seize Silhadi, came and took him with the two other Pūrabīs who were with him into custody. At this time one of Silhadi’s attendants raised a clamour, and placed his hand on his 2 dagger. Silhadi told him, “Do you want to kill me”. The man replied “I wanted to do it for your sake, but as it causes injury to you, now I can smite myself, so that I might not see you in captivity”; and striking his dagger under his abdomen went to 3 hell. When the news of Silhadi’s arrest was spread about, the Gujrat army and the populace of the city plundered his camp, and killed a large number of his followers; and his elephants and horses and equipage were seized for the Sultān’s government. Those who escaped the sword, fled and joined Bhumat.

Towards the end of the day Sultān Bahādur sent 4 ‘Imād-ul-mulk to attack Bhumat. He left Khudawand Khān to accompany the camp; and in the morning himself started towards Ujjain. ‘Imād-ul-mulk told him at this time, that before his arrival, Bhumat had received the news of Silhadi having been seized, and he had fled and gone to Chitār. Sultān Bahādur conferred the government of Ujjain

1 There are slight variations in the reading. The MSS. have دیدن او از معاشت and دیدن او بار معاشت; while the lith. ed. has دیدن او بار معاشت and Firishtah lith. ed. has دیدن او بار دیگر معاشت.

2 The word jamdhar, a kind of dagger, was used once before describing the attack on Khōr Muhammad Khān by one of the Rājpūts who came as ambassador to him from the Rāja of Sirōh.

3 The word is جهنم in both MSS., and in the corresponding passage of Firishtah; but it is عدم non-existence in the lith. ed.

on Daryā Khān, who was one of the old amirs of Mālwa, and had formerly come as the ambassador to Sultān Bahādur; and advanced towards Sārangpūr. He bestowed Sārangpūr on Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, who had in the time of Sultān Muḥammad gone away from Mandū; and ¹ had entered the service of . . . . , and who in the reign of Shēr Khān had assumed the title of Qādir Shāh, and had the public prayers read and the coin struck in that country in his own name; some account of him will be written before long. And having given permission to Ḥabīb Khān the ruler (wali) of Āshṭa to go back to Āshta, himself marched towards Bhīlsa and Rāsin. Ḥabīb Khān went to Āshṭa, and took possession of it, after slaying a large number of the Pārabīs. When the Sultān arrived at Bhīlsa, it became known (to him), that it was eighteen years since the time when all vestiges of Islām ³ had disappeared from that country; and the rites of heathenism had gained currency there. At this time spies informed the Sultān, that when Bhūpaṭ, the son of Silhadī,

¹ The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah who copies the Šabaqt closely, are ملازم شدة برد without specifying the person whose servant he had become, but, according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 358, he had from the time of the Sultān's (i.e., Sultān Bahādar's) accession been in continuous attendance upon him; this explains his having become a mulāzim. It appears that he was a servant of the Khalji Sultāns of Mālwa, who afterwards assumed the title of Qādir Shāh, and ruled in Mandū, Ujjain, Sārangpūr and Rantambhūr.

² The readings in the MSS. are حبيب خان وألى را حبيب خان وألى را حبيب خان وألى را حبيب خان وألى را. I have changed the sequence to حبيب الله حبيب خان وألى را حبيب خان وألى را حبيب خان وألى را حبيب خان وألى را.

³ The language in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is اثر اسلام ازین دیار كور. The marching away” of the vestiges of Islām appears to me to be inappropriate. The language in the other MS. اثر اسلام ازین دیار برطوف شده is better, and I have adopted it. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has منقطع كشته instead of برطوف شده. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 358, that "Bhīlsah which had been converted to Islām by Sultān Shamsh-ud-din of Dehli", but having been eighteen years in the possession of Silhadī, “Muḥammedi law and custom had been set aside for idolatry”.

⁴ The reading in one MS. is باحم اعلی سلطان رسانید, and in the other اعلی سلطان رسانیدن, but the lith. ed. has neither باحم اعلی nor اعلی سلطان.
went to Chitôt, Lakhman Sën the brother of Silhadi had strengthened the citadel of Râisín, and was making preparations for a battle, and was waiting for reinforcement from Chitôt.

Sultân Bahâdur waited at Bhilsa for three days for the erection of mosques, and other houses for pious purposes, and marched from there on the 7th of Jamâdi-ul-âwwal of that year and encamped at a distance of two karôhs from the town on the bank of the river. On the morning of Wednesday the 8th of the aforesaid month, he had the kettle-drum of victory beaten, and set up his position on the bank of the reservoir of Râisín. The army had not yet arrived, when the Pûrâbîa Râjpûts divided themselves into two detachments and sallied out of the fort. Sultân Bahâdur with the few men that he had with him attacked them, himself hewing down two or three men into halves from their wastes. The army of Gujràt arrived one after another from behind, and completely routed the

1 The name is Lakhman, and Lakhân Sën in different places in the MSS. and Lakhmân Sën in the lith. ed. It is Lakhman in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs has Lakhun Singh and the Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 360, has Lakhman Sën. The Cambridge History of India, page 328, has Lakhman Singh. I think Lakhman Sën is the correct form of the name and I have adopted it.

2 Firishtah agrees as to what Sultân Bahâdur did at Bhilsa; but he does not mention his encamping on the bank of the river; and he says that he set up his in Râisín on the 8th of the Jamâdi-ul-âwwal. The Mirât-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 358, says the Sultân left Bhilsah on the 17th Jamâdi-ul-âkhir, and proceeded by successive marches to a river two kôs from Râisín. On the next day he pitched his camp on the bank of the tank near the fort of Râisín.

In spite of these contradictions about the date the Cambridge History of India, page 328, says that Bahâdur "was attacked as he approached the town on January 26".

3 Both MSS. have ; and Firishtah lith. ed. has ; but I prefer which is in the lith. ed., and which agrees with the Mirât-i-Sikandari. M. Hidayat Hossain, however, has followed the MSS. in the text-edition.

4 Firishtah agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 119) says Bahadur Shah slew ten men with his own hand; and Bayley in a note, on page 358, ascribes, as in the other cases, Col. Briggs's statement to Firishtah.
infidels. The Parabias, being struck by the bravery and courage of Sultan Bahadur, took shelter in the fort. The Sultan forbade his soldiers from continuing the fight, and postponed it for the following day.

The next day he marched from that place; and fixing on the fort as the centre, distributed the batteries (among the different commanders); and commenced the construction of covered passages. Within a short time these reached a place whence they commanded the garrison. The Sultan went there himself, and leaving Rumi Khan with the artillery, returned to his quarters. Rumi Khan brought down two of the bastions of the fort by firing from his cannons. He also dug a mine from another side, and setting fire to it blew down some yards of the wall on that side. Silhadi seeing the weakness of the Parabias, and the great strength of the enemy sent a message to the following effect, "This slave wishes to be dignified with the nobility of Islam; and after that if he gets leave, he would go above, and after evacuating the fort, make it over to the representative of the Bahadur Shah government." The Sultan was delighted on hearing this news, and summoning Silhadi to his presence, repeated to him the words expressing the unity of God. When Silhadi accepted the faith, the Sultan gave him a special robe of honour; and sent him various kinds of food from the (royal) kitchen. He then took Silhadi with him to the foot of the fort.

Silhadi summoned Lakhman, his brother, and said to him, "As I am now included in the community of Musalmans, Sultan Bahadur will, either on account of a feeling of communal favour, or on account of his noble spirit, raise me to a high rank. It is fit that after surrendering the fort to the adherents of the Sultan, I

---

1 The actual words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are گریش گوشته, the meaning of which is not quite clear to me.

2 The meaning is not quite clear. The words are بالا رفته in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but they are omitted from the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat. The meaning probably is, "Going up into the fort". It would be remembered that he was a prisoner in the Sultan Bahadur's camp, and it appears from the Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 350, that he informed the Sultan, "Having obtained the friendly offices of some of the chief nobles".
should bind the girdle of service strongly and should continue to render him service". 1 His brother then told him privately, that now that it is not right, according to their religion, to shed your blood, and Bhūpat is coming to their assistance, bringing the Rānā and 2 forty thousand men with him; something should be done, so that there might be a delay of a few days longer, in the capture of the fort. Silhādī having applauded this opinion, said to the Sultān, "Let this matter be postponed today. Tomorrow after two watches (pāh) of the day, the fort would be evacuated, and made over to the servants of the Sultān".

Sultān Bahādur then left that place and returned to his residence; and waited for two watches of the (next) day to pass. When a moment elapsed after the appointed time, Silhādī again represented to the Sultān, "If you order, this slave would go near the fort, and having ascertained the state of things would report". Sultān Bahādur made Silhādī over to trustworthy men, and sent him to the neighbourhood of the fort. Silhādī went to the fallen bastion, and began to give advice to the people in the fort. He said, "Oh ye careless Rājpūts! take note of the Sultān. He would immediately come out of the battery, and put you all to death". His object was this, that they should immediately rebuild the bastions. Lakhman gave no reply, and Silhādī returned in a state of fear. That night Lakhman

1 According to this the plan of deceiving the Sultān first originated with Lakhman, and according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 360, Silhādī informed the Sultān, that he was willing to become a Musalmān, as he was afraid that the Sultān's attack would be successful and all his people would be slaughtered; but according to the Cambridge History of India, page 328, "Silhādī conciliated Bahādur, by perfidiously feigning to accept Islam, and thus obtained permission to meet his brother, ostensibly with the object of arranging for the surrender of the fortress, but when he and Lakhman Singh met, they agreed to await the relieving force expected from Chitor".

This is, on the face of it, somewhat contradictory. If they agreed to await the arrival of the relieving force (only), when they met, Silhādī could not have perfidiously feigned to accept Islam, and have met his brother.

2 The relieving force is said to have been forty thousand in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and in Col. Briggs's translation. It is four thousand in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 360, makes it "forty or fifty thousand picked horse and artillery and innumerable infantry."
sent two thousand *Pūrabias* with a 1 son of Silhadi to the station where Bhūpat was. 2 Silhadi’s son began to fight, and the Gujrat army having exerted themselves beyond the power of men, killed many of the Rājpūts, and sent the head of Silhadi’s son with the heads of other Rājpūts to the Sultān.

When Silhadi received information of the death of his son, he fainted. Sultān Bahādur now became aware of the real state of things, and made Silhadi over to Būhrān-ul-mulk, so that he might be kept in prison in the fort of Mandū. At this time news came, that Bhūpat was bringing the Rānā with him from Chitār. 3 As he knew that the Sultān had arrived *jarīda*, or with a small force, the Rānā with great audacity came along by successive marches. The Sultān said, “Although I may have only a small force with me still in accordance with the saying, that one Musalmān is equal to ten *Kāfrs*, I shall meet them”. The Sultān’s 4 wrath became violent on hearing the news of the Rānā’s approach; and he immediately sent Muḥammad Khān the ruler of Būhrānpur, and ‘Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī for their chastisement. When Muḥammad Khān and ‘Imād-ul-mulk arrived in the town of 5 Sarisā, news came that the Rānā and Bhūpat had arrived near the town of 6 Kahrār. Muḥammad

---

1 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say simply سلیمان سردار Silhadi’s son, but Firishtah has Silhadi’s younger son (سردار بزرگ); and Col. Briggs has Silhuddy’s youngest son. He is called a younger son of Silhadi in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 361, and Silahdi’s youngest son in the Cambridge History of India, page 328.

2 He was apparently intercepted by the Gujrat army. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 361, gives a different version of the incident. According to it, “A younger son of Silhadi’s made an attack upon a royal post in the town of Barsiah with two thousand horse. But the Musalmāns were victorious; and the infidel fled to his elder brother, Bhūpat”.

3 One MS. has فرید قبیب but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have قبیب فرید.

4 The name of the town is سرسره in one MS. and looks like سرسره in the other. In the lith. ed. it is سرسرہ Sisra. Firishtah and Col. Briggs do not give the name of the place, but say they had not gone far when they met Poorunmal. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 361, has Barsiah. The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of the place.

5 The name is كهور Kahrār and كهور Kahrār in the MS. It is كهور Kahrār in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has كهور Kehria. Col. Briggs does
Khān and ‘Imād-ul-mulk arrayed their troops for battle and advanced towards them; and when they arrived in the vicinity of Kahrār, Pūran Mal, another son of Silhādi, 1 appeared there with two thousand Pūrabā Rājpūts. Muḥammad Khān advanced to attack the fort, but Pūran Mal fled without fighting, and some of the Pūrabās who were under him were taken prisoner. Muḥammad Khān and ‘Imād-ul-mulk submitted a report to the Sultān to the effect that Pūran Mal had fled and joined the Rānā; and the latter had arrived quite near; and although the force under him was beyond any computation, still relying on divine help, and the auspicious fortune of His Majesty, they would not hold themselves excused from making all efforts to attack him.

On receiving this report, the Sultān left Ikhtiyār Khān and other amirs to carry on the siege, and marching very rapidly traversed in the course of a night and a day, seventy Mālwa karōhs; and shone like a flash of lighting in the neighbourhood of Kahrār. Muḥammad Khān went a part of the way to receive him and brought him to his own quarters.

The spies of Rānā and Bhūpat took them the news, that the Sultān had on the preceding night joined his army; and his troops, which were like swarms of locusts and ants, would arrive almost immediately. The Rānā on hearing this news retired, and sat down one stage behind (his previous camp). In the morning Sultān Bahādur advanced one stage beyond Kahrār. At this place two Rājpūts came as emissaries with the object of making inquiries and delivered the following messages from the mouth of the Rānā, “The Rānā was one of the servants of the threshold, and his object in coming to these parts was, that he would advance his foot by way of intercession,

1 The word is حافز in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and حافز in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. also has حافز. According to the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, as well as the lith. ed. of Firishtah and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 361, and the Cambridge History of India, page 328, the force under Pūran Mal was two thousand men; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 121) makes it ten thousand cavalry.
and ask for the pardon of Silhadi’s offences”. The Sultān said, “At present his forces and grandeur are greater than mine. If he had submitted a petition without fighting, he would of course have attained his object”. When those two Rājūts went back, and reported that they had seen the Sultān with their own eyes, the Rānā and Bhopat in spite of all their great strength and pomp fled, making three or four stages into one. At this time, news came that Ulugh Khān with thirty-six thousand horsemen, and the elephants and artillery of Gujrat had arrived in the neighbourhood. The Sultān owing to his great bravery, did not wait for the arrival of Ulugh Khān, but pursued the enemy for seventy karōhs with only the troops that

1 The word is استعفافی, and looks like استعفافی in the MS. It is استعفافی in the lith. ed. I have retained the latter, though Firishtah has استعفافی. Of course استعفافی and استعفافی have the same meaning; the latter has been used by M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition.

2 The words are جمعیت و شوکت شما جمعیت و شوکت او in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and جمعیت و شوکت or جمعیت and شوکت in the other MS. I think the latter reading is better and I have adopted it. The Sultān was addressing the emissary, but the force and grandeur he was referring to was not theirs, but the Rānā’s.

3 The reading in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is جنگ کردنه جنگ ناکردہ but in the other MS. it is جنگ ناکردہ. This latter is the correct reading and I have adopted it. Firishtah lith. ed. also has جنگ ناکردہ.

4 The reading is مطلب شما مطلب شما in both MSS. and in the lith. ed.; and مطلب شما also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, although it is misplaced there before ہمار. I think ہمار would be better, and I have adopted it; but M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained مطلب شما in the text-edition.

5 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have ہمار، but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has ہمار. The making of three or four stages into one shows the rapidity of their flight.

6 The name is Ulugh Khān in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has 알 파خان. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 121) has Aluf Khan. The Mirat-i-Sikandari has Aluf Khān; but Bayley in a note, page 362, says there is the usual confusion between Aluf and Ulugh. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the arrival of the reinforcement, or the name of the commander. The number of horsemen is thirty-six thousand in the MSS. and in the Mirat-i-Sikandari; but it is thirty thousand in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and also in Col. Briggs’s history.
he had with him. The Rānā however got into Chitōr; and the Sultān leaving the punishment and castigation of the Rānā to the next year, returned to Rāīśīn; and on arriving there made the siege closer than before.

About the end of Ramaḍān, when Lakhman became hopeless of receiving reinforcement and saw destruction before his eyes, he came forward with humility and submission; and submitted a representation, that if the Sultān could summon Silhādī to his presence, and would draw the pen of forgiveness across the page of his offences, and would give him assurance of safety, this slave (that is he himself) would evacuate the fort, and would surrender it to him. The Sultān, after much consideration, reminded himself that his object in undertaking the expedition was to free the Musalmān women from the disgrace of kufr (heathenism). If their (i.e., Lakhman’s and Silhādī’s) prayer is not acceded to, it is likely, that there should be a jauhar, and those helpless women would all be killed. Considering all this he granted Lakhman’s prayer, and summoned Silhādī to his presence from the fort of Mandū. Burbān-ul-mulk hastened from Mandū bringing Silhādī with him.

After Silhādī had come, Lakhman hastened to wait (on the Sultān); and having obtained a farmān granting assurance of safety (to Silhādī), went up to the fort. The Sultān detailed a body of soldiers to guard the fort. Lakhman brought down the families of the other Rājpūts from the fort; but kept his own family and those of 2 Tāj Khān and of the principal Rājpūts in the fort. He again represented to the Sultān that there were about 3 four hundred women, who appertained to Silhādī, and Rānī Durgāwati, the mother of Bhūpat had a prayer, that as Silhādī had become one of the special slaves of the Sultān,

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have مسلم مسانيد, but the other MS. has تسلم مسانيد. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqat omits the passages from مرضاشت to بخاري اوردوند. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has تسلم ملازمان مسانيد.

2 It is not clear how Tāj Khān got mixed up with the Rājpūts. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 121, 122) says that “Taj Khan, who had come to negotiate on the part of Lokmun, was permitted to return to the fort”.

3 The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 363, makes the number seven or eight hundred.
if he was allowed to come to the fort, and to take down the members of his own family from it, the latter would be protected from the taunt of being taken down by strangers. The Sultan sent Malik 'Ali Shér with Silhādi to the fort; and when the latter arrived there, Lakhman and Tāj Khān asked of him, "What would the Sultan grant to them in exchange for the fort of Rāisin, and the country of Gōndwāna". Silhādi said, "At present the town of Bāroda with its dependencies has been determined upon for our residence; and it is likely that the Sultan would, out of his generosity, exalt me (more)".

Rānī Durgāwati and Lakhman and Tāj Khān said, "Although the Sultan would show us favour and kindness, still for many generations this country has been in our possession, in reality if not in name, like an empire; and now fate has ordained that we should all be (again) together. The right way of bravery is this, that we should perform jauhar of our women and children, and should ourselves fight and be slain; and there should be no further longing left in our hearts". Silhādi was much moved by Rānī Durgāwati's words, and assumed an attitude of rebellion and revolt. Although Malik 'Ali Shér offered much friendly counsel, it was of no avail. (Silhādi) said in reply to Malik Shér, "Every day one krōr of betel leaves, and some seers of camphor are consumed in my harem, and every day 1 three hundred women put on new garments. If we are killed with our women and children, what honour and glory!" He then arranged for the rite of jauhar, and Rānī Durgāwati, taking her 2 daughter-in-law, who

---

1 The word is سیصد, but I suppose it means three hundred, and not thirteen hundred, or three thousand. The lith. ed. is defective here, having مال instead of پان and leaving out the words سیصد زن دارم گه. There is a slight difference in the MSS. also; one has سیصد زن هر زوز, but the other has سیصد زن دارم گه. Silhādi's ideas of his own pomp and grandeur were rather curious.

2 The word is عروس, which ordinarily means a bride, but it can only mean a daughter-in-law here. The lith. ed. of Firastah, however, omits the word عروس, and makes Rānī Durgāwati herself the daughter of Rānā Sānkā. The passage in the Mīrāg-i-Sikandari is doubtful. It is said there according to the translation, that a daughter of the Rānī, who was the wife of Bhūpat was among the seven hundred women who were burnt. Bayley, page 365, in a note says that the word wife may be a mistake for mother. I think, however, that the account in the Tabaqāt is correct.
was the daughter of Rānā Sāṅkā, with (her) two children by the hand
got into the jauhar; and they with seven hundred beautiful women were
burnt. 1 Silhadī with Tāj Khān and Lakhman then armed themselves,
and coming out fought with the Dakini infantry, who had gone up
to the fort. When the news reached the camp, the Gujrat army
galloped up to the fort, and sent that ill-fated band to hell; while of
the army of Sultān Bahādur, only four foot soldiers attained to the
happiness of martyrdom.

About this time Sultān 'Ālam, the ruler of Kālpī came as a sup-
plant to Sultān Bahādur, against the assaults of the armies of 2 His
Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī. Sultān Bahādur granted the forts of Rālīn
and Chandīrī, and the territories of Bhīlsa as a jāgīr to him. He also
appointed Muḥammad Khān, the ruler of Asīr, to capture the fort
of Kākrūn, which in the time of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālījī had come into
the possession of the Rānā; and himself started on an expedition to
hunt elephants. He captured many elephants; and after meeting
out their deserts to the rebels of the 3 hilly country of Kānūr, made it
over to 4 Ulugh Khān. He also took possession of Islāmābād and
Hūshangābād and the whole of the country of Mālwa, which was in
the possession of zamīndārs; and granted them as jāgīrs to the amirs

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 328, says that the Rājpūts
showed little of their usual spirit, as although they were all slain, the losses of
the Muslims amounted to no more than four or five. It appears, however,
from Firishtah, that the total number of Rājpūts was not more than one hundred;
and according to the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī, they offered a stout resistance.

2 Firishtah agrees with this; and the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī gives an account
of Sultān 'Ālam, from which it appears that he was placed in charge of Kālpī
by Nizām 'Ali Khalīfah, Bābar's wāzir. He ruled Kālpī well during Bābar's
lifetime; but after his death he rebelled against Humāīn, and then sought
shelter with Sultān Bahāadar. The Cambridge History of India, page 328,
however, says that "He had fled from his principality before Bābar".

3 The name is کورا کالر in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and کورا کالر
in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. also has کورا کالر, but the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī,
Bayley, page 388, has the fort of Kānūr; and the Cambridge History of India,
page 328, Kanōr. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted کورا کالر in the text-edition.

4 The name is الف خان in the MS., and خان in the lith. ed.
Firishtah lith. ed. has خان; and the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī and the Cambridge
History of India, page 329, have Alp Khān.
of Gujrat, and to his own trusted adherents. When Muhammad Khan, the ruler of Asir, was advancing towards Karkun, Sultan Bahadur also arrived in that neighbourhood with great rapidity. 1 A man of the name of Ram, who was the governor of the place on behalf of the Rana, evacuated it, and fled. Sultan Bahadur occupied himself there for four days in festive assembly and entertainment; and granted rewards and favours to each one of the men who were near his person. He then sent Imam-ul-mulk and Iqtiyar Khan, who were among his great nobles, to capture the fort of Mandisor; and himself went to Mandu. The governor of Mandisor, who was an officer of the Rana evacuated it 3 and fled; and in the course of one month the forts of Karkun and Mandisor came into the Sultan’s possession.

The Sultan advanced from Mandu to Champai. Information came at the latter place, that the 4 firangis had come to the port of

---

1 The MSS. have رام ناميا, while the lith. ed. has رام ناميا. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has رام جي ناميا. The name is not given either by Col. Briggs or in the Mirat-i-Sikandari or in the Cambridge History of India. It would appear from Col. Briggs and the Mirat-i-Sikandari that Muhammad Shah had not yet succeeded in capturing Gagraun, but when Sultan Bahadur appeared, the place was evacuated (Bayley, pp. 367, 368).

2 The name is دسطور, and Dastur in the MSS.; and looks like دئسطور Dastur in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has رسول راهور, and Col. Briggs has Runtubhore (vol. IV, p. 123). The Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 368, and the Cambridge History of India have Mandisor or Mandasor, which I have adopted.

3 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has قلعه را خالی گذاشتہ گربخت. The other has the same, but inserts between قلعہ and گربخت. The lith. ed. has خالی کردہ باشتہ گربخت. Firishtah lith. ed. has the same reading as the first MS., and I have adopted it.

4 With reference to this, see the footnote in Col. Briggs, vol. IV, page 123, from which it appears that according to Faria-e-Souza (tome I, part iv, chapter iv) it was one of the greatest efforts made by the Portuguese, but it appears to have failed entirely. The fleet consisted of four hundred vessels, on which were embarked three thousand six hundred European soldiers and ten thousand native soldiers, besides seamen and Lascars. The Mahomedans under Moostufa Khan the Governor of Diu or Dip so completely repulsed the attack that the Portuguese had to return to Goa. Bayley also in a note, on page 369, says that it was a very important struggle, and he hoped to discuss it more
Dip, and had raised the standard of power. The Sultān advanced
towards Dip and when he arrived in its neighbourhood, (he heard)
that the firangis had fled; and a great cannon, which exceeded in
size all other cannon in India, came into his possession. The Sultān
had it conveyed to Chāmpānir by means of a special machine.
He then determined to seize Chitōr, and marched from Dip to Kan-
bāyet and from there to Aḥmadābād. Here he went on pilgrimage
to the tombs of the holy Shaikhs and of his great ancestors. He
collected troops, and with the artillery of Dip and Gujrāt advanced
towards Chitōr. 1 At this time Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā fled from
the court of His Majesty Humāyūn Bādshāh, and came as a suppliant
to the Sultān. When the latter arrived at Chitōr, the Rānā shut
himself up in the fort; and the period of the siege was prolonged to
three months. On many occasions brave men prepared for combat
came out from the two armies, and performed gallant deeds. On
most of these occasions victory and triumph fell to the lot of the
GuJRāTis. In the end the Rānā came forward with humility, and paid
a large subsidy and making the crown and the 2 jewelled belt, which
he had taken from Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī the ruler of Mālwa, and
some horses and elephants, the ransom of his life, turned the Sultān
back to Gujrāt.

This victory and the coming of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā, and
the gathering together of the descendent of Sultān Bahīlū Lūdī in
his service became the cause of the increase of Sultān Bahādur’s pride.
It also became the cause, that set on move the chain of hostility
with His Majesty Muḥammad Humāyūn Bādshāh. In order to carry
out this intention, he conferred favours on Tātār Khān, son of Sultān
‘Alā-ud-din, son of Sultān Bahīlū Lūdī, who was distinguished above

---

1 Muhammad Zamān Mirzā was a prisoner in the fort of Biāna, and fled
from there in the year 940 A.H.

2 About this belt see Note on page 124 of Col. Brugg’s History, vol. IV, from
which it appears that it was sent with Bahādur Shāh’s family to Medina; and it
eventually found its way in the shape of a present to the Grand Seignior, Soliman
the Magnificent.
all his equals in manliness and bravery; and paid 1 thirty krörs of
gold to Burhān-ul-mulk, the governor of the fort of 2 Ranthambōr,
so that in concert with him and with his advice the money might be
spent by Tatār Khān in collecting an army. Within a short time
about forty thousand horse assembled 3 round Tatār Khān. He
began to make inroads on the outskirts of the dominions of His Majesty
Jinnat Āshīānī. In the year 941 A.H. repeated 4 letters came from

---

1 The actual words in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. are, سی کروز ز کروز مقری سی کروز مقری which means thirty krörs of gold coin (probably Muṣaffarīs) and Firishtah has definitely سی کروز مقری سی کروز مقری thirty krörs of Muṣaffarīs. Col. Briggs, however, has three crores of rupees and says, in a note, three millions sterling. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 382) does not mention the amount, but it says that thirty (not forty as in the text) thousand horse were placed under Tatār Khān Lodī to march to Dehli by way Bāiānāh.

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have بہار الیلک حاکم قلعہ زنیب بہار بہار الیلک حاکم قلعہ اسبر, Burhān-ul-mulk, the governor of the fort of Ranthambōr; but Firishtah lith. ed. has بہار الیلک حاکم قلعہ Bāiānāh, Burhān-ul-mulk the governor of the fort of Asb; while Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 125) has Īmād-ool-Moolk, the governor of Runtunbhore. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī does not mention Burhān-ul-mulk or Īmād-ul-mulk. The Cambridge History of India, page 330, has Burhān-ul-Mulk governor of Ranthambhor.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بہار تاتار خان; but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has بہار تاتار خان. I have adopted the former reading.

4 It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 375, that several letters passed between Humâyūn and Bahādār about the extradition or expulsion of Muhammad Zamān Mirzā. In the first letter Humâyūn urged Bahādār to act in an amicable spirit; in the second he expressed surprise at Bahādār’s unfriendly conduct. A copy of the third letter is given in Mir Ābū Turāb’s Tārīkh-i-Gujarat, and a translation of it in Bayley’s History of Gujarat. A copy of the fourth letter, which was Bahādār’s reply, is also given in the Tārīkh-i-Gujarat and a translation of it by Bayley. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 380, that Bahādār’s replies were written by Mullā Mahmūd Munshī, who had been formerly in Humâyūn’s service, but had done something which had greatly incensed the latter, and he had accordingly fled and taken refuge with Sultān Bahādār. The drafts of these letters by this man were in rude and insolent language, but Bahādār’s ministers, who were wise and prudent men, had all the insulting expressions erased before the letters were sent. The last draft was, however, brought by the Munshī to the Sultān when he was drunk, and he directed it to be despatched at once, and it was sent accordingly, when the Munshī had affixed the Sultān’s seal to it. Next morning when the ministers and the other āmirūs saw the draft they were surprised at its insolent language.
Humāyūn Bādshāh to Sultān Bahādur, to the effect that even if he does not send Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā to his presence, he should at least expel him from his own dominions. Sultān Bahādur on account of his great pride and self glorification did not send a satisfactory reply. In addition to this Tātār Khān attacked Bīāna and seized it. His Majesty Jinnat Āshlānī sent Hindāl Mīrzā to crush him. When the Mīrzā arrived in the neighbourhood of Bīāna, the men who had gathered round Tātār Khān dispersed; and not more than two thousand horsemen remained with him. Owing to his great shame and remorse, that he had spent such a large sum of money upon his faithless soldiers, he could not go and wait on the Sultān and ask him for further help. Having no alternative left, he decided on a battle; and, when the two armies met, he made an onslaught on the centre of Mīrzā Hindāl’s army; and was, with the three hundred men who were with him, slain; and the fort of Bīāna came into the possession of Mīrzā, the royal officer.

His Majesty Jinnat Āshlānī took this victory to be a good omen, and advanced to crush Sultān Bahādur. It so happened that the latter had at this time again advanced to seize the fort of Chitōr, with a large army, and all the appliances for the capture of fort. When the news of the defeat and death of Tātār Khān, and of the advance of His Majesty (Humāyūn) reached him at the foot of the fort of Chitōr, he became extremely anxious, and had a conference as to the course he should adopt. The opinion of most of the amirs was to the effect, that he should raise the siege of Chitōr, and advance to meet Humāyūn; but 1 Ṣadr Khān, who was the greatest of his nobles, submitted, “We are besieging the Kāfir; if a Bādshāh of the Musalmāns comes to attack us, he would be supporting and helping the Kāfir; and 2 such an act would be talked about among Musalmāns

A messenger on a swift horse was at once sent to intercept the letter but he was unable to do so; and the letter reached Humāiūn, and was the direct cause of the war between the two sovereigns.

1 It is curious that although he is called the he has never been mentioned before. Firishtah lith. ed. has by mistake حیدر خان حیدر خان. The Cambridge History of India, page 330, has “Ṣadr Khan, one of his officers”.
2 One MS. has by mistake این امر روزا قیامت.
till the day of the resurrection. It is right for Your Majesty’s benefit, that we should not abandon the siege; and there is a strong likelihood that he (i.e., Humayun) would not attack us during this time”. When His Majesty Jinnat Ashiání encamped at Sarangpur, and the facts of this conference were reported to him, he halted there for a few days; so that Sultán Bahádur having erected covered ways, took the fort of Chitoor by force and violence; and put a large number of Rájpúts to death.

When Sultán Bahádur after his mind had been freed from all anxieties about the conquest of Chitoor advanced to fight with Humayún Bâdshâh, the latter also having had the drum of departure beaten, prepared to meet him; and the two armies met each other in the vicinity of Mandisór. While the tents had not yet been fixed, Saiyid ‘Ali Khán and Khuráshán Khán, who were the commanders of the vanguard of Sultán Bahádur’s army, fled from the army to His Majesty the Humayún Bâdshâh, and united with the main body. The Gujrátís on seeing this were heartbroken. Sultán Bahádur then took counsel with the amírs and the leaders of different groups as to the way in which the war should be carried on. Sadr Khán said, “We should fight a drawn battle tomorrow, 1 for the troops have gained strength and courage from the capture of Chitoor, and their eyes have not yet been frightened by the power and grandeur of the Mughal army”. 2 Rûmî Khán, who was the officer in-charge of the artillery of Sultán

---

1 The MSS. have جراح شکریان; while the lith. ed. has جراح که شکریان.

2 Rûmî Khán’s statement that cannon and muskets do not come into action in a battle appears to be preposterous on the face of it; and it is strange that his advice was accepted by Sultán Bahádur, and acquiesced in by the other leaders. None of the other histories says anything about the treachery of Rumi Khán, but the Mirat-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 383, and the following pages, gives a circumstantial, and what appears to me, a convincing account of such treachery. It appears that Sultán Bahádar had given a promise to Rumi Khán, that he would place him in command of the fortress of Chitoor, but after it was taken, the ministers and nobles were jealous and strongly objected; and the Sultán could not keep his promise at the time. Rumi Khán was deeply offended, and he wrote secretly to Humayún, and informed him that if he would march in that direction the defeat of Sultán Bahádar might easily be compassed, “for”, he wrote “the Sultán places entire reliance on my judgment, and I will contrive a way for the success of the Emperor’s army”. The words within inverted
Bahādur, submitted that cannon and muskets ¹ do not come into use in a battle; and the artillery, which has come into the possession of this government is such, that it is not known whether any sovereign except the Qaṣīr of Rūm (the Sultān of Turkey) has anything like it. On this account it is advisable that a ² ditch should be dug around the army, and skirmishes should be fought every day, and bold warriors of the Mughal army would come and deliver attacks all round the camp, and would be killed by the discharges of cannon and the muskets.

Sultān Bahādur approved of this plan and a ditch was dug round the camp. At this time Sultān Ṭālim Kālpīwāl, on whom Sultān Bahādur had conferred Rāisīn and Chandīrī and that ⁴ zūba as jāgīrs, came with a large army, and joined the Gujrat camp. For two months the two armies sat face to face; and ³ the Mughal troops raided round the camp, and shut up the way of the ingress and egress of grain. After some days had elapsed in this way, a ⁴ great scarcity made its

commas are also within inverted commas in Bayley's history, from which it would appear that the writer had seen the letter and was quoting from it; but unfortunately no reference has been given.

¹ The Tārikh-i-Gujarat (Denison Ross, p. 14), however, says something which is slightly different, and which if correct makes the advice less absurd. It says what Rūmī Khān said was ما توب و تفنگ سبیار دارم ان فا را کار نفرمای و سپاه خود را بکشتی دهم and further on و چندم هر روز طرح چنگ انداخته - مغران روبوی تویخانه بارند و توب را سر دهد. As a matter of fact, however, much use does not appear to have been made of the cannon and muskets.

² The Tārikh-i-Gujarat (p. 14) says کہ ابادت کندہ. Sir Denison Ross, the editor of the Tārikh-i-Gujarat, says araba means “an enclosed camp or zariba”, although in the dictionary it only means a cart or wagon.

³ Firishtah's account explains better, how it was that the Mughal army suffered such small loss from the cannon and muskets of the Gujratīs, and was still able to blockade the camp.

⁴ A graphic, but what appears to me, to be a somewhat exaggerated account of this scarcity is given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 384. On the same and also on the next page a further instance is given of Rūmī Khān's treachery. It appears that a leader of Banjārahs came and told Sultān Bahādar that he had brought a million bullock-loads of grain, but could not bring them into the camp for fear of the Moghals. Sultān Bahādar accordingly sent out five thousand men secretly at night to escort the Banjārahs; but Rūmī Khān wrote and informed Humāūn, and the Gujarāt escort was defeated, and the grain was intercepted and taken into the Moghul camp.
appearance in the Gujrat army; and all the fodder that was in the
neighbourhood was entirely exhausted. Owing to the attacks of the
Mughals, no one had the power, that he should go to a distance from
the camp and bring grain and fodder. Sultan Bahadur saw that his
remaining there any longer would result in his capture. Therefore
one night he came out from behind his pavilion and, with five of his
trusted amirs, one of whom was the governor of Burhanpur and another
Mallu Qadir Khan, governor of Malwa, fled towards Mandu. When
his army came to know of his flight, each man fled in a (different)
direction.

His Majesty Jinnat Ashtihi Humayun Badsah pursued (Sultan
Bahadur) to the foot of the fort of Mandu, and on the way many men
were killed. Sultan Bahadur shut himself up in Mandu; and after
some time Hindu Beg Qulchah and a number of other Mughal amirs
got into the fort from the bastion of the seven hundred steps. Sultan

1 One MS. omits Qadir.

2 A somewhat different account of the circumstances attending and
immediately proceeding Sultan Bahadar's flight is given in the Mirat-i-Sikandari,
Bayley, pp. 385, 386. The date of the flight is given as the 20th Ramazan,
941 A.H., 25th March, 1535 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 331,
gives 25th April, 1535, as the date of the flight. The Tarikh-i-Gujarat (pp. 17, 18)
have a rather incoherent account of Sultan Bahadur's proceedings immediately
before his flight.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have هر كدام but the other MS. has ما هر كدام;
I have adopted the former.

4 One MS. and the lith. ed. have تعقب فروده در راه; the other MSS. have
تعقب نمود و در راه. I have adopted the latter reading.

5 The names are Hindu Beg Quljeh and Hindu Beg Quljeh in the MSS. In
the lith. ed. it is Hindoo Beg without any suffix. The name does not appear to be
mentioned in the Tarikh-i-Gujarat, the Mirat-i-Sikandari or the Cambridge
History of India.

6 The words are از مرحله فتح ندیه زنده in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.
Firistaht lith. ed. has incorrectly فتح ندیه زنده, i.e., with seven hundred men;
and Col. Briggs says that "Hindo Beg and seven hundred Moguls who
entered the fort at night along with his followers". The Tarikh-i-Gujarat
(p. 17) says the Mughals got into the fort طرف راه فتح ندیه زنده, i.e., from the direction
of the path of the seven hundred steps. The Cambridge History of India (p. 331)
says, "A division escaladed the walls of the fort at night". The Mirat-i-Sikandari
Bahādūr was asleep when there was a great noise; and the Gujrātīs in great dismay took the path of flight. Sultān Bahādūr with five or six horsemen went away in the direction of Chāmpānīr. Sadr Khān and Sultān ‘Ālām, governor of Rālsīn and that gūba, took shelter in the citadel of Sūnkār; and after two days they asked for assurances of their lives being spared, and waited on Jinnat Āshīānī. Sadr Khān was taken into the latter's service; but Sultān ‘Ālām, as he had been guilty of improper behaviour, had, by order of Humāyūn, his sinews cut off (i.e., he was hamstrung). Sultān Bahādūr sent the treasure and jewels which he had at Chāmpānīr to the port of Dīp, and himself went to Kānābayet. When His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī in pursuit of him arrived at the foot of the fort of Chāmpānīr he marched from there and proceeded towards Kānābayet on wings of speed. Sultān Bahādūr took fresh, strong horses and went on to the port of Dīp. His Majesty Humāyūn arrived at Kānābayet the very day that Bahādūr started for Dīp, and leaving Kānābayet he took possession of Chāmpānīr. Ikhtiyār Khān Gujrātī, the governor of the fort, occupied himself in defending it, but his Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī seized it by a plan which has been described in the narrative of his history. Ikhtiyār Khān took shelter in the citadel of the fort, which was called Mūlā; and in the end after praying for quarter, acquired the honour of serving His Majesty. As he was distinguished by great excellence and accomplishments above all the other amirs of Gujrāt, he was enlisted among the courtiers of Humāyūn's special majlis.

(Bayley, p. 387) ascribes the capture of Mandū to the treachery of Rūmī Khān. It says that the latter wrote to Bhūpest son of Silhadi, who had charge of one of the gates, to revenge the wrongs of his family by throwing it open, and the Mughals entered by it.

1 Written as سونکھر and سونکھر in the MSS., and سونکھر in the lith. ed.
2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بجائے تمہار but the other MS. has بجائے تمہار in the text-edition.
3 The actual words are اسپان تارہ روز of Firishtah, but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has by mistake اسپان تارہ اللوز.
4 The MSS. have قبل كردن and قبل فرمودند, The lith. ed. has قبل كردن. I have adopted قبل كردن.
5 See ante, Translation, vol. II, pp. 54 and 55. See also note 55, page 353.
All the treasures of the Sultāns of Gujrat, which they had collected in the course of many long generations, fell into his hands and were distributed among the soldiery by shield-fulls.

As much booty had fallen into the hands of Humāyūn's soldiers, no one that year paid any heed to the collection of the revenue; and in the beginning of 940 A.H., in spite of the fact that His Majesty continued to be at Chāmpānir, repeated petitions were sent by the ratayats of Gujrat to Sultān Bahādur, to the effect that if he would appoint one of his servants to collect the revenue, the proper amounts would be remitted into the treasury. Sultān Bahādur deputed his slave 'Imād-ul-mulk, who was noted for his great bravery and the excellence of his powers of management, with a large army for collecting the revenue. When 'Imād-ul-mulk began to collect troops, and arrived in front of Aḥmadābād; according to a statement, about fifty thousand men had already collected round him. From that place he deputed officers to all the neighbouring countries to collect the revenue. When this news reached Jinnat Ashfāni, he entrusted the guarding of the treasure to Tardī Bēg Kān, who was one of the great amirs, and a man on whom he reposed his trust; and himself advanced towards Aḥmadābād. He sent Mirzā 'Askari with Yādgār Nāsir Mirzā and Hindū Bēg one stage in advance of him. In the neighbourhood of Maḥmūdābād, which is twelve karōhs from Muḥammadābād, Mirzā 'Askari had a severe battle with 'Imād-ul-mulk, and the latter was defeated; and many Gujratīs were slain.

---

1 The words in the MSS. are زر به سیر بلسکویان and زر به سیر به لشکرین. The lith. ed. has با سیر بلسکویان. I have not been able to find out in any other history how the money was measured and distributed. Firishthah in the corresponding passage simply says زر به لشکرین تقسیم شد.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishthah have یکی از ملایر، but the other MS. has یکی از مملکت. I have adopted the former.

3 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have بتحصیل ولایت فرستاد; but Firishthah in the corresponding passage has بتحصیل سالائک ولایت which is better, and the Tarikh-i-Gujarat (p. 25) has تحقیل مالیات واجب.

4 According to the Tarikh-i-Gujarat (p. 27) the treasure was entrusted to Maulānā Maḥmūd Lārī who is said to have been a Guardian or tutor; and the fort to Tardī Bēg.

5 Firishthah copies the language of the Tabaqāt almost word for word, but here he says عماد الملك شکست یافته با گجراتیان بیشمار بقتل رسید, from which it
After that His Majesty encamped in front of Aḥmadābād; and 1 made over the government of that place to Mīrzā 'Askari, and Pattan Gujrāt to Yādgār Nāṣir Mīrzā, and Bahrōj to Qāsim Ḥusain Sultān and 2 Barōda to Hindū Bēg Qūlchīn, and Chāmpānīr to Tardī Bēg Kīhān, and himself went to 3 Burhānpūr. From there he went to Mandū.

4 At this time, Kīhān Jahān Shīrzī who was one of the amīrs of Sultān Bahādur, collected an army and took possession of Nausāri; and Rūmī Kīhān having joined him from the port of Sūrath, they marched towards Bahrōj. Qāsim Ḥosain Sultān finding that he was not strong enough to meet them went to Tardī Bēg Kīhān at Chāmpānīr; and disturbances and rebellion commenced over the whole of Gujrāt. At this time Ghaḍīnfar who was one of the amīrs of Mīrzā 'Askari fled and went to Sultān Bahādur, and incited him to advance to Aḥmadābād. The details of this 5 brief statement have been narrated in their proper place. All the amīrs 6 except Tardī Bēg Kīhān now would appear that 'Imād-ul-mulk was himself slain, though this is not expressly stated anywhere else. The battle and most of the incidents narrated here were narrated previously in the history of Humāyūn's reign; see translation, vol. II, p. 57. A rather long account of the battle with some irrelevant matter is given in the Tārīkh-i-Gujrāt (p. 27); but the purport of it agrees with that given in the Akbarnāma.

1 This distribution of governments has already been mentioned in the history of Humāyūn's reign (translation, vol. II, p. 58).

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have برودرا, but I have as before adopted the present spelling Barōda, but M. Ḥidayat Ḥosain has retained برودرا Barōdra in the text-edition.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 333, says Humāyūn marched to Burhānpur. Muhammad Shāh or Muhammad Kīhān Aṣfī wrote to him to spare his little kingdom, and invited the other rulers of the Deccan to form a league for their mutual defence; but Humāyūn's operations were confined to a military promenade through Khāndesh.

4 See ante, translation, vol. II, page 58. The conduct of Rūmī Kīhān contradicts, to some extent, the accounts given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī of his treachery against Sultān Bahādur. The Tārīkh-i-Gujrāt (p. 29) describes in some detail, how Humāyūn's governors vacated or were made to vacate their various districts or fiefs.


6 Both MSS. have بغض از تردى خان; but the lith. ed. has بغیر از تردى بیگ خان; بیگ خان.
assembled in Ahmadabad. Sultan Bahadur advanced into 1 Gujrat. Askari Mirza and Yadgar Nasir Mirza and all the amirs agreed among themselves, that as it was difficult or in fact impossible to meet and withstand him, and as Jinnat Aashani was in Mandu, it would be most advisable to seize the treasure which was in Champenan, and advance towards Agra; and having taken possession of those districts, 2 read the public prayer in the name of Mirza Askari. At the same time the rank of vazarat should belong to Hindu Beg, and the other Mirzas should go and take possession of any province which they might think of. On this decision they relinquished the country of Gujrat for nothing; Gujrat which had been acquired with so much trouble and hardship. They advanced towards Champenan. Tardi Beg Khan having obtained information of the wicked design of the Mirzas and the other nobles endeavoured to strengthen the fort.

3 The amirs started from Champenan in the direction of Malwa; and commenced to tread along the desert of disgrace and shameless-

---

1 He was at Dip, which was in Sorath.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 333, says, "Askari Mirza at Ahmadabad was meditating his own proclamation as King of Gujrat". This appears to me to be totally incorrect. Askari Mirza and all the other Mughal nobles were giving up the possession of Gujrat, and were marching towards Agra. He could not, therefore, think of proclaiming himself as the king of Gujrat. He wanted to proclaim himself as Badshah of Dehli. The Cambridge History of India further goes on to say that Mirza Askari and others besieged Tardi Beg at Champenan. This is scarcely correct. Neither Tabaqat nor Firishtah says so; and even the Tarikh-i-Gujarat which gives, on page 31, the negotiations between the Mirzas and Tardi Beg Khan does not say so. The Tarikh-i-Gujarat which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross is slightly incoherent; for instance, the sentence beginning with in the page referred to is incomplete. The punctuation is peculiar. There are two marks, a * and a —; and it is not clear what they exactly represent; but whether the sentence referred to ends with بهجتانمبر است, where there is the dash mark or with گریفسئ نو کرده اند, where there is the star mark; there is no verb to سلطان بهادر; and if the sentence begins and ends with the star mark then it curiously jumbles up two totally unconnected matters.

3 Both the MSS. have no nominative to the verb گریفسئ, but the lith. ed. had امرا, and Firishtah in the corresponding passage has میتزاین. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed.
ness. When Sultan Bahadur found Gujrat unguarded, he advanced towards Champānir to crush Tardi Bег Khan. The latter took with him such portion of the treasure of Champānir as he could, and commenced to retrace his steps to Āgra. Sultan Bahadur halted at Champānir for ten days, and occupied himself in arranging the affairs of that neighbourhood. As, in the times of the power of Jinnat Ashānī, he had owing to his great distress and weakness asked for help from the firangīs, he knew for certain that they would come; and knowing that the ports of Gujrat were unguarded, and being afraid that they should come under the possession of the firangīs, he started from Champānir, and advanced towards Sərath and Junāgarh, so that, on the arrival of the firangīs, he might turn them back by any means that might be possible. ¹ He had been engaged for some days in travelling about and hunting, when news came that five or

¹ The circumstances attending Sultan Bahadur's death are given in the different histories in a way which mainly agrees with the text. Firishtah copies it almost word for word. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 132-141) reduces the number of Europeans to four or five thousand but otherwise agrees. He, however, gives extracts from Fariah-e-Souza's History of the Portuguese in Asia, and also from the Mirut Iskundry, to give the two opposite versions of the incidents connected with Sultan Bahadur's death. The Portuguese version shows that Nuno de Cunha, who commanded at Goa, but who having been informed by Emanuel de Souza, who commanded at Diū, had come to the latter place, were both convinced that Badur intended to seize, and put them to death, and to secure the fort of Diū which he, when hard pressed by Humāyūn had given them permission to build; and they were also contriving to seize him, put him to death. As to the actual occurrence, the Portuguese version is that Emanuel de Souza was going to invite the king to the fort . . . . He came up with the king's barge, and made the offer (invitation !) by means of Rume Cham (رومي خان). The latter cautioned the king, he might slighted the warning, and invited Emanuel de Souza to come into his barge. The latter when doing so fell into the sea, but was pulled up, and taken to the king. At the same time another Portuguese barge came up with some gentlemen on board, who seeing Emanuel de Souza hastily got into the king's barge. The king suspecting their sudden coming on board, and remembering the caution given by Rume Cham ordered his officers to kill Emanuel de Souza. James de Mesquita understanding it, flew at and wounded the king. Emanuel de Souza was killed and there was a bloody fray. Finally Badur attempted to escape by swimming, but he was in danger of drowning. Then Tristan de Payva de Santarem reached out an oar to him to take him on board,
six thousand firangis had arrived in gharâbs. When they arrived at the port of Dip, and heard of the restoration of Sultân Bahâdur to power, and of the return of His Majesty Jinnât Āshlânī, they became ashamed and repentant about their coming. They agreed among themselves, that by any deception that might be possible they should take possession of Dip. Their chief, in accordance with this plan, feigned illness and spread a report about it. His object was that he might not have an interview with Sultân Bahâdur. The latter sent men one after another to summon him, and got (the same) reply. In the end thinking that the firangis were afraid of him he got into a barge, with a small number of men, to go and reassure them. The firangis finding the opportunity which they had been seeking, planned to act treacherously. The Sultân perceiving this, tried to get back into his barge. At the time when he was stepping into it, from the gharâb of the firangis, the latter separated the two vessels; and the Sultân being unable to get into his own barge fell into the sea, and having sunk once, put his head out of the water. At this time one of the firangis struck him with a spear and drowned him. The Gujràt army returned without any delay to Aḥmadābâd; and the

when a soldier struck him across the face with a halbert, and so others, till he was killed.

The Mirut Iskundry's account is different. According to it the Portuguese built a fort at Diū after obtaining Bahadur Shah's permission to build an enclosure on a hide of land, but they cut the cow hide into narrow strips and enclosed a large area on which they built a strong fort. When Bahadur was restored to power, he began to think of a stratagem to expel them and the Portuguese becoming aware of his intention became suspicious. When he came to the neighbourhood of Diū, he sent one Noor Mahomed Khuleel to the Portuguese chief with instructions to persuade the latter to come and visit the king. The envoy when drinking with the Portuguese chief divulged the king's real intentions to the latter. The Portuguese chief told him that he was unable to go on account of his indisposition. The king determined to go on board the Portuguese chief's barge on the plea of inquiring about his health, but really with the object of allaying his suspicions. When he got on board, the Portuguese, according to a pre-conceived plan, cut him and his companions down. The date of the murder is given as 3rd Rumsân, 943 A.H., 14th February, 1537 A.D.

The Cambridge History of India, page 334, gives 13th February, 1537, as the date of Sultân Bahâdur's death.
port of Dip came into the possession of the firangis. This event happened in the month of Ramaḍān, in the year 943 A.H.

The period of Sultān Bahādur’s reign was 1 eleven years and nine months.

2 A NARRATIVE OF MIRĀN MUḤammad SHĀH, RULER OF ASIR AND BURHĀNpur.

When Sultān Bahādur packed up the goods of existence, his mother Makhdūma-i-Jahān and the amir, who had been attending on his, stirred up, retraced their steps from Dip to Aḥmadābād. On the way intelligence reached them, that Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā, whom Sultān Bahādur had, in the time of the disturbances, sent towards Dehlī and Lāhore, that he might create disturbances in northern India, and cause dissensions in the Chaghtāī army had returned from the neighbourhood of Lāhore, and had arrived at Aḥmadābād. Immediately on hearing of the martyrdom of Sultān Bahādur, he commenced weeping and making much lamentation, and changed his dress, i.e., put on mourning; and started towards Dip in order to offer his condolence. When he joined the camp, Makhdūma-i-Jahān, as far as lay in her power, sent the necessary articles for his entertainment, and made him put off his mourning garb. 3 But that fortunate Mīrzā made his inquiries into the circumstances

1 One MS. has only eleven years, but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. have eleven years and nine months.
2 The heading is partly obliterated in one MS. In the other it is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has between حكومت and ذكر محمد شاه, and substitutes والي for حاكم.
3 The Tabaqāt and Firishtah confine themselves to the above narrative of Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā’s misdeeds; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, and the Ṭahrīkh-i-Gujarāt say that he attempted to usurp the throne of Gujarāt. Their accounts are, however, different. According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 400, he went to the apartments of the Sultān’s wives, and after offering many condolences, he urged that they should adopt him as a son and help him. The ladies said that they never interfered in politics; and the question of the Sultān’s successor should be settled by the ministers. When his pretensions became known, the amir decided that the task of putting him down must have precedence of all other matters; and should be entrusted to Ṣimād-ul-Mulk. There was some opposition to the latter part of the plan by Afzal Khān. Ṣimād-ul-Mulk, however, started with a large army for Sūrath; and when he reached
of the Sultān’s mother, and showed his kindness towards her, in this (strange) way, that at the time of his departure he made an attack on the treasury, and carried away from it, according to a reputed statement, seven hundred chests of gold, and went away to a distance; and twelve thousand horsemen, Mughals and Hindūstānis collected round him.

The amirs of Gujrat became perturbed on beholding this new disturbance, and took counsel with one another, about the choice of a bādhād. As Sultān Bahādur had repeatedly expressed his intention of making Mirān Muhammad Shāh, who was his nephew (sister’s son), his heir, 1 everyone agreed to select him as the Sultān, and had the neighbourhood of U‘nah the Mirzā came out and bravely offered battle; but was defeated and was obliged to take refuge in exile.

The Tārīkh-i-Gujarat (pp. 38–39) says that Muhammad Zamān Mirzā hastened to Dīb, that he might take his revenge of Sultān Bahādur’s murder from the frangīs. He then seized the treasure which was being brought from Dīb, and took possession of it; and, according to the account which is generally believed, there were nine hundred chests of gold. He also had the public prayer read in his own name at Dīb. When this news reached Aḥmadābād, the amirs determined to vacate Aḥmadābād, and go away to different places. At this juncture ‘Imād-ul-mulk came to the majīls and demanded of Afjāl Khān and Ikhtiyār Khān, who were the evīls of the Sultān, what they intended to do. On hearing their views he reproached them that they could think of lowering their heads before Muhammad Zamān Mirzā. They say that the people of Gujrat were too weak to meet the army, which Muhammad Zamān Mirzā had raised with the treasure he had robbed. He exhorted them to remain quietly at Aḥmadābād and allow him to deal with Muhammad Zamān Mirzā. They agreed. He had at that time only nine horsemen with him. He started from Aḥmadābād, and halted at ‘Uthmānpūr, and made a proclamation of the grant of jāgīr, etc., to the soldiers. Within one month he had forty thousand horsemen. He then marched against Muhammad Zamān Mirzā. The latter however took shelter in an entrenchment. His evīl, and the commander of this army Ḥisām-ud-dīn Mirak, son of Mir Khālīfa, offered battle; and on the 3rd day when he was fighting, Muhammad Zamān Mirzā escaped from the entrenchment, and fled to Sind.

The Cambridge History of India, pp. 334, 335, says that Muhammad Zamān Mirzā claimed the throne of Gujrat on the ground that Sultān Bahādur’s mother had adopted him but says nothing further about what happened to him later.

1 Firishtah agrees generally, and so does the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī. The Tārīkh-i-Gujarat, however, says that while the amirs were engaged in discussing
the khutba read and the sikka struck in his name in his absence. They sent swift messengers to bring him. They also nominated ¹ 'Imād-ul-mulk with a large army for the destruction of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā. The ² latter fought with him and was defeated.

Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, whom Sultān Bahādūr had sent as far as Mālwa in pursuit of the Chaghtāi army, died of natural causes, a month and half after the khutba had been read in his name.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULṬĀN MAHMŪD SHĀH, SON OF LATĪF KHĀN, SON OF MUṢAFFAR SHĀH.

As Mirān Muḥammad Shāh Fārūqī passed away from the evil place of the world to the well-filled land of the after-world; and ³ except

the matter of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā, ambassadors came from Mirān Muḥammad Shāh demanding the kingdom on the ground of his appointment by Sultān Bahādūr to be his successor, and on that of his right of inheritance and kingship.

¹ See note 3, page 381.

² One MS. and the lith. ed. here call him Muḥammad Zamān, but the other MS. prefixes Mirzā to the name; and adds 'retired to the country of Sind'.

³ Both MSS. have بیگر, but the lith. ed. has بیگر. Firestoth lith. ed. also has بیگر. The Cambridge History of India, page 335, in order I suppose to be original and quaint, calls Mahmūd Khān the last remaining heir of Muhammad Karim instead of calling the latter Sultān Muhammad or Sultān Muhammad I. The Cambridge History of India also says that "Mubarāk II, who had succeeded his brother in Khāndesh, and had almost certainly hoped to receive a summons to the throne of Gujarāt, would not surrender him, until a force led by Ikhtiyār Khān invaded Khāndesh". It appears to me that there are several mistakes in this sentence. In the first place, Mubarāk II did not succeed his father. The latter was succeeded by his infant son, and after the latter had been put to death by Mubarāk he ascended the throne of Khāndesh. In the second place there is no evidence to show that he had hoped to be summoned to the throne of Gujarāt. Even the Tārikh-i-Gujarāt, which has been edited by Sir. Denison Ross, who is also the author of Chapter XIII of the Cambridge History of India, does not say so. The Tārikh-i-Gujarāt (p. 30) says that the emissaries from Khāndesh claimed the throne of Gujarāt for the infant son of Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, but Mubarāk II, who had put that infant son to death, would hardly have the face to claim the throne of Gujarāt, or had the hardihood to expect a summons to it. And finally it does not appear that Ikhtiyār Khān had to lead a force into Khāndesh. He did not even go there. Mahmūd Khān was, according to the testimony of all the historians, brought to Gujarāt by Ikhtiyār Khān's brother Muqbil Khān. According to the Tārikh-i-
Maḥmūd Khān, son of Latif Khān, son of Sultan Muṣṭafar, there was no heir left to the throne; and he was imprisoned in the custody of Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh by order of Sultan Muṣṭafar; the amīrs of Gujarāt sent a man to summon him. 1 Muḥammad Shāh’s son raised objections about sending him. The amīrs of Gujarāt collected an army, and decided to march to Burhānpūr; and 2 he (apparently the son of Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh) becoming aware of this sent Maḥmūd Khān to Gujarāt. He was placed on the throne of Gujarāt on the 3 10th Dhi-bijja, 944 A.H., 10th May, 1538 A.D., with the title Gujarāt, as also according to the Tabaqāt and Firishtah, there was a threat of an army being sent to Burhānpūr; and the Tārīkh-i-Guarāt only adds that tents were sent out.

It is, however, true, as Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 144) says that a Guzerat chief marched to Boorhanpoor to invite Mahmood to the capital.

1 It appears from the Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī that Mīrān Muhammad Shāh’s son was an infant at the time of his father’s death. He was, however, placed by the ministers on the throne; and they determined to put Mubārak Khān Muhammad Shāh’s brother to death, lest he should rebel against his nephew. They accordingly had him brought to Burhānpūr and made him over to a nobleman of the name of ‘Arab Khān. He, however, gained the latter over; and with his help attacked the palace, and placed his nephew in confinement. He then told the amīrs that the regency belonged of right to him. They knew that they were helpless. He then put his nephew to death, and was proclaimed as Mubārak Shāh (Bayley, pp. 404, 405).

The Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt (pp. 39, 40) says that the ambassadors came to Gujarāt, and demanded that as Ḟuḥa had been read in the name of Mīrān Muhammad Shāh, it should be read also in the name of his son. The Gujarāt amīrs did not agree to this argument and pointed out that as Maḥmūd Khān was living in safety in the fort of Bīwāl, they should send him to Gujarāt. They also appointed Muqbil Khān, brother of Ikhtiyyār Khān, to bring him; and threatened, that, if he was not sent, they would march to Burhānpūr. When Muqbil Khān went there, Maḥmūd Khān was made over to him.

2 Firishtah says that it was Mīrān Mubārak Shāh, brother of Mīrān Muhammad Shāh, who raised objection to the sending of Maḥmūd Khān. See also the preceding note.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 335, mentions August 8th, 1587, as the date of the accession. I suppose this is a misprint, for otherwise it is incorrect by 59 or 60 years. The date given in the text agrees with that of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 144), however, makes it “10th Zeekad 944 A.H., April 8th 1538”. The Cambridge History of India also gives the new Sultan the title of Sa’d-ud-din Maḥmūd Shāh III. This may be correct, but I have seen it nowhere else; and no other bādshāh of Gujarāt had the first name ending in dīn.
of Maḥmūd Shāh. 1 Ikhtiyār Khān Gujrātī, who had gone to Burhānpūr to bring him, became all-powerful; and the reins of the affairs of the kingdom 2 came into his grasp of power.

3 After a few months, in the year 945 A.H. the amirs fell out amongst themselves. Daryā Khān and ‘Imād-ul-mulk united together and put Ikhtiyār Khān to death. ‘Imād-ul-mulk became Amir-ul-ʿamārā, and Daryā Khān, the vazir. 4 At the end of that year enmity appeared between them also. Daryā Khān took Sultān Maḥmūd out of the city on the pretext of a hunting excursion; and went away in the direction of Chāmpānīr. When ‘Imād-ul-mulk

1 Firishtah also says that it was Ikhtiyār Khān who went to Burhānpūr; but see note 1, page 384, from which it would appear that it was his brother Muqbil Khān who went. Col. Briggs also says that it was Mokbil Khan.

2 The word ʿajūz is omitted in one MS.

3 Firishtah agrees generally but he calls Daryā Khān, Daryā Khān Ghūrī; and he calls ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s jāgīr, Siramgān and Sūrat. Col. Briggs does not say that ‘Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān combined together, and put Ikhtiyār Khān to death; but he says Yekhttiār Khan lost his life in an affray. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, pages 407, 408, gives a circumstantial account of how Ikhttiār Khān was killed. According to it, the young Sultān was kept practically in confinement by Ikhttiār Khān, Mukbil Khan and the latter’s son Lād Khan. He was dissatisfied, but feigned to be totally indifferent. Lād Khan one day proposed to him that if he would give the word, he would so manage that Dariā Khan and ’Imād-ul-Mulk would go to retire behind the veil of death. The Sultān at once rode to the house of ’Imād-ul-Mulk; and the latter and Dariā Khān went to the palace; and Ikhttiār Khān, Mukbil Khān and Lād Khan were all hanged in front of the audience hall; Ikhttiār Khān protesting his innocence to the last moment.

The account given in the Tārīkh-i-Gujrāt (pp. 41, 42) is not very clear; but according to it there was a quarrel between Ikhtiyār Khān and ’Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān, because the young Sultān was kept in charge of Ikhtiyār Khān’s brother Muqbil Khān. ’Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān charged Ikhtiyār Khān with disloyalty to the Sultān; and with conspiring with the ruler of Burhānpūr. He stoutly denied it; but they appeared to have wrung his neck; and buried his body in the garden of the palace where the quarrel took place.

The Cambridge History of India, page 345, seems partially to follow this version.

4 As to the quarrel between ‘Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khan, all the histories appear to agree. It appears that most of the nobles were on the side of Daryā Khān; and ‘Imād-ul-mulk was deserted by them and by the army he had collected; and so had to give in.
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became aware of these happenings, he began at once to collect his forces; and opening his hands for lavish gifts, got an immense army together, and advanced towards Chāmpānīr. After two or three months most of the Gujrāt soldiers, who had obtained large sums of money from him, separated from him and united with the Sultān. 'Imād-ul-mulk in his distress agreed to an amicable settlement, and it was settled that 'Imād-ul-mulk should go away to Jhālāwār, and some paraganas of Sōrath which were in his jāgīr; and the Sultān should return to his capital of Aḥmadābād.

Again in the year 949 A.H. Daryā Khān advanced towards the country of Sōrath, taking Sultān Maḥmūd and a well-equipped army with him, in order to extirpate 'Imād-ul-mulk. The latter came forward to meet him; but after a battle fled and went as a suppliant to Mirān Mubāрак Shāh, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr. Sultān Maḥmūd advanced towards Burhānpūr in pursuit of him. Mirān Mubāрак Shāh assembled his army and came forward to aid 'Imād-ul-mulk. He encountered the Gujrāt army in the battlefield, but was defeated. 'Imād-ul-mulk then fled from Burhānpūr, and took shelter with Qādir Shāh, the ruler of Mālwa. ¹ Mirān Mubāрак Shāh sought the intervention of the great men of the age, and coming in by the door of peace rendered homage to Sultān Maḥmūd. Daryā Khān acquired much power and strength owing to the departure of 'Imād-ul-mulk, and took upon himself the performance of all matters and affairs of the government and revenue administration; and allowed no one else to interfere in them. Gradually things came to such a pass that he made Sultān Maḥmūd a puppet and acted himself as the bādshāh. Then one night, in concert with ² Jarjiū, a pigeon fancier, the Sultān

---

¹ The reason for Mirān Mubāрак Shāh's asking for peace, and doing homage to Sultān Maḥmūd is explained by Firishtah, who says Sultan Musamman Shah Qajar, i.e., Sultān Maḥmūd invaded Khāndesh, and occupied himself in plundering and ravaging (the country).

² The name is given as Jarjiū Khorasānī in the MSS., and Jirījiū Khorasānī in the 18th ed. It is Jirījiū Khorasānī in the 17th ed. of Firishtah. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the Tārīkh-i-Gujrāt. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 416, the man is called Jarji the bird catcher; and the Cambridge History of India, page 337, has Chirji a fowler. I have adopted Jarjiū, a pigeon fancier. The way in which the Sultān fled
came out of the citadel of the fort of Ahmadābād; and went to ʿĀlam Khān Lūḍī, who held Dūlqa and Dandūqa as his jāgīr.

1 ʿĀlam Khān Lūḍī considering the advent of the Sultān a great honour, collected his troops; and four thousand horsemen gathered round him. Daryā Khān brought forward a 2 boy of unknown descent, and gave him the title of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh; and collected the army of Gujrat. He brought the commanders of the army over to his side by promising to increase their jāgīrs and add to their titles; and advanced towards Dūlqa. ʿĀlam Khān came forward, and met him, and 3 a great battle raged between the two armies. At the first onset, however, ʿĀlam Khān defeated the vanguard of Daryā Khān’s army; and advancing into his special detachment fought with great gallantry and courage. But when he came out of the battlefield there

to ʿĀlam Khān is described in almost identical words in the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 416, gives a circumstantial account which differs in various particulars from that in the Ṭabaqāt. The Tārīkh-i-Gujarat gives some account of what happened before the flight, but does not say anything about the flight itself. The Cambridge History of India’s account is somewhat different. جرجر

1 One MS. has معززم عالم خان but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have عالم خان لودی and I have adopted it.

2 The lith. ed. of Firishtah has مجهول النسب. The Tārīkh-i-Gujarat has از قیبلة سلطان احمد بانی احمد ایوب. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 417, describes the boy as a descendant of Sultan Ahmad, the founder of Ahmadābād. The Cambridge History of India calls him a child of obscure origin. It appears that Daryā Khān was willing to give up his position; and in fact sent in his resignation; but was overruled by Fattūjī Muhāfīz Khān, who was a relation of his, and a man of much experience; and then he produced the pretender, and marched out to meet ʿĀlam Khān and Sultān Mahmūd (p. 338).

3 The account of the battle as given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī is entirely different. According to it Dariā Khān was victorious, and took possession of Dholkah; and both the Sultān and ʿAlam Khān fled. After their defeat, however, large bodies of troops joined him, and Dariā Khān found his army dwindling away. He attempted to enter Ahmadābād, but the people shut the gate in his face, and attacked him with arrows and musket fire. Then the Sultān and ʿAlam Khān advanced to Ahmadābād. Dariā Khān sent his family and treasures to Chāmpānīr; and went himself to Burhānpūr to bring Mirān Mubārak Shāh as his ally.
were no more than five horsemen with him, and he could not find Sultān Māhmūd, whom he had left with his own troops at the gate. He became perplexed and distressed, but it came into his mind that as after the first attack the vanguard of Daryā Khān's army had fled and gone away towards Aḥmadābād, the news of his defeat might have been spread about in the city; and he should therefore betake himself there. Then with the five men who were with him he advanced to Aḥmadābād; and going to the royal palace made a proclamation of his victory. When the citizens saw ʿĀlam Khān, as they had seen some of the fugitives belonging to (Daryā Khān's) vanguard a moment before, they became sure of Daryā Khān's defeat. They came in a large\(^1\) body; and waited on him. He gave an order, and in a moment the people plundered Daryā Khān's house and having strengthened the gates of the city, sent swift messengers to bring Sultān Māhmūd. The messengers from Aḥmadābād came to Daryā Khān, who had after gaining the victory (over the troops that were opposed to him), halted in his camp; and informed him of what was happening at Aḥmadābād. He then advanced towards that city. As the families of the amirs were in the city, which was in the possession of ʿĀlam Khān, most of them separated from Daryā Khān before he arrived there. About this time Sultān Māhmūd also arrived. Daryā Khān then fled towards Burhānpūr and matters turned\(^2\) upside down. Daryā Khān did not find a resting place at Burhānpūr, and went to Shēr Khān Afgān, and\(^3\) was received with favour by him. After the departure of Daryā Khān, ʿĀlam Khān took up the post and the work of the vazārat. But he also, owing to his great pride, wanted

---

\(^1\) One MS. has جماعة جماعة while the other has جماعة جماعة and the lith. ed. has جماعة جماعة but I prefer جماعة جماعة.

\(^2\) The words are قفية منعكس شد. There are no similar words in Firishtah and the Tārikh-i-Gujarat. I think the meaning is, that Daryā Khān had defeated Mrān Mubārak Shāh, and the latter had to sue for peace. The tables were now turned, and Daryā Khān had to go and seek shelter in Burhānpūr.

\(^3\) Firishtah and the Tārikh-i-Gujarat also say so. The latter says he entered the service of Shēr Khān; but the Cambridge History of India, page 339, gives an account of some of his further adventures, and of an unsuccessful attempt made by him and ʿĀlam Khān Lodī, who according to the Cambridge History of India had now joined him to place ʿAlā-ud-dīn Fath Khān of the royal line of Sindi on the throne of Gujarāt.
to be independent and overbearing like Daryā Khān in all respects. Sultān Maḥmūd got the amīrs to combine with him, and attempted to seize him. He received warning of this, and fled and went to Shēr Khān. After his mind had been set at rest by the termination of the dissections of the rebel amīrs, Sultān Maḥmūd set himself to manage the government of the country, to increase the cultivation and to comfort the soldiers. Within a short time he restored the country to its original condition. He treated the nobles and other great men, and the gentry and pious men with kindness and favour. He carried on the government till the year 961 A.H. without any dissension and any enemy.

1 But in the month of Rabī‘-ul-āwwal of that year, one of his servants who had the name of Burhān, and who showed himself to be a man of piety in the eyes of men, and devoted most of his time in prayer and worship, and always acted as the Sultān's pēsh-namāz or leader in the prayers, in a hunting excursion murdered him. The particulars of this brief statement are these: on one occasion, the Sultān shut him up between walls on account of some fault committed by him in his service, and left an aperture for his breath to pass

---

1 Before mentioning the assassination of Sultān Maḥmūd, Firishtah mentions the foundation of the new city of Maḥmūdābād, which, however, could not be completed by the Sultān, and also the erection of the fort of Surat under the supervision of Ghādanfar Aqā, his Turki slave, who had the title of Khudāwand Khān. The Tārīkh-i-Gujrāt says that Humāyūn after his restoration wrote a letter to Sultān Maḥmūd, proposing an alliance, and suggesting that Sultān Maḥmūd should invade Mālwa, while he himself would advance against others, whom he, rather vaguely, describes as مغفلان باي or rebellious enemies. Accordingly, Sultān Maḥmūd took a muster roll of his troops, and مندو زندت, which I suppose means, invaded Mandū (pp. 43, 44). The Mirāt-i-Sikandari has a long account of Sultān Maḥmūd's liking for low company, and of his conferring the title of Muhāfiz Khān on Jarjī the pigeon fancier; and of this man's insolence towards the amīrs, and his getting a farāmdān from the Sultān for the execution of 'Alā-ud-dīn Lōdti and Shujā‘at Khān. The amīrs then demanded that Jarjī should be made over to them. The Sultān refused to do so. The amīrs pretended to accept the Sultān's order, but prayed that he would allow them to make their obeisance to him. The Sultān held a darbār, and when Jarjī appeared there, he was murdered in open darbār in the Sultān's presence. The amīrs then made a plan for guarding the Sultān, and later of blinding him, and dividing the kingdom among themselves (Bayley, pp. 421-423).
through, but after a time released him. The wretched Burhān kept this old grudge concealed in his mind. He united with himself a number of hunters, whose occupation was to hunt tigers, and promised each one of them the rank of an amīr. One night when the Sultan had gone to sleep after coming back from hunting, he in concert with his nephew (sister’s son) named Daulat, who was in close attendance on the Sultan, tied the latter’s hair firmly to the wood of his bedstead, and passed a sword across his throat. That victim (of their cruelty) had placed both his hands on the edge of the sword, so that his hands were also cut, and he was murdered. (Burhān then) kept the tiger hunters hidden in a corner, and sent men to summon the great amīrs. He also told the musicians that the Sultan had ordered that they should play on their instruments outside the house.

Half the night had passed when he secured the attendance of Khudāwand Khān and Āṣaf Khān, who were both the vazīrs; and took them to a private chamber, and had them murdered. In the same way he summoned twelve of the great amīrs and killed them all. Then his men went to summon I’tmād Khān. The latter said, “The Sultan cannot possibly have sent for me at such a time; I have only a little while ago come from attending on him”; and he delayed in coming. Burhān sent another man to summon him. His suspicion and alarm became greater, and he did not come. When Afḍal Khān, who was one of the distinguished amīrs and with whom Burhān had ancient friendship came, Burhān took him to a private place, and told him, “The Sultan is displeased with Khudāwand Khān and Āṣaf Khān, and wants you to take their place, and he has sent this robe of the vazārat for you”. Afḍal Khān said, “Until I go to the Sultan’s presence and see him, I shall not put on the robe”. Burhān then took Afḍal Khān to the place, where the martyr Sultan was lying, and said, “I have killed the Sultan and the vazīrs and all the nobles. I now make you my vazīr,

1 The accounts of the murder as given in Firishtah and the Tārikh-i-Gujarat and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India agree mainly with that in the text; but there are various differences in details. It was committed on the night of the 12th of Rabī‘-ul-Awwal, the anniversary of the birth of the Prophet Muhammad. The murderer is called Burhān in all the histories, except the Cambridge History of India, where he is called Burhān-ud-din (p. 342).
and will entrust all the power to you”. Afdal Khān commenced calling him names, and made an outcry. That wicked man then murdered him also. He then conferred titles on each one of a number of obscure soldiers, and vulgar men who came that night; and gave them hopes of being made amīrs. He stretched his hands to the public treasure and gave much gold to the people. He was occupied till the morning with the giving away of the gold; and in the morning placed the royal umbrella over his head, and made a general proclamation. He then collected all the elephants belonging to the Sultān, which were in the city and having distributed the horses in the Sultān's stables among the people of the lower classes, made them the supports of his power. When it became morning, the news of the Sultān’s martyrdom spread about. 'Imād-ud-mulk, the father of Chengiz Khān and Ulugh Khān Ḥabshi and other amīrs collected together, and attacked that man of wretched destiny. He, in accordance with the line:

Hemistich:

Empire if even for a moment is precious,

had the royal umbrella raised over his head, and came to oppose them with a mob of common people and a few elephants; and at the first 1 assault fell on the dust of wretchedness, and was slain by Shērwān Khān. A rope was then tied round his leg, and he was dragged about all round the bāzār, and in different parts of the city.

The period of the reign of Sultān Maḥmūd was eighteen years and two months and odd days.

It so happened that Islām Khān, son of Shēr Khān, the ruler of Dehlī, and Nizām-ul-mulk Bahīrī, the ruler of Aḥmadnagar, died during 2 this year by natural death; and a poet has composed the following couplets, giving the date of their death:

1 The manner in which Burhān met his fate is described in much the same manner in Fīrishtah and the other histories. The account in the Tārīkh-i-Gūjarāt (p. 49) is very circumstantial. The encounter with Shīrwān Khān is somewhat differently narrated in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī.

2 According to Fīrishtah, the year was 961 A.H.; and his own father Maulānā Ghulām 'Alī Hindū Shāh was the writer of the couplets. The couplets are also given in the Tārīkh-i-Gūjarāt, but the name of the author is not mentioned there and there are slight variations in the wording (p. 49).
Couplets:

Three sovereigns died in the course of a year,
Through their justice, was Hind (India) the seat of peace.
One Mahmūd Shāh, of Gujrat Sultan,
Who like his grandeur, youthful was;
The other Islām Khān of Dehli Sultan,
Who in his reign, was a Lord of Conjunction great.
The third was Niẓām-ul-mulk Bāhir,
Who in the Deccan, held sovereign sway.
Of the date of the death of these sovereigns three
If they ask thee 't was "the death of monarchs great".

Sultan Mahmūd was 1 a virtuous ruler, and possessed pleasant manners. He spent most of his time in the society of learned and pious men; and on great days, such as the day of the death of His Holiness the Prophet, may the blessings of God and His peace be on him! and on the dates of the deaths of his own ancestors, and on other auspicious days, he gave food to faqirs and other deserving persons. He held the ewer and the basin in his own hand and washed the hands of the men. 2 And sarīsāf and all pieces of cloth, which were intended for his own garments, were first made into 3 tablecloths for darwishes and faqirs, and afterwards fashioned into wearing apparel for him.

1 The actual words are بادشاه نیک نهاد و پنده‌IDE اطراف بود.
2 The readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are unintelligible at this place. The MSS. have و پارچه‌ای صرقاف و هر باچه. The lith. ed. has the same with the exception that instead of صرقاف it has صرقاف. The corresponding passage in Firishtah has و پارچه‌ای صرقاف که بعهت پرتش و مقرب بود. اول دستوار جامه دروشان میکردن. This makes sense. It means the sarīsāf and other kinds of cloth, which were intended for garments for his own use, were first made into turbans and garments for the darwishes, etc. Firishtah has been followed in the text-edition except that بود has been changed to بود.
3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have دستوار خوان, but the other MS. has دستوار خوان; but see the preceding note, from which it will appear that in the corresponding passage Firishtah has دستوار و جامه.
At a distance of twelve karōhs from Aḩmadābād, he laid the foundation of the city, to which he gave the name of 1 Maḩmūdābād; and built an arcaded bāzār from Aḩmadābād to that place. He also established a deer park on the bank of the stream called 2 Khārī nādī, and built a wall of burnt bricks adorned with turrets for a distance of seven 3 karōhs. In this deer park he erected beautiful structures at different places; and various kinds of animals were allowed to roam about free in the park; and they increased and multiplied by breeding in it. As he was very fond of the society of women, he collected a large number of them in his harem. He always hunted and played chaugān in the deer park with them. The trees in it were wrapt in red and green velvet. There were many pleasant gardens in it and handsome women were engaged in attending to them.

Whenever any of the women in his harem became pregnant, he ordered that she should have a miscarriage; and did not allow any of them to have a male child. He had made Iʿtmād Khān the attendant of his harem, and had directed him to attend to the direction of the ladies. Iʿtmād Khān had by way of prudence and caution, destroyed his own virility by eating camphor. The writer of this book has on various occasions visited the deer park and the buildings in it.

As visits to the tomb (of holy men) by the women, and their gathering together on various 4 pretexts had become extremely common in Gujrat; and immorality and licentiousness had become, as it were, a matter of habit and custom, and there was (in the opinion of the people) no wickedness in such conduct, Sultān Maḩmūd forbade the going of women to these places, and their going and coming during days and nights to the houses of people. He also

---

1 The town had been built by his ancestor Maḩmūd Bāgarha; and Sultān Maḩmūd III, took up his residence in it, and restored and enlarged it.

2 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has كہار ندی in the text-edition.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have the words حفت کروہا را دہلی between دبوار از خشت بیغنہ.

4 One MS. has خانہ instead of بیانہ.
gave money to some, and sent them to procure women, and when they brought them before him, he ordered them to be punished; and in this way he effectively stopped such acts.

3 An account of Sultān Ahmad.

When Sultān Mahmūd became a martyr and left no son behind him, I’tmād Khān, in order to prevent the bursting out of the flames of disorder and disturbance, produced a boy of tender years by the

1 One MS. and the lith ed. havi but the other MS. has which appears to me to be better, and has been adopted in the text-edition.

2 The actual words are which translated literally, would be, had in the best way closed this door. The MSS. have , but the lith ed. has.

3 This is the heading in the MS. The lith. ed. has.

4 This is the account in the MSS. and in the lith ed. Firishtah, however, says that it was Rażī-ul-mulk, who produced the youth, who was a descendant of Ahmad Shāh II. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, pp. 454, 455) says, that after the death of Sultān Mahmūd, the amirī inquired of I’tmād Khān, who was fully acquainted with the late Sultān’s domestic affairs, whether the latter had left a son behind him. On his answering in the negative, they inquired whether any of his widows was expecting a child. This also he answered in the negative. They then inquired, whether there was any relative of the Sultān, who was fit to succeed to the throne. He said there was a youth of the name of Ahmad Khān who was living in Ahmadābād. Reżī-ul-Mulk was accordingly sent in a cart with very fast horses. He found Ahmad Khān buying some grain at a shop near his house, and recognising him, brought him at once to Mahmūdābād. The account in the Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt (pp. 49, 50) agrees, except that it says that the nobles wanted to know from I’tmād Khān if the late Sultān had even left a daughter behind, so that they might place her on the throne. Here again the answer was in the negative. Then it became necessary to enquire about distant relations; so Rażī-ul-mulk, one of the descendants of Ahmad Shāh, the founder of Ahmadābād, who was five or six generations below him, and was a youth in his twelfth year, was brought forward.

It will be seen that there is considerable amount of divergence among the four historians, who were more or less contemporaneous with the events which they were describing. According to the author of the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, whose father Shaikh Mahmūd, commonly called Shaikh Mānjhū, was the manager of Sayyid Mubārak’s affairs, the name of the youth, who was selected to be the Sultān, was Ahmad Khān, and Rażī-ul-Mulk was the name of the man who was sent to bring him from Ahmadābād. Firishtah appears to agree, though
name Raḍī-ul-mulk, describing him as a descendant of Sultan Ahmad, the founder of Ahmedabad; and in concert with Miran Saiyid Mubarak Bukhari, and the other amirs, who had escaped with their lives from the sword of the ungrateful Burhan, placed him on the throne of empire, and gave him the title of Ahmad Shah. They comforted the amirs by confirming their jagirs. I'tmād Khan kept the affairs of the kingdom in his own hand, and left the newly chosen Sultan nothing but the name; and having obtained the whole power, kept him (confined) in his house.

When five years had passed in this way, Sultan Ahmad unable any longer to remain in this state got out of Ahmedabad, and went to Mahmudabad to Saiyid Mubarak Bukhari, who was one of the great amirs. Mūsā Khan Fūlādī and Sādāt Khān and 'Alam Khān Lūdī and other men collected round him. 2 Shaikh Yusuf also went and joined him. The Sultan conferred on him the title of Ā'zam Humāyūn. I'tmād Khān, in concert with I'mād-ul-mulk, father of Chengiz Khān, and Ulugh Khān and Juhjār Khān Ḥabshi and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and other amirs of Gujarāt with a part of artillery attacked Saiyid Mubarak. The latter although he had a smaller army than I'tmād Khān arrayed his troops to meet him in battle. When the battle began, a cannon ball struck Saiyid Mubarak, and he was slain; and Sultan Ahmad was defeated. He wandered

he does not give the name of the youth who was raised to the throne; but the Tabaqat and the Tarikh-i-Gujarat say that it was Raḍī-ul-mulk, who was placed on the throne.

The Cambridge History of India (p. 343) does not mention these differences, but in its own confident way, gives a narrative which differs in some particulars from all of them. It says that one Khalil Shāh was at first reported to be a son of the murdered Sultan, but on enquiry he could not be produced; and the writer surmises, that there was a conspiracy to foist a lad of unknown parentage on the throne, but the conspirators lost heart at the last moment. This Khalil Shāh is mentioned by none of the other historians. Then Raḍī-ul-Mulk who was the great-grandson of Shaker Khan, a younger son of Ahmad I, was raised to the throne with the title of Ahmad Shāh II.

1 One MS. omits the prefix Mirān.
2 Firishtah calls him Ā'zam Khān Mālwi.
3 Firishtah also says گولوله تیری, but the Cambridge History of India, page 344, says that Saiyid Mubarak was killed by an arrow.
about in distress for some days in the jungle; and then came and saw I’tmād Khān again. The latter confined him in his house, and did not permit anyone to approach him.

When I’tmād Khān’s power increased, ‘Imād-ul-mulk in concert with Tātār Khān Ghūrī attacked his house with 1 great force; and placing their cannon in position, commenced a bombardment. I’tmād Khān unable to meet them fled towards 2 Pāl which is in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānīr; and began to collect men from all sides. Then people intervened, and brought about a peace between him and ‘Imād-ul-mulk. The districts of Bahrōj and Chāmpānīr and Nādōt and the other parganas between the rivers Mahindri and Narbada were allotted to ‘Imād-ul-mulk as his jāgīr; and I’tmād Khān came back, and again took charge of the duties of the vakīl of the Sultān; and endeavoured to guard Sultān Aḥmad as before; and they detached a body of fifteen hundred horsemen out of the personal jāgīrs of Sultān Aḥmad. Other men joined the Sultān and in spite of the fact that I’tmād Khān prevented men from mixing with him, a number of men 3 gathered round him, and for a short time he attained to some grandeur. He thought of getting rid of I’tmād Khān, and held a consultation with his confidants about slaying him. Sometimes, owing to his youthful inexperience he would strike his sword on a plantain tree and say “I have cut I’tmād Khān in two”. When the latter became cognizant of these matters he forestalled the young Sultān, and one night put him to death and threw his corpse over the wall towards the river opposite to the house of Wajih-ul-mulk; and spread a report among men to the effect that the Sultān had gone to Wajih-ul-mulk’s house at night to carry on an intrigue; and not being recognised, had been killed.

The period of his rule was eight years.

---
1 The actual words are بضروب راست in some MSS.; M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted بطرف راست in the text-edition.
2 FIRISHTAH also has PĀL, but the Cambridge History of India, page 344, has HĀLOL.
3 The MSS. have بر اور جمع شدند, and the lith. ed has بر گرد اور جمع شدند. But دور اور جمع شدند, and the lith. ed has بر دور اور جمع شدند.
1 An account of Sultan Muzaffar, son of Sultan Mahmud, son of Latif Khan.

At the end of the year 967 A.H., 1562 A.D., I’tmād Khān brought a boy by the name 2 Nanū before the assembly of the amirs of Gujarāt; and swore that he was the 3 son of Sultan Mahmūd. He said “that the boy’s mother 4 Jāriah was an inmate of the 5 special harem of the Sultan. When she became pregnant, the Sultan made her over to me, so that I may bring about her miscarriage. As her pregnancy had passed the fifth month, I concealed her in my house, and have looked after her up to this day”. As the throne of Gujarāt was vacant, Saiyid Mirān, the son of Saiyid Mubārak Gujrrātī took up the imperial crown in the assembly of the great and the noble, and 6 placed it on the head

---

1 This is the heading in the MS. In the lith. ed. the word سلطنت is inserted before the word Sultan.

2 The name is نانū Nanū in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and appears to be تانū Tanū in the other MS. Fīrishtah does not give the name. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 155) calls him “Hubbū”, which he says in a note is the “familiar contraction of Hubbeb”. The Tārikh-i-Gujarat (p. 52) gives him the name of نانū Nathū. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, calls him Nathū.

3 The Tārikh-i-Gujarat (p. 52) tells a curious story about Nathū’s father having been a گاولان or cowherd; and his mother having been taken prisoner by Sultan Mahmūd; that she was kept outside the harem of the Sultan, and before the latter could see her, and decide whether he would take her into the harem, she gave birth to Nathū. As the child was born almost under the shadow of the Sultan’s presence, it resulted in his having the insignia of royalty for a time.

If this story is correct, it is curious that the facts should not have been known to the amirs, and I’tmād Khan’s stories should have received any credence.

4 I do not know what جاریah is, or whether it is a proper name.

5 The word خاص occurs in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but is omitted from the other MS.

6 Fīrishtah lith. ed. does not mention the coronation; but says, somewhat inconsistently, that the amirs having no other alternative divided the kingdom among themselves, and became completely independent. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 155) says that the mother of the boy concealed her pregnancy till the fifth month, when the medicines given to her to produce an abortion had no effect, and the child was born, and was brought up privately. Witnesses were
of that child. He received the title of Muzaffar Shāh; and the amirs offered congratulations and felicitations on his accession.

The duties of the vazīrat continued to be entrusted to I'tmād Khān; and he received the title of Masnad-i-Ālī. The great amirs having acquired independence in their jagirs did not allow anyone to interfere with them. Among them the district of Pattan as far as the pargana of Kāri came into the possession of Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān Fūlādī. In Rādhanpur and Tarwāra and Tahrād and Maujpūr, and some other parganas, Fath Khān Balūch was in possession.

The parganas, which were situated between the Sābarmati and the Mahindri were in the possession of I'tmād Khān, who gave a portion of them to other Gujratīs. The port of Sūrath and Nāgoṭ and Chāmphālur were in the possession of Chengiz Khān son of Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī. Rustam Khān who was the husband of Chengiz Khān's sister held Bahrōj. Dūlqa and Dandūka were allotted to Saiyid Mirān son of Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī. Amin Khān Ghūrī seized the fort of Junāgarh, and Sūrath; and kept himself aloof from the other amirs of Gujrat.

procured to swear to these facts and the evidence being considered sufficient, the boy was crowned. The version of the Tārikh-i-Gujarat has already been given. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, says that I'tmād Khān's history was totally false, but as an heir had to be found, the boy he produced was accepted.

1 The name is in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is omitted in the other. Firishtah lith. ed. has, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 156) has Kurry. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, has Kādī.

2 Firishtah agrees as to the first two names. He does not mention the third, and calls the fourth Mūrchpūr. Col. Briggs calls them Radunpoor, Nerīad, Tehwarā and Moonjpoor. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, does not give the names, but says that the whole of the north of Gujrat as far south as Kādī was in the possession of Mūsā Khān and Sher Khān and Fath Khān. The Tārikh-i-Gujarat does not specify the jagirs of the different amirs, but says they were all trying to extend their respective jagirs, and encroaching on that of I'tmād Khān; and the latter sent petitions to Akbar to invade Gujrat.

3 Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India, page 345, agree generally; but Firishtah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 156) call Roostoom Khan the nephew (خواهرزاد) of Chungiz Khan. The Cambridge History of India agrees with the Tabaqāt in calling him his brother-in-law.

4 One MS. has instead of Anfāq.
I'tmād Khān kept Sultān Muẓaffar Nānū, more or less in a state of imprisonment, in the palace of the Sultān. On the days of audience a masnad used to be spread for him, and having seated him on it, I'tmād Khān himself sat behind him. The amirs attended to salute the Sultān. When some days had passed in this way, Chengīz Khān and Shēr Khān Fūlādī arrived at Aḥmadābād to offer their condolences and congratulations to the Sultān. When a year had passed in this way the Fūlādis having found an opportunity, attacked Fath Khān Balūch, who had parganas Tahrād and Tarwāra and Rādhanpūr and Mūrwāra and Kākṛēj as his jāgīr, and who on account of his proximity had hostility with them. He fought with them, was defeated, and went to I'tmād Khān and complained to him. I'tmād Khān was enraged at this and having collected troops attacked the Fūlādis with a large and powerful force. The latter shut themselves up in the fort of Pattan, and commenced to show their weakness and repentance. I'tmād Khān did not accept their excuses; and went on vigorously with the siege. When the Fūlādī Afghāns were reduced to great straits, the young warriors among them collected together, and going to Mūsa Khān and Shēr Khān, said that as (I'tmād Khān) does not accept our humility, there is no other alternative but that we should fight with him, and if necessary surrender our lives. Five hundred of them then sallied out of the fort; and Mūsa Khān and Shēr Khān with the men that they had—whose numbers did not amount to three thousand—also came out. I'tmād Khān arrayed the Gujratī army, which exceeded thirty thousand horsemen. The Fūlādis

1 The words are محبوبًا گربا در پس سر او, lit., behind his head.

2 One MS. omits the name of Shēr Khān Fūlādī, apparently by mistake, for the suffix Fūlādī, which belongs to Shēr Khān is appended to the name of Chengīz Khān. Firishtah has both names.

3 It is possible that something has been omitted here, for it was hardly necessary to mention the arrival of Chengīz Khān and Shēr Khān, unless it was meant to lead to something.

4 This may be the same as Maujpur already mentioned. In the text-edition کاکرمچ has been adopted in place of کاکرمچ.

5 One MS. and the lit. ed. and the lit. ed. of Firishtah have ابن جماعت, but the other MS. has ابن طاغه.
hurled themselves on I'tmād Khān's special troops and drove them away. Ḥāji Khān, a slave of Salim Khān the son of Shēr Khān, who was one of the leaders of I'tmād Khān's army stood aside without joining in the battle. I'tmād Khān was defeated and went back to Ahmadābdād. He endeavoured to seize Ḥāji Khān. The latter, becoming aware of it, fled and joined the Fūlādis. They then sent a message to I'tmād Khān to the following effect: "As a half of pargana Karī was the jāgīr of Ḥāji Khān, and he has come and joined us, you should relinquish possession of it". I'tmād Khān did not agree to this, and replied, "He was my servant. Although he has fled and gone away, why should I give up his jāgīr?" Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān then collected a force and came to the jāgīr of Ḥāji Khān; and posted themselves in the town of Jūthānah. I'tmād Khān again collected a force and came and met them. They stood opposing one another for a period of four months; and at last engaged in battle. I'tmād Khān was defeated; and went to Chengiz Khān at Bahrōj; and brought him to help and reinforce himself. The parties again met in the neighbourhood of Jūthānah. After a great deal of talk, there was an amicable settlement. I'tmād Khān gave up possession of Ḥāji Khān's jāgīr; and went back and took up his quarters at Ahmadābdād.

Chengiz Khān went back to his own country; and began to aspire to independence. It became bruited about among men, that he had no wish to continue to be in allegiance, and no intention to act as a subject. He sent a message to I'tmād Khān to the following effect: "I am a khānāzād or slave of this threshold (i.e., of the Sultāns of Gujrat); and have knowledge of every incident that takes place in the harem. It was known as a matter of certainty till today, that the martyred Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh had no son; and in spite of that you have produced a boy before the people, describing him as the son of Sultān Maḥmūd. And what is the meaning of this that he himself sits in the majlis, and his men guard that boy? And as long as he does not come no one can go to offer homage. If in fact the boy

---

1 The name is written as Jōtānā in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is Jōtānā in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, has Jōtāna.
is the son of Sultān Maḥmūd, then he (Iʿtmād Khān) should like all
the other amīrs and the special tribesmen render homage; and when
the other amīrs sit down in the majlis he should also sit down after
obtaining permission'. Iʿtmād Khān wrote in reply: 'I solemnly
swore on the day of the accession in the presence of the great men of the
city and the amīrs, that this boy was the son of Sultān Maḥmūd;
and they relying on my words placed the imperial crown on his head,
and rendered homage to him. And as to what you have said about
my sitting in the majlis, it is known to everyone, ¹ what my rank and
condition in the service of Sultān Maḥmūd was. You were only a
boy at that time. If your father Iʿtmād-ul-mulk Sultānī had been alive,
he would have testified to the truth of what I am saying. This lord
and master of ours, the son of our martyr lord and master, by whose
accession the imperial throne has now acquired a new beauty and glory,
is your sovereign and the son of your sovereign. Your well being
consists in this that you do not turn your head from service and
allegiance to serve him, so that you may gather the fruit of your desire
from the tree of hope'.

And Shēr Khān Fūlādī having become aware of this correspondence
wrote a letter to Chengiz Khān to the following effect: 'You should
for a few days draw your feet beneath the skirt of patience, and should
not abandon the path of gentleness, and should not unnecessarily
begin a show of hostility towards Masnad-i-ʿAlī (Iʿtmād Khān)'. ²
After some days Chengiz Khān, having struck the teeth of greed into
the town of Barōda, sent the following message: 'Many men have
collected round me and this contemptible country, which is in my
possession, is not sufficient for them. As the reins of all affairs and
the loosening and tying of all matters are entrusted to the wisdom and
insight of Masnad-i-ʿAlī, he should think about it'. Iʿtmād Khān
wanted to entangle him in a dispute with the rulers of Burhānpūr,
so that being engaged with them, he might not make any attempt

¹ The MSS. and the lith. ed. have در چه مرتبہ . I think the correct reading
should be در چه مرتبہ , and I have adopted it.
² Firishtah copies the Tabaqāt almost word for word, but with reference
to Chengiz Khān's demand for additional territory, he says in so many words,
what indeed is implied in the Tabaqāt, that he did not agree to Shēr Khān's
suggestion.
against these parts. He accordingly sent the following reply, "The town of Nadarbār was always in the possession of the amirs of Gujrat. At the time when the martyr Sulṭān Maḥmūd Shāh was in the fort of Sāwal, in the company of Mirān Mubārak Shāh, he made a promise to the latter that if the great and holy God should ever place the reins of the government of the country of Gujrat in his grasp of power, he would make Nadarbār over to him as a reward. After that the martyr Sulṭān sat on the throne of the empire; and in order to fulfil his promise, which is the absolute duty of and is entirely encumbent on all great men, he gave the town of Nadarbār to Mirān Mubārak Shāh. Now that the Sulṭān has attained the rank of a martyr and Mirān Mubārak Shāh has also departed (from the world), it is advisable that you should march with your troops to the town of Nadarbār, and should with great quickness, in order to increase your revenue take possession of it, till in the course of time some better plan can be devised".

Chengitz Khān was duped, and commenced to collect troops. After a few days, he advanced to Bahrōj with a well-equipped army ready for action; and marching by successive stages, took possession of Nadarbār. Owing to his vanity, conceit and pride he advanced still further, till he reached the neighbourhood of the fort of ¹ Tālūnīr. It so happened that at this time news came that ² Mirān Muḥammad Shāh son of Mirān Mubārak Shāh was coming to give him battle, in concert with Tufāl Khān and the Rāja of Māhūr. Chengitz Khān posted his army in a place which was broken and cut up by ravines; and on the side on which the ground was even, he strengthened his position by a line of carts fastened by chains. Muḥammad Shāh and Tufāl Khan arrayed their troops in a line in front of Chengitz Khān's army and waited till sunset. As Chengitz Khān did not come

---

¹ The lith. ed. of Firishtah has by mistake Thānūsar; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 159) has Talwār, and the Cambridge History of India, page 346, has Thānlīr.

² Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India agree, but the former calls Mirān Muḥammad Shāh Muḥammad Mirān Shāh; and the latter rather inadequately describes him as Muḥammad II. Tufāl Khan is called ruler of Berār by Firishtah; and is described as of Berar in the Cambridge History of India (p. 346). The Rāja of Māhūr is not mentioned by either.
out, they encamped where they were. Chengiz Khān owing to the bad luck due to his pride and malice, was so overwhelmed with fear and alarm that leaving all his troops and followers behind, he fled to Bahrōj. Muḥammad Shāh seized much booty and pursued Chengiz Khān as far as Nadarbār, and again took possession of that purgana.

When Chengiz Khān arrived in the fort of Bahrōj after his defeat, he began to repair the damage which his army had sustained; and having acquired new strength and vigour, from the coming of Ibrāhīm Husain Mīrzā and Shāh Mīrzā, descendants of Muḥammad Sultān Mīrzā, his own determination to punish Iʿtmād Khān was revived in his mind. In order to carry out this design, he collected troops, and advanced towards Aḥmadābād. He occupied the town of Barōda without any fighting. When he arrived at Maḥmūdābād he sent the following message to Iʿtmād Khān, namely that “It is patent and evident to the world and to all its inhabitants that my defeat at Tālnīr was really due to your malice; for if you had either come yourself to reinforce me or had sent a body of troops, the dust of flight would not at all have settled on the skirts of my honour. Now I am coming to Aḥmadābād in order to offer my congratulations and felicitations to the Sultān in person; and I know that if you are present in the city, some dispute or hostility is sure to occur. It is, therefore, desirable that you should go out of the city, and like all the other amirs, take up your abode in your jāḡīr, and make the arms of the Sultān strong in the government, so that he may exercise every act of dominion in his ancestral territory in any way that he may like”.

1 Firishtah copies this almost literally, except that he says that Chengiz Khān fled با نباه حشن خرد. The Cambridge History of India (p. 346) says that he was attacked, defeated and fled, instead of fleeing ignominiously without being attacked at all.

2 Firishtah explains that the Mīrzās fled from Sambal, and came to Mālwa, and when Akbar’s army advanced against them in 975 A.H., they having no other alternative came and joined Chengiz Khān.

3 Both MSS. have در خاطر خطر, but the lith. ed. has در خاطر شن.

4 One MS. inserts و between اگر and بکوم; but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not.
I'tmād Khān had commenced to equip his army even before the arrival of this message; and when it came, he knew what Chengiz Khān's real object was. He raised the royal umbrella over the head of Muṣṭafar, and in concert with the Saiyids of Bukhāra and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and Malik Sharq and Ulugh Khān and Jhujjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk left the city, and encamped in the neighbourhood of the town of Batūh. The next day they marched from there and halted at mauḏa' 1 Kāvrī, which is situated on the bank of the Khārī nadi, and is six kārōhs from Aḥmadābād. On the morning of the next day Chengiz Khān arrayed his troops, and came out of Maḥmūdābād, and advanced towards the battlefield. When he arrived at mauḏa' Kāvrī, at the time of the morning meal, I'tmād Khān placed Sultān Muṣṭafar on a horse, and placing the royal umbrella over his head, advanced towards the battlefield, and the Saiyids and the Gujratī amīrs and the Ḥabshi group took up their positions. When the two armies faced each other, and the frightened eyes of I'tmād Khān fell on Chengiz Khān's army, as he had 2 formerly repeatedly heard of the courage and prowess of the Mirzās, he imagined each one of those 3 brave men and bold warriors to be the captor of his sword, and took the way of flight before even a sword was drawn out of its scabbard, and fled towards Dūngarpūr without even going to Aḥmadābād. The other amīrs also fled, after heaping a hundred 4 plaudits on I'tmād Khān. The Saiyids went to Dūlqā, and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk to Maḥmūdābad. Ulugh Khān and Jhujjār Khān and the others went towards Aḥmadābād, taking Muṣṭafar with them.

Chengiz Khān was pleased and delighted at gaining this victory, which was one of the favours of God; and halted at Batūh. Early on the following morning, Ulugh Khān and Jhujjār Khān and the other Ḥabshīs left Aḥmadābād by the Kālūpūr gate, taking Sultān Muṣṭafar with them; and went towards Bīpūr and Ma'ūrābīād. When

1 M. Hidayat Ḥosain also has كاوري as the name of the mauḏa' in the text-edition.

2 One MS. has ساق while the other and the lith. ed. have ساقًا.

3 One MS. has دلبران instead of دلباران.

4 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firsiṭah have آتروین. One would have thought that نفرین would be the right word.
Mużaffar was leaving Aḥmadābād, Chengiz Khān entered the place, and took up his abode at the mansion of I'tmād Khān. Shēr Khān Fūlādī on hearing this news in the neighbourhood in the town of Kārī sent a message to Chengiz Khan to the effect that all this country had been in the possession of I'tmād Khān to defray the expense of the Sultān; and now that he alone had come to be in possession of it, it was contrary to the custom of generosity and the rules of kindness; and he advanced with a large army towards Aḥmadābād. Chengiz Khān saw that it was not expedient, that he should at such a time be engaged in a dispute with Shēr Khān. He, therefore, settled with the latter that whatever should be situated on the other side of the river Sābarmatā should belong to him. Owing to this some portions of Aḥmadābād, such as 2 'Usmānpūr, Khānpūr and Kālpūr fell into Shēr Khān's share. Chengiz Khān held the Mirzās in great honour and regard owing to the excellent services, which they have rendered him.

As Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, son of Mirān Mubārak Shāh had been emboldened by his first victory, and found the kingdom of Gujrat without a head, he considering the disputes and hostility among the amīrs to be a very great mercy, advanced with the object of conquering the country, and did not draw his reins till he came opposite to Aḥmadābād. Chengiz Khān in concert with the Mirzās, came out of the city with the object of giving battle. The Mirān was defeated in the battle which took place and fled and went back to Asrī in great confusion, losing everything that he had with him.

As this victory was gained by the great exertions of the Mirzās, Chengiz Khan in order to please them, allotted some fertile and well

---

1 The sentence is rather clumsily worded, although its purport is clear enough. Shēr Khān did not think it right that Chengiz Khān should get hold of the whole of the territory, and he should have no part of it, but it is not quite clear what was remote from Azīzin Socrot wa Rasm Furt. Probably he wanted to appeal to Chengiz Khān's better nature; but in that case one would expect that he would wait for the result of that appeal, instead of marching at once at the head of a large army.

2 One MS. has Iṭmādpur, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. and the litb. ed. of Firshtah have 'Usmānpūr. The first MS. and the lith. ed. have Kālpūr after Khānpūr, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. of Firshtah omit Khānpūr.
populated parganas in sarkar Bahrôj as their jâgîrs; and gave them permission to go there; so that they might entertain retainers and equip them. When they arrived in the estates appertaining to their jâgîrs, and low class people, and the people who were always in search of adventure collected round them, and as the revenues of their jâgîrs did not suffice for their entertainment, they found it necessary to occupy other estates without the permission of Chengiz Khân. 1 When this news reached the latter, he sent an army to attack them. They defeated that army and slew a number of the men; and advanced towards the territory of Burhânpur, and after interfering in the affairs of that country they went to Mâlwa. The details of the affairs of the Mirzá's have already been narrated in the history of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilâhi.

In short, when Ulugh Khân and Juhujr Khân went to the country of 2 Kânthâ, which is the name given to the broken country along the bank of the river Mahindri, taking Mużaffir with them, and waited for a long time in the expectation, that perhaps I'tmâd Khân would come himself, or send his son Shër Khân to take Mużaffir away; but as there was no hint of any kind from him, they themselves took Sultân Mużaffir to Dûngarpur, and made him over to I'tmâd Khân. After some days they asked for some money from him to defray the expenses of their soldiers. I'tmâd Khân told them in reply that the yield or revenue of his jâgîr, such as it was, known to all; and also the amount of his expenditure; and besides the place where they were was not

1 Firishtah goes into greater detail about the force sent by Chengiz Khân against the Mirzâs, and about the proceeding of the latter, after their victory, and also gives a reason for their retiring to Burhânpur. According to him Chengiz Khân's army consisted of three or four thousand Habhis, and five or six thousand Gujrâts. The Mirzâs after defeating the army put a number of them to death, and pursuing the others captured a number of men, both Habhis and Gujrâts. The young and beardless among them they kept as personal attendants, and released the others who had beards, after treating them with great barbarity, putting arrows through their noses, and binding their arms behind them, and placing circular pieces of wood round their necks. As they did all this, and knew that Chengiz Khân would come in person to attack them, they went away towards Burhânpur.

2 The name is Kânthâ in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Kânhâ in the other MS. It is Kânth in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
a city, that he should be able to pay them after taking a loan from someone. Owing to this, Ulugh Khān and the other amirs were annoyed with I'tmād Khān.

Chengiz Khān becoming aware of this, sent conciliatory letters to each one of them, and asked them to come to him. Ulugh Khān and Juhjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk and other Habshis advanced towards Ma'mūrābād without obtaining leave from I'tmād Khān; and having met Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk Gujrātī there, they all went forward towards Aḥmadābād. When they arrived at the Kākrī tank or reservoir, which is close to the city, they halted at the garden of Sultān Maḥmūd to change their dresses. At that time Chengiz Khān came there in haste to welcome them; and met Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, Ulugh Khān, Juhjār Khān and other Habshis there. After they had finished making courteous enquiries about one another, Ulugh Khān and Juhjār Khān said, 'It is clear to the world and to all men that we are all slaves born and bred in the house of Sultān Maḥmūd. If one of us has been favoured by fortune more than the other, yet as regards that primary fact there is no difference amongst us; and it is right that it should be borne in mind and observed in all our interviews. The reason for this remark is that among the Sultān's slaves, some have been distinguished by advancement in the service, and they are now present in this assembly. Hereafter whenever any of us has to salute or see any other, it is to be hoped that he will not be prevented by chamberlains and ushers'. Chengiz Khān with great show of politeness, accepted this statement; and taking the other amirs with him went to the city; and having caused some houses to be vacated, placed them at their disposal.

After some time, one day, a spy came to Ulugh Khān, and informed him that Chengiz Khān wanted to put him and Juhjār Khān to death;
and he has settled, that on the following morning when you are careless, he will have you assassinated in the chaugān field. The test of the truth of this information is this, that if he goes tomorrow to the chaugān field near the Kākrīa tank there will be no danger, for it is an extensive plain; and one can escape from it in all directions. But if they go to the field of Bahdar, which is inside the citadel, you may note with certainty that he will effect his purpose there. The spy had not yet finished speaking, when a messenger came from Chengiz Khān; and after prayers (for the interlocutor’s well-being) said, “We (speaking apparently for his master) will go to the chaugān ground; will you also come early?” Ulugh Khān hearing this became anxious, and mounting his horse, went to the house of Saif-ul-mulk Ḥabashī Sultanī (i.e., Saif-ul-mulk the Abyssinian slave of the Sultan). There Juhjār Khān and Saiyid Badr Sultanī and Mahdīr Khān and Khorshed Khān were sent for; and the matter was brought up for discussion. After much interchange of words, they all agreed, that they should forestall and kill Chengiz Khān.

Early the next morning, Ulugh Khān and Juhjār Khān mounted with their companions, and went to the darbār (palace) of Chengiz Khān. The latter came out mounted; and they all turned towards

---

1 The readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. differ slightly, and they are all difficult to understand. One MS. has the other has while the lith ed. has . The corresponding passage in Firishtah is . This is good sense and I have adopted it. But M. Hidayat Hosain has retained in the text-edition. 

2 There is difference in the readings here also. The MSS. have while the lith. ed. has . This latter reading is manifestly incorrect as the word should be changed to ; but otherwise it is somewhat better than the reading in the MSS.; but I have adopted the former, as it is found in both the MSS., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

3 These names are correctly given in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah lith. ed. has instead of Saiyid Badar Sultanī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 182) has further changed Jahāz Khān to Hijaz Khan, but he does not mention the other man.

4 Firishtah gives some more details, from which it appears, that when Ulugh Khān and Jahāz Khān arrived Chengiz Khān’s soldiers and followers had not yet come, so a man had to be sent to him with their prayers and with the
the Bahdar chaugān field. After they had gone a part of the way, Ulugh Khān who was to the right of Chengiz Khān, made a sign to Juhūjār Khān who was on his left side, that it was an opportunity that should not be lost. Juhūjār Khān immediately struck Chengiz Khān with his sword in such a way ¹ that it appeared as if his head had not at all been accompanying him. They then all galloped back to their houses and prepared to fight. Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk also joined with them and made ready. ² Rustam Khān threw the body of Chengiz Khān on the back of an elephant and started towards Bahrój, instead of taking it to his house in the city. The mob of the city then stretched their hands to plunder Chengiz Khān’s followers.

When it was known for certain that Rustam Khān had gone away towards Bahrój, Ulugh Khān and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and Juhūjār Khān and the other leaders went to the citadel which was known by the name Bahdar. They wrote a letter to I’tmād Khān, and informed him of what had happened and invited him to Aḥmadābād. On the same day Badr Khān and Muḥammad Khān, sons of Shēr Khān Fūlādī, came into the city in order to offer their congratulations; and brought presents of horses for every one (of the amīrs). They (⁻²⁻) confirmed anew the distribution of the jagīrs among the amīrs, as Chengiz Khān had settled it.

The next day Shēr Khān Fūlādī sent his spies, and ascertained, ³ that none of the retainers of the amīrs remained in the fort in Bahdar request that it would be better if he came quickly. Chengiz Khān had apparently been drinking, but he came out mounted, after putting on some light clothing.

¹ The words كه سریش یا یکدست گویا باد همروان نبود are somewhat fanciful and difficult to understand. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has introduced باد between گویا and كه سریش یکدست از تن جدا شد. Firishtah’s language is clear. As regards the complaint of Changiz Khān’s mother to Akbar about Juhūjār Khān having killed her son, and Akbar’s punishment of Juhūjār Khān by ordering him to be trampled under the feet of an elephant, see page 389 of vol. II of the translation. Juhūjār Khān apparently did not plead right of self-defence, as he might well have done.

² According to Firishtah, he was a nephew, sister’s son of Chengiz Khān, who was following the latter with his troops. The Cambridge History of India, page 347, calls him Chingiz Khān’s brother-in-law.

³ Somewhat contrary to this, the Cambridge History of India, page 347, says that Ulugh Khān and his partisans took possession of the citadel.
to guard it. Acting on this information on the 3rd night after the murder of Chengiz Khan, he sent Sadat Khan, who had been one of the nobles of Sher Khan, with three hundred men. They broke down the walls of the fort in the direction of Khānpur, and took possession of Bahdar. After some days I'tmād Khan arrived at Aḥmadābād, bringing Muṣaffar with him. As the fort of Bahdar was in the possession of Sadat Khan, he took Muṣaffar to his own house; but he wrote a letter to Sher Khan on the subject of the evacuation of Bahdar. He told him that Bahdar had always been the residence of the Sultāns. Even if the Sultān did not happen to be in Aḥmadābād, it was the duty of his servants and well-wishers, that they should guard the palace of their master; and should not occupy it themselves, or take possession of it. Now that the Sultān had come to the city, he should direct Sadat Khan to vacate it. Sher Khan acted according to his request, either because it was the only right thing to do, or because he was under certain obligations to I'tmād Khan; and vacated Bahdar. Sultān Muṣaffar then went and took up his abode in his own palace.

While these things were happening, scouts brought the news, that the Mirzās had fled from Mālwa and were coming to Gujrat; and that when they heard, while they were still on the way, that Chengiz Khan had been murdered, they became pleased and delighted; and turned towards Bahroj and Sūrath, so that they might seize that sūba also. Iḵtiyār-ul-mulk and Ulugh Khan went to the palace, and said that Bahroj was at present without any master, and people were saying that the Mirzās were advancing in that direction. It was right that all the amirs should collect their forces and march to Bahroj, and take possession of that territory; and in the carrying out of this intention should not give way to any hesitation or delay; for if Bahroj went once into the possession of the Mirzās, they would all have to pour out much of their heart's blood, before they would be able to recover it from them.

1 The MSS. appeared to be imperfect here. One has . . . The other is better; it has . . . The lith. ed. appears to have the best reading; it agrees with the second MS., but has instead of , and instead of . I have adopted this reading, but has been retained in the text-edition.
I'tmād Khān sent a messenger to Shēr Khān; and asked his opinion. Shēr Khān also agreed to undertake the expedition. It was then agreed, that the entire army should be divided into three detachments. The first detachment headed by Ulugh Khān and the other Ḥabshīs should go one stage in advance. When they would advance beyond their first station, I'tmād Khān and Iḥtiyār-ul-mulk and the other amīrs, who would command the second detachment, should encamp there. When the second detachment should advance from that station, the third detachment, which would be commanded by Shēr Khān Fūlādī and other amīrs, should take up its position there. Sādāt Bukhārī should remain in the position where he was. When, according to this agreement, Ulugh Khān and Juhjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk and the other Ḥabshīs arrived at Maḥmūdābād, I'tmād Khān did not go out of the city, and cancelled the previous agreement.

Ulugh Khān and his friends suspecting treachery on his part, from this conduct, said to each other, "We slew a (powerful) enemy of his, like Chengiz Khān, and he is now acting traitorously towards us. It is advisable that we should take possession of this territory (fief), and divide it among ourselves". They confirmed this determination, and took possession of pargana Kanbāyet and Patlād and some other parganas. Men who had no jāgirs came from the city, and joined the service of Ulugh Khān. The latter said to Juhjār Khān, "Soldiers

1 There are variations in the readings, and they are all more or less incorrect. One MS. has اعتماد خان بورون نفت و فنح آن عزیمت لمود; the other has اعتماد خان از شهر بورون نفت و فنح آن عزیمت لمود; the lith. ed. agrees with the latter reading but substitutes فنح صبیح for فنح صبیح. It is needless to say that both فنح صبیح and فنح صبیح are utterly incorrect, and the correct word is فنح. Firishtah lith. ed. has it. His version is different, and I am quoting it, as it gives some reason for I'tmād Khān's conduct. He says: اعتماد خان متهم شد - از شهر بورون رفته فنح آن عزیمت لمود, which means I'tmād Khān became suspicious, and going out of the city cancelled the previous agreement. Col. Briggs's (vol. IV, p. 184) version is that "Etimad Khan, with his accustomed cowardice, threw obstacles in the progress of the second corps, which he commanded, and refused to move". The Cambridge History of India, page 347, also says: "I'timad Khan refused to leave the capital".
have come to me from the capital, it is advisable that one of the parganas of I'tmād Khān should be allotted for the payment of their wages". Juhujār Khān replied, "Give all the land that you wish to give to these men to me; and whatever you expect from them, you will get from me". In the end there was contention and hostility between them, on the score of the division of this territory.

I'tmād Khān receiving information of this deceived Juhujār Khān by his artifice and trickery, and summoned him to join him. As he went to I'tmād Khān, there was great infirmity and weakness in the grandeur of the Habshi party. Ulugh Khān then went to Shēr Khān Fūlād; and Sādāt Bukhārī also joined the latter. As Shēr Khān's side became stronger, Sultān Mużaffar also, availing himself of an opportunity, came out one day through a window and with a few of his immediate attendants went to Ulugh Khān at Ghiyāspūr, which is near the town of Sarkhōj. Ulugh Khān went to wait on Shēr Khān, without seeing him. He told Shēr Khān, "Sultān Mużaffar has, without giving me previous intimation, come to my house; but I have not yet seen him". Shēr Khān said, "As a beloved guest has come, you should go and carry out the rites of service".

Early the next morning, a letter came from I'tmād Khān to Shēr Khān, to the following effect: "As Nañū was not the son of the Sultān, I have repudiated him. And I have summoned the Mirzās, so that I may make over the capital of Gujrat to them". After reading

---

1 There are some differences in the readings. The word before is omitted in one MS., but occurs in the other and in the lith. ed.; and the same word before occurs in both MSS., but not in the lith ed. I have inserted it.

2 Both the MSS. have which is in the lith ed. and in the corresponding passage in the lith ed. of Firishta is just as good.

3 The reading in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. is. This may have the meaning I have given it in the text, or it may mean, when I brought him forward. The context shows that the first is the correct meaning. Firishta lith ed. is more explicit. It is , i.e., as Mużaffar was not the son of Shāh Mahmūd Shāh III, I have driven him out, and have summoned the Mirzās.
this letter, Shēr Khān went to the house of Saiyid Ḥāmid 1 Bukhārī, and enquired of him, as to what had been ascertained at the time of the accession. Saiyid Ḥāmid and the other Saiyids said, “I’tmād Khān swore on the Qurān, that the boy was a son of Sultān Maḥmūd; and he has now written these words on account of his enmity”. Shēr Khān rode back from the house of Saiyid Ḥāmid, to that of Ulugh Khān; and with his bow in his hands rendered homage to Sultān Muḥaffar, in the way in which a servant does homage to his master; and mounting him on a horse, brought him to his own house, in order to render homage to him there.

I’tmād Khān summoned the Mirzās from the country of Bahrūj. He sent detachments from their followers, and those of Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk every day 2 to fight. Gradually the contention and hostility was much prolonged; and as I’tmād Khān saw that nothing was affected, he sent a petition to His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī; and begged him to come and conquer the country of Gujrāt. As it happened, at that time which was the year 988 (1572 A.D.), His Majesty had come to Nāgūr; and had sent Mir Muḥammad Ātka, who was celebrated as Khān Kalān, with a large army of renowned amirs to conquer Sirōhi. As 3 the Khān Kalān was wounded by the ambassador of the Raja of Sirōhi, the emperor himself, with good fortune and prosperity, advanced towards the Khān Kalān’s army; and (from there) without any delay marched towards Gujrāt. The particulars of this brief statement have been narrated in the history of the events of the reign of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī.

In short, when the world-conquering standards arrived at Pattan Gujrāt, Shēr Khān, who was at this time besieging Ahmādābād, lost the use of his hands and feet (i.e., became utterly bewildered), and fled; and Ibrāhīm Ḥusain Mirzā and his brothers went towards Barōda and Bahrūj. I’tmād Khan and 4 Mir Abū Turāb and Ulugh Khān

1 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has 2 م. حيدر حسین in the text-edition instead of Saiyid Ḥamīd Bukhārī as in the translation above.
2 Fīrishtah adds: and the Habshihs.
3 He was actually wounded by one of the followers of the mission. See page 371 of vol. II of the translation.
4 Fīrishtah lith. ed. calls him Mirzā Abū Turāb Shīrūzī. He is the author of the Tārikh-i-Gujarat, which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross. His full
Habshi and Juhjär Khān and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, having determined on serving at the threshold, which was the abode of the angels, became enlisted in the band of the loyal servants. The kingdom of Gujrat ended here, and became a part of the imperial dominions of His Majesty the Khalfā-i-Ilāhī. Other incidents connected with Sultān Mużaaffar Khān and the Gujratīs have been narrated in the auspicious history of His Majesty the Khalfā-i-Ilāhī.

The period of the rule of Sultān Mużaaffar extended to thirteen years and some months.

SECTION VI. THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF BANGĀLA.

It will not remain concealed from the minds of men of understanding, that the beginning of the appearance of Islām in the country of Bangāla was from (the time of) Muḥammad Bakhtiyār who had been one of the great amīrs of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn Aibak. After him the amīrs of the Sultāns of Dehli ruled one after another. Their histories have been narrated in the course of the history of the Sultāns of Dehli. When Malik Fakhr-ud-dīn who was the silāhdār, trooper or armour-bearer, of Qadr Khān, the ruler of Bangāla as Viceroy of name appears to be Mīr Abu Thābī Wālī who belonged to the Salāmī Saiyids of Shīrāz.

1 The correct date is given as the 14th Rājab, 980 A.H., in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The corresponding date according to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 165) is November 20th, 1572. The same date is also given in the Cambridge History of India, page 348.

2 This section which follows that about Mālwa in the MSS. is printed between those about Gujrat and Sharqā in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has followed the sequence in the lith. ed. for the text, and the same has been adopted for the translation.

The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. In the lith. ed. it is طبقه از حكومت سلطانين بنگاله .

3 One MS. has Māhmūd instead of Muḥammad.

4 The same MS. has by mistake سلطان قطب بگ Sultān Quṭb Bāg.

5 Both MSS. have سلاطین طبقه دهلی This is incorrect. If the word طبقہ is at all inserted, it should be before سلاطین .
Muḥammad Tughluq Shāh, slew him, he gave himself the name of ultān. After him the kingdom of Bangāla became separated from the empire of Dehli, and the hand of the dominion of the Sultāns of Dehli did not reach the kings (of Bangāla); and they appropriated the ame of Sultān for themselves.

The beginning of the section about Bangāla has been made from laik Fakhr-ud-din. (The names of the various Sultāns are):

---

1 One MS. has Muḥammad, Maḥmūd.

2 One MS. has by mistake ʿAmr; but the other and the lith. ed. have ʿAmr.

3 One MS. has ʿAmr; while the lith. ed. has ʿAmr.

4 For the list of the kings of Bengal as given in the Cambridge History of India, see vol. III, page 695. According to it there were two kings in east Bengal with their capital at Sūnārgāon in the Maghān in the present district of Jessa; namely, Fakhr-ud-din Mubārak Shāh, 739 A.H., 1338 A.D. to 750 A.H., 1349 A.D.; and ʿIqtiyār-ud-din Ghāzī Shāh, 750 A.H., 1349 A.D. to 753 A.H., 1352 A.D.; after which this kingdom was conquered by Haijī Shams-ud-din Iyās Bhangara, and incorporated with western Bengal. The kings of western Bengal begin with No. 2 of the lists given in the Tabaqāt. As regards the names and period Firishtah agrees about No. 1; but about No. 2 he has one year and five months. As regards No. 5 there is great divergence. One MS. and the lith. ed. have ten years, the other MS. has two years. Firishtah has nine years and some months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 335) has ten years; and the Cambridge History of India, page 266, also gives him ten years from 1396 A.H., when he is said to have peaceably succeeded his father to 1406 A.H., when he died. In the list of the kings of Bengal, on page 695, however, he is only given two years from 1410 to 1412 A.H. No. 7 is said to have reigned for three years according to a MS. and the lith. ed. and Firishtah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 336). The Cambridge History of India, page 266, says he was allowed to ascend the throne, but was a mere puppet and exercised no power; he died after a reign of little more than three years. His name is not, however, given in the lists on page 695, though another puppet, Shuhāb-ud-din Bāyazīd, who succeeded him, has his name in that list. No. 8 is called Rāja Kāns in one MS., and Rāja Kānșī in the other. The lith. ed. both of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah have Rāja Kāns. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 336) has Raja Kans Poorby. The Cambridge History of India, page 266, calls him Raja Ganūsh of Dinājjpur, but says that he is called Raja Kāns by most Muslim historians; in the list on page 695 he is called Gānūsh of Bhadurīā (Kāns Narāyān). About No. 9 there is no difference in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., except that one MS. calls the father Kānșī and not Kāns. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Jivmal the son of Kāns, who had the title of Sultān Jalāl-ud-din, and says that he ruled for seventeen years and some
months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 337) calls him Jeetmul entitled Jalah-ud-din and says he reigned for seventeen years. The Cambridge History of India, page 266, calls him Jatmaul, who was raised to the throne under the title of Jalal-ud-din Muhammad and says he ruled for seventeen years. In the list on page 695, he is, however, called Jalu alias Jalal-ud-din Muhammad Shah. About No. 10 there is no difference in the MS. and the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah the word Sultân is prefixed to the name of the father and the period of his reign is said to have been sixteen years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 338) calls him Ahmud Poorby and says he reigned for eighteen years. The Cambridge History of India, page 267 and also page 695, calls him Shams-ud-din Ahmad Shah, and says he reigned for eleven years only from 1431 to 1442 A.D.

About No. 11 there is no difference in the MS., but the lith. ed. omits the word bin, son of, before Ahmad. Firishtah lith. ed. says Nasir-ud-din, a slave, who usurped the throne, reigned for seven days and according to another account for half a day. Col. Briggs agrees. The Cambridge History of India, page 267, calls him Nasir Khan, originally a slave, and later one of the principal officers of the State, who assumed the title of Nasir-ud-din Mahmud and is said on page 267 to have reigned peacefully for seventeen years. In the list on page 695, he is said to have reigned from 1442 to 1460. About No. 12 there is no difference between the MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Sultân Nasir-ud-din Shâh Bhangara and says he ruled for thirty-two years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 339) calls him Nasir Poorby, and says he reigned for two years. In the Cambridge History of India the Nasir-ud-din and the Nasir Shâh of the Tabâqât and Firishtah are, apparently, made into one man. He is said on page 268 to have died in 1459, though in the list on page 695 he is said to have reigned from 1442 to 1460. As regards No. 13, one MS. calls him Bin Bârbak Shâh, but otherwise the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree. Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs (who, however, calls him Barbik Poorby) agree. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, calls him Rukn-ud-din Bârbak and says he succeeded his father in 1459 and died in 1474, and thus reigned for about fifteen years. On page 695 he is called Rukn-ud-din Bârbak Shâh and is said to have reigned from 1460 to 1474, or for about fourteen years. About No. 14 the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree; but the lith. ed. of Firishtah gives him seven years and six months, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 339) gives him between seven and eight years. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, calls him Shams-ud-din Yusuf, who reigned for seven years from 1474 to 1481. There is much difference in the periods of No. 15's reign; one MS. and the lith. ed. have half a day, while the other MS. has two half years and two half days. The meaning of which is difficult to find out. Firishtah lith. ed. gives him two months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 340) says he was deposed on the day he was raised to the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, also says that he was immediately deposed, as his intellect was deranged.

The name of No. 16 is omitted from one MS. I have given in the text what is written about him in the other MS. The lith. ed. calls him Fath, without any
prefix or suffix; and gives him seven years and five months. Firishtah lith. ed. agrees with the lith. ed. of Tabaqat in giving him a reign of seven years and five months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 340) calls him Futteh Poorby, and says he was murdered after a reign of seven years. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, says he reigned from 1481 to 1486 (i.e., for five years), when he was assassinated. As to No. 17 both the MSS. and the lith. ed. have the reading I have in the text. Firishtah lith. ed. says Bārbak Shāh reigned according to one statement for eight months, and according to another for two and a half months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 341) calls him the Eunuch Shahzada, and says he reigned for two months. The Cambridge History of India calls him Bārbak the Eunuch, Sultān Shāhūzāda in the list on page 696, and gives a rather long account of how he was killed on page 269, but does not mention the exact period of his reign. The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree as to No. 18, and say what I have translated in the text. Firishtah calls him Malik Indil Ḥabshi who had the title of Firūz Shāh and says he ruled for three years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 344) calls him Mullik Andeel Feroze Poorby, and says he ruled for thirteen years, apparently from 886 A.H. to 899 A.H. The corresponding A.D. period 1401 to 1493 is apparently incorrect. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the year of his accession on page 269, but says he reigned for two years and died in 1489. In the list of the kings on pp. 695, 696, the years of his accession and death are 1488 and 1489 respectively. As to No. 19, the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree but there are slight mistakes. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Shāh Māhmūd Shāh, and says he ruled for one year, but it also mentions a statement in the History of Ḥāji Muhammad Qandahārī, according to which he ruled merely in name under the guardianship of Ḥabīb Khān, a slave of Shāh Bārbak Shāh, at the end of which Ḥabīb Khān wanted to rule himself, but he was slain by Sīdī Badr Diwana, who also slew the infant king, and proclaimed himself as Sultān Muzaffar Shāh. Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India agree generally. The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree in saying what I have in the text in respect of No. 20. Firishtah calls him Sīdī Badr Ḥabshi who had the title of Muzaffar Shāh, and says he reigned for three years and five months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 348) says he reigned for three years. The Cambridge History of India, page 270, also says he reigned for three years, and in the list of kings he is said to have reigned from 1400 to 1493 A.D. The MSS. and the lith. ed. also agree about No. 21. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Sharif Makki, celebrated as Sultān Ḍalā-ud-dīn, and says he reigned for twenty-seven years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 348) agrees as to the period of his reign, but calls him Alā-ood-deen Poorby, II. The Cambridge History of India, page 606, calls him Saiyid Ḍalā-ud-dīn Sharif-i-Makki, and says he reigned from 1493 to 1518, i.e., for twenty-five years. His full title, as can be gathered from his coins, is given on page 270 and the period of his reign is mentioned there also as twenty-five years. Neither of the MSS. gives the period of Naṣīb Shāh’s reign. The lith. ed. calls him Naṣīr Shāh and gives him eleven days. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Shāh Naṣīr Shāh, and says he ascended the throne in 927 and died in 943, which would give him about sixteen years. Col. Briggs
Sultan Fakhruddin, two years and some months;
Sultan 'Ala'-ud-din, one year and some months;
Sultan Shams-ud-din, sixteen years and some months;
Sultan Sikandar, son of Sultan Shams-ud-din, nine years and some months;
Sultan Ghiyas-ud-din, son of Sikandar, seven years;
Sultan Sultan-us-Salatin, ten (?) years;
Sultan Shams-ud-din, son of Sultan-us-Salatin, three years;
Raja Kansa, three years;
Sultan Jalal-ud-din, son of Kansa, seventeen years;
Sultan Ahmad, son of Jalal-ud-din, sixteen years;
Sultan Nasir-ud-din, son of Ahmad, seven days;
Sultan Nasir Shah, two years;
Barbak Shah, seventeen years;
Yusuf Shah, seven years;
Sikandar Shah, half a day;
Fath-Shah, seven years and some months;
Barbak Shah, eunuch, two and a half months;
Firuz Shah, three years;
Mahmud Shah, son of Firuz, one year;
Muzafrar Habshi, three years and five months;
'Ala-ud-din, twenty-seven years;
Nasib Shah, son of 'Ala-ud-din, eleven years.

(vol. IV, p. 351) calls him Nuseeb Poorby, and says he reigned from 1523 to 1538 A.D. or for a period of fifteen years. The Cambridge History of India calls him Nasir-ud-din Nusrat Shah, and gives him a reign of fifteen years from 1518 to 1533. M. Hidayat Hosain has eleven years as the period of his reign in the text-edition, and this has been followed in the translation.

The list in the Tabaqat ends here, but Firishtah mentions four more Sultans, and the Cambridge History of India thirteen more, ending with Daud Khan Karan.

1 M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted 35 سال as the period of the reign in the text-edition.

2 In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has ہفتہ سال .
An account of Sultān Fakhr-ud-din.

Malik Fakhr-ud-din was the silāhdār (armour bearer) of Qadr Khan. He treacherously slew his master, and attributed the name of the saltanat to himself. He sent one of his slaves by the name of Mukhlīs, with a well equipped army, to the frontier district of Bangāla (أقصى بكاله). But Malik ‘Ali Mubarāk, the pay master of Qadr

1 One MS. inserts Shāh after Fakhr-ud-din.
2 Firishtah describes in some detail the way in which Qadr Khan was murdered by his own soldiers at the instigation of Fakhr-ud-din; and Stewart, History of Bengal, 1813, page 81, follows him. According to Stewart, Fakhr Addeen proclaimed his independence at Sunergong about the end of 740 or the beginning of 741, and this is confirmed by his coins which also show that he continued to reign in Sōnārgānūn till 750 A.H. This agrees generally with the list of Bengal Kings on page 695 of the Cambridge History of India, according to which he reigned from 739 A.H. to 750 A.H. The Cambridge History of India, page 262, differs from the Tabaqat and from Firishtah and Stewart. According to it, Qadr Khan was not slain by or at the instigation of Fakhr-ud-din, as he died in 1339, and was succeeded by Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din ‘Ali as the Cambridge History of India calls him or Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din ‘Ali Shāh. It is doubtful whether Bahārūm Khan, who had been associated with Ghiyās-ud-din Bahādur in the government of Eastern Bengal and since the latter’s rebellion and death in 1330 was the sole governor of East Bengal, was or was not slain by Fakhr-ud-din; but it was after his death in 1336 that Fakhr-ud-din or Fakhr-ud-din Mubarāk Shāh assumed the royal title at Sōnārgānūn; but Qadr Khan did not die till 1339, i.e., three years later, at Lakhnautī.
3 According to Firishtah and Stewart he was sent to conquer Lakhnautī and the neighbouring districts.
4 Firishtah agrees as to Malik ‘Ali having defeated Mukhlīs, but he says nothing about his defeating Fakhr-ud-din and putting him to death. Stewart (pp. 82, 83) agrees with the Tabaqat, and says that Aly Mubarick defeated Fakhr Addeen, and put him to death in 743 A.H., 1342-43 A.D. This cannot, however, be correct, as there are coins struck by him up to 749 A.H. in existence.

According to Firishtah, he was taken prisoner in 741 A.H. by Malik Ilyās, who assumed the title of Sultān Shams-ud-din, and was brought to Lakhnautī where he was hanged by the neck. This also cannot be correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 262, says that hostilities continued between Eastern and Western Bengal till 1349 A.D., when Fakhr-ud-din disappeared from the scene; but he was succeeded by his son Ikhtiyār-ud-din Ghāzi Shāh at Sōnārgānūn. This latter Sultān is not mentioned by Niẓām-ud-din or Firishtah or Stewart; but his coins show that he reigned at Sōnārgānūn from 750 to 763 A.H., 1349-1352 A.D. (See Bhattachariya’s Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent
Khan’s army, met him in battle, and slew him; and all his horses and other equipages which were with him fell into the victor’s hands. As Sultan Fakhr-ud-din had only newly acquired his power, and had no faith in his followers, he could not attack ‘Ali Mubarak. In the end Malik ‘Ali Mubarak assumed the title of Sultan ‘Ali-ud-din; and went and attacked Sultan Fakhr-ud-din; and in the year 941 A.H. having taken him prisoner alive, sentenced him to death. He then left a thāna (military post) at Lakhnauti, and returned to the country of Bangala (probably Sūnārgāon).

The period of Sultan Fakhr-ud-din’s rule was two years and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTÂN ‘ALÂ-UD-DIN.

As he had put Sultan Fakhr-ud-din to death, he with great strength left a thāna at Lakhnauti and advanced towards Bangala. ² After

Sultans of Bengal, 1922, pages 18, 19, and the Cambridge History of India, pp. 262, 695.) He is also mentioned by Edward Thomas, The Chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi, 1871, pages 265, 266, and is included in Lane-Poole’s list in The Mohommedan Dynasties, 1925, page 307.

¹ The meaning is not clear. Firishtah and Stewart are of no help. The former merely copies the words of the Tabaqāt, and the latter says nothing whatever about ‘Alâ-ud-din. It appears, however, from Bhattasali, page 15, and the Cambridge History of India, page 262, that ‘Alâ-ud-din at this time removed his capital to Pandūlah for strategic reasons. The dīyār Bangala would therefore mean Pandūlah.

² There is a good deal of difference in the readings in the MSS. and the lith. ed.; and they are all more or less incorrect. One MS. has حاجي البلاس علی‌ی كه در لشکر بهانوی نامرد برده، لشکرا به خود پار و موافقت ساخته سلطان علاء الدین را کشت و خود را سلطان شیخ الدین لقب گذاشته و جنرال سلطان علاء الدین دیار الله نامرد الکلویی و بنگاله مصرف گردید the other MS. has حاجی البلاس علاء الدین instead of حاجی البلاس علی‌ی; and instead of ساخته ساخته; and omits the words from خود را گذاشته گذاشته. and then has خود دیار بهانوی و بنگاله مصرف گردید. The lith. ed. omits before لشکر لشکر; and has instead of نامرد لقب گذاشته گذاشته; and in the reading in the first MS.: and inserts the words before لقب افشار علاء الدین after گداشته گداشته. The reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah is somewhat different.
a few days, Malik 1 Ḥājī Iliyās 'Alāf, who had been nominated (for the office of Sultān) in the army of Lakhnauti, made that army friendly and united with him; and slew Sultān 'Alā'-ud-din, and giving himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-din Bhangara, took possession of the country of Lakhnauti and Bangāla. The period of the government of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-din was one year and some months.

2 An account of Ḥājī Iliyās, who had the title of Sultān Shams-ud-din Bhangara.

When 'Alā'-ud-din was slain and the whole country of Lakhnauti and Bangāla came into the possession of Iliyās, he in concert with the amirs gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-din; and had public prayers read in his name. He made very great efforts in obtaining the good wishes of the people and in attracting the hearts of the soldiers.

After some time he equipped an army, and marched to 3 Jājnagar; and having obtained many large elephants from that country, returned

I have adopted the reading in the first MS. changing گذاشت to گذاشت, and inserting the words سلطان علاء الدین کشتہ شد after کشتہ شد. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has generally followed the second MS. in the text-edition.

1 The relationship of Malik Ḥājī Iliyās with Sultān 'Alā'-ud-din, and their antecedent as detailed in the Riyāzu-s-Salātīn are given on pages 19, 20 of Bhattasali's book. I do not think that Nizām-ud-din and Firishta are correct in saying that Malik Ḥājī Iliyās gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-din Bhangara. The last word was a nick name popularly given to him on account of his addiction to the preparation of hemp known as Bhang. According to Firishta Ḥajīpūr opposite to Patna got its name from Ḥājī Iliyās.

2 The heading given in the text is that in the MSS. with the slight difference that the last word is داشت in one MS. and داشت in the other. The latter is correct. The heading in the lith. ed. is ذکر سلطان شمس الدین بنگر.

3 Neither the Riyāzu-s-Salātīn nor the Ṭabaqāt nor Firishta attempts to identify this place. Bhattasali (pp. 24, 25) says, Sultan Shamsuddin "seems to have levied tribute from the kingdoms of Orissa and Tirhut", from which it appears that he identifies Jājnagar with Orissa. The Cambridge History of India, page 263, says "Iliyās is said to have invaded Jājnagar, as the Muslim historians styled the kingdom of Jājpur in Orissa". There is no connected account of this kingdom anywhere in the Cambridge History of India, and it is only mentioned incidentally in this place, and in connection
to his own capital. 1 For a period of thirteen 2 years and some months, the Sultāns of Dehli did not interfere with him in any way; and he with full and absolute authority, performed the duties of the salṭanat. But on the 10th of Shawwāl, in the year 754 A.H., 3Sultān Frīzū Shāh, son of Rajab advanced from Dehli towards Lakhnauti. Sultān

with Sultān Husāng’s journey to acquire elephants on page 350 and the following pages, and in connection with Sultān Muḥammad of the Deccan’s invasion of Orissa in 1478 on page 417. In all these places the Musalmān historians call the place Jānjagar; and the Cambridge History of India persists, so far as I can see, without any authority whatever in calling it Jāipur. Apart, however, from this question I think that the Jānjagar mentioned here does not mean Orissa at all, but Tipperah. Stewart, on page 83, has Tippera in brackets after Jagenagur (Jānjagar). He gives no authority but Shums Adīn, with his capitals at Pandūrah and Sānārgāon, is more likely to have invaded Tipperah, less than one hundred miles from Sānārgāon than Orissa which was quite five hundred or six hundred miles off. It will be seen moreover that Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn Balban pursued the rebel Tughrāl in the direction of Jānjagar through Lakhnauti and Sonargāon, see pages 109 and 110 of the first volume of the translation. The Jānjagar mentioned there cannot be identified with Orissa, but must be some place east of Sānārgāon, and most probably Tipperah. In this connection see also note 1, page 104 of the English translation of the Rīāzu-s-Salātīn, where the translator says, that he was inclined to agree with Professor Blochmann, that there were two Jānjagars, one in Orissa and another towards Tipperah.

1 The Rīāzu-s-Salātīn (text-edition, p. 96) says بندريد تا حدود و بنارس تا سربه سال سلاطین دهلی متعرض حال بنگال نشدنند and earlier on متصرف گردید and hence Frīzū Shāh’s attention was directed to Bangāla and he attempted to reconquer it.

2 One MS. omits by mistake the word سال years.

3 One MS. has سلطان فیروز شاه while the other MS., and the lith. ed. leave out the word بن. The first MS. is correct. Sultān Frīzū Shāh was the son of Sīpāh-sādār Rajab, brother of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tūghlūq.

Bhattasali (p. 25) cannot understand how the Tabakat gives a detailed diary (as he calls it) of the expedition, when neither Shams-i-Siraj Afīf nor Zia-Barni the two contemporary historians go into details of dates. The account of the expedition as given in the Ṭabaqāt is translated on pages 244, 245 of the first volume of this work. Zia ‘Barni’s Tarikh-i-Frīzū Shāh is not before me; but it appears from note 3, pages 100, 101, of Maulāvī Abdus-Salām’s translation of the Rīāzu-s-Salātīn, that Zia ‘Barni gives a full account of the expedition, and all facts mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt are to be found in it.
Shams-ud-din took shelter in the fort of 1 Ekdāla, and 2 left the whole country of Bangāla unoccupied (i.e., unguarded).

When Sultān Firūz heard, that Sultān Shams-ud-din had fortified himself in Ekdāla, he advanced from the road towards that place. When he arrived in its neighbourhood, Sultān Shams-ud-din sallied out of the fort, and engaged in a regular battle, and many were slain on both sides. Sultān Shams-ud-din fled, and again took shelter in Ekdāla. The large elephants, which he had brought from Jājnagar, fell into the hands of Sultān Firūz Shāh’s men.

As the rains had commenced, and there was heavy rain, Sultān Firūz Shāh returned on the 1st of Rabi‘-ul-āwwal to Dehli. After that in the year 755 A.H. Sultān Shams-ud-din sent a large quantity of tribute, such as might be fit for the 3 Sultān with his ambassadors, as homage to Firūz Shāh, and prayed for pardon. Sultān Firūz Shāh also, behaving with kindness conferred robes of honour on the ambassadors; and granted them permission to 4 depart.

Again the end of the 5 year 759 A.H., Sultān Shams-ud-din sent Malik Taj-ud-din to Dehli with much tribute; and Sultān Firūz

---

1 As to the position of Ekdāla, see the excellent note 2 on page 100 of the English translation of the Rīyaḍu-s-Salātīn. Zia ’Barnī says: “It is the name of a mouza close to Panduah; on one side of it is a river and on another a jungle”. Shams-ud-Din Siraj calls it “The isles of Ekdalāh”. I may note here that the name is transliterated in the Cambridge History of India, page 263, as Ikdāla. No Indian will, however, pronounce the name with an initial I.

2 The Rīyaḍu-s-Salātīn (p. 100), however, says that Sultān Shamsu-d-din left his son with an army in the fort of Pandūyah. The son, however, was soon taken prisoner. According to the Rīzā also there was a great battle on the day Firūz Shāh arrived near Ekdāla, after which the siege was continued for twenty-two days.

3 One MS. inserts مجلس before سلاغين. Firishtah lith. ed. also has اب集市 مجلس نادشامان.

4 One MS. has انظر by mistake for انصرف.

5 The Rīyaḍu-s-Salātīn has 758 A.H. 759 A.H. appears to be incorrect. Bhattasali (pp. 41–45) enters into a long disquisition on the subject, and comes to the conclusion that Sultan Shamsuddin died about the end of Zul-hijjah 758. The Cambridge History of India, page 263, discusses the question as to whether or not Firūz acknowledged the independence of Sultān Shams-ud-din. It comes to the conclusion that Firūz Shāh had to return without obtaining a formal declaration of Shams-ud-din’s homage. It also says that the tributes
Shâh treated the ambassador with greater kindness than before; and after some days, sent 'Arab and Turki horses with other fine presents for Sultân Shams-ud-din, with Malik Sâif-ud-din, the superintendent of the elephants. Malik Sâif-ud-din and Malik Tâj-ud-din had not yet passed through Behâr, when Sultân Shams-ud-din died. Malik Sâif-ud-din gave the horses to the amirs of Behâr, in accordance with the emperor's order; and Malik Sâif-ud-din himself went back to Dehli.

The period of the rule of Sultân Shams-ud-din was sixteen years and some months.

3 An account of the rule of Sultân Sikandar Shâh, son of Sultân Shams-ud-din.

When Sultân Shams-ud-din departed (this life), the amirs and the chiefs of the different groups, on the third day after his death, sent by Shams-ud-din in 755 A.H., 1354 A.D. and 758 A.H., 1358 A.D. were merely the customary exchanges of presents, but it should be noted in both instances that the presents or tributes were sent from Bengâl. It appears to me that the relations between the two rulers remained undeviating; and I cannot find any evidence in support of the statement made in the Cambridge History of India (p. 263) that "In December, 1356, Firûz formally recognised the independence of Bengal".

1 The Riyâzu-s-Salâtîn (text-edition, p. 99) says: تر عوض مراحب سیاهیان i.e., in lieu of the pay due to the imperial soldiers stationed in Behâr.

2 Both MSS. have Malik Tâj-ud-din instead of Malik Sâif-ud-din. This is incorrect.

3 There are slight differences in the heading. It is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other MS. it is simply ذکر سکندر شاه. The lith. ed. has the same heading as the first MS., with the exception that it omits the word سلطان سکندر after شاه.

4 One MS. has زحلد نمود instead of زحلد نمود. The relations between the rulers of Dehli and Bengal at this time are extremely obscure. The Riyâzu-s-Salâtîn, the Tabaqât and Firishtah all begin abruptly by saying that Sultân Sikandar considered it extremely important to conciliate Firûz Shâh, without saying anything about the relations between Sultân Shams-ud-din and Firûz Shâh, after the latter's first expedition to Bengâl. According to the Tarîkh-i-Firûz Shâhî by Shams-Siraj Affîl, the object of the second expedition was to reinstate Zafar Khân on the throne of Sônârgâon, but that work is also silent about the relation between Firûz Shâh and Sultân Shams-ud-din, just before the latter's death. According to Bhattasali (p. 44) after the experi-
placed his eldest son on the throne of empire, giving him the title of Sikandar Shāh. He proclaimed the gospel of justice and beneficence, evidences of his first expedition to Lakhnauṭi, Firoz Shah was in no mood again to interfere in the internal affairs of Bengal; but he had to take cognisance of the complaint of Zafar Khan, who arrived in Dehlī in 758 A.H., as he was the latter’s liege lord; but he was, at least according to Bhattasali, apparently afraid of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn; and it was not till the news of the latter's death had come to Dehlī, that he finally made up his mind, and began to prepare for marching against the unsuspecting Sikandar. Bhattasali (p. 48) goes on to say that, according to the Riyāż and Firishtah, Sikandar was ignorant of the motive of Firoz Shah in thus hurrying towards Bengal, even when Firoz reached Zafarabad (near Jaunpur). I do not consider this latter statement correct. Even immediately after his accession Sikandar knew that it was extremely important for him to conciliate Firūz Shāh. This is expressly mentioned in the Riyāż and the Ṭabaqāt and by Firishtah. As to Sikandar’s not knowing the motive of Firūz Shāh’s march towards Bengal (Firūz was certainly not hurrying, for taking the dates given by Bhattasali himself, he commenced his preparations in 759 A.H., started in Muḥarram 760 A.H., and arrived in Jaunpur about Jamādi-ul-āwwal 760 A.H., and halted there for six months, and the siege of Ekdāla did not commence till Zi qa‘da 760, and did not end till Jamādi-ul-āwwal 761 A.H. This snail-like march contrasts very unfavourably with the first expedition, in the course of which Firūz Shāh reached Ekdāla in three days less than five months after leaving Dehlī) he must have been both very ignorant and very dense. It is not quite correct to say that the Riyāż and Firishtah say that Sikandar was ignorant of Firūz Shāh’s motive, even when the latter arrived at Zafarābād. The former says that he was متردود or anxious, but that does not mean that he was ignorant. Firishtah does not even say this.

The Cambridge History of India, page 263, gives a different view of the matter. According to it, in December 1356 A.D., as already noted, Firūz formally recognised the independence of Bengal, but apparently he intended to treat this recognition as so much waste paper. He accordingly as soon as the news of the death of Shams-ud-dīn reached him, ordered the gifts to the latter to be distributed among the nobles of Bihar, and recalled Saif-ud-dīn to assist in the preparation for an invasion of Bengal. I do not know what the authority for this statement is. None of the chroniclers or historians say so. But though Firūz Shāh wanted to brush aside his declaration of December 1356 A.D., he was apparently unable to do so, without a pretext; and this was furnished by the arrival of Zafar Khan.

It is unnecessary to labour this point further. I consider that Firūz Shāh thought that he was entitled to reannex Bengal to the empire of Dehlī, and he made a second attempt to do so.
and occupied himself with the duties of the sultanat. Knowing that seeking the pleasure of the heart of Sultan Firuz Shah was of the greatest importance, he sent fifty elephants and various stuffs in the way of tribute to Sultan Firuz Shah. In the meanwhile, the latter had advanced towards Lakhnauti in the year 760 A.H. with the object of conquering Bangala. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Pandua, Sultan Sikandar following the example of his father, fortified himself in his citadel of Ekdala. 1 As he had not the strength to oppose him (i.e., Firuz Shah), he agreed to pay an annual tribute and turned the Sultan back. The latter was yet in the neighbourhood of Pandua, when Sikandar sent thirty-seven elephants and many valuable things and various kinds of stuff to the Sultan, and prayed for the pardon of his offences. Then following the example of his father, he passed the whole of his life in pleasure and 2 enjoyment. The period of his rule

1 The Riyazu-s-Salatin and Firishtah agree. Stewart (p. 85) also agrees, but he says that Emperor Feroze found out that there was no probability of his being able to capture Akdala. Bhattachari (pp. 51, 51) says Sultan Firoz returned discomfited and says, that he and not Sultan Sikandar sought for peace. It appears, however, that proposals for peace were sent by Sikandar’s ministers, who took their master’s silence to imply his consent to their being sent; and Firoz’s ministers received them with great joy, and had no difficulty in persuading their masters to listen to them. Firoz, however, stipulated for the restoration of Sonargaon to Zafar Khan, but the latter did not dare to resume sovereignty in the dangerous proximity of Sikandar.

The Cambridge History of India, page 264, practically agrees with the above.

2 The Tabaqat and Firishtah are silent about some very important incidents of the life of Sikandar. The Riyazu-s-Salatin (p. 105) mentions them. One of these is the erection of the Adina Mosque in Pandua, which is perhaps the finest and most remarkable religious edifice in Bengal. Unfortunately it remained unfinished at the time of his death.

The second is the rebellion of Ghayasu-d-din, who afterwards succeeded him. It is said that Sikandar had two wives, one of whom had seventeen sons, while Ghayasu-d-din was the only son of the other. The latter, in the words of the Riyazu-s-Salatin (text-edition, pp. 101-104) was در حسن اخلاق و جميع اوصاف برهمه برادران فائق و در امر ملکنت و جهاداداري نسب و لائق which may be translated as superior to all his brothers in the beauty of his morals and in all (good) qualities, and the fittest and most meritorious in the arts of sovereignty. His step-mother, however, complained to the Sultan against him, and suggested that he should either be put into prison, or deprived of his
was nine years and some months.

2 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN GHIYĀS-UD-DĪN.3

4 When Sultān Sikandar died, the amirs and the chiefs of the different groups of the people gave the title of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn sight. The Sultān reproved her, and put the government in Ghiyāsu-ud-dīn’s hands. The latter was, however, afraid of his step-mother’s machinations; and one day on the pretext of hunting escaped to Sunārgāon. He collected an army there, and the Sultān marched to meet him. A battle took place at Gaūlpāra, which appears to be near Jafarganj in the Dacca district, and nearly opposite to the junction of the Ganges and Jumna or Jamuna. Ghiyāsu-ud-dīn is said to have given strict orders that Sultān Sikandar should be taken alive, but as it was decreed otherwise he was mortally wounded. Ghiyāsu-ud-dīn hastened to the place, and took his father’s head in his lap, and tears trickled down his cheeks. Sikandar then opened his eyes and said “My life’s work is over, the kingdom is welcome to thee”.

1 This is not correct. He actually reigned from 758 a.h., 1357 a.d., to 795 a.h., 1393 a.d., or for thirty-six or thirty-seven years. Bhattasali (p. 72) is inclined to place his death in October 1393 a.d.

2 The heading is as I have in the text in the MSS. The lith. ed. adds بن سلطان سکندر after Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn.

3 Unlike the Muhammadan historians the Cambridge History of India, page 264, calls this Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn A’zam, and later A’zam. It appears to follow Bhattasali, who, on page 78, calls him Ghiauddin A’zam Shah, and a few lines further down A’zam Shah. It is true that the full name of the Sultān on his coins was Ghiyās-ud-dīn Abul Muṣaffar A’zam Shah, but I see no reason for calling him by any name other than Ghiyās-ud-dīn.

4 The account of this reign is even briefer in Fīrūštah, and what there is, is copied almost verbatim from the Tabaqät. Notwithstanding the praise of the author of the Riyāz, Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn’s first act was to get the eyes of his seventeen brothers dug out, and by a refinement of cruelty to send them to their mother.

He is more pleasantly remembered as the correspondent of the illustrious poet Ḥāfīz of Shirāz. The correspondence is said to have commenced in the following way. He had a very serious illness and when he had no hope of recovery, he directed that three of his concubines who were named respectively, the sarv (the cypress), the gūl (the rose), and the lāla (the tulip), should perform the last bathing ceremony. The other inmates of the harem used to taunt the sarv and her companions by the name of غسالة (ghaṣṣala or corpse washer).
to his son and seated him on the throne in the place of his father. He also following the rule of his father and the custom of his grandfather passed the whole of his life in pleasure and enjoyment; and 1 in the year 775 A.H. passed away from the narrow place of the body to the wide spaces of the spirit.

The period of his rule was seven 2 years and some months.

After his recovery, when he was in a jovial mood the Sultan recited the line:

None of the court poets could make another line to match it; so the Sultan sent it to Hafiz by a special messenger. The latter quickly sent the second line.

He also sent a whole ghazal (ode) beginning with these lines. The Sultan sent him many valuable presents, and invited him to his court; but Hafiz could not come. The word ghassāla also means a morning draught, so the double entendre is extremely witty (vide Cambridge History of India, pp. 264, 265, and Riyāz, p. 109).

Another anecdote also shows the Sultan in a pleasing light. He is said to have wounded the only son of a widow while practising with his bow and arrow. The widow went and complained to Qâdi Siraj-ad-din. The latter summoned the Sultan to appear before him. The officer sent to serve the summons could not get admission into the palace; but he used the device of calling the adhān. The Sultan ordered the man who had made this untimely call to be brought before him. When the man was brought to him, he produced the summons. The Sultan at once went with him, taking a short sword under his arm. When he appeared before the Qâdi, the latter told him to satisfy the widow. The Sultan did so, and when on the Qâdi's asking the widow, she stated that she was quite satisfied, the Qâdi rose from his seat, and seated the Sultan on the masnad. The Sultan then eulogized the Qâdi, but producing the sword, said that if he had found the Qâdi afraid to administer justice he would have cut off his head with it. The Qâdi then produced a scourge which he had kept concealed under his masnad; and said that if he had found the Sultan unwilling to satisfy the widow, he would have sacrificed his back with it. As the Cambridge History of India (p. 265) says, "Bengal can boast of a prince more law abiding than Henry of Monmouth, and of a judge at least as firm as Gascoigne".

1 This also is incorrect. He actually reigned from 795 A.H., 1393 A.D., to 813 A.H., 1410 A.D., or for seventeen or eighteen years. The Riyāz (p. 111) gives seven years and some months as the period of his reign, but adds that according to another account it lasted for sixteen years, five months and three days.

8 According to the Riyāz, page 111, he was slain by deceit and treachery by Râja Kâns who was a zamindar of the neighbourhood.
AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN-US-SALĀTĪN.

When Sultān Ghīyās-ud-dīn departed (from the world), the amīrs raised his son on the throne of the empire, giving him the title of Sultān-us-salātīn. He was a merciful and patient and brave ruler; and went away in the year 795 from the waste place of this world to the populous country of the next life.

He reigned for ten years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DIN.

As Sultān-us-salātīn went from the house of this world to the house of the after life, the amīrs and the chief men of the State gave the

1 That is the heading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the Riyāz, p. 111, he is called Saif-ud-dīn, who had the title of Sultānu-s-salātīn.

2 The account of this reign in the Riyāz, pages 111, 112, agrees generally with the text, but it says that, according to one account, his reign lasted for three years, seven months and five days and not ten days. Firishtah also agrees, but says the amīrs and vazīrs were amazed (حصب, where is probably a mistake for حرب, where is probably a mistake for خلاف (i.e. opposition to the Ṣharā'); and the Rāyās of the country around never drew their heads from the circle of his obedience, and never made any delay or objection in paying the proper revenue. Firishtah also says in one place that he carried on the government for ten years, but in another place he says the period of his rule was seven years and some months. Col. Brugge's account (vol. IV, p. 335) agrees with that in the text, and not with that in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. According to Bhattachar (page 90) Saifuddin was king only in name. The real power seems to have passed to Raja Ganesh. He also comes to the conclusion after considering his coins and the synchronisms of the Chinese Annals, that his reign lasted only for one year and some months in 813 a.h., and the whole of 814 a.h. (p. 98). According to the Cambridge History of India, page 266, he is said to have peacefully succeeded his father, to have had an obscure reign, to have been defeated in 1404 by Ganesh but to have continued to reign till his death in 1406.

3 The heading is as I have it in the text in the MSS. In the lith ed. it is ذكر بر سلطان السلطانين يعني سلطان شمس الدين. Firishtah also calls the son and successor of Saif-ud-dīn, Ḥamzā Shāh or Sultān-us-salātīn, Sultān Shams-ud-dīn II. In the heading in the Riyāz, p. 112, he is also called Sultān Shamsu-d-dīn, son of Sultānu-s-salātīn; but it is stated a few lines further down that Shamsu-d-dīn was not the son but the adopted son of Sultān-us-salātīn; and his name was Shāhābū-d-dīn and not Shamsu-d-dīn. It goes on to say that Raja Rānas attacked and slew him and assumed the name of Sultān. It appears to be uncertain, as far as our present information goes, as to what the actual political
title of Sultān Shams-ud-din to his son; and placed him on the 1 throne of the empire. He also following the custom of his ancestors passed his whole life in pleasure; and in the year 790 A.H., he passed away.

The period of his reign was three years and some months.

2 An account of Rāja Kāns.

When Sultān Shams-ud-din died, a zamindār of the name of Kāns acquired power and dominion over the country of Bangāla. As the just and holy God 3 was kind to his son, the latter became a Musalmān and sat on the throne.

situation in Bengal was at the time, i.e., between 813 and 810 A.H.; but it appears that Shamsu-d-din or Shahābu-d-din was only a king in name and the entire authority was vested on Raja Ganesh or Kāns of Bhaduria. He appears, according to Bhuttasali (p. 99), to have been supported on the throne by the Raja as harmless, and not likely to interfere with his own authority, and also to keep down the legitimate Ihyas Shahis. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, says that Saif-ud-din Hamza Shāh was succeeded by Shams-ud-din, who was permitted to ascend the throne but exercised no power; and died after a reign of little more than three years. He was succeeded by another puppet Shihāb-ud-din Bāyazīd. In the list of the kings of Bengal on page 685 the name of Shams-ud-din does not appear at all; but Shihāb-ud-din Bāyazīd succeeded him in 815, and appears to have reigned for two years. The two accounts contradict each other. The account on page 266 appears to be incorrect. Shamsu-d-din and Shihāb-u-d-din, which are two names given in the Riyāz, page 112, to the same man, have been given to two men, one of whom did not exist at all. It may be mentioned, however, that Lane-Poole has both Shams-al-din and Shihāb-al-din in his list on page 307.

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have اورنگ, but the other MS. has اورنگ.
2 The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other MS. it is simply راجہ کانس ذکر حکومت کانس.
3 The readings are slightly different. The reading in the MS. is not very clear, but appears to be شروارا کتابت کردن; the meaning of which is not at all clear. The lith. ed. has very distinctly شروارا کتابت کردن the meaning of which is also obscure. کتابت کردن means to suffice, to serve, to do, also to spare. The meaning of the reading in the MSS. may be "undid his wickedness"; and that of the reading in the lith. ed., "was kind to his son"; but I am not sure of either of these.

The Ṭabaqāt gives no information of as to the events of the reign of the Kāns or Ganesh; and of his attitude towards the Musalmāns. The Riyāz, p. 113, says he persecuted them, and murdered many of them, including many
The period of the power of Kâns was seven years.

learned and holy men, such as Shaikh Badrul Islâm, son of Shaikh Mu'nu-d-din 'Abbas. Then the saintly Nûr Qutbu-l-'Alam wrote to Sultân Ibrahim Sharqi to come and invade Bengâl, and save the Musalmans of the country from the persecution of this cruel and inhuman kafir. Ibrahim Sharqi accordingly invaded Bengal, and encamped at Firuzpur (i.e., Pandua). Kâns then went to the saint, and begged him to intercede in his favour so that Sultân Ibrahim might go back. The saint refused to do so, unless he consented to accept Islâm; but his wife refused to allow him to do so. Upon this he brought his son, Jadû, who was then twelve years of age, and said, I have now become too old and have little to do with this world; but I have brought my son, and offer him as a proselyte to Islam. Then the saint took some pân which he was chewing out of his mouth and put it into the boy's mouth; and made him recite the creed of Musalman faith. After that he persuaded Sultân Ibrahim, much against his will, to go back to Jaumpur; where he died shortly after this. After his death Kâns again commenced his persecution of the Musalmans. He also tried to make Jadû a Hindu again, by passing him through a golden image of a cow, portions of which were afterwards given to Brahmins. He commenced to persecute and kill the servants and relations of Nûr Qutbu-l-'Alam himself. He even put the son of the saint, who was named Shaikh Anwar, to death; but he himself died at the very time when Shaikh Anwar became a martyr (pp. 113-116).

The account given by Firishtah is entirely different. According to it although Râja Kâns never became a Musalmaan, he mixed much with, and had great love for the followers of the faith, so much so, that many believed him to have become a Musalmaan, and wanted to bury his dead body.

The account in the Riyâz has been accepted by historians in preference to that of Firishtah. It appears from Bhattasali's account (pp. 117-122) that it is substantially correct: the only serious mistake in it, being the statement that Ganesh or Kâns resumed sovereign power after the death of Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi. As a matter of fact Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi died long after the death of Raja Ganesh, which took place in 821 A.H., 1418 A.D., which is the last coin of Danujamarddana Deva (title assumed by Ganesh after his second accession); and also of Mahendra Deva's coins from Pandua and Chittagong. Mahendra Deva was the title assumed by Jadu or Jalaluddin, after his second accession, after the death of his father, and before his second conversion to Islam. Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi died in 840 A.H., 1436 A.D. It would appear that Ganesh resumed his power after the death of Nur-Kutub 'Alam, when he began his second persecution of the Musalmans, and banished and afterwards put to death Nur-Kutub 'Alam's son Shaikh Anwar. After this he assumed the title of Danujamarddana Deva; and coins were struck by him in 820 A.H., in Chittagong, Sonargaon and Pandua, and in 821 A.H., in Pandua have been
An account of Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-dīn, son of Kāns.

As Kāns went to his original abode (i.e., I suppose hell), his son, owing to his love of rule became a Musalmān, and assumed the name of Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-dīn. The people were contented and happy during his time; and at the end of the year 812 A.H. he passed away.

The period of his reign was seventeen years.

found. Coins of Mahendra Deva bearing the date 821 A.H., and struck at Pandua and Chittagong have also been found.

The Cambridge History of India (pp. 266, 267) agrees generally with Bhattasali; but it does not mention Danujamarddana Dēva or Mahendra Deva; and according to it Ganesh died in 817 A.H., 1414 A.D.; and Jadū or Jalāl-ud-dīn succeeded him in that year.

There are slight differences in the heading. The heading in the text is that in the lith. ed. One MS. has the same heading up to ّ بن bin, but has left out the word Kāns by mistake. The other MS. has simply an account of Sulṭān Jalāl-ud-dīn.

Both MSS. omit the word أَو after بَن. Both MSS. is اننی عشر و ثمانیالله. The lith. ed. has اننی عشر و ثمانیالله. Both are incorrect. He died in 834 or 835 A.H. Some account of him has been given in note 2, page 859 of the type-script. The Tabaqat says: the people were contented and happy in his reign. The Rīyāz, p. 118, gives a different account. According to it he converted many infidels to Islam, and forced the Brahmins who had partaken of portions of the golden image of the cow to eat beef. He became a disciple of Shaikh Zāhid, grandson of Nur Qutb-Il-‘Alam, and nephew of Shaikh Anwar. It is also said, of course, that people were happy and contented; and the population of Pandua became very large; and he erected a mosque, etc., in Gaur; and the re-population of Gaur commenced in his time.

Firishtah's account is different. He gives him the name of Jaimal and says that he offered to abdicate in favour of his younger brother, if the chief men of the country objected to him, on the ground of his being a Musalmān; but they in an extremely tolerant way said, that religion did not in any way affect worldly affairs. According to Firishtah also he became the Nūshirwān of the age, i.e., the ideally just ruler.

Bhattasali (p. 112) says he became zealous Muhammadian, converted many to the Muslim Faith, recalled Shaikh Zahid from Sonargaon and showed him every respect. He also quotes Firishtah's account; and it appears that the copy of Firishta from which he quoted gives Jeetmal as his Hindu name.

The Cambridge History of India, page 267, says: "He persecuted the Hindus, as his father had persecuted the Muslims. ............. and hosts of
An account of Sultan Ahmad, son of Sultan Jalal-ud-din.

As the inevitable happened to Sultan Jalal-ud-din, the amirs

Hindus are said to have been forcibly converted to Islam. It also considers it probable that the present "numerical superiority of Muslims in Eastern Bengal is due to an immense wave of proselytisation, (which) must have swept over the country, and it is most probable that the period was the reign of Jalal-ud-din Muhammad".

It appears to me, however, that the numerical superiority of the Musalmāns in Eastern Bengal exists chiefly among Musalmāns of the lower classes; and low caste Hindūs (many of whom were untouchables) did not require much persuasion or persecution to accept a religion, according to which they might claim equality with the best.

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. Ahmad Shāh is substituted for Sultan Ahmad. As to the events of this reign Firishtah copies the Tabaqāt word for word, but unfortunately adds a few words of his own, which are totally opposed to the facts as given by the Riyāż. These words are: او نبیپوری بدر بزگوار نمرده، بدادر کوشیده خالیق بسیر را غریق انمام احسام گردانند. Stewart (p. 98) agrees with Firishtah as to the impartial administration of justice by Ahmed Shah; and adds that both the followers of Mohammed and the worshippers of idols were in their attachment to his person. He also says that during his reign Sultan Ibrahim of Joanpore invaded Bengal, and plundered several districts, and carried away many of the inhabitants as slaves. Ahmed Shah unable to contend with him sent an ambassador to Shah Rookh, the son of Timour at Herat. The latter wrote a letter to Sultan Ibrahim, threatening exemplary vengeance, if he did not immediately release the captives, and again molested the King of Bengal. After that Sultan Ibrahim never again invaded Bengal. An extract from Shah Rookh's letter is given by Stewart, who says the letter is taken from Firishtah and adds that the circumstances of the embassy are also confirmed in the "Mutila Assacine", a very eloquent Persian history of Shah Rookh.

There is no mention of the letter in Firishtah lith. ed.; or in Col. Briggs's history; and no mention of this invasion of Bengal by Sultan Ibrahim, in any other history.

The Riyāż, pages 118, 119, gives a very different account of Ahmad Shāh. He was very harsh tempered, tyrannical and blood-thirsty, and shed unrighteous blood; and used to cut open the bodies of pregnant women. When his barbarities reached an extreme point, two of his slaves Shādi Khān and Nāsir Khān, who had attained to the rank of nobility, conspired together, and brought about his death.

Bhattasali's account terminates with the history of Jalaluddin.

The Cambridge History of India says little is known of his reign, and then mentions the aggressions of Ibrahim Sharqi, and the remonstrance of Shāh-
bestowed the title of Sultān Aḥmad on his son and made him the successor of his father. In the end of the year 830 A.H., he sought release from bodily restraints and joined the spiritual existence.

The period of his reign was sixteen years.

4 An account of Nāṣir the slave.

5 When the throne of sovereignty remained unoccupied after the death of Sultān Aḥmad, son of Jalāl-ud-dīn, a slave of his named Nāṣir placed his foot with great audacity on the throne of the empire, and commenced to issue all orders. The amīrs and Malikṣ of Sultān Aḥmad put him to death; and raised one of the grandsons of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Bhāngara to be the ruler.

The period of his rule was seven days, and, according to another account, half a day.

6 An account of Nāṣir Shāh.

When Nāṣir Ghulām (the slave) was put to death, they found out one of the descendants of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Bhāngara, and placing him on the throne of the empire gave him the title of Nāṣir rukh; and goes on to say that towards the end of his reign his tyranny, became unbearable; and he was put to death by Shādi Khān and Nāṣir Khān. Nāṣir Khān forestalled his fellow conspirator, and put him to death and assumed the sovereignty of Bengal (p. 287).

1 One MS. has قرار, by mistake, for خطاب.

2 Both MSS. have در آخر سنه; while the lith. ed. has دار آخر سنه.

I have retained the reading in the lith. ed.

3 One MS. has خلاص خلاصي, the other omits the word by mistake; while the lith. ed. has خلاص.

4 The reading in one MS. is as I have it in the text. In the other MS. Nāṣir-ud-dīn is substituted for Nāṣir. The lith. ed. has ذكر حكومت ناصر الدين an account of the rule of Nāṣir-ud-dīn.

5 The Riyāż, Firishtah, Col. Briggs and Stewart all agree generally. The Cambridge History of India, page 287, contrary to all the other authorities, makes Nāṣir the slave and Nāṣir-ud-dīn Mahmūd one and the same person. Lane-Poole (p. 308) also has Nāṣir-al-dīn Mahmūd Shāh II, who was apparently the slave, and also the first Sultān of the house of Ilīyās (restored) apparently as one and the same person.

6 The heading in the text is the heading in both MSS. The lith. ed. inserts the word حكومت, rule, before Nāṣir Shāh.

7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have دادند, but the other MS. has داد.
Shāh. All classes of men, common and noble, and great and small were happy and contented in the cradle of peace and safety. And in the end, in the year 862 A.H., he passed away.

The period of his reign was ¹ two years.

² An account of Bārbak Shāh.

When Nāṣir Shāh died, the amirs and the great men of the country seated Bārbak Shāh on the throne of sovereignty. In his time the residents of the city and the soldiery were in a state of contentment. He also passed his time in pleasure and enjoyment. When the period of his life and the days of his existence came to an end, in the year 879 A.H., he ³ passed away.

¹ Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. have two years. This is manifestly incorrect. The period from 830 A.H., the year of the death of Sultān Aḥmad to 862 A.H., the year of Nāṣir Shāh’s death is thirty-two years. The ۳۰ in the text is a mistake for ﺔ۰ or 32. The accounts of this reign, as given in the Riyāz and by Firistaḥ, Col. Briggs and Stewart generally agree with the text. The Riyāz, page 120, adds that he erected some of the buildings, and the fort of Gaur. As to the length of his reign, he says that it was thirty-two years, but according to others did not exceed twenty-seven years. Stewart (p. 100) also says that he constructed the fortification round the city of Gour.

As to the Cambridge History of India, see note on page 418. According to it the period of his reign was seventeen years from 846 to 864 A.H., 1442 to 1460 A.D.

² The heading in both MSS. is as I have in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word sultānat before Bārbak Shāh. The Riyāz (text-edition, p. 118) agrees generally as to the account of this reign, but adds مرمد دانشمند ومتشور بود. It appears from a note on page 120 of Salam’s translation of the Riyāz that his full name was Rukn-u-d-din Abul Mujahid Barbak Shāh, that he reigned from 864 A.H., and that before that he was governor of south-west Bengal in 860 A.H. Firistaḥ copies the Tabaqāt as regards the early part of the account, but adds that he was the first sovereign of India who employed Abyssinians and raised them to high rank. Neither the Cambridge History of India nor Stewart has anything new about him; but both mention his employment of the Abyssinians. The Cambridge History of India (p. 268) says he reigned from 1450 to 1474 A.D., or for fifteen years.

³ One MS. and the lith. ed. have رحلت نمود; but the other MS. has شروع در مرحله پیمانی عالم نیستی کرد. This MS. is very imperfect here. The words quoted are taken from the latter part of the accounts of the reign of Yūsuf Shāh, the next Sultān, the earlier part of the account of whose reign is altogether omitted in it.
The period of his reign was 1 seventeen years.

2 An Account of Yusuf Shâh.

After the death of Bârbak Shâh, the amîrs and the well-known men of the kingdom placed Yusuf Shâh on the throne of government. He was a patient bâdshâh and a well-wisher of his subjects, and of a virtuous disposition. He began to measure the stages to the world of non-existence (i.e., died) in the year 887 A.H.

The period of his sovereignty was seven years and six months.

3 An Account of Sikandar Shâh.

4 After the death of Yusuf Shâh, 5 the amîrs and vazîrs placed

---

1 One MS. has ten years. The other has ٟهِغْتِ سَال و شَش مَال (omitting the word مُال) which was the period of the reign of Yusuf Shâh. The lith. ed. has seventeen years which is correct and which I have adopted.

2 One MS. omits the heading and the first part of the account of this reign, and joins the latter part on to the account of the reign of Bârbak Shâh. See note on page 416. The other MSS. have the heading which I have in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word حكومت before Yusuf Shâh.

The account of this reign in the Tabaqât appears to be copied from the Riyâż (text-edition, p. 110) which adds the virtues of being صاحب علم و رياضي, i.e., learned and abstemious, to those mentioned in the Tabaqât, and explains خير خروة by adding the word شمس الظفر Yusuf Shâh; and he appears to have reigned from 879 A.H. According to Firishtah he was very strict in the observance of the law of the Prophet. Stewart (p. 101) says he was very strict about the administration of justice, and enjoined on all judges to act with the strictest impartiality.

The Cambridge History of India (p. 268) calls him "a preciseion".

3 The heading in the MS. is as I have in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word sultanat before the name of Sikandar Shâh. The Riyâż (p. 121) calls Sikandar the son of Yusuf Shâh but the other historians, except the Cambridge History of India (p. 268) which also says that he was Yusuf's son, do not say so. Stewart (p. 101) says that Yusuf Shâh died without children, so the nobles raised a youth of the royal family to the throne. The Riyâż (p. 121) says that he was deposed on the very day on which he was placed on the throne. The Aini-Akbari gives him half a day. Firishtah mentions no period; and Stewart (p. 101) gives him two months.

4 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بعد أم فوت. The other MS. omits the word ام.

5 There are differences in the readings. One MS. has ووزرا بي نمتي نظر This I have adopted. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has the same
Sikandar Shāh on the throne of the empire without careful enquiries. 1 As he did not possess the qualifications or the right of being invested with this high office, they removed him from it, and 2 raised Fatḥ Shāh to the chieftainship.

The period of Sikandar Shāh's reign was two 3 and a half days.

4 An account of Fatḥ Shāh.

After the deposition of Sikandar Shāh, the amirs and the great men raised Fatḥ Shāh to the chieftainship and placed him on the throne of the empire. He was intelligent and wise; and placing the usages of ancient rulers and Sulṭāns in the forefront of his spirit, distributed word. The other MS. has امراء و وزانين بعد امتحان و تممتم نظر امراء و وزانين تممتم نظر. The lith. ed. has امراء و وزانين بعد امتحان و تممتم نظر امراء و وزانين تممتم نظر.

1 Here again the readings are different. One MS. has چون استحفاقت ولد این عمر خنظر نداست. I have adopted this but have changed عمر which is manifestly incorrect, for امر. The other MS. omits the word استحفاقت and substitutes for عمر. The lith. ed. omits the word ولد and has استحفاقت این امر.

2 One MS. has by mistake بسرداری برداری برداشتن.

3 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has نیم روز, half a day, in the text-edition.

4 Here again the heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text; but the lith. ed. inserts the word sulṭanat before the name of Fatḥ Shāh.

The Riyāz (p. 119) says he was another son of Yūsuf Shāh. Otherwise the Ṭabaqāt agrees with it. His full name was Jalāl-ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Fatḥ Shāh. He is said to have reigned from 887 to 896 A.H., but his coins and inscriptions show that he was already reigning in 886 A.H. Some of the coins of 886 were struck at Fathabad (now Faridpūr town) which was named after him.

Firīshṭāh says that Fatḥ Shāh punished with the scourge of justice the eunuchs and Ḥabshi slaves, who had become powerful and violent. So they went to the chief eunuch called the Sulṭān Shāhzhāda Bangāli, who was in charge of all the men who attended by turns (مردم نوینی) ; and also had the keys of all the palaces. It so happened that the eunuch Khān Jahān, the vazir and Malik Andil Ḥabshi, the Amīr-ul-umarā, were engaged in punishing the Rāys of the frontier, with a picked body of the army; so Sulṭān Shāhzhāda could carry out his nefarious purpose with impunity.

The Cambridge History of India, page 206, contrary to the Riyāz, says that Fatḥ Shāh was a great uncle of Sikandar, and a son of Mahmūd which I suppose means Naṣīr-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh.
favours to everyone in accordance with his condition and rank. In his time the doors of pleasure and enjoyment remained open in the faces of the people.

As there was a custom in the country of Bangālah, that five thousand pāiks attended every night for watch and ward, and early in the morning, the bādshāh came out, and sat on the throne for a moment, and took their salute, and gave them permission to go away, when another body of pāiks came into attendance.

On one occasion, the chief eunuch of Fath Shāh tempted the pāiks with money and they slew the Sultān. Early the next morning the eunuch himself sat on the throne, and took the salute of the pāiks. This event occurred in the year 896 A.H.

The period of the rule of Fath Shāh was seven years and five months.

They say that during some years, there was such a custom in Bangālah, that whoever slew a ruler, and sat on the throne, everyone became submissive and obedient to him. 1

1 An account of Bārbak Shāh.

As the wretched Khwājah Sarāi after murdering his master took the title of bādshāh, all the eunuchs, wherever they were, collected

1 The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word حکومت Hikmat before Bārbak Shāh.

The Riyāż (p. 121) agrees generally, but says the eunuch styled himself Sultān Shāhzāda. It goes on to say that he tried to destroy the powerful nobles. The most powerful of them, the Abyssinian Malik Andil, who was at the frontier wanted to come to the capital. Bārbak also wanted to bring him there so that he might, by fraud and deceit, put him into prison. He therefore summoned him, and on Malik Andil's coming made him swear on the Qurān that he would not injure him in any way. Malik Andil took the oath, with the reservation that he would not do so as long as Bārbak was on the throne. He then schemed to avenge the murder of his benefactor. He got into the palace, and found the eunuch asleep on the throne. On account of his oath he was unable to kill him; but the eunuch who was drunk rolled down. Malik Andil drew his sword, but was unable to kill the eunuch. After this there was a Homeric struggle between the two in the dark. In the end Malik Andil got others to join in the attack and the eunuch was killed.

Malik Andil then summoned the vazīrs and a council was held to select a suitable person to succeed to the throne. Fath Shāh had left a son who was-
together round him; and he allured mean and low spirited men with wealth, and, strengthening their allegiance with false promises, assembled them round him. His pomp and strength increased day by day; but in the end the great *amirs* who had many retainers 2 joined together; and on one occasion having united the *pāiks* with themselves, slew him.

The period of his reign was two and a 3 half months.

4 **AN ACCOUNT OF FIRŪZ SHĀH.**

When the eunuch who had the title of Bārbak Shāh was killed, the *amirs* and the well-known men raised Firūz Shāh to the chieftainship; and the throne. All the nobles then went to the widow of Fath Shāh. She said she had made a vow that the throne should belong to the person who should slay her husband's murderer. Malik Andil at first declined to accept the crown, but was finally persuaded to do so (pp. 122-124).

Firishtah and Stewart and the Cambridge History of India follow the Riyāz generally; but the Cambridge History of India (p. 289), contrary to all the others, calls Malik Andil Indil Khan; I do not know the authority for doing so. He was certainly not a Khān but was a Malik. As to Andil or Indil, I know no Persian or Arabic word like either. There is a colloquial Bengāli word *Andil*, which means much; but I do not know whether it has any connection with the name. In any case I prefer to follow the older historians, instead of accepting the new spelling.

---

1 One MS. has منظر instead of منظرة by mistake.
2 There are differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have اتفاق نوودة نورتني گروه پاکانیا, which I have struck out. The other MS. has اتفاق نوودة و گروه کرده گروه پاکانیا. The latter reading appears to be somewhat better, but as the other MS. and the lith. ed. both give the other, I have adopted it, with the slight correction I have mentioned. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has followed the second MS. in the text-edition.
3 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has دو عاہ و نم روز or two months and half a day as the period of his reign in the text-edition.
4 The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word *sulṭanat* before the name Firūz Shāh.
5 The Ṭabaqāt does not say that it was Malik Andil who assumed the title of Firūz Shāh.
6 It appears from the Riyāz (p. 125) that he took up his residence in Gaur, where he erected a mosque, a tower and a reservoir. He had done great deeds-
ship. He was a merciful and benevolent king. When the number of the days of his life were folded up (i.e., finished), he passed away by natural death in the year 899 A.H. But another statement is that the pāik watchmen killed him.

The period of his rule was three years.

1 An account of Mahmūd Shāh.

When Firūz Shāh passed away, the amirs and the great men placed his son on the throne of the empire, giving him the title of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh. He was a bādshāh endowed with the moral qualities of the great.

as a general and an administrator; and he was respected and feared when he ascended the throne. He was a just and efficient ruler, but his great fault was his prodigality, and he lavished the treasures accumulated by the former Sultāns on beggars and mendicants. As to his death, the Riyāž (p. 125) says that the statement that he was killed by the pāiks appears to be more correct than that he died a natural death. His full name appears from his coins to have been Saifu-d-din Abul Muẓaffar Firuz Shāh. His coins show that he reigned from 893 A.H., to 895 A.H., and not during the three years ending in 897 A.H., as stated in the histories (p. 124).

Firishtah and Stewart mention no new facts about him. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 696, he reigned from 891 to 894 A.H.

1 The heading in the MS. is as I have it in the text. In the lith. ed. it is ذكر محمود شاه بن فرزو شاه.

The full name of Sultān Mahmūd appears to have been Nāṣir-ud-din Abul Muẓaffar Mahmūd Shāh. According to the Riyāž (p. 126) he was only a Sultān in name. During the early months of his brief reign, an Abyssinian of the name of Habah Khan usurped all the authority. The Sultān Bādh Dīwāna, another Abyssinian, slew Habah Khan, and became the de facto ruler. After some time, he got the sardârs of the pāiks to join him; and one night slew Mahmūd Shāh; and with the concurrence of the amirs and the officers of the court, proclaimed himself Sultān under the title of Muẓaffar Shāh.

The Riyāż (p. 126) also says, that according to the history of Haji Muhammad Qandahari, Mahmūd Shāh was the son of Fath Shāh, and not of Malik Andil or Firūz Shāh. He had been brought up by Jashn Khan, a slave of Bārbag Shāh, under the orders of Firuz Shāh; and after the latter’s death was placed on the throne. The name Jashn Khan appears to be a copyist’s mistake for Habah Khan.

Firishtah agrees generally with the Riyāż. He gives the name of the slave who brought Sultān Mahmūd up as Ḥabsh Khān and not Jashn Khān.
A slave of the name of Saiyidī Muẓaffar Ḥabshi having got the 
urdārs and the paīks to combine with him, made Maḥmūd Shāh 
a martyr one night; and early the next morning ascended the throne 
of the empire, giving himself the title of Muẓaffar Shāh. 

The period of the reign of Maḥmūd Shāh was one year.

1 An account of Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshi.

When Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshi took the place of the great by force 
and violence, darkness spread over the world. He was an audacious 

1 I have adopted the reading in the lith. ed. Those in the MSS. are very 
imperfect. One has only Muẓaffar Shāh, and the other has دَرَك مَطْفَر حِبْشِيُّ. 
His name according to his inscriptions and coins was Alau-d-dīn Abul Muẓaffar 
Shāh (Salam’s translation of Riāż, p. 128, note 2). From his coins it appears 
that he reigned from 896 to 899 A.H., i.e., from 1491 to 1494 A.H.

According to the Riāż (p. 127) Muẓaffar ascended the throne at Gaur. 
He was extremely audacious and blood-thirsty; and put many learned and pious 
men and nobles and the Rajahs to death. He appointed Syed Husain a 
Sharif of Mecca (who is called one of Muẓaffar’s sīpāhis in the Ṭabaqāt) to be 
his minister, and made over to him all powers. Afterwards he added avarice 
to his other iniquities; and according to the advice of Syed Husain, he reduced 
the wages of his cavalry and infantry men; and also collected the revenue with 
great harshness. Then the great amīrs rebelled against him; and he shut himself 
up in the fort of Gaur. The siege lasted for four months; and Muẓaffar is said 
to have slain four thousand men, who had been seized and brought to him from 
time to time with his own hand. Then he came out of the fort, and a drawn 
battle took place between his men and the amīrs now headed by Syed Husain. 
The latter were victorious and Muẓaffar was slain. It is also stated, that 
according to Hajī Muhammad Qandaharī, one hundred and twenty thousand 
men, Musalmān and Hindus were slain during this civil war. The Riāż (p. 128) 
then quotes from Ṭabaqāt, what is stated in the latter about the manner in 
which Muẓaffar was slain.

Firishtah and Stewart give no further information. The Cambridge 
History of India, page 270, calls the minister, who according to the Riāż 
was called Syed Husain, Sharīf Makt, Saiyid ‘Alā-u-d-dīn Husain, who belonged 
to a family which came from Tarmūz on the Oxus; and it also states that this 
man probably restrained Muẓaffar’s violence, while according to the Riāż and 
Firishtah the reduction in the pay of the soldiers, which was one of the causes 
of the rebellion, took place at his instance. It appears from what is stated in 
the account of the reign of Sultān ‘Alau-d-dīn, in the Riāż that the name of 
Sultān ‘Alau-d-dīn before his accession was Syed Husain Sharīf Makt, that 
his father Syed Ashrafal-Husainī was probably Sherif of Mecca, but the family
and blood-thirsty man. He raised many learned and pious men to the rank of martyrdom. In the end one of his soldiers, of the name of 'Alā-ud-dīn, having made the sardārs and the paiks friendly and in league with him, entered the seraglio one night with thirteen paiks, and slew him. Early the next morning, he sat on the throne and gave himself the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn.

The period of the reign of Muzaffar Shāh Ḥabshi was three years and five months.

1 An account of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn.

Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn 2 was an intelligent and able man and was a soldier. He showed favour to the amirs of old lineage; and he also came from Tarmūz or Tarmūj in Tukestān. Sayyid Husain and his brother Sayyid Yūnūf came with their father to Bengal; and settled in Chandpur in Raḍha, of western Bengal. According to Blochmann, however, this Chandpūr was really situated near 'Alāīpūr in the present district of Khūna. It appears also that although Sayyid Husain adopted the title of 'Alāuddīn Abul Muzaffar Husain Shāh, his name is universally known as Husain Shāh; and that name is found on various inscriptions on the edifices in Gaūr; and according to Blochmann (J.A.S.B. for 1873, page 291) "the name of Husain Shāh the good" is still remembered from the frontiers of Orissa to the Brahmputra". The statement in the Cambridge History of India (p. 270) about the original name of 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh being Sayyid 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain appears to be incorrect.

1 The heading in one MS. and the lith. ed. is ذکر سلطان علاء الدين; in the other it is only سلطان علاء الدين; I have retained the former.

2 The lith. ed. has the word ʻAlā-ud-dīn before Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; but as both MSS omit it, I have also omitted it. The account of his reign in the Ṭabaqāt is very imperfect. According to the Riyāz (pp. 129-136), although he became a good and great Sultān, his conduct does not appear to have been quite straightforward before his accession. Although he was in the service of Sultān Muzaffar he always spoke to everyone of the latter's meanness and avarice. In this way his own virtues and the vices of his master became known to everybody; so when Muzaffar was killed, the chiefs and the people readily consented to his becoming his successor. Then the way in which he rewarded the people, who raised him to the throne, was extremely objectionable. He allowed them to plunder and ravage the city of Gaur. Some days after his accession, he ordered the men to cease plundering, and when they did not do so, he had twelve thousand of them put to death. As a result of searching the houses of the wealthy he collected much wealth including thirteen hundred golden dishes.
raised his own special servants to high ranks and eminent positions. He removed the *paiks* from the duty of watch and ward, so that no injury might be caused to him by them. He summoned learned, great and pious men from different parts of the kingdom, and showed kindness to them. He made very great efforts and exertions for enriching and improving the condition of the country; and he allotted many villages for defraying the expenses of the alms houses, attached to the tomb of that leader of the wayfarers (in the path of the law), Shaikh Nūr Qūṭb ʿĀlam, may his soul be sanctified! He came eyery year from Ekdāla, which was the seat of his government to Pandūmah, with the object of circumambulating the tomb, which was the recipient of illumination, of Shaikh Nūr.

Owing to the auspiciousness of his laudable morals, and pleasing virtues he performed the duties of sovereignty for long years; and all his life was passed in pleasure and enjoyment. And in the end in the year 929 A.H., he passed away by death from natural causes. The period of his reign was twenty-seven years and some months.

---

His evil deeds ceased after this. He removed the *paiks* from the work of watch and ward; and banished all the Habshis; and he employed Syeds, Mughals and Afghans in position of trust. He subjugated the Rajas of the country, and having conquered as far as Orissa levied tribute from the rulers of that country. He then invaded Assam; and conquered that country as far as Kāmrūp and Kāmtah (Kāmaksha (?)). He left his son there with a large army, and returned to Bengal. Afterwards when the rains commenced, the Rajas, who had fled to the mountains, returned; and his army was defeated, and his son was slain.

The Riyāz then mentions his charities and his religious endowments.

In the year 900 A.H., Sultān Ḥusain Sharqi on being defeated by Sikandar Lodi took refuge in Kahlgaon (Colgong), where he was received with honour and where he passed his remaining years.

Sultān ʿAlau-d-din died of natural causes in 927 A.H. The period of his reign was, according to different authorities, twenty-seven years, twenty-four years and twenty-nine years and five months. He had fourteen sons and one of them, Nāgrat Shāh, succeeded him.

Firishtah does not mention any fresh fact. Stewart (p. 110) says that Ala Addeen Hussein Shah came from the sandy deserts of Arabia to the fertile region of Bengal.

The Cambridge History of India also adds nothing to what is stated in the Riyāz. According to it his reign lasted for twenty-five years (p. 272). The words و سباً and a soldier, are omitted in the text-edition.
1 AN ACCOUNT OF NAŞİB ŞĀH.

When Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-dīn passed away, the amīrs and the great men of the time raised 2 Naşib Şāh from amongst his eighteen sons to the chieftainship (i.e., to be the Sulṭān). 3 He, trusting his brothers, conferred on each one of them, double of what their father had bestowed on them.

And when, in the year 932 A.H., His Majesty Firdūs Makānī Zahir-ud-dīn Muḥammad Bābar Bādshāh, having slain Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Lūdi, son of Sulṭān Sikandar Lūdi, took possession of the country of Dehlī, the amīrs and the heads of 4 the various groups of Afghāns fled and came as suppliants to 5 Naşib Şāh. After some days, Sulṭān Maḥmūd, brother of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm also came to him, 6 as a suppliant. Naşib Şāh bestowed on all of them jāgīrs, as far as possible and depending on the exigencies of the time. 7 He also prayed for the hand of the daughter of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm for himself.

In 8 the year 939 A.H. he sent by the hand of the eunuch Malik Marjān to Sulṭān Bahādur Gujrāṭī, fine and beautiful presents, in

---

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. The lith. ed. has ذكر سلطان نصب شاه, an account of the reign of Naşib Şāh. Both headings are incorrect. It appears that the correct name of the eldest son of 'Alā-ud-dīn Ḥusain Shah was Naşib Khān; and he assumed the title of Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn Abul Muẓaffar Naşrat Şāh. The Riyāţ, however, says that his name or title was Naṣrat Şāh; and he was commonly known as Naşib Şāh.

2 The name is Naşir Şāh in one MS, and in the lith. ed. and Naşib Şāh in the other MS. I have adopted Naşib Şāh.

3 This was quite unusual for the age. The Riyāţ (text, p. 136) says بندیدہ کو نہیں کوئی کہ اور نظر آئے امیدہ اس بود کہ برادران ر حمیس و قید ندادے- مساغہ هارکی ہے گرا. ایک انہوں پہر عثمان فرمودے بود- دو چند ساخت. Other historians have also mentioned this generous action.

4 The readings in the MSS. are و سرائ گروہ افغان و سرائ گروہ و افغان and و سرائ گروہ افغان. The lith. ed. has و سرائ گروہ افغان, which appears to me to be better than the other readings, and I have retained it.

5 Here both the MSS. have Nصب شاه Naşib Şāh.

6 One MS. and the lith. ed. have پاڑہ ملنجی شد, but the other MS. has پاڑہ ملنجی.

7 As was usual under the circumstances he married her.

8 The reason of this embassy to Sulṭān Bahādur Şāh of Gujrāt which was sent in 939 A.H., is said in the Riyāţ (pp. 137, 138) to have been a report that Humāyūn after his accession intended to conquer Bengal.
order to secure relation, attachment and friendship. Malik Marjān waited on Sultān Bahādur in the fort of Mandū and was honoured by the gift of a special robe of 1 honour. No account of the Bengāḷa has after this come under my eyes. Naṣīb Shāh ruled for a period of eleven years. After him, Bangāḷah came within a short time into the possession of Shēr Khān. When His Majesty Jinnat Ashīānī came into Bangāḷah, in pursuit of Shēr Khān, Jahāngīr Qulī Bēg ruled (the country) on behalf of him. Afterwards Shēr Khān slew Jahāngīr Qulī Bēg, and took possession of the country, as has been mentioned in its place. Then Muḥammad Khān, one of the amīrs of Salīm Khān, son of Shēr Khān, governed the country for a time. After him, his son gave himself the title of Sultān Bahādur, and raised the standard of rule. The government of Bangāḷah and Behār was then held by Sulaimān Kararānī, one of the amīrs of Salīm Khān. He ruled independently for a period of 2 nine years, and also took possession of the

1 Nizām-ud-dīn gives no account of the death of Naṣīb Shāh. It appears from the Riyāż and other histories, that contrary to the mildness which he had shown in the beginning of his reign, he now indulged in evil deeds, and committed acts of oppression; so the eunuchs, one of whom he had threatened with punishment, combined together and killed him in the year 943 A.H. The period of his reign is variously given. The Riyāż (p. 138) says that he reigned for sixteen years, but according to some thirteen years, or less than that, Firuštāḥ gives him sixteen years from 927 to 943 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 350–352) says he reigned from 930 A.H., 1523 A.D., to 945 A.H., 1538 A.D. i.e., for about fifteen years; but he says also that he had a reign of eighteen years. According to Stewart (pp. 114–117) he reigned for thirteen years 1521 A.D. to 1533–34 A.D. Lane-Poole (p. 308) gives him fourteen years from 925 A.H., 1518 A.D., to 939 A.H., 1532 A.D., and the Cambridge History of India (p. 696) fifteen years from 1518 to 1533 A.D.

2 There are differences as to the period of Sulaimān Kararānī’s rule. One MS. has seven years; the other has the word sāl, year without any number. The lith. ed. has one year. There is much diversity also in the other histories as to the period of his rule. The Riyāż (p. 153) says he ruled independently for sixteen years, and died in 981 A.H. Firuštah says he had the Khuṭba read in his own name, but called himself Haḍrat A‘lā, and sent presents to Akbar from time to time; and after reigning for about twenty-five years died in 981 A.H. Stewart (pp. 149, 150) says he reigned from 972 when he came from Behar to Bengal till his death in 981 A.H., affecting to hold his kingdom under Akbar. In the Cambridge History of India, the name of Sulaimān does not appear in the Index at all but in the list of the Kings of Bengal on page 696, he is shown as having reigned in 980 A.H. for some months only.
country of Orissa. Although he had not had the Khuṭba read in his own name, still he assumed the title of Ḥadrat Ālā’. When he died, his son succeeded him; but his rule did not extend beyond thirteen days. He was killed by the efforts (machinations) of his own relations. The government was then allotted to his brother Dāūd. He made dying struggles for a period of two years, till he was defeated in the year 982 A.H. by Khān Khānān, who was the commander-in-chief of the army of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī; and the country of Bangālah was conquered. Afterwards in the year 984 A.H., he was slain by Khān Jahān, who after Khān Khānān had been honoured with the government of Bangālah, as has been narrated in its own place. And up to this day, which is the year 1002 Ḥijrī, the country of Bangālah and Ekdāla are in the possession of the servants of the powerful empire.

SECTION VII. THE SECTION ABOUT THE SHARQĪ SULTĀNS.

The Sharqi Sultāns ruled in the country of Jaunpūr and the neighbouring tracts from the beginning of the year 784 A.H. to

1 His name is Bāyazīd.
2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have كرندن, but the other MS. has كردن. The lith. ed. is very incorrect. The MSS. agree; but whereas the total period is said to be 97 years, the total of the different reigns come to over one hundred and twelve years. I have compared the list with those given by Lane-Poole, page 309, and by the Cambridge History of India, page 701. It was somewhat difficult to find the latter list, for in the Index page 701, it is not mentioned either against Jaunpur or against the Sharqi dynasty. Comparing these lists with that in the text, I find that the names agree, except that the fifth name is Mahmūd Shāh in the list in the text while it is Muhammad Shāh in the other list; but the periods differ. No. 1, has sixteen years in the Tabaqāt, but only 6 in the other lists. The difference in the case of No. 2 is negligible. Ibrāhīm, No. 3, who has forty years in the Tabaqāt has forty-one years according to the A.H. chronology and forty years according to the A.D. chronology in Lane-Poole, while the Cambridge History of India gives him only 36 A.H. or 31 A.D. years. No. 4 who has twenty-one years in the Tabaqāt, has 17 A.H. years or 16 A.D. years according to Lane-Poole, and 22 years both A.H. and A.D. according to the Cambridge History of India. No. 5, who has 5 years according to the Tabaqāt has 2 years according to the Lane-Poole and less than.
the year 881 A.H., which was a period of ninety-seven years. (The
rulers were):—
Sultān-ush-sharq, Khwājah Jahān, sixteen years;
Mubārak Shāh Sharqi, one year and some months;
Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqi, forty years and some months;
Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Ibrāhīm, twenty-one years and some
months;
Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, five years;
Sultān Ḥusain, son of Maḥmūd, nineteen years;

1 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN-USH-SHARQ.

It is traditionally recorded that when the turn of the reign of
Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān 2 Muḥammad, son of Firūz Shāh came,
he sent the eunuch, Malik Sarwar, on whom Sultān Muḥammad Shāh
had conferred the title of Khwājah Jahān to the country of Jaumpūr,
after bestowing on him the title of Sultān-ush-sharq; and conferred
the government of that country on him. When Sultān Maḥmūd lost
his (power and) grandeur, Sultān-ush-sharq became completely inde-
pendent; and having punished the insurgents of parganas Kōl and
Itāwah, 3 Kampilah and Bahraich, brought all the territory from the

---

1 year according to the Cambridge History of India. No. 6 has 19 years according
to the Tabaqāt, but 18 years according to Lane-Poole from 863 to 881 A.H.,
when he fled to Bengal, and 22 A.H. years or 21 A.D. years according to the
Cambridge History of India. It appears to me that it is impossible to have a
correct list of the periods of the different reigns.

1 The heading in the MS. is as I have it in the text. In the lth. ed. the
word سلطان الشرق is inserted before Sultān-ush-sharq.

Firishtah says that the Sultān-ush-sharq was sent to Jaumpūr and Behār
and Tirhūt in Jamadi-ul-āwwal 726 A.H., and he died in 802 A.H.; and the
period of his rule was six years. According to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 359) he was
sent in 796 A.H., which reconciles the discrepancy. The dates in Col. Briggs’s
history agree with those given by Lane-Poole and the Cambridge History of
India.

2 One MS. has Muḥammad which is correct. The other omits the words,
“son of Sultān Muḥammad”, while the lth. ed. has Maḥmūd instead of
Muḥammad.

3 Written as كنبيلة, and كنبيلة in the MSS., and كنبيلة in the lth. ed.
Firishtah lith. ed. has Kōl, Itāwah Bharāich and Kampilah. (كنبلة) all in the Daehr.
direction of Dehli, as far as parganas Kōl and Rāprī, and in the other
direction as far as Behār and Tirhūt under his government. The
country again attained a new grandeur. He again obtained elephants
and other tributes which used to come every year from the country
of Lakhnautī, but which had not come for some years owing to the
weakness of the rulers (of Dehli). His greatness and grandeur made
such an impression on the minds of the zamīndārs (Hindu chieftains),
that they without any demand used every year to send the tribute
that had been fixed.

In the year 802 A.H., the marauding 1 Turk of death robbed the
capital of the life of the Sultān-ush-sharq.

The period of his rule was sixteen years.

2 AN ACCOUNT OF MUBĀRAK SHĀH SHARQI.

When Sultān-ush-sharq died, and about the time when the affairs
of the government of Dehli became more and more disordered; and the
administration became disorganised, Malik Mubārak Qarnful, who was
the adopted son of Sultān-ush-sharq, in concert with the amīrs and
sardārs gave himself the title of Mubārak Shāh, and raised the standard of
government. The Khūṭba was read in his name in the country of
Jaumpūr and in the other countries, which had been in the possession
of Sultān-ush-sharq.

When the news that Sultān-ush-sharq had died, and Malik
Mubārak Qarnful had assumed the title of Mubārak Shāh, reached
Mallū Iqbāl Khān, he in the year 3 803 A.H., collected a large army.
and advanced towards Jaumpūr. On the way, he chastised the insur-

---

1 One MS. omits the word ترک.
2 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. The lith. ed. inserts
the word مبارک شاه شرقی before مسلمات.
3 The year is 803 A.H. in one MS. In the other it is 804 A.H. The reading in the first MS. is correct. Firishta has
that year; further, the year 804 A.H. was crowded with too many events. An
account of these events has been given on pages 283, 284 of vol. 1 of the translation
of this work. Neither Firishta nor the Cambridge History of India
gives any additional facts.
gents of Itāwah and arrived at Kanauj. Mubārak Shāh also collected an army, and came forward to oppose him. As the river Ganges flowed between the two armies, they remained camped opposite each other for two months, and neither had the courage and boldness to place their foot on the field of bravery, and to cross the river. They retired each to their own country without risking a battle. After Mubārak Shāh had arrived at Jaunpūr, news reached him that Sultān Maḥmūd had returned to Dehli from Gujrat; and Mallū Iqbal Khān was again advancing towards Kanauj, taking Sultān Maḥmūd with him. Immediately on hearing this news, he began to collect his army; but death did not give him time; and in the year 804 A.H., he accepted the summons of the just God.

The period of his rule was one year and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN IBRĀHĪM SHARQI.

After the death of Mubārak Shāh, the amīrs of the Sharqī dominions placed his younger brother, to whom they gave the title of Sultān Ibrāhīm, on the 2 seat of the government, and the throne of the empire. All classes of men had rest in his time in the cradle of peace and safety. The learned and the great, who were in distress of mind from the disturbances in the world, turned their faces to Jaunpūr which became at that time the seat of peace; and that metropolis (that is, Jaunpūr) became, from the splendour of their advent, the city of learning. Some books and treatises, such as the 4 "Ḥāshlah";

1 The words are جمعية ندوءة in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and incorrectly حميت ندوءة in the other MS.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have اورنج حكومت; the other MS. has حكومت; I have followed the reading in the first manuscript.

3 Firishtah amplifies and explains this by saying فضلاني مالک مندوستان ودانشندان اپرائ ونوران i.e., the learned men of the country of India, and the wise men of Persia and Turkistan.

4 Firishtah gives some account of these books. They appear to have been all written by Qāḍī Shihāb-ud-din Jaunpūrī, whose native place was Ghaznī, and who had received his education in Daulatbād in the Deccan. Firishtah says that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī held him with such honour that once when he was seriously ill, the Sultān went to make enquiries, and after making them fill a cup with water, and passing it round the head of the sick man, drank
i-Hindi”, “the Bahr-ul-Mawaj”, the “Fatawi-i-Ibrahime Shahi”, the “Irshad” and others (were written in his name). As divine help was always attendant on that world-protecting Badshah, he had necessarily in the beginning of his reign carried off the prize in the field of spirituality from all the sovereigns of Hindustan, in the matter of experience and knowledge of affairs.

In the beginning of his reign he collected an army, and advanced to destroy Sultan Mahmud and Mallul Iqbal Khan, who had the thought of conquering Jaunpur in their heads. When the two armies encamped in front of each other, Sultan Mahmud, on the ground that Mallul Iqbal Khan did not permit him to interfere at all in the affairs of the empire, and did not place before him, for his decision, the facts and circumstances of any administrative problems, went out from his own camp on the pretext of going out to hunt, and joined Sultan Ibrahirum. The latter owing to haughtiness and pride did not perform the duty which he owed to his salt, and delayed and procrastinated in making enquiries (about his health, etc.). Sultan Mahmud feeling aggrieved betook himself to Kanauj; and removing the thanadar of the place, who had been there from before the time of Mubarak Shah, and who was called Amirzadah-i-Harwi (Amirzada of Harat) took possession it off, praying to God, that every danger that might happen to him may ward off him, and should fall on himself. This was like Babar’s offering himself for the recovery of Humayun, but it was more beautiful, being quite disinterested. The Qa’di also loved the Sultan so dearly that he died the same year as the Sultan, though according to another account, he died two years later.

1 One of the MSS. omits 15 or 16 lines from after the word بحر المراج to the words أمراً رخصت جاكي نورد. They are, however, written further on.

2 The words actually used are مضمار معالي. I cannot find any meaning of مضمار which would suit the context.

3 Firishtaah explains, that Sultan Mahmud had expected that Sultan Ibrahime keeping before his eyes the rights and dues of hereditary salt and service, will either raise him to sovereignty, or giving him help, crush Iqbal Khan; but as Ibrahime Sharqil had tasted the joys of sovereignty, and his rule had not yet become quite firm, neither of Sultan Mahmud’s hopes were realised. For another version of these incidents, see page 284 of vol. I of the translation.

4 The word appears to be أميرزاده هروی in the MSS. The lith ed. has أميرزاده هروی. Firishtaah in the corresponding passage has أميرزاده هروی. I have adopted this.
of the place. On hearing this news, Sultan Ibrahim and Mallu, Iqbal Khan went respectively to Jaunpur and Dehli, leaving Kanauj to Sultan Mahmud. It has, however, come to my notice in some histories, that Sultan Mahmud actually went to Mubarak Shah Sharqi; at this time the latter died, and Sultan Ibrahim succeeded him. God only knows the truth!

In the year 807 A.H., Mallu Iqbal Khan again came to besiege Kanauj. Sultan Mahmud with a small number of his special retainers fortified himself, and behaved with bravery. Mallu returned to Dehli disappointed and unsuccessful. And when in the following year he was slain by Khizr Khan in the neighbourhood of Ajodahan, as has been already mentioned, Sultan Mahmud came to Dehli, leaving 1 Malik Mahmud at Kanauj, and sat on the throne of his great ancestors. Sultan Ibrahim availing himself of this great opportunity, determined to conquer Kanauj in the year 809 A.H. Sultan Mahmud marched with the army of Dehli, in order to engage him. The two armies encamped facing each other on the banks of the Ganges; and after a few days went back without fighting to their own territories. When Sultan Mahmud arrived in Dehli, and gave permission to the amirs to go back to their own jajirs, Sultan Ibrahim came back again, and laid siege to Kanauj. After the period of the siege had been protracted to four months, and no help or reinforcements arrived from Dehli, Malik Mahmud prayed for quarter, and surrendered Kanauj. Sultan Ibrahim made over Kanauj to Ikhtyar Khan, and advanced to conquer Dehli. On the way Tattar Khan, son of Sarrang Khan, and Malik 2 Marjan slave of Mallu Iqbal Khan came from Dehli, and joined him. Sultan Ibrahim gaining greater power and strength marched towards Sanbal; and when he arrived there, Asad Khan Ludi abandoned the place and fled. Sultan Ibrahim entrusted Sanbal

1 Called Malik Mahmud Tarmati on page 287 of vol. I of the translation. He is also called ترمتى in Firishtah's account of Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi. It also appears from that account that Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi passed the rainy season at Kanauj; and advanced towards Dehli in the month of Jamadi-ul-awwal, 810 A.H.

2 Called Malik Marhaba on page 288 of vol. I of the translation.
to Tātār Khān, and continued his march towards Dehli. On the way he seized the town of Baran, and made it over to Malik Marjān.

When he arrived on the bank of the 2 Jamunā, his scouts brought the news, that Sultān Mużaffar Gujratī had arrived in Mālwa, and was coming to aid and reinforce Sultān Mahmūd. Sultān Ibrāhīm surrendering the reins of bravery returned towards Jaunpūr. Sultān Mahmūd made over the government of Sanbal, in accordance with the ancient custom to Asad Khān Lūdī, and returned to Dehli.

In the 3 year 831 A.H., Sultān Ibrāhīm advanced to attack the fort of Biñānah. At this time Khiḍr Khān ruled in Dehli. He advanced from there to meet and destroy Sultān Ibrāhīm. After the two armies had met, the battle raged from morning to evening; and much slaughter and bloodshed occurred. On the following day a 4 peace was concluded, and Sultān Ibrāhīm returned to Jaunpūr and Khiḍr Khān to Dehli.

In the year 837 A.H., Sultān Ibrāhīm was able to repair the damages and losses sustained by his army; and having set his mind at rest in respect of the insurgents in the various parts of his dominions, he determined to conquer Kālpi; and advanced with full force.

---

1 It would appear that the rule of Tātār Khān and Malik Marjān or Malik Maḥbābā was of very brief duration. Sultān Mahmūd marched to Sanbal and Baran. Tātār Khān fled to Kanauj; and the other, who offered some resistance, was slain. See page 288 of vol. I of the translation.

2 جوین in the text-edition.

3 There is a long interval of about twenty years here. During this time, Sultān Ibrāhīm was engaged for some time in an invasion of Bengal, at the request of the holy Shaikh Qūṭb-ul-ʿĀlām. He had to return from Bengal, as Rāja Gānṣāh persuaded the Shaikh afterwards to ask him to do so, on his promising to become a convert to Muḥammadanism. This invasion is not mentioned by either Niẓām-ud-dīn or Firīshṭāḥ in their accounts of the reign of Sultān Ibrāhīm.

Firīshṭāḥ, however, mentions a projected invasion of Dehli in 816 A.H., from which, however, Sultān Ibrāhīm returned after some marches; and then according to Firīshṭāḥ he occupied himself for some years in the society of Shaikhs and learned men, and in rebuilding and improving Jaunpūr and in increasing the cultivation of land all over the province, so that Jaunpūr was described by people as a second Dehli.

4 The words are گرگ اشکی کردی or گرگ or گرگ اشکی کرد. I cannot find any meaning of گرگ or گرگ which would suit the context.
At this time news came that Sultan Hūsang Ghūrī had also determined upon the conquest of Kālpī. When the two ḍādshāhs arrived near each other, and a battle became a matter of today or tomorrow, the scouts brought the news, that Mubārak Shāh, son of Khīḍr Khān, had collected an immense army, and intended to march from Dehlī for the conquest of Jaunpūr. Sultan Ibrāhīm having lost all control of himself retired towards Jaunpūr. Sultan Hūsang took possession of Kālpī, without any dispute, and having had the Khūṭbā read in his own name returned to Mandū.

In the year 840 A.H. a disease attacked Sultan Ibrāhīm’s person. Although physicians treated him, no improvement resulted; and in the end he accepted the summons of God.

The period of his rule was 1 forty years and some months and some days.

2 An Account of Sultan Maḥmūd, Son of Ibrāhīm Sharqi.

When Sultan Ibrāhīm surrendered the deposit of life, his eldest son Sultan Maḥmūd sat on the throne of Jaunpūr and became the successor of his father. The gardens of the hopes of the people became refreshed and verdant with the abundance of the rain of his benediction. The kingdom acquired a new grandeur and greatness; and the people received happiness and joy. After regulating the affairs of the army and the kingdom and the punishment of the insurgents and the turbulent people, he sent in the year 847 A.H., an eloquent ambassador with beautiful gifts and presents to Sultan Maḥmūd Khalji, and with the message 3 that “Naṣīr Khān Jahān, son of Qādir

---

1 The readings are slightly different. One MS. has the reading I have adopted in the text. The other has جهل سال و خند ماه بود without any verb, while the lith. ed. has جهل سال و خند روز بود; this has been adopted by M. Hidayat Ḥosayn in the text-edition.

2 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. In the lith. ed. the word sulṭanat is inserted before and the word Sharqi after the word Sultan Maḥmūd.

3 He is so called in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah, however, omits the word Jāhān. The Cambridge History of India (p. 252) says that Naṣīr and before him his father Qādir had taken advantage of the disputes regarding the succession to the throne of Mālwa to declare their independence,
Khan, the ruler of Kalpi, had placed his foot outside the path of the law of the Prophet, and was following the path of heterodoxy, that he had destroyed the town of Shahpur, which was larger and more populous than Kalpi, had banished Musalmans from their homes, and had made over Musalmans women to Kafrs, and as from the time of Sultan Husang, of blessed memory, to the present day, the chain of attachment and the relations of affection had become strengthened between the two parties, it appeared obligatory on me under the behest of the Qadi 'Aqal (Reason), that I should reveal it to your justice-loving mind. If you permit it, I shall chastise him, and make the tenets and rites of the Muhammadan religion current in that country”.

Sultan Mahmud Khalji wrote in reply, “These matters had come to my hearing in the shape of false rumours; but that now your honourable self, the leader of Sultanis, has notified them to me, they have reached the standard of definite knowledge; and under these circumstances, the destruction of that wicked person is incumbent on all badshahs. If my own forces were not engaged in chastising the rebels of Mewat, I would myself have advanced to destroy him. Now that that asylum of sultanats has formed this resolution, may it be of good omen!”

The ambassador came back to Jaunpur, and narrated what had happened. Sultan Mahmud Sharqi was pleased in his mind; and sent twenty-nine elephants to Sultan Mahmud Khalji, as a present.

and to assume the title of Nasir Shah and Qadri Shah. Nasir Shah appears to have adopted some heretical practices; but I think the Cambridge History of India is wrong in assuming that Sultan Mahmud was entirely actuated by religious motives in his proceedings against him. It should be remembered that Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi had attempted unsuccessfully to seize Kalpi, which had, however, been taken by Sultan Husang of Malwa. Indeed a few lines later on, the Cambridge History of India (page 253) expresses a doubt as to whether Sultan Mahmud Sharqi was impelled by ambition or by a just appreciation of the offences of which Nasir had been guilty.

1 One MS. has by mistake دنبع ان instead of دنبع اول خاعر جميع پادشاهان.

2 There are slight variations in the readings. The MSS. have علامہ میکوردت and حاکم میکوردت; while the lith. ed. has عالم میکوردت. I prefer عالم میکوردت.
He then collected his troops, and advanced towards Kālpī. Naṣīr Khān, becoming acquainted with this, submitted a report to Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī to the following purport: "Sultān Ḥūshang Shāh of blessed memory bestowed this country on me. Now Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī wishes to take possession of it with force and violence; and the defence of this faqīr is obligatory on the (noble) spirit of the Sultān."

Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, on becoming acquainted with the purport of this petition, wrote a letter couched in terms of sincerity and affection, and sent ‘Ali Khān with it and with suitable presents to the Sharqī Sultān; and mentioned in it that "Naṣīr Khān, the ruler of Kālpī having the fear of God and that Lord of grandeur before his eyes, has become repentant; and has promised, that, having redressed and corrected what had happened, he would not again place his foot outside the path of the law of the Prophet; and in carrying out the behests of providence (Aḥkām Sāmīwī) would permit no hesitation or dilatoriness. As Sultān Ḥūshang, who has received the mercy of God, had bestowed that country on Qādir Khān, his successors are enlisted in the band of those who are faithful and obedient to me. We should, therefore, pardoning his former transgressions, forbear from further interference with his territory."

The reply to the letter and petition of ‘Ali Khān (i.e., I suppose the letter of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī sent by the hand of ‘Ali Khān) had not yet arrived, when another petition of Naṣīr Khān came, to the effect that, "This faqīr has borne the ring of sincere loyalty in his ear, and the burden of obedience on his shoulder (these were ancient marks of slavery) since the time of Sultān Ḥūshang; and now Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī has, on account of an old grudge and ancient enmity, invaded Kālpī, and seizing the country with pomp and power, has turned the faqīr out of his native territory and has imprisoned Musalmān women". And in spite of the fact that Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī had obtained permission to chastise Naṣīr Khān, still when the latter had made humble and pitiful supplications, (Sultān Maḥmūd

---

1 The word is different in the MS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. has the other has what looks like The lith. ed. has Firishtah in the corresponding passage has نقلنا.
Khalji) advanced on the 2nd Sha'ban of the year 840 A.H. towards Chanderi and Kali. At Chanderi Nasir Khan came and waited on him. From Chanderi, the Sultan advanced towards Erij. Sultan Mahmud Sharqi, hearing this news, immediately started for Kali to meet him. Sultan Mahmud Khalji sent a detachment to oppose the Jaunpur army, and another detachment to plunder the rearguard of that army. The latter went and slew the men, who had been left behind in the camp; and looted whatever they could lay their hands upon. The detachment, that had been sent to confront the Jaunpur army, stretched its hands in conflict and battle; and brave and useful men were killed on both sides. In the end, the two armies retired to their respective camps. On the following morning, Sultan Mahmud sent 'Imad-ul-mulk to block the enemy's road. The latter becoming aware of this intention remained where they were, which was a strong and rugged and difficult position.

Sultan Mahmud, becoming aware of the strength of the ground sent a detachment to plunder the environs of Kali, and it returned after taking much booty. When the rainy season came, a sort of peace was patched up; and the parties retraced their steps. Sultan Mahmud Khalji came to Chanderi; and Sultan Mahmud Sharqi, taking advantage of the opportunity, sent troops to raid the country of Barhar, the residents of which were obedient to Sultan Mahmud Khalji. The latter sent a detachment, to help and reinforce the headman of the country of Barhar. As the detachment, which had been sent by Sultan Mahmud Sharqi, was not sufficiently strong to meet it, the latter himself came and joined it.

After a few days, Sultan Mahmud Sharqi sent a letter to the Shaikh-ul-Islam, Shaikh Jai-alah, who was one of the great and holy men of the age, and towards whom Sultan Mahmud Khalji had right relations of reverence and faith, and whose remains are now buried under the dome of the tomb of the Sultans of Mauwa at Mandu, to the following purport, viz., "Musalmans on both sides have been slain.

1 Both MSS. have بیلابات; but the lith. ed. has بیلابات, which appears to me to be more appropriate, and I have retained it. M. Hidayat Hosain has retained بیلابات in the text-edition.
2 M. Hidayat Hosain has بیلابات in the text-edition.
and it would be well if (your Holiness) would endeavour to effect concord and friendship (between the contending powers)

The emissary of Sultan Mahmud Sharqi made this statement to Shaikh Jaialdah, that his master would at once make over the town of Ratlah to Nasir Khan; and within four months after the return of Sultan Mahmud Khalji, he would also make over to Nasir Khan the town of Erij, and the whole of the country of Kalphi, which had come into his possession.

When Sultan Mahmud Sharqi's emissary submitted this proposal to Shaikh Jaialdah, the latter sent him in the company of his own Khadiim, (servant or disciple), to Sultan Mahmud (Khalji); and also sent a letter containing much advice. Sultan Mahmud Khalji decided, that no peace could take place unless Kalphi was immediately handed over. But Nasir Khan, who had been driven out of his territory considered that the recovery of Ratlah would be a great boon; and submitted that as Sultan Mahmud Sharqi was making the promise in the presence of noble men and before Shaikh Jaialdah, it was certain that there would be no deviation from it. When Sultan Mahmud Khalji saw, that the man most interested in the matter was satisfied with this settlement, he sent for Sultan Mahmud Sharqi's emissary into his presence and accepted his proposals, on the condition that after that date Sultan Mahmud Sharqi would not in any way interfere

---

1 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has اگر صلاح ذات الين توجه فرمايند - بهتر باشد اگر صحح ذات الين می‌شد. The other has اگر در صلاح ذات الين می‌شد - بهتر باشد, after which some words are evidently left out. The lith. ed. has اگر صلاح ذات الين می‌شد - بهتر باشد. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has اگر در صلاح ذات الين سعی رود. The meaning is not quite clear, but I think the translation conveys the intended idea.

2 There are differences in readings here also. One MS. has قصبه ابرجه و سائر بلاد کالپی. This appears to be correct and I have adopted it. The other MSS. have قصبه ابرجه و چرتور و سایر بلاد کالپی. The corresponding line in the lith. ed. of Firishtah appears to be different and incorrect. It is بالفعل قصبه ابرجه و کالپی که به تصرف سلطان شرقي درآمد انا نبی به نصرت خواهند گذاشت.

3 The name is transliterated as Erij in the Cambridge History of India (p. 253), but later on (pp. 355 and 364), it is printed as Erij.
with the descendants of Qādir Shāh, and more specially with Naṣīr Ḳhān Jahan; and for the last time the footsteps of his soldiers should not reach this country; and after four months, he should make over Kālpī and the other towns to Naṣīr Ḳhān Jahan. When the foundations of the peace became strengthened by the physical and spiritual attention of Shaikh Jāmalah, Sultan Mahmūd Ḳhaljī granted permission to the emissary of Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī after bestowing rewards and favours on him to retire; and he himself cast the shadow of his favour on the residents of his capital of Mandū.

And Sultan Mahmūd Sharqī also returned to Jaunpūr; and on his arrival there, bringing out the hand of lavishness and benevolence from the sleeve of generosity and liberality made all sections of the people, according to the difference of their ranks, fortunate and happy.

1 And when he had rested for some time at Jaunpūr, and his army had repaired the damages and losses which it had sustained he advanced towards the country of Chunār, and having plundered and devastated that country, made all the refractory people of that neighbourhood, food for the sword. He took possession of some parganas and towns, and left thānadārs there, and having made the necessary arrangements returned to Jaunpūr.

After some days he advanced into the country of Orissa with the object of Jihād (war of religion) and the intention of becoming a Ghāzi; and having plundered and devastated that country, and pulled down and destroyed idol temples, returned with triumph and victory; and in the year 862 A.H., (1458 A.D.), he was united with the divine mercy.

The period of his reign was 3 twenty-one years and some months.

---

1 Niẓām-ud-dīn does not mention here that Mahmūd Shāh Sharqī had two conflicts with Sultan Bahūlū Lūdī, first attack on Dehli in 856 A.H., 1452 A.D., and second, an advance on Itāwah in 1457 A.D., for some account of which see pages 340-342 of vol. I of the translation.

2 It is in the text-edition.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have twenty-one years and some months; as I have it in the text. The other MS. has twenty years and some months.
THE SHARQI SULTANS

AN ACCOUNT OF 1 SULTAN MAHMUD SHAH, SON OF MAHMUD SHAH.

When Sultan Mahmud Sharqi passed away from amongst (men), the amirs and the pillars of the state raised Shahzada Bhikan Khan, who was his eldest son, on the throne of the empire; and gave him the title of Sultan Mahmud Shah. As he was unfit for the duties of a ruler, he perpetrated deeds which were improper for him. The amirs and the chief men of the country excused him from carrying on the government; and raised his brother Husain Khan to the position of power.

The time of his (i.e., Sultan Mahmud Shah's) rule 2 was about five months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN HUSAIN, SON OF MAHMUD SHAH.

As they excused Mahmud Shah his brother from the duties of government, they raised him to the seat of power, and made a proclamation of justice and equity. All the amirs and great men submitted to him and obeyed him. As the huma (a fabulous bird) of his noble spirit had the ambition of conquering various countries in its head, he collected three hundred thousand horsemen and fourteen hundred elephants, and 3 advanced towards the country of Orissa. In the course of the march he subjected the country of Tirhut to various calamities; and levied tribute from the refractory people 4 of that

1 One MS. leaves out the word Sultan before Mahmud Shah. He is called Mahmud Shah in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. His correct title was Sultan Muhammad Shah according to Firishtah and according to the Cambridge History of India. The account of his five months' rule, as given here, is very vague and hazy. For a fuller and more vivid account see under Bahlul Ludi, pages 343-45 of vol. I of the translation.

2 The word is است, i.e., is, in the MS. and in the lith. ed. I have changed it to بود, was.

3 The account of the invasion of Orissa, and of the devastation of Tirhut on the way, as given by Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 255), agrees mainly with that in the text. The numbers of horsemen and elephants in Sultan Husain's army appear to be exaggerated.

4 There are differences in the readings. One MS. has منوجه منبردان گوتن, which is incorrect and meaningless. The other has از منبردان اندار ناهیت خراج گوتن, which should be changed to از منبردان اندار ناهیت خراج گوتن. The lith. ed. has از منبردان اندار ناهیت خراج گوتن, which is better, but still needs correction.
country and its environs. When he arrived in the country of Orissa, he sent detachments for plundering and ravaging the various parts of the country. The Rāy of Orissa, in great distress and helplessness, made his submission, and sending an agent to wait on the Sultān prayed for the pardon of his faults and offences; and sent thirty elephants and one hundred horses and much stuffs and other goods in the way of tribute. Sultān Ḥusain returned from that country to Jaunpūr crowned with victory and triumph.

1 In the year 870 A.H., he put the fort of Benāres, which had become dilapidated in the course of time, into repairs; and in the following year (871 A.H., 1466 A.D.) he sent some of his amīrs to capture the fort of Gwāliar. When the siege was much prolonged, the Rāy of Gwāliar paid tribute; and became enlisted in the band of his tributaries.

In the year 878 A.H., 1473 A.D., he, at the instigation of his wife Makhār-i-Jahān, who was the daughter of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-din, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Farīd Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, son of Khwād Khān, raised the standard of departure with one hundred and forty thousand horsemen for a war with Sultān Bahīlū Lūdī and for the conquest of Dehli. 2 Sultān Bahīlū sent an emissary to wait on Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, and sent him a message to the effect, that if he should advance to support and aid him, the country as far as the fort of Bīnānah should belong to him. A reply had not yet come from Mandū, when Sultān Husain seized a large part of the territory appertaining

---

1 Firishtah gives 871 A.H. as the year in which the fort of Benāres was repaired and the army was sent to capture Gwāliar. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 376) does not mention the repairs to the fort of Benāres, and gives 870 A.H., 1465 A.D., as the year of the invasion of Gualiar. The Cambridge History of India also does not mention the repairs of the fort of Benāres; and places the invasion of Gwalior in the year 1466 A.D. (p. 255).

2 The Cambridge History of India does not mention this appeal to Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī for help, but Firishtah does. The Cambridge History of India (p. 256), says that Bahīlū was obliged to make this humiliating proposal, as he could not get more than eighteen thousand horsemen to meet Sultān Husain’s large army. It also appears from what follows, that he came out of Dehli to meet the enemy with only that small number of horsemen.
to Dehlī. Sultān Bahlūl, making humility and a piteous appeal the means of his safety, sent a message to Sultān Ḥusain, that the country of Dehlī would belong to the servants of the Sultān, if he would leave the country round Dehlī for a distance of eighteen karōhs in his possession; and he should be enlisted in the bands of the Sultān’s servants, and would remain in the post of the dārōgha of Dehlī, on behalf of the latter. Sultān Ḥusain, on account of his great pride and haughtiness, did not listen to these proposals, with the intention of consent and acceptance. In the end, Sultān Bahlūl, relying on divine aid and assistance, came out of Dehlī with eighteen thousand horsemen, and encamped in front of Sultān Ḥusain’s army. As the river 1 Jamunā lay between the two armies, neither advanced to give battle. It so happened, however, that one day, Sultān 2 Ḥusain’s soldiers had gone on a marauding excursion, and except for the commanders no one was left in the camp. Sultān Bahlūl’s soldiers taking advantage of such an opportunity plunged their horses into the river 3 at the time of midday. Although this news was taken to Sultān Ḥusain, he did not, owing to his haughtiness and pride, believe it, until Sultān Bahlūl’s men stretched their hands to plunder the camp and seized its outskirts. In this way Sultān Ḥusain was defeated without a battle; and Malkah-i-Jahān and all the inmates of the harem were seized. Sultān Bahlūl having regard for the rights of the salt he had eaten, endeavoured to show all respect and honour to Malkah-i-Jahān, and having made necessary preparations, sent her to Sultān Ḥusain.

When Malkah-i-Jahān joined the Sultān, she again 4 got into his kernel and skin; and again commenced to incite him; and in the

---

1 Ab Joun
2 Firishtā’s statement is just the opposite. He says Sardarán Bzerk Ḥusayn Shāh, Shīrūni, Bashaft Wāliy-e Rāznād. The Cambridge History of India (P. 258) says Husain Shāh was “accustomed to permit nearly the whole of his army to disperse for the purpose of plundering the rich villages of the Doab”.
3 The words are رفت استنوا, which quite suit the context. Firishtah says در میں مرسم نابستان از جاییکہ پاپیہ برد, i.e., in the very midst of the hot season at a place where there it could be forded.
4 Firishtah uses the same words. I do not know their exact meaning, but I suppose it is either acquired great influence over him, or worried him by constant iteration.
following year induced him again to collect and equip his army to fight with Sultan Bahlu'l. When there was only a short distance between the two armies, Sultan Bahlu'l sent an emissary with the following message, "Would the Sultan be pleased to pardon my offences; and leave me in my present condition; for I shall one day be of use to him".

As the pen of fate had so decreed, that greatness should pass away from the dynasty of the Sharqi Sulțans, Sultan Husain did not at all listen to his words. After the forces had been arrayed, defeat again fell on the Jaunpūr army. In the same way, on a second occasion, he came with a well-equipped army, but had to take to flight. On the fourth occasion things became so difficult for Sultan Husain, that he had to throw himself off his horse and run away. These facts have been narrated with full particulars and details, in the section about the Sulṭāns of Delhī.

On the fourth occasion, Sultan Bahlu'l took Jaunpūr into his own possession, and established his son Bārbak Shāh there. Sultan Husain had to content himself with a section of his territory, the revenues of which amounted only to five kroņs, and to pass his time there. Sultan Bahlu'l, acting in a spirit of generosity, did not interfere with him.

When Sultan Bahlu'l accepted the summons of the just God, and the office of the Sultan was allotted to his son Sultan Sikandar, Sultan Husain induced Bārbak Shāh to advance on Delhī and seize his father's kingdom for himself. With this intention Bārbak Shāh advanced from Jaunpūr towards Delhī. Then a battle took place, and Bārbak Shāh fled back to Jaunpūr. He again equipped an army, and advanced

---

1 There are differences in the readings. One MS. has بندند رنده بند. This appears to be correct and I have adopted it. The other MS. has بندند رنده بند, leaving out the words قلم نقدیر که درمط. The lith. ed. has قلم نقدیر بند, the word تقدیر being used by mistake for تقدیر.

2 The third occasion is not mentioned, or the fourth occasion in the text here is a mistake for the third.

3 See page 348 and the following pages of vol. I of the translation.

4 It is مرتبہ جمال in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. and in Firuśṭah; but a fourth occasion has already been mentioned in the previous paragraph.
o Dehlī. When he fled a second time, Sultaṅ Sikandar pursued him and took Jaunpūr out of his possession. As Sultaṅ Ḥusain was the cause of all the confusion and disturbance, Sultaṅ Sikandar went and attacked him; and after some fighting seized the territory which was in his possession. Sultaṅ Ḥusain then fled, and found an asylum with the ruler of Bangālah. The term of his reign was 19 years. After his defeat, he was for some years confined in the bounds of borrowed life, (which is a very figurative way of saying that he lived for some years). After that the Sharqi Empire came to an end. Six persons ruled for a period of 97 years and some months.

---

1 One MS. has by mistake محدث for مهرهون; and the other has مثبت for مستعار.
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SECTION VIII. ¹ THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTÁNS OF MÁLWA.

From the year 807 A.H. to the year 970 A.H., which is a period of one hundred and sixty-three years, there were eleven persons, who either themselves or through their deputies governed Málwa.

² Dilāwar Khān Ghūri, 20 years;
Sultān Hūshang, son of Dilāwar Khān, 30 years;
Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Hūshang, one year and a few months;
Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, 34 years;
Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, 20 years;
Sultān Nāṣīr-ud-dīn, son of Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, 11 years and 4 months;
Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Nāṣīr-ud-dīn, 20 years and six months and eleven days;
Sultān Bahādur Gujrātī, 16 years;
Mallū Qādir Shāh, 6 years;
Shūjāʾ Khān, as Naib of Shēr Khān Afghān, 12 years;
Bāz Bahādur Afghān, 16 years.

¹ The Section about Málwa is the heading used by the late Mr. H. De in his notes, but the editor has followed the text-edition in which M. Hidayat Ḥosain has طبعت سلطن مالر. Regarding the sequence of various sections see note 2, page 414.
² There are some variations and omissions in the lists in the MSS. and in the 8th. ed. I have tried to get a correct list after comparing them.
It should not remain concealed that the country of Mālwa is an extensive territory. Great rulers have always been (reigned) in that country. Great Rājas and renowned Rāys like Rāja Bikramājit from the commencement of whose reign the Hindū era begins, and Rāja Bhōj and others, who were among the Rājas of Hindūstān, possessed great renown, by their rule of Mālwa. Islām first appeared in that country from the time of Sultān Mahmūd Ghaznavi. Among the Sultāns of Dehlī Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din Balban acquired dominion over it; and after him till the time of Sultān Fīrūz Shāh it was in the possession of the Sultāns of Dehlī.

Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī attained to the rule of the country from a time before the reign of Sultān Muḥammad, the son of Fīrūz, and

1 Firisṭah copies the Ṭabaqāt in this place almost verbatim; but as regards Islām, he says بعد از زمان سلطان مصموئذ غزنوی که اسلام در هندوستان شائع شده از سلطان دهلی غیاث الدين بران سلطان شت� اسکیا بانی. This is different from what is stated in the text, and is more correct historically. Islām certainly did not become known in Mālwa from the time of Sultān Mahmūd. Of course if the expression در آن بلاد refers to Hindūstān and not to Mālwa, then there is nothing wrong with the text.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have می بردن, but the other MS. می بوده اند.
3 One MS. omits the word Rāja. Bikramājit is of course a variant of the Vikramāditya. The era which dates from his accession commences 56 years before Christ.

4 The MSS. have داشتنده وناد, and the lith. ed. has داشتنده اند.
5 One MS. has پیدا شده, while the other has simply پیدا, and the lith. ed. has پیدا شده گرفت. The reading of the second manuscript has been followed by M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition.
6 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Fīrūz Shāh, but the other MS. has Sultān Muḥammad Fīrūz Shāh. Firisṭah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has Sultān Muḥammad, son of Fīrūz Shāh. This last statement is correct. The conquest of Mālwa took place in the reign of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din Balban in 710 A.H., 1316 A.D.; and it became independent in the reign of Muḥammad, the son of Fīrūz Tughlaq, 789 A.H., 1389 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 348, says, that the date of Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī’s appointment as governor is not precisely known; but he was certainly in Mālwa in 1392, and he was probably appointed by Fīrūz Shāh of Dehlī who died in 1388. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has سلطان مصموئذ غزنوی شت� in the text-edition.
7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Maḥmūd, while the other has Sultān Muḥammad, son of Fīrūz.
declared his independence. From that time the rulers of Mālwa ceased to own allegiance to the Sultāns of Dhlī; and eleven persons ruled one after another till the time of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī. The section about Mālwa, therefore, begins from the time of Dīlāwar Khān Ghūrī. They say that Sultān Muḥammad son of Fīrūz Shāh granted favours to a body of men, who had accompanied him during his earlier expeditions; and had shown loyalty and sincerity. When he became Sultān he conferred four countries on four of them; and each of these four attained to sovereign power. (He) sent Zafar Khān, the son of Wajth-ul-mulk to Gujrāt, Khāṣr Khān to Multān and Dībālpūr, Khwājah Sarwar Khwājah Jahān, to whom he granted the title of Malik-ush-sharq, to Jaunpūr, and Dīlāwar Khān Ghūrī to Mālwa.

5 An account of Dīlāwar Khān Ghūrī.

As in the year 809 A.H., Dīlāwar Khān came to Mālwa, he brought the country into his possession, by the strength of his brave

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have حكومت كردند, but the other MS. has حكومت كردند; the latter has been followed in the text-edition.

2 One MS. omits the words هر يك را رعایتها كرد - شهار كس را شهار ملك داد - و هر شهار سلطنت رسدند.

3 One MS. has رسيدن, another رسيدن; while the lith. ed. has رسيدن.

4 M. Hidayat Ḥosain has سلطان الشرق instead of ملك الشرق in the text-edition.

5 Fīrishtah’s account agrees; but he mentions in addition, that Dīlāwar Khān’s first capital was at Dhrār; but as he intended to make Shāhībād Mandū his capital, he went there from time to time and endeavoured to build it. He also says that when Sultān Māhmūd of Dhlī, fleeing from Timūr came to Gujrāt in 801 A.H., and as he was not received with due honour by Muẓaffar Shāh, he came to Mālwa and was welcomed with great honour by Dīlāwar Khān. He remained in Dhrār till 804 A.H. Alp Khān, Dīlāwar Khān’s son, was not pleased with the latter for the welcome given to Sultān Māhmūd; and retired with most of the soldiers to Mandū, where he built a very strong fort in the course of three years. In 804 A.H., Sultān Māhmūd returned towards Dhlī.

6 The year is 809 A.H. in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed.; and the year of his death 829 A.H., in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. These dates are incorrect according to Fīrishtah. According to him, his rule commenced in the year اربع و ثمانیاته 804 A.H., which is
arms and the power of his beneficent wisdom, and collected retainers and servants and made all arrangements and shortened the hand of encroachment of rebels from the environs and surroundings of that country. When 1 Sulṭān Māhmūd passed away, and the empire of Dehlī became enfeebled and heads of different bands appeared in different parts of India, Dilāwar Khān also turned his head away from allegiance to the lord of Dehlī, and claimed to be independent; and in the way of 2 Badshāhs took upon himself the etiquette of sovereignty. He passed many years with success and pleasure; and in the year 829 A.H., surrendered the deposit of his life. It has come to my notice in some books that he was 3 poisoned at the instigation of his son Alp Khān. The period of his rule was twenty years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULṬĀN HŪSHANG, SON OF DILĀWAR KHĀN.

Alp Khān, who was the son of Dilāwar Khān, became the successor of the latter, and had the public prayer (Khūṭba) read in his name and the coin struck in his name. He raised the royal umbrella over his head and gave himself the title of Sulṭān Hūshang. The amīrs and the great men of that country rendered homage to him.

The affairs of the kingdom, and the foundations of power had not yet been firmly fixed, when scouts brought the news, that Sulṭān Muẓaffar Gujrātī had arrived at Ujjain; and 4 information had reached

also incorrect. The correct date is 789 A.H., 1387 A.D. The correct year of his death is 808 A.H., 1405 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, gives 1406 as the year of Dilāwar Khān’s death.

1 One MS. and the text-edition have Sulṭān Muḥammad, which is incorrect. See page 290 of vol. 1 of the translation.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says, “Dilāwar Khān never assumed the style of royalty.” This is not correct according either of the Tabaqāt or Firishtah. The latter is even more particular than the Tabaqāt. He says:

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says definitely Alp Khān “removed his father by poison”. Neither the Tabaqāt nor Firishtah says so positively. See note 3, page 185.

4 The words باو خبر رسیده occur only in one MS. but neither in the other MS. nor in the lith. ed.
him that Alp Khan had, 1 for the sake of worldly power, administered poison to Dilawar Khan; and had given himself the name of Hushang Shah. As there had been a bond of brotherly feelings between Dilawar Khan and Sultan Muzafr, (the latter) 2 had equipped an army, and was marching to Malwa. In the beginning of the year 810 A.H., Sultan Muzafr encamped in the vicinity of Dhâr. Sultan Hushang came out of the fort, with the determination to give battle; and 3 the two armies engaged each other. In the end Hushang fled, and took shelter in the fort. As he found that he did not possess the power to withstand (Sultan) Muzafr, he prayed for quarter; and came and waited on the Sultan. In the same majlis he and his nobles were placed under arrest, and made over to custodians. The Sultan then left his own brother 4 Nasir Khan, with a large force, in the fort of Dhâr; and himself returned with victory and triumph to Gujrat.

As Nasir Khan, who was without any experience, in the very first year demanded from the ru'iyats rents which were beyond their power to pay, and otherwise 'ill-treated them. The Malwa army seizing the opportunity after the departure of Sultan Muzafr had carried him out of Dhâr by 5 Khwajahdars, and pursuing him caused injury

1 The words براة حكام دنيوي occur in one MS, and in the lith. ed., but not in the other MS.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says that the "avenging the death of his old friend" was merely a "pretext" for Muzafr's invasion of Malwa.

3 Firishtah says that Muzafr was wounded, and Hushang was thrown from his horse; but they went on fighting, but victory or defeat does not depend on one's exertions, and victory was allotted to Sultan Muzafr from the supernatural world.

4 He is called نصر خان in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., except in one place in the latter where he is called نصر خان and Nasir Khan. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Nusrat Khan, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 172) Noosrat Khan and in the Cambridge History of India, page 349, Nusrat Khan. He was called Nusrat Khan in the History of Gujrat (see p. 186 and also note 1 on the same page).

5 The construction of the sentence is not very clear. The corresponding passage in the history of Sultan Muzafr Gujrat was و أورا خواجه دار از دهار بر وردة راز کچرات نمودند (text-edition p. 94). There I thought that the Khwajahdar was some kind of a palace official, who took him out of Dhâr and showed him the way to Gujrat. Probably the word Khwajahdar here also has the same significance.
to such of his followers as fell behind. They left Dhār for fear of Sultān Muẓaffar, erected buildings in the fort of Mandū, the strong bastions of which 1 claimed rivalry with the celestial 2 girdle or the Zodiac (and took up their residence there); and made Mūsa Khān, who was a cousin, uncle's son, of Sultān Hūshang, their chief. After this news had reached Gujrāt, Hūshang Shāh sent a petition to Sultān Muẓaffar to the effect, "That the lord and master of the people of the world was in the place of this faqir's father and uncle, and the words which certain self-interested people had spoken to him were, the great God knows, contrary to the truth. At this time it was being reported that the noblemen of Mālwa had acted with disrespect to Khān-i-Āzām 3 Naṣir Khān; had made Mūsa Khān their leader and had taken possession of the country. If this faqir was lifted up from the dust, and was placed in the bonds of gratitude, it was possible that the country should again come into his possession."

4 Sultān Muẓaffar having approved of this proposal, released him, after he had been in prison for one year, and began to show favours to him. He took engagements from him, and after arranging his affairs, granted permission to Shāhzāda Āḥmad Shāh, in the year 821 A.H., to proceed to help and reinforce him; so that he might recover possession of Dhār and the neighbouring country from the 5 rebellious amirs, and make it over to him. Āḥmad Shāh recovered the country from the amirs, and made it over to him, and then returned to the capital city of Pattan.

After Sultān Hūshang had been in Dhār for some days, and a body of his special guards had collected round him, he sent a man to the fort of Mandū, and giving assurances of favour to the amirs, summoned

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have لاف بزربط زد while the other MS. has لاف بزربط زد; M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted the former in the text-edition.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have منطقة البروج, but the other MS. has منطقة العين.

3 The name is Naṣrat Khān, here in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but in the other MS. it is Naṣir Khān. I have kept Naṣir Khān, as he has been so named in the earlier parts of this section.

4 Firishtah agrees. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says that Hūshang swore "on the Koran that he was guiltless of his father's death".

5 One MS. omits the words from از نفس امراء to غدار.
them to his side. The amirs and the soldiers were anxious to join him, and were all pleased and delighted; but as they had taken their wives and children with them to the fort of Mandū, ¹ they could not join his service. Hūshang went with a small force to the town of ² Mahēsar, and every day his men went forward to fight, but were wounded, and had to come back. As the fort of Mandū was very strong, Hūshang Shāh considered it advisable, that he should march away from that place, and take up a position in the centre of the town; and sending his men to the different towns and parganas, take possession of them. About this time, Malik Mughīth, who was the son of the aunt of Sultan Hūshang, had a consultation with Malik Khīrīr who was celebrated as ³ Miyān Aghā and said, “Although Mūsa Khān is a young man of good breeding, and is a son of one of our aunts, yet Hūshang Shāh surpasses all his evils in manliness and intelligence and wisdom and patience; and this kingdom belongs to him by inheritance as well as acquisition; and besides in his childhood, he was brought up in the loving arms of my mother. It is advisable, therefore, that the reins of this government and rule should be placed in the grasp of his power.” Miyān Aghā praised the decision of Malik Mughīth; and they in concert came out one night from the fort of Mandū, and joined Sultan Hūshang. The latter gave Malik Mughīth a promise of being made his deputy; and this gave the latter great pleasure and delight.

Mūsa Khān on hearing this news cut the thread of hope by the scissors of despair; and became anxious about his safety. In the end, he sent a messenger to Malik Mughīth, with the request, that a place

¹ No reason is given for this in the text or in Firishtah lith. ed.; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 173) says, they were unwilling to abandon their families; and the Cambridge History of India, page 350, says, “As their wives and families would be left exposed to Mūsā’s wrath”.

² The name is مهسا in one MS., and also in the other, but is partly obliterated in it. It is بح in the lith. ed. and بح in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India, page 350, says that Hūshang marched to Māndū.

³ The nickname looks like میان آغا in the MS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Miyān Khān and Miyān Aghā in different places. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 174) calls him Moean Agha. The name is not given in the Cambridge History of India. میان آغا in the text-edition.
might be allotted to him for his residence, so that he might surrender the fort of Mandū. After much discussion, a place was fixed for him; and he evacuated the fort and went away. Sultān Hūshang entered the fort of Mandū, and took up his abode in his capital. He conferred the title of Malik-ush-sharq on and entrusted the duties of the vazīrat to Malik Mughīth, and in all matters made him his deputy and representative.

In the year 813 A.H., 1410 A.D., Sultān Muṣṭaffar Gujrātī accepted the summons of God; and the government of the empire devolved upon Sultān Aḥmad, the son of Muḥammad Shāh the son of Sultān Muṣṭaffar. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān, sons of Sultān Muṣṭaffar raised the standard of revolt and hostility in the country of Bahrōj, and asked for help from Hūshang. The latter returning the rights acquired by Muṣṭaffar Shāh by the support he had given to him, and the aid given to him by Aḥmad Shāh, by enmity, turned towards the country of Gujrāt; and his ancient grudge induced him to advance into that country, and to destroy the rules of the government. Sultān Aḥmad advanced with a large army, and besieged Bahrōj immediately, on hearing the news. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān, frightened by the 1 grandeur and power and awed by the immense number of Ahmad Shāh’s troops, prayed for protection, and joined the latter. Hūshang turned back from the way, and returned to Dhār. The narrative of these transactions has been written in detail in the section about Gujrāt.

The sweats of shame and repentance had not yet dried up on the forehead of Hūshang, when he again attempted the same kind of nefarious deeds. For when in the year 816 A.H., 1413 A.D., he heard that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī had advanced to attack the 2 Rāja of Jhālāwār, and was compelled to remain there, he at once collected his troops, and turned towards the country of Gujrāt. Sultān Ahmad,

---

1 The readings in the MSS. are از خوف سقوط و استیاء و هیبت و کترب سیاہ احمد شامی. The lith. ed. omits the two and before کترب and هیبت and I have adopted the readings in the MSS., though I think that it would be better to omit the two and before کترب.

2 Firishtah agrees with the Tabaqāt about Hūshang’s first and second inroads into Gujrāt. As to the second, he calls the Rāja the Rāja of Jālwāra instead of that of Jhālāwār.
immediately on receiving this news, advanced to attack and destroy him. When they approached each other, and Hūshang got no help from the Rāja of Jhālāwār, he had no alternative left, and returned to his own country.

After his return petitions from the zamindars of Gujrāt, and specially from the Rājas of Chāmpānīr, Nādōt and Idar came one after another to him, to the effect, that on the first occasion there had been neglect and dilatoriness in their service to him, but this time there will be no minutia left in their loyal devotion in his service. If the Sultān would turn towards Gujrāt, they would send some guides to attend on him; and they would guide his army along a road in such a way, that Sultān Aḥmad would not know anything about his advance, up to the time of his arrival in the country of Gujrāt. The indignity (of his repeated failures) being added to his former enmity induced Sultān Hūshang again to collect his troops and advance into Gujrāt. In order to carry out this intention, he advanced in the year 821 A.H., 1418 A.D., with great pomp by way of Mahrāsa. It so happened, that at that time, Sultān Aḥmād was in the neighbourhood of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, attending to some matters connected with the government. When the news of Hūshang’s advance reached him, he considered that the extinguishing of the flame of the disturbance created by Hūshang should have precedence over all other matters; and he advanced to Mahrāsa with speed; and in spite of heavy rains he arrived there in a short time. When the spies of Sultān Hūshang gave him information of the arrival of Sultān Ahmad, he was in great anxiety; and sent for the zamindārs, who by sending their petitions had raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion, into his presence; and reproached

---

1 One MS. and the lth. ed. have فرستم but the other MS. has فرستم.
2 As to the third expedition, Firduštaq says that the petitions were sent by the Rājas of Jālwāra, of Muḥammadabād Chāmpānīr, of Nādōt and Idar, and not by the last two only as mentioned in the text. Firduštaq also says that Sultān Ahmad had gone to punish Naṣīr Khān Fārūqī, who with the help of fifteen thousand horsemen sent under Ghazvīnī Khān by Sultān Hūshang, was attempting to take away the fort of Thānhīr from his younger brother Malik Ittikhār, but on Sultān Ahmad’s arrival at Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, Ghazvīnī Khān fled towards Mālwa, and Naṣīr Khān Fārūqī went away towards Aṣfir. After this when he was at Sultānpūr, Sultān Ahmad heard of Sultān Hūshang’s invasion.
them, and spoke unseemly words to them. In the end he returned scratching the back of his head by the same road by which he had come.

Sultān Ahmad halted at Mahrāsa for some days, so that his army might join him. After the troops had collected he advanced, in the month of Safar, into the country of Mālwa; and by repeated marches arrived at and encamped in the neighbourhood of Kāliādah. Sultān Hūshang also advanced a few stages with the intention of engaging him. After the battle he fled and took shelter in the fort of Mandū. Sultān Ahmad’s army pursued him up to the gate of Mandū; and seized some of his elephants and soldiers. Sultān Ahmad himself went as far as Na’lcha; and, halting there some days, sent detachments in different directions in the country. As the fort of Mandū was very strong, he was obliged to turn his reins towards Dhār. From that place he wanted to go to Ujjain, but as the rains had commenced the amirs and vazirs represented to him, that the welfare of the state demanded that he should return that year to the capital of Gujrat; and should punish the turbulent men, who had been the cause of the disturbance and rebellion, and teach them a lesson; and in the next year he should, with a mind freed from all anxieties, set about the conquest of Mālwa. Sultān Ahmad agreeing to this proposal returned from Dhār, and cast to the shadow of his favour on the people of Gujrat.

In the year 822 A.H., 1417 A.D., Sultān Hūshang conferred the title of Maḥmūd Khān on Malik Maḥmūd, the son of Malik Mughīth, on whose clear forehead the signs of nobility and knowledge of affairs were patent and bright; and made him the partner of his father in the administration of the government. Whenever he went anywhere, he left Malik Mughīth in the fort of Mandū, and took Maḥmūd Khān with him, so that he might attend to the affairs of state.

---

1 One MS. has by mistake استماع instead of اجتماع.
2 One MS. has by mistake ترتیب instead of تعاقب.
3 Firishtah in his account of this expedition has instead of Na’lcha Zafarābād only Na’lcha. Otherwise his account agrees with that in the text.
4 The words يا پدر are omitted in one MS.
5 The MSS. have بره صهیات, and the lith. ed. has بره صهیات. M. Hidayat Ḥossain has followed the lith. ed. in the text-edition.
In the year 825 A.H., 1421 A.D., Sultan Hushang selected one thousand horsemen out of his army; and in the garb of merchants advanced towards Jajnagar. He took some silver gray and iron

Before describing Sultan Hushang’s expedition to Jajnagar, Firishtah says, that Sultan Ahmad intended to invade and plunder Malwa, but Sultan Hushang becoming aware of this, sent eloquent ambassadors with many valuable presents, and Sultan Ahmad took the presents, and returned to Ahmadabad. He also says that in 823 A.H., 1420 A.D., Sultan Hushang attacked the fort of Kehrla which was on the boundary of Berar. Rây Narsingh, the ruler of Kehrla, met him with fifty thousand horsemen and foot soldiers, and fought a fierce battle, but was defeated and slain. Sultan Hushang then besieged and took the fort of Sârangadha which belonged to Rây Narsingh, and took the treasure and 84 great elephants which were in it, and reduced the son of Rây Narsingh to be a suzerain and tributary to himself.

The following account of Sultan Hushang’s expedition to Jajnagar, compared with the disjointed accounts of it previously given in the history of Ahmad Shâh of Gujrat (see pp. 204, 205, and note 2, p. 204), is more connected and consistent; but the expedition itself was curious in various ways. It is clear that merchants used to go from Malwa and the neighbouring country to Jajnagar or Orissa with horses and other merchandise to barter them for elephants, for the account shows, that it was well known that the Rây of Jajnagar was fond of horses of particular colour and that his subjects were likely to buy certain merchandise. It is difficult to say whether Hushang intended to barter his horses and other merchandise for elephants like an honest merchant, or whether he intended from the beginning to plunder the Rây of Jajnagar of some of his elephants, which at that time were considered to be a valuable instrument of war. Probably he had an undercurrent in his mind for looting the elephants from the beginning.

The account given by Firishtah agrees mainly with that in the text. The account in the Cambridge History of India, pages 350, 351, also agrees, although it calls the Orissa chief, the Râja of “Jajpur, the capital of Orissa”. It will be seen that both the Tabaqât and Firishtah call the place Jajnagar. In the previous incidental reference to this expedition on page 298, the Cambridge History of India, the expedition is designated Sultan Hushang's "famous raid into Orissa", and no mention is made of either Jajnagar or Jajpur. It will be remembered that Sultan Firuz Shâh had hunted elephants in Jajnagar. There is a Jajpur in Orissa also, which is the headquarters of a civil division in the district of Cuttack, but as far as I know it is not mentioned anywhere in history.

There is some difference in the readings in the description of the horses. The MSS. have اسپیلی نفره سر نگل اسپیلی نفره و برخنگ, and the lith. ed. has اسپیلی نفره سر خنگ. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has اسپیلی نفره رنگ.
gray horses which the Rāy of Jājnagar was very fond of, and some other kinds of merchandise, which the people of that country took with pleasure. His object in taking this journey was this, that in exchange for the horses, and the other merchandise, he would select some elephants, and take (or buy) them. So that by means of their strength, he should be able to have his revenge against Ahmad Shāh. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Jājnagar, he sent a man to the Rāy, and gave him notice that a great merchant had come with the object of buying elephants and had brought with him many silver gray and gray and white horses, and various linen and silk stuffs and 2 *narmina*. The Rāy enquired, "Why has he encamped at a distance from the city." The man whom Sultān Hūshang had sent replied, "He has many merchants with him and has encamped at a place where he found water and an open plain." The Rāy said, "I shall come to the caravan on such and such a date, let the horses be kept ready for my inspection on that day; and let the linen and silk goods be spread out on the ground, so that after inspecting them, I shall give in exchange for what I buy, elephants, if they want elephants, or money in cash if they want that." When the man who had been sent came back, Sultān Hūshang summoned the trusted men (among his followers) and took new engagements from them, that they should not act contrary to whatever he might order; and waited for the day (named by the Rāy).

When that day came the Rāy sent forty elephants to the caravan, in advance of himself, so that the merchants might please themselves (by inspecting them). He gave them notice that he was coming, and sent a message that they should expose their goods, and keep their horses ready. Sultān Hūshang sent back all the elephants, and spread out a part of the goods on the ground. At this time the Rāy

---

1 Here the horses are described in one MS. as نفرة وصور خنک، and in the other as نفرة وصور خنک، and in the lith. ed. as نفرة وصور خنک. Firishtah has نفرة وصور خنک. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 178) has "horses of different colours; viz. bright bay, bright chestnut, and different shades of grey." M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted نفرة وصور خنک in the text-edition.

2 The MSS. have فرمینه and the lith. ed. has زمینه. I cannot find the meaning of these words. Firishtah has no corresponding word. He has پناش وصمان دیگر. M. Hidayat Hosain has only پناش مقام دیگر in the text-edition.
came to the caravan with five hundred men and inspected the various goods. As it was the rainy season, a dark cloud appeared, and drops of rain began to fall. The elephants hearing the sound of the thunder and frightened by the lightning began to run away. The goods which was spread out on the ground were spoiled under their feet. At this time a great noise rose from the caravan; and Sultān Hūshang in the manner of a merchant tore handfulls of hair from his head and beard, and said, “My merchandise has been damaged, I do not wish to live.” Then with his soldiers he mounted the horses which had been already made ready and attacked the Rāja’s troops. At the first onset the latter lost their firm foothold and the rule of their firmness and power was shattered. Some of the men were made food for the sword, and some fled. The Rāy himself was taken prisoner alive.

At this time Sultān Hūshang revealed his identity; and said, “I am Hūshang Shāh Ghūrī. I have come to this country for (obtaining) elephants.” The vazīrs and amīrs of Jānjagar sent an emissary to wait upon the Sultān with the message, that they were willing to agree to anything which the Sultān might wish. The Sultān sent the reply, “There was no idea of deceit or fraud in the purpose of my coming. I came to buy elephants. My merchandise has been damaged. I have seized the Rāja as a hostage, in exchange of whom I would take elephants.” The vazīrs of Jānjagar sent 75 splendid elephants to him, and also made their excuses. Sultān Hūshang returned towards his own country taking the Rāy with him. When he passed the boundary of the Rāy’s territory he comforted him and tried to please his heart, and gave him permission to go back. When the Rāy arrived at his own capital he sent some more elephants to the Sultān.

On the way, information reached the Sultān, that Sultān Ahmad had again invaded Mālwa and had besieged the fort of Mandū. When he arrived near the fort of Kehrla, he summoned the Rāy of Kehrla,

---

1 One MS. has by mistake بُرَائِي سِبَاه, instead of بُرَائِي سِبَاه.
2 See note 1, page 475, from which it will appear that, according to Fīrishtah, Sultān Hūshang attacked the Rāy of Kehrla before going on expedition to Jānjagar.
placed him in confinement, and took possession of the fort. He then advanced towards Mandū. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of that city, Sulṭān Āḥmad summoned his amīrs and soldiers from the batteries, collected them together and prepared for battle. Sulṭān Hūshang entered the fort by the Tārāpūr gate and did not prepare for battle. But when Sulṭān Ahmad saw that the capture of the fort was difficult, and in fact impossible, he rose from the foot of the fort, and prepared to plunder and devastate the country. He passed by Ujjain, and determined to seize Sārangpur. Sulṭān Hūshang on becoming aware of this determination, managed to betake himself to the citadel of Sārangpūr by another route. He then sent a message to Sulṭān Āḥmad to the following effect; "As the rights of Musalmāns are mixed up in this, and you know 1 yourself that the shedding of the blood of Musalmāns without any reason is fraught with great calamity; and in this case immense herds of them would perish, it is fitting that you should turn the bridle of your determination towards your own capital. 2 The necessary tribute shall be sent soon after".

Sulṭān Āḥmad's mind becoming composed owing to the (promise of) peace, he evinced negligence and carelessness in the guarding of his troops, and in taking necessary precautions and care. Sulṭān Hūshang taking advantage of this opportunity made a 3 night attack on the night of the 12th Muḥarram-ul-ḥarām in the year 826 A.H.

1 The word خُوَّن is omitted in one MS.
2 It is not clear whether this last clause is part of the message. The verb خُلَّازم فِرْسَتَه is in the third person, which would indicate that it is not.
3 For the account of this night attack, as given in the history of the reign of Sulṭān Āḥmad of Gujrat, see pages 206, 207, and note 4 on page 206 and notes 1–3 on page 207. The account of the night attack as given here agrees mainly with that given by Fīrishtah, with the exception that in the text Rāy Šāmat is called the Rāja of Dundūh and the vulgar name of the place is given as Gari. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 181, 182) gives the 14th (and not the 12th) Mohurrum, 826 A.H. (29th December, 1422) as the date of the night attack. Šāmat Rāy is designated Savant Ray, Raja of Dundooka, who was "afterwards known by the name of Kurry Raja". He also says that Ahmad Shah captured "twenty elephants belonging to Sooltan Hooshung besides seven of those he had recently brought from Jainuggur". The Cambridge History of India passes over the night attack and the subsequent engagement.
Many people perished that night; among them Rāy Sāmat, the Rāy of the country of Dundāh, which now on the tongues and in the mouths of the (people) is called Kārī, was slain with five hundred Rājpūts, in the vicinity of the Sultān's pavilion. Sultān Ahmad came out of the camp with only one attendant, and stood on the open plain. Towards the morning men gathered round him, and about the time of the true dawn, which indeed was the dawn of the morning of good fortune, the Sultān fell upon Sultān Hūshang's troops, and the battle of bloodshed and slaughter became so severe, that both the Bādshāhs received wounds, and in the end Sultān Hūshang fled and took shelter in the citadel of Sārangpūr. Seven of the Jānjagār elephants were seized by Sultān Ahmad; and on the 4th of Rabī'-ul-ākhir of that year, Sultān Ahmad turned towards Gujrāt with victory and triumph.

When Hūshang became aware of this he came out of the citadel of Sārangpūr with great pride and audacity and started in pursuit. Sultān Ahmad turned round and confronted him. The flame of battle blazed up between the two armies, and at the first onset Sultān Hūshang put the army of Gujrāt into confusion. Sultān Ahmad seeing this himself advanced into the battle-field, and fought so well that the breeze of victory and triumph began to blow upon the plumes of his standards. Hūshang again fled, and took shelter in the fort of Sārangpūr. Then Sultān Ahmad returned to Gujrāt. It may be said that on the whole Sultān Hūshang was distinguished by bravery and high spirit, but he was not victorious in war; and in most of his battles, after much striving and struggle, he had to flee, and to soil the skirts of his courage with the dust of flight. When authentic information arrived that Sultān Ahmad had passed over the boundary of Gujrāt, Hūshang went from Sārangpūr to the fort of Mandū. The same year after some days, he repaired the damage sustained by his army, and advanced to conquer the fort of Kākrūn; and seized it in the course of a short time. In the same year he again advanced to conquer Gwāliar, and by successive marches, took possession of the neighbouring territory. After a month and some days had passed, Sultān Mubārak Shāh, son of Khiḍr Khān, marched with an army by way of Biyāna to aid the Rāy of Gwāliar. When this news reached Sultān Hūshang, he raised the siege, and advanced to meet the army
up to the 1 river of Dhōlpūr. After some days a peace was ratified; and it was agreed that Ḥūshang should give up the idea of conquering Gwāliar. The two parties then sent presents to each other and returned to their respective capitals.

2 In the year 832 A.H., 1428 A.D., messengers swift-footed like the wind and desert-traversing scouts brought the news that Sultan Aḥmad Shāh Bahmani, the ruler of the Deccan, had come with his troops, and was besieging the fort of Kehrī. When this news reached Ḥūshang Shāh, the humours of his spirit came to motion, and collecting a large army, he advanced to aid and succour the Rāy of Kehrī. Sultan Aḥmad becoming aware of this abandoned the idea of the conquest of Kehrī; and retired towards his own country. Ḥūshang, at the instigation of the Rāy of Kehrī, pursued him for three stages. Sultan Aḥmad then incited by his high spirit and shame turned round and engaged him. Although in the first assault defeat had fallen on the army of Sultan Aḥmad, yet the latter coming out of ambush attacked the centre of Ḥūshang’s army, and dispersed it. He fled towards Mandū; and the veiled one (his wife) with all the inmates of the harem fell into Sultan Aḥmad’s hands. The latter followed the path of generosity, and after making necessary 3 preparations, sent them to Mandū, and sent five hundred horsemen with them to escort them. This incident has been described in detail in the section about the Sultan’s of the Deccan.

In the year 4 835 A.H., 1431 A.D., Sultan Ḥūshang marched out of Mandū, with the determination to conquer Kālpī. When he arrived

1 The words are تا آب دهولپور in one MS. and تا باب دهولپور in the lith. ed. and in the other MS. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has تا تآلب دهولپور as far as the tank or reservoir of Dhōlpūr. I have adopted تا آب دهولپور as the correct reading.

2 Firishtah’s account contains greater details. The ruler of Kehrī recalled the son of Narsingh Rāy and it is added that Sultan Ḥūshang came to his succour at his invitation. The way in which the battle was fought, and the way in which Sultan Ahmad captured the baggage of Ḥūshang’s army, and the latter’s wives and daughters, and treated them with great respect and hospitality, and sent them back are described in greater detail. The Cambridge History of India’s account, page 351, also agrees, but Kehrī is written as Kherīa.

3 One MS. inserts حرم between سامان and حرمودة.

4 The account of Sultan Ḥūshang’s expedition to Kālpī, as given by Firishtah, agrees generally with that in the text, but he calls the former governor
near that place, news was brought to him that Sultan Ibrahîm Sharqî was coming with an innumerable host from his capital also to conquer Kâlpî. He considered the destruction of Sultan Ibrahîm should be taken up in preference to the conquest of Kâlpî, and advanced to give him battle. When the two armies approached each other, and a battle became a matter of today or tomorrow, Sultan Ibrahîm's scouts brought the news that Mubârak Shâh, Sultan of Delhi, availing himself of the opportunity was advancing on Jaunpûr. Sultan Ibrahîm, giving up the rein of control, started towards Jaunpûr. Hûshang obtained possession of Kâlpî without a contest, and had the public prayer read in his name. He remained there for some days, and placing the chain of gratitude on the shoulders of Qâdir Khân, who was a former ruler of Kâlpî, returned to Mâlwa.

On the way he received petitions from the thânâdârs, that turbulent tribes from the direction of the 1 Jâtbâ hills had come into his kingdom and had ravaged some villages and towns, and taken shelter in the reservoir of Bîhm. The description of this reservoir is as follows. In ancient times Bîhm had erected an embankment across the valley situated between (two) hills with chiselled stones. Its length and breadth were such that one bank was not visible from the other and its depth was unfathomable. Some days after this, even when they were on the way, 'Uthmân Khân, Shâhzâda, sent horsemen near the pavilion of 2 Ghaznîn Khân Shâhzâda, who was his elder brother;

---

1. The name is جانبه in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has جابه, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 185) has Jan hills. M. Hidayat Hosain has جانیہ Jâtiâ in the text-edition.

2. The name is عزتی خان Ghazni Khan here in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., though he was always عزتی خان, when it occurred in the section about the history of Gujrât. Firishtah has عزتی خان here also. Firishtah gives a detailed account of the seven sons of Sultan Hûshang. Of these three, viz., 'Uthmân Khân, Fath Khân, and Halbat Khân were united together, while Ahmad Khân, 'Umar Khân and Abû Isâq sided with Ghaznîn Khân. As to the disputes Firishtah's account agrees generally with that in the text, but the
and the man seated on his horse abused Ghaznīn Khān, and spoke harsh and unbecoming words about him. Although the ushers and eunuchs forbade him, he would not desist. Then the eunuchs pelted him with stones, and drove him away from the vicinity of the pavilion. Īthmān Khān Shāhzhāda then came to protect his servants and bastinaded the eunuchs. Becoming conscious of the impropriety of his conduct, however, he separated himself from the camp. He tempted the amirs of evil destiny with false promises, and commenced to act traitorously. When all this reached the ears of the Sultān Hūshang, the fire of wrath flamed up in the oven of his heart. He consulted Malik Mughīth Khān Jahān. The latter told him, acts like this have been repeatedly perpetrated by the Shāhzhāda, and have been pardoned. On the present occasion also the Sultān might overlook it, so that he might again join the camp. Sultān Hūshang overlooked the act as if by negligence; and Shāhzhāda Īthmān Khān came back and joined the camp. When Sultān Hūshang spread the shadow of his clemency over the inhabitants of the town of Ujjain, one day he arranged a majlis of public audience, and summoned Īthmān Khān Shāhzhāda with his two brothers, who were Fath Khān and Haibat Khān into his presence, and stood them in the place of punishment; and after reprimanding them made the three of them over to custodians. Then after some days he ordered Malik Mughīth, that he should place them in confinement, take them with him to the fort of Mandū, and guard them there.

1 He then advanced to chastise and punish the turbulent men of Jātba, and advancing by successive marches, broke down the embankment of the Bhim reservoir and traversing a distance on wings of speed totally destroyed the refractory people. The Rāja of the country

three refractory princes are there said to have been put in chains, and made over to Malik Mughīth. There are indications also of Sultān Hūshang’s intentions of making Maḥmūd Khān his heir; but Malik Mughīth always pretended that he had no desire to have the sovereignty for his son.

1 Firishtah’s account of the expedition against these men agrees with that in the text almost word for word; but he calls the Rāja, the Rāja of the Jābīs hill. He also says that among the prisoners there were many daughters and sons (of the Rāja). The references to these proceedings in Col. Briggs and in the Cambridge History of India are very brief.
at the foot of the Jâtbâ hill fled on foot, and concealed himself in jungle; and his family and all his treasure and wealth fell into the Sultân’s hands; and the towns and cities were devastated. So many prisoners were taken, that they were beyond all count. The Sultân returned with victory and triumph and went to the fort of Hûshangâbâd and passed the rainy season there.

One day he went out with the intention of hunting. While he was out, a Badakhshâni ruby fell out of his head-dress. On the 3rd day after that a man who was going on foot brought it back to him. The Sultân gave him a reward of five hundred gold tankas; and in connection with this, he told the following anecdote: “One day a ruby fell out of the crown of Sultân Firûz Shâh; and a man who was passing brought it to him. Sultân Firûz Shâh gave him a reward of five hundred gold tankas; and said, ‘This is a sign of the setting of the sun of my grandeur’; and after some days he departed from this ephemeral world. I also know that the thread of my life has been twisted, and there are not more than a few breaths left.”

The men who were in the majlis, having offered prayers (for his health etc.), submitted that “On the day, on which Sultân Firûz said these words, his age had reached 90 years, while His Majesty the Sultân was yet in the prime of his life and success.” Hûshang said that “The number of one’s breaths can neither be increased nor diminished.”

After some days he had an attack of diabetes, while he was still at Hûshangâbâd. When the Sultân saw the signs of his departure and marks of his demise, he started from Hûshangâbâd towards Mandû. On the way, he held a majlis of public audience, and he gave the seal ring of the kingdom to his true-born son Ghaznîn Khan in the presence of the amîrs and his personal attendants and the commanders of the army; and declared him to be his heir. He held the latter’s hand

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 352, says that “at this time he founded the city of Hoshangâbâd on the Narbada,” but neither the Tabaqât nor Firishtah says so.

2 The word is جوâ and the Cambridge History of India, page 352, calls it his “jewelled crown”, but the Sultân would hardly have gone out hunting, with a jewelled crown on his head. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 185) calls it his tiara.

3 The name is صلال بیر. The dictionary meaning is a morbid excess of urine, diabetes. Col. Briggs calls it an attack of stone (vol. IV, p. 189).
and placed him in charge of Maḥmūd Khān. The latter after carrying out the rites of homage, submitted, "As long as there would be remnant of life left in me, I shall not hold myself excused from loyal and devoted service." The Sultān then directed the amīrs generally, that they should not soil the field of the kingdom by the dust of malice and hostility.

As the Sultān had, by the clarity of his perception, come to know, that Maḥmūd Khān intended that the office of the sovereign should be transferred to himself, he filled his ears with counsel and advice; and bringing the rights of the support and nurture, which he had received, to his recollection, said, "Sultān Aḥmād Gujratī is a monarch of great grandeur, and is a lord of the sword. He has always had the determination to conquer Mālwa, and is waiting for an opportune moment. If there is any neglect or dilatoriness in the organisation of the affairs of state, or in the supervision of the troops and subjects, or if there is any negligence in the carrying out of your duties towards Shaḥzāda Ghaznī Khān, his determination to conquer this kingdom will be strengthened; and your union will be changed to dissension."

At the next stage Shaḥzāda Ghaznī Khān sent Malik Maḥmūd Nāmī, who had the title of 'Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Maḥmūd Khān, and sent him the following message, "If you, the asylum of the vazārat, should strengthen the knot of allegiance by oaths, it would be the cause of my mind being greatly assured." Maḥmūd Khān accepted the request of the Shaḥzāda, and confirmed his promise and engagements by oaths.

Some amīrs, who wanted that Shaḥzāda 'Uṭhmān Khān should succeed (to the throne), represented to the Sultān, through Khwājah Naṣr-ul-lah Dabīr, that as Shaḥzāda 'Uṭhmān Khān was also a young man of good manners and a true son, it would be right and proper that he should be released from prison, and a part of the country of Mālwa should be allotted to him as his jāgīr. Sultān Ḥūshāng said, "This has also appeared to be desirable in my mind, but if I release

---

1 The MSS. have no متنظر. The lith. ed., has متنظر. I have retained this. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted متنظر in the text.

2 The MS. as well as the lith. ed. have only بدل امام which does not make the meaning quite clear. Firishtah makes it clearer by adding the words
‘Uthmān Khān, the affairs of the kingdom would be in danger, and disorders and disturbances would take place.’ When Ghaznīn Khān heard that some amīrs had tried to procure the release of ‘Uthmān Khān, he again sent Malik Maḥmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Maḥmūd Khān, and represented to him, 1 that they should, in their presence, strengthen the lofty edifice of their agreement by oaths. Maḥmūd Khān joined the Shāhzhāda while he was riding on the march, and again swore, that as long as the last remnant of life would be left to him, he would not abandon the side of the Shāhzhāda.

When the amīrs became acquainted with all these affairs, Malik ‘Uthmān Jalāl, who was one of the great amīrs, sent two reliable sardārs with Malik Mubārak Ghāzi to wait on Maḥmūd Khān. It so happened that Malik Maḥmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk was yet in attendance on Maḥmūd Khān, when the prayers of Malik Mubārak Ghāzi and those two amīrs were brought to him. Maḥmūd Khān left Malik Maḥmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk in the pavilion, and himself came out and sat at the door, so that Malik Maḥmūd ‘Umdat-ul-mulk 2 might hear

Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah Col. Briggs says that “The King at his (i.e., Mahmood Khan’s) instance consented to release the young Prince, Oothman Khan, from confinement, and to give him an estate on which he might reside, and have no plea for disturbing the reign of Ghizny Khan” (vol. IV, pp. 186, 187).

1 The readings are different, and not quite intelligible. One MS. has ك در حضرت بکدگر قصر شامع عهد را بقسم استنحکام دهدن while the lith. ed. has حضرت بکدگر قصر سامع عهد را بقسم معکم سازد; while the lith. ed. has حضرت بکدگر قصر سامع عهد را بقسم معکم سازد. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has ک در حضرت بکدگر قصر شامع عهد را بقسم استنحکام دهدن. None of the readings is quite satisfactory. I have adopted the reading of the first MS., which agrees with that in the lith. ed., except that in the latter قصر has been changed my mistake to مصر. Even in this reading, however, the metaphor of calling the agreement a lofty edifice appears to be fantastic. In the reading in Firishtah there is no noun for the adjective شامع to qualify; and it does not appear quite right that Ghaznîn Khān should call himself faqr, in speaking to Maḥmūd Khān. M. Hadiyât Hosain has ک در حضرت بکدگر قصر شامع عهد را بقسم استنحکام دهدن in the text-edition.

2 Instead of instead of دندن has been adopted in the text-edition.
whatever would be said. When Malik Mubarak Ghazi came with his two companions, and 1 conveyed the prayers of Malik 'Uthman Jalal and Shahzada 'Uthman Khan, Malik 'Uthman Jalal represented that, "The questions of the sultanaat and the vazirat were under consideration; and when a vazir like him was seated on the masnad, it was strange that in spite of the fact that 'Uthman Khan was adorned with liberality and courage and the qualities of administering impartial justice, and of protecting and helping the ra'iyyats, it should be decided, that Ghazan Khan should be declared as the heir to the throne. Moreover 'Uthman Khan has the relationship of a son-in-law to the Malik-ush-sharq (i.e., Malik Mughith, father of Mahmud Khan); and therefore his sons are also your (i.e., Mahmud Khan's) sons. If infirmity had not prevailed over the Sultân, and 2 if an error had not occurred in his righteousness, he would never have attempted to do such a thing. All the Khâns and amirs urge you, that paying (favourable) attention to the circumstances of 'Uthman Khan you would not withdraw your hand of support from his head, for if the work of the sovereignty is transferred to 'Uthman Khan, the kingdom would again acquire greatness and splendour." Mahmud Khan replied, "A slave or servant is concerned only with slavery and service. As to authority or over-lording 3 he knows. In the whole

1 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has ملك عثمان جلال معمودش. The other MS. inserts between عثمان جلال رسبيد and ملك عثمان جلال معمودش; while the lith. ed. has رسبيد ملك عثمان جلال. I have adopted the first reading, but M. Hidayat Hosain has inserted between عثمان جلال رسبيد and ملك عثمان خان رسبيد. According to lith. ed. of Firishtah also it was Malik 'Uthman Khan Jalâl who was sent by the partisans of 'Uthman Khan with Malik Mubarak Ghazi, but the latter as in the text was the spokesman of the party. Malik 'Uthman Jalâl is called Mullik Othman Julwany by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 187).

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah all say, this appears to be incorrect. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqât which has قوي في تصورى instead of قوي Ì نمي يامع; but M. Hidayat Hosain has retained قوي in the text-edition.

3 It is in both the MSS., the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I suppose the or he refers to the Sultân.
period of my service I have never strayed after what is beyond my province."

When Malik Mubarak Ghazi obtained permission to leave, (Mehmed Khan) called Malik Mehmed 'Umdat-ul-mulk outside, and said, "Go and report this to the Shahzada." Malik Mehmed went and narrated what had happened. The Shahzada's mind being now reassured about Mehmed Khan, was highly pleased.

After the amirs had become despondent of the life of Sultan Hushang, 1 Zafar Minjumla, who was the peshwa of Malik 'Uthman Jalal, fled from the camp of Sultan Hushang, with the intention of winning over the custodians of 'Uthman Khan, and arranging for the latter's escape. When this news reached Mehmed Khan, he immediately acquainted Shahrzada Ghaznun Khan of it, so that he might try to remedy what had happened. The Shahrzada sent Malik Barkhurdar, 2 Malik Hasan and Shaikh Malik to seize Zafar Minjumla. Malik Barkhurdar and Malik Hasan asked for horses, which should be 3 fresh and strong. He ordered that fifty horses should be given to them from the royal stables. As the superintendent of the stables was a partisan of 'Uthman Khan Shahrzada, he said in reply, "As long as the Sultan is alive, I shall not give a single horse without his express order;" and going to one of the chief eunuchs, who was also a partisan of 'Uthman Khan, 4 repeated these words to him. The wretched Khwajah, supposing that these words would be the cause

---


2 One MS. has Malik Husain instead of Malik Hasan; and neither MS. has the between Malik Hasan and Shaikh Malik. The name of Shaikh Malik is omitted in the next sentence in the MSS. Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Hasan and Malik Barkhurdar, and omits Shaikh Malik altogether. Col. Briggs says that Ghizny Khan "ordered a party of fifty men of the royal guards to overtake and bring back Zaffar Khan" (vol. IV, p. 187).

3 The word is تازة زور.

4 The words تقرار نموذ - خواجه بي دولت اين سفن را are omitted in one MS. and in the lith. ed. The MSS. and the lith. ed. are very incorrect and imperfect here, and I am rather doubtful about the correct reading. As to the word خواجه د ول as an epithet of خواجه I do not know what it really means, but it may mean wretched, though why this epithet should be used I do not know.
of the Sultan's protest and anger, explained to the superintendent of
the stables to go near the place, where the Sultan was lying and to
repeat these words in a loud voice, so that they might reach the
Sultan's ears, and make an impression on his mind, that even while
he was still alive, Ghaznîn Khân was stretching his hand to seize his
property. When the superintendent of the stables said these words
with vigor and emphasis, the Sultan in his unconciousness, having
regained a little perception, said, "Where is my quiver?" and called
for the amîrs.

The amîrs, thinking that God forbid! that the Sultan should
have died; and Ghaznîn Khân should have got hold of us by means
of this trick, and should destroy us, did not go to the Sultan 1 except
Maîmûd Khân. When this news reached Ghaznîn Khân a great fear
and awe fell upon his heart, and he fled and went to Kâkrûn, which
was three stages from the camp. He sent Malik Maîmûd 'Umdat-ul-
mulk to wait on Maîmûd Khân with the following message, "All the
amîrs have combined together to raise 'Uthmân Khân to the throne,
and I have no one to support me except yourself. As the Sultan
had called for his quiver, I thought that he might after arriving at
Mandû imprison me also, and place me beside my brothers." Maîmûd
Khân sent the following reply: "You have never done anything
contrary to the wishes of the Sultan. I shall explain to the Sultan,
the matter of your order about giving the horses, at the right moment."
Ghaznîn Khân again sent Malik Maîmûd 'Umdat-ul-mulk, with the
following message: "Although you, the asylum of the vazîrat, have
taken me by the hand, yet as I know that the eunuchs have com-
unicated some displeasing words (about me) to the Sultan, fear has
overwhelmed me." Maîmûd Khân sent this message, "There is no
2 matter. Do you please return soon to the camp, for there is little
time, and the sun is about to set." He also wrote a letter in the
presence of Malik Maîmûd 'Umdat-ul-mulk and sent it to Malik
Muglîth to the following purport: "His Majesty the Sultan has

---

1 The words  ممود خان occur in the MS., and in the lith. ed. The meaning
is doubtful.

2 The word is  جعف, or نفظه in the MS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah
lith. ed. also has  جعف.
declared Ghaznìn Khán to be his heir and successor; His Majesty’s illness has made him very weak, and those who are near him have given up all hope of his life. It is right that you should make every endeavour to guard Sháhzáda ‘Uthmán Khán.”

When Malik Maḥmúd went and waited upon Ghaznìn Khán, and gave him Maḥmúd Khán’s message, and described the purport of the letter, he was delighted and came back to the camp. When 1 Malik Änchhá, the paymaster of the forces, and the eunuchs, who were partisans of ‘Uthmán Khán, saw that there was a breath left in the Sultán, they determined among themselves, that early next morning, they would place him in a palanquin without informing the amírs and 2 Maḥmúd Khán, and go with all speed to Mandú, and bringing Sháhzáda ‘Uthmán Khán out of prison place him on the throne. Maḥmúd Khán having obtained information of the plan became watchful for the death of Húshang. He ordered the palanquin to be placed on the ground there, and then 3 Ghaznìn Khán, under

1 The name is Malk Añjha in the MS. and Malk Añjha in the lith. ed.

2 One MS. omits Maḥmúd Khán. The other MS. has Amra Muḥammad Khán. The lith. ed. has Amra Muḥammad Khán. I have adopted the second reading, but it may be that the reading of the lith. ed. is correct, for there is no reason why the amírs, who were in favour of ‘Uthmán Khán should be kept in ignorance of the plan. If this reading is correct, then the text would be the amírs on the side of Maḥmúd Khán instead of the amírs and Maḥmúd Khán.

3 There is some difference in the readings here also. The MSS. have Ghaznìn Khán was so much under the thumb of Maḥmúd Khán, that it is quite possible that he should have acted under the orders of the other, and therefore the reading in the MS. which I have accepted is correct; though one would have thought, that whatever the actual relations of the two men might have been, Maḥmúd Khán would have, outwardly at least, acted under the orders of Ghaznìn Khán and not vice versa.

Firishtah gives a slightly different account. He says that the Khán Jahán and the eunuchs started with the palanquin with the dying Sultán in it. After they had gone some distance the Sultán died. Maḥmúd Khán obtaining information of this sent men, so that they might reprimand the eunuchs about their haste, and keep the palanquin there. The eunuchs explained that Húshang had ordered that he should be carried to Mandú as quickly as possible, and they
the orders of Maḥmūd Khān had the royal pavilion fixed up, and occupied himself in putting the corpse into a shroud and coffin. Each one of the amīrs (apparently of the opposite faction) went to a secluded place and stayed there.

After the enshrouding of the corpse Maḥmūd Khān came out, and said in a loud voice, “Sultān Hūshang has died under Divine Dispensation; and has made Ghaznīn Khān his heir and successor. Whoever is with us should come and make his homage; and whoever is against us should separate himself from the camp, and should go about his own affairs.” Maḥmūd Khān then kissed Ghaznīn Khān’s hand, and having rendered him homage, wept much. Then the other amīrs one after another kissed Ghaznīn Khān’s feet, and wept, crying Alas! Alas! When the accession of Ghaznīn Khān was confirmed by the homage of the amīrs and of the great men of the age, they took up the corpse of Sultān Hūshang and carried it towards the madrasa; and on the 9th Dhī-hijjah, 838 A.H., consigned it to the dust.

Verses:

Where are the kings of Jamshīd-like power,
From Hūshang and Jamshīd to Isfandiyār!
Farīdūn and Kaikhūsrū and  Jām Kū,

were only carrying out his orders. Ghaznīn Khān and Maḥmūd Khān did not give any reply, and the latter ordered the royal pavilion to be set up, and commenced to put the Sultān’s corpse into the shroud and coffin.

1 I think this is the first time in this history, that the ceremony of the kissing of the hands is mentioned. Of course there are plenty of instances of kissing the feet and of kissing the ground near the Bādshāh’s seat or feet. Here also the other amīrs kissed the feet while Maḥmūd Khān alone was privileged to kiss the hand.

2 Firishtah adds in Shādīlābd Māndū.

3 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 189) gives the Hijri date as the 9th Zoehuj, 835 and the corresponding A.D. date as 7th September, 1432. The correct date according to the Tabaqāt and Firishtah is 9th Dhī-hijjah, 838 A.H. The Cambridge History of India, page 352, gives July 6th, 1435, as the date of Sultān Hūshang’s death. The correct A.D. date according to Sewell and Dikshit’s Indian Calendar appears to be 7th September, 1435.

4 I cannot exactly find out what Jām Kū means.
Where are gone Shāpūr and Bahram Kūr.  
They all rest their heads on brick and dust.  
Happy he, who, save of good, sowed not seed!

A grand assemblage was convened in the palace of Sultān Hūshang; and Malik Mughīth Khān Jahān and all the other amīrs rendered homage, and performed the ceremony of making thanks-offerings.

The period of Hūshang’s reign was thirty years. The date of his death (838 A.H.) can be found and understood from the words “Alas! Shāh Hūshang is no more.”

AN ACCOUNT OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF HŪSHANG SHĀH GHŪRĪ.

When Hūshang Shāh accepted the summons of the just God, on the 11th Dhul-hijjah, the amīrs, against their wishes, but by the exertion of Malik Mughīth, and the arrangements made by Mahmūd Kūrān rendered homage anew to Ghaznīn Khān, who had been chosen by Hūshang. He distinguished each one of the amīrs by conferring on them robes of honour and titles, and assured them (of safety). 2 The great and well-known men of Mālwa were made happy by the grant of rewards and stipends. The city of Mandū received the name of Shādiābad, and the public prayers having been read, and the coins struck in the name of Ghaznīn Kūrān he received the title of Sultān Muhammad Shāh. Every one who had a fief or a stipend anywhere had it confirmed and resettled. In short, although the amīrs had not been pleased with Ghaznīn Khān being made the Sultān, yet owing to the excellence of the management and the skill of Malik Mughīth and Mahmūd Kūrān, a new grandeur and splendour appeared in the administration. The people became the new Sultān’s adherents, and an affection for him gained an ascendancy over the empire of men’s heart. He conferred the title of Masnad-i-‘Āli Khān Jahān on

---

1 One MS. has گر, the other MS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have گر. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has گر. The name of Bahram is so closely associated with گر or the wild ass which he hunted, that I have thought that the reading should be گر. M. Hidayat Hosain has گر in the text-edition.
2 One MS. inserts an ی before گر.
3 One MS. omits the word ہیہ.
Malik Mughith, and kept the reins of the vazārat, as before, in his powerful grasp.

But as after some days he made attempts on the lives of his brothers, and shed unrighteous blood; and drew the pencil across the eyes of Nizām Khān, his nephew and son-in-law, and of the three sons of the latter, men’s heart were filled with abhorrence of him, and hatred took the place of love in them. The blood of his murdered brother was necessarily not a good omen for him; and in a very short time the rule of the empire passed out of his dynasty.

1 Disturbances and rebellion, 2 which had fallen asleep in the country, awoke again; and refractory and turbulent men 3 raised the standard of violence, and the dust of disturbance and rebellion.

Couplet:

If evil thou hast done, hope not danger to escape,
For, it is right for nature to retaliate.

Among the others the Rājpūts of the country of 4 Hārūtī placed their feet outside the circle of allegiance and raided a part of the kingdom. When this news reached Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, he nominated Khān Jahān on the 11th of Rabī‘-ul-awwal 839 A.H., to punish them and bestowing two elephants and a special robe of honour on him, started him on the expedition.

He placed the affairs of the soldiery and the ra‘iyats on the shelf of oblivion, and contracted the habit of continual drinking. He always united and joined up the morning draughts with the evening draughts and vice versa. At last one day a number of the old wretches sent him a message through an inmate of his harem, to the effect,

---

1 One MS. has پہلے پادیت ارد after آشوب.
2 One MS. has خواب شد instead of خواب شدہ.
3 One MS. has پر انتخابند instead of پر انتخابند.
4 The name is Hārūtī in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has ناندہ, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 192) has Nandota. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the rebellion here, or the expedition under Malik Mughis to crush it, but later on after Mahmūd Khān had seized the palace, he is said, on page 353, “to have summoned his father, who was engaged in hostilities against the Hārā Rājpūts of Hārūtī”. Hārūtī cannot, however, be transliterated as Harōti. It can be transliterated either as Hārūti or Hārauti. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has حادرتی in the text.
that a crow of greed had laid an egg of pride in the brain of Mahmūd Khān; and he was thinking, how he could remove the Sultān out of the way and himself sit on the throne of empire. Sultān Muḥammad made an agreement with those men, that before Mahmūd Khān could carry this wicked wish from potentiality to actual facts, he himself should be removed out of the way. When this news reached Mahmūd Khān, he said, "Praise be to God! that the breach of the agreement has not occurred from my side." He occupied himself in attending to his own affairs, and always collected troops and retainers. He went to wait on Sultān Muḥammad with great caution and care. When the Sultān observed the cautious ways of Mahmūd Khān, it became the cause of increased anxiety and fear. One day, he seized Mahmūd Khān’s hand, and took him into the harem. He called his wife, who was a sister of Mahmūd Khān, and said in her presence, "It is my hope that you will not do any harm to my life, and the affairs of the kingdom will be in your charge without any contention or hostility". Mahmūd Khān said, "Perhaps the engagements and oaths have passed out of the Sultān’s mind that he brings such words on his tongue. If some malicious persons, for their own wicked purpose, have spoken words to him, he will in the end be abashed and ashamed. If there is any fear or apprehension of me in the mind of the Sultān, I am now alone, and there is nothing to prevent it (my death).

Couplet:
If for loyalty you are, here are my heart and life,
If for enmity, here are the charger and my head".

Sultān Muḥammad then made his excuses; and the two men behaved with softness and flattery. But as the Sultān was obsessed by his suspicions; words and gestures indicating his distrust appeared

---

1 The phrase is written in different ways. It is الله الحمد لله in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and is الله الحمد لله in the other. Firishtah lith. ed. has الله الحمد لله على كل. M. Hidayat Ḥasan has correctly الله الحمد مثلي لله the text.

2 One MS. has خود را محاورته مي نموذ استعداد أمي بود instead of خود را محاورته مي نموذ استعداد أمي بود, which occurs in the other and in the lith. ed.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ما اعتناني, but the other MSS. have ما اعتناني ما اعتناني.
from him every moment. Maḥmūd Khān began to make great exertions and endeavours in gaining his objects. He tempted the Sultān's cup-bearer with much gold, and had the Sultān killed by giving him poison in his wine. The tongue of the circumstances of Sultān Muḥammad thus victimised and done to death, began to sing in this tune; and the faithless time throw up this noise into the curve of the arch of the sky.

Couplets:

A few breaths, I said with pleasure, shall I take,
Alas! they were stopped on the path from my heart.
Alas! that at the table of the viands of life,
I, for a moment partook; and then they said "stop".

When the amīrā became cognisant of this, 1 Khwājah Naṣr-ullah
Paraniyānī and Malik Mashir-ul-mulk, and Lāṭif Zakariyā and some other sardārs combined together, and bringing Shāhzāda Masʿūd Khān, who was in his thirteenth year, out of the harem, placed him on the throne. They agreed among themselves, that they would remove Maḥmūd Khān out of the way by any means that they could. They sent Malik Bāyazīd Shaikhā to him, and told him, "Sultān Muḥammad Shāh has sent for you to come with great quickness; and wishes 3 to send you as an ambassador to Gujrat." As Maḥmūd Khān was aware of the death of Sultān Muḥammad he replied, "I have relinquished the duties of the vazīrat, and wish to pass the remaining years of my life, as a sweeper of the tomb of Sultān Hūshang. But notwithstanding this determination of mine, as the marrow of my bones has been nourished by the beneficence of Hūshang Shāh,

---

1 The names are as I have them in the text in one MS. except that of Mashir-ul-mulk, which is that of Shār-ul-mulk. In the other the name is Malik Mashir-ul-mulk; and in the lith. ed. Paraniyānī is written as Harṣānī; otherwise they agree with the first MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has Khwājah Naṣr Ullah, vazīr, and Mashir ul-mulk and Lāṭif Dīkākāriyā. The names are not given by Col. Briggs and in the Cambridge History of India. The former (vol. IV, p. 193) has, "The officers about the king's person", and the latter (page 353) "a faction among the nobles".

2 M. Hidāyat Ḥosain has برد نبایی in the text.

3 The MSS. have رسول، and the lith. ed. has رسولی. It is in the corresponding passage in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. This would mean, wishes to send you on an embassy, and appears to be a better reading than the others.
if all the amirs would come to my house, then after discussing all differences of counsels, we would report to the Sultan whatever is determined upon, as appears to be right and proper."

Malik Bayazid Shakhbah returned to the amirs, and informed them, that "Mahmud Khān has not yet received the news of the Sultan's death; if you will all go together to his house, he will go with you to the palace, and he can then be disposed off." Acting on Bayazid Shakhbah's words the amirs went to Mahmud Khān. The latter had kept his men ready in concealed places. When the amirs entered, he asked, "Has the Sultan recovered his senses or is he still lying drunk?" The amirs knew what he was saying. After a moment his men came out of the chambers, and fell upon the amirs. They seized all of them and made them over to guards. As the lofty edifice of the remaining amirs, who were with Mas'ud Khān tottered under the blow of this news, they collected their troops, and made the retinue of the Sultan ready; and bringing the royal umbrella from the tomb of Sultan Hūshang, raised it over the head of Mas'ud Khān.

Mahmūd Khān on hearing this news mounted and advanced towards the palace, with the object of seizing both the Shāhzādas, and disposing off them. When he got near the palace both sides seized their arrows and spears, and the battle of slaughter and bloodshed lasted till night. When the lord of the stars (that is the sun) hid himself behind the veil of darkness, Shāhzāda 'Umar Khān got down from the fort and took the path of flight; and Mas'ud Khān took sanctuary with Shaikh Jāildah, who was one of the great (holy) men of the age. The amirs fled and betook themselves to the corners of safety. Mahmūd Khān remained in front of the palace till the morning, fully armed and ready for all emergencies. When the white light of morning appeared from the sea of the darkness of night,

---

1 One MS. has شوق و كنگاش, the other has شوق و كنگاش, and the lith. ed. has شوق و كنگاش. Firishtah lith. ed. has شوق و كنگاش. The first reading is followed in the text-edition.

2 The word is نهان خانها. The corresponding word in Firishtah lith. ed. is نهان corners.

3 The meaning of this is not quite clear, but the same words occur in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
news was brought to him, that the palace was empty, and the enemies, each one of them, had hid themselves in corners.

Mahmūd Khān then entered the palace, and sent a swift messenger to summon his father Khān Jahān. The latter arrived on the wings of speed. Mahmūd Khān assembled the amirs and Maliks and sent the following message to Khān Jahān: 1 “The world cannot exist without a ruler. If the throne of the empire remains unoccupied by the person of a sovereign, many disturbances are produced in the world from the womb of time, the suppression of which becomes difficult. The kingdom of Mālwa has become extensive and refractory, and turbulent men have not yet wakened from sleep. Also the news has not yet reached the Sultāns of the surrounding countries. Otherwise they would have advanced towards us from all directions.” Khān Jahān sent the following reply: 3 “No one should attempt to assume this exalted position, which is a twin brother of the rank of the Prophet, unless he is possessed of the qualities of exalted lineage and perfect generosity and bravery and justice and wisdom, (and unless this is the case) the affairs of the empire do not acquire grandeur and glory. Praise be to God! that my son has all those qualities, which a Sultan should possess. It behoves him (therefore) that at an auspicious moment, he should place his foot on the masnad of the sultanat, and seat himself on the throne of

---

1 The message does not contain a direct appeal to Malik Mughlī to assume the sovereignty of Mālwa, though it implies it. Fīrishtah lith. ed., however, says that Mahmūd Khān wrote to Khān Jahān, that the sultanat belongs by right to you; and you should come quickly and seat yourself on the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, also says that Mahmūd Khān “offered the crown to his father”, but the latter “declined the honour”.

2 Both MSS. have incorrectly جهایانی, people of the world. The lith. ed. has the correct reading جهایانی a ruler. Fīrishtah in the corresponding passage also has جهایانی.

3 Khān Jahān’s message as given in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. appears to me to be incomplete. It appears to me that some word like کس should be inserted before منقل and some words like نباید شد after نباید شد; and the منقل after اور is changed to or. Fīrishtah lith. ed. omits the words from مسند to and then the sentence makes good sense.

4 One MS. and the lith. ed. have ان but the other MS. has اب. This latter appears to me to be better.
"empire." When the messenger brought this message, all the amirs and great men applauded this sentiment, and attested to the truth of the word. The astrologers, who knew the stars, were ordered that they should select an auspicious moment for the accession. All the amirs and the wise men of the kingdom and the great men of the city kissed Mahmud Khan's hand, and congratulated him on his accession.

Couplet:
If one goes, another in his place doth come,
The world never without a bridegroom (ruler) is.

The period of the rule of Sultan Muhammad was one year and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN MAHMUD KHALJI.

The narrators of the histories of the Sultan have related, that on Monday 1 the 29th of the month of Shawwāl in the year 839 A.H., Sultan Mahmud Khalji ascended the throne of the Khilafat of Malwa. His age at that time had attained to 34 years. In the whole of the country of Malwa public prayers were read, and coins struck in his name. All the amirs were gladened with kindness and favour, and the stipends and rank of each were increased. A number of them were selected, and received titles. Among these Mashir-ul-mulk had the title of Nizam-ul-mulk conferred on him, and the reins of the vazarat were placed in his powerful hands. Malik Barkhurdar received the title of Taj Khan, and the office of the pay-master of the kingdom was entrusted to him. Khan Jahan received the title of Azam Humayun; and an umbrella and white quiver, which were specially reserved for sultans, were bestowed on him; and it was also settled that the harems and squires of Azam Humayun should have staffs of gold and silver in their hands, and, whenever he should mount or dismount, should say in a loud voice: In the name of the benevolent and merciful God!, which in those days was the exclusive privilege of sultans.

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 196) gives the corresponding A.D. date as May 16th, 1435. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, gives 13th May, 1436, as the date of Mahmud Khalji's accession. According to Sewell and Dikshit's Indian Calendar the day and date appear to be Thursday, the 24th of August, 1435.
When the empire was firmly fixed on Sultân Mahmûd, he devoted his energy to the support of learned and wise men; and whenever he heard of any person of great ability, he sent money to him, and summoned him. He also established colleges in his kingdom, and granted stipends to the learned men and to students, and kept them occupied with imparting and receiving knowledge and learning. In short, the country of Mâlwa in the period of his rule became an object of envy to Shirâz and Samarqand.

As the work of the government was properly administered and all the affairs of the kingdom acquired order, 1 Malik Qûṭb-ud-din Shaibânî and 2 Malik Naqîr-ud-din Dabîr, and a number of the other Hûshang Shâhî amîrs, owing to their envy, attempted to act treacherously in concert with 3 Malik Yûsuf Qawâm. With the object of carrying out their intention, they placed a ladder one night, and climbed to the roof of a masjid which was adjacent to the palace of Mahmûd Shâh. From that place they came down to the courtyard of the palace, and were thinking what they should do next. At this time Mahmûd Shâh appeared there, and with very great bravery came out of the house with his quiver bound round him; and coming within bow-shot wounded some (of them). About this time 4 Nizâm-ul-mulk and Malik 5 Mahmûd Khîdr arrived fully armed.

---

1 The suffix to the name is Shâbânî in both MSS., but it is Rustânî in the lith. ed. and Sumnânî in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 197) has Sumnâm.

2 He is called Malik Nâsir-ad-din Dâbir and Col. Briggs gives Nuseer-ad-din Jooryanj. Is he the same man as Khwâjah Nâsir-ad-din Parniyânî mentioned on page 494 and in note 1 on the same page?

3 He is so called in both MSS. The lith. ed. calls him, evidently by mistake, Malik Yûsuf Qaum. Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Yûsuf Qawâm-ul-mulk. Col Briggs does not mention him. The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of any of the conspirators.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Mashîr-ul-mulk, who had the title of Nizâm-ul-mulk.

5 Both MSS. call him what I have called him in the text. The lith. ed. erroneously inserts a word between Malik Mahmûd and Khîdr. Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Muhammed Khîdr.
from outside with a body of *silâhdârs*. The conspirators fled by the
very route by which they had entered, and made their escape. One
of them, however, who had been wounded by an arrow, could not
descend by the ladder; and threw himself on the ground from the
roof of the mosque. His leg was broken, and he was seized, and was
taken (before the Sultân ?); and he wrote down the names of all the
men who were among the conspirators. Early next morning, they
were all brought before the Sultan, and were punished.

But Ā'zam Humâyûn begged for the ¹ pardon of the offences
of Shâhzâda Aḥmad Khân, son of Hūshang Shâh, and Malik Yûsuf
Qawâm and ² Malik Anghâ and Malik Naṣîr-ud-dîn Dâbîr, although
they had had a full share in creating the disturbance; and selected
the fort of Islâmâbâd for the Shâhzâda; and conferred the title of
Qawâm Khân and the fief of Bâllâ on Malik Yûsuf Qawâm; the fief
of Hūshangâbâd on Malik Anghâ; and the title of Naṣîr Khân,
and the fief of Chandârî by deputation (*Nîyâbat*) to Malik Naṣîr-ud-dîn.
They obtained leave to go to their *jâgîrs*. When Shâhzâda Aḥmad
Khân reached Islâmâbâd, he at once raised the dust of disturbance
and rebellion. His forces began to increase day by day, and although
Tâj Khân, who had been nominated to suppress them, sat down at the
foot of the fort of Islâmâbâd, he was unable to effect any result.
Aḥmad Khân sent out a detachment every day from the fort, and
kept (the men at) the foot of the fort hotly engaged in battle. Tâj
Khân sent a petition, and begged for reinforcements. About this
time scouts brought the news to the Sultan that Malik Anghâ, the
feudatory of Hūshangâbâd, and Naṣîr Khân the feudatory of
Chandârî had raised the flag of hostility and the standard of revolt.
Sultân Maḥmûd sent Ā'zam Humâyûn Khân Jahân, to teach the
rebels a lesson, and to arrange all the affairs of the country. When
the latter arrived within two *karûhs* of Islâmâbâd, Tâj Khân and the
other *sardârs* hastened to meet him, and explained the true state of

¹ The word is in one MS. and استعفائي in the other. The lith. ed.
has what looks like استعفائي. Firishtah lith. ed. has استعفائي. M. Hidayat
Hosain has adopted استعفائي in the text-edition.

² He is not mentioned by Firishtah here, but later on in the distribution
of fiefs he is called ملك جهاد in the lith. ed., and Mulik Ithad by Col. Briggs
(vol. IV, p. 198).
things to him. On the second day, he started, and having occupied the environs of the fort, distributed the batteries. The next day he sent a number of wise men and Shaikhs to Ahmad Khan, so that they might after filling his ears with the pearls of advice and the gems of precepts, warn him of the evil effects of a breach of agreements and engagements. Although the Shaikhs and learned men read the texts of persuasion and intimidation to him, his stony heart did not become affected. In reply to the sound precepts he gave equally rare replies, and having given permission to the kind-hearted preceptors sent them out of the fort. Qawam Khan also, acting in a spirit of hostility, sent some arms and other war-like materials to him from his own battery, and strengthened the foundations of amity by promises and engagements. When the siege was prolonged, one day one of the musicians gave poison to Ahmad Khan in his wine; and throwing himself out of the citadel joined the camp of Azam Humayun; and the fort was captured. Azam Humayun after arranging matters there left one of his trusted men at that place, and marched towards Hushangabad.

On the way Qawam Khan fled from Azam Humayun's camp, and went away towards Bhilsa. Azam Humayun considered the overthrow of Malik Anchha to be of primary importance, and continued his advance to Hushangabad. Malik Anchha, finding that he had not the strength to meet him, left all his equipage and other things, and went away towards the foothills of Gondwana. When the Gonds knew that he had turned his face from his lord and master, they collected in large numbers and blocked his way; and killed all of them by pelting them with stones, and shooting them with arrows, and plundered all their goods and property. Azam Humayun on

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بنیان, but the other MS. has بنیاد.
2 One MS. has كار معاصرة, the other omits كار, while the lith. ed. has حول معاصرة. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has كار معاصرة.
3 Firishtah makes this somewhat clearer by saying ساکنشی اعظم همايون بالنظر مقدمه دیگر با بنابر مقدمه دیگر i.e., either at the instigation of Azam Humayun or for some other reason; and adds زمین داده نشده. The Cambridge History of India, page 333, says positively that Ahmad Khan was poisoned “at the instigation of Mughals.”
hearing this news was highly pleased and entered the fort of Hūshangābād. He arranged the affairs of that quarter in the best manner, and left one of his trusted men there; and advanced towards Chandērī, to chastise Naṣrat Khān.

When he arrived within two stages of Chandērī, Naṣrat Khān, finding himself weak and helpless, came out to meet him; and wanted 1 to cover up his misdeeds with grass. Ā'zam Humāyūn sent for the Sayyids and the learned and great men of the city, and collected them together, and asked each one of them to describe the behaviour and circumstances of Naṣrat Khān. Each one of them told a story, most of which were: that the crow of pride and vanity had laid an egg in his brain, so that marks of hostility and rebellion have made their appearance. Ā'zam Humāyūn transferred the government of Chandērī from Naṣrat Khān to 2 Malik-ul-umarā Ḥājī Kamāl; and advanced towards Bhīlsā. Although he sent men of rank to Qawām Khān, and tried to guide him in the right path, it was productive of no good result. Qawām Khān got out of Bhīlsā and fled. Ā'zam Humāyūn halted there for a few days, and after assuring his mind of the affairs of that country, turned his face towards the capital city of Shāhībād.

On the way news was brought to him, that Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī was advancing with the object of conquering Mālwa; and had sent Shāhzāda Mas'ud Khān with a large army and twenty elephants 3 to attack him. Ā'zam Humāyūn started with rapidity, and passing the army of Sultān Ahmad at a distance of six karōhs entered the fort of Mandū by the Tārāpūr gate. Maḥmūd Shāh was delighted at the arrival of his father, and performed the rites of offering thanks to God. He sent out detachments every day from the fort, and went on fighting hard. With great bravery and courage he wanted to sally out of the fort and engage in a drawn battle. But as the thorn of the hostility of the Hūshang Shāhī amīrs had caught in his skirt.

---

1 The words are خس پرُش سازد in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtāh.
2 The name is as in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 213) Mullik Kaloo.
3 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have بر صحبا. Fīrishtāh lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has بر صحبا.
and a sort of caution had taken possession of his mind, so that he considered those who were near him, in spite of the kindness with which he had treated them, to be his ¹ enemies. But having regard to their hostility and opposition, he stretched out his hands of generosity and benefactions from the sleeve of liberality and munificence, and kept all the men, even in the narrow and straitened circumstances of the siege, ² satisfied and contented. He also distributed grain from the (royal) granaries to faqîrs and poor men. On account of his great generosity, grain was cheaper in the fort than it was in Sultân Ahmad’s camp. He established boarding houses for faqîrs and poor men, and gave them cooked and uncooked food. He also summoned to his service some amîrs such as ³ Saiyid Aḥmad and Şûfî Khaân, son of ‘Alâ-ul-mulk, and Malik-ush-sharq, and Malik Muḥammad, son of Aḥmad Şîlâh, and Malik Qâsim, and Hisâm-ul-mulk Hândîrî who had an attitude of rebellion and hostility to

¹ The MSS. have اعداد عدوز خرد, and the lith. ed. has اعداد عدوز خرد. FIRISHTAH in the corresponding passage has اعداد عدوز خرد. The necessity of the insertion of the words عدوز خرد is not very clear.

² Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have أسودة ومنعم but the other MS. has أسودة و بينهم. FIRISHTAH lith. ed. has only أسودة و بينهم.

³ There is considerable difference in the names. There is no difference as regards the first name, but one MS. omits the ٰ after it, which makes it doubtful whether Saiyid Aḥmad and Şûfî Khaân are two men or only one. There is also no ٰ between Saiyid Aḥmad and Şûfî Khaân in the lith. ed. of FIRISHTAH, and the father’s name is given there as ‘Imâd-ul-mulk and not ‘Alâ-ul-mulk. The name of Malik-ush-sharq occurs in the MS. but is omitted from the lith. ed., and is changed to Malik Sharîf in the lith ed. of FIRISHTAH. Malik Muḥammad has that name in one MS., but is called Malik Aḥmad in the other and Malik Maḥmûd in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of FIRISHTAH. His father who is called Aḥmad Şîlâh in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. is called Aḥmad Silâhsâr in the lith. ed. of FIRISHTAH. The name of Hisâm-ul-mulk which is found in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. is changed to Malik Qiyâm-ul-mulk and the suffix to his name is rather difficult to decipher but appears to be Handbârî. The names are not given by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 200) who describes them collectively as the “Malwa officers in Ahmad Shah’s camp who were at all discontented.” The Cambridge History of India (p. 353) refers to the chapter about Gujrâît for a detailed account of these transactions, but even there very few details are given, and there is no mention of any of the names.
Sultān Aḥmad, by promising them gold and jāgīra. Owing to these acts there was a certain amount of wickedness in Sultān Aḥmad’s affairs; and by the advice of some men who had come from the latter’s camp and had joined him, Sultān Maḥmūd intended to make a night attack. It so happened that 1 Qaiṣar Khān, the inkstand-bearer of Sultān Hūshang, 2 informed Sultān Aḥmad of this intention. So when Sultān Maḥmūd’s army came out from the fort, they found the men in the camp 3 ready, and all the paths closed. In the end, they pulled down a wall and the battle began. Up to the rising of the true dawn, it went on furiously from both sides; and a large number of men were wounded and killed. About the time of the rising of the sun, Maḥmūd Shāh retraced his steps, and went into the fort of Mandū.

After some days the scouts brought the news, that the inhabitants of Chandērī, and the troops in that neighbourhood had rebelled against Malik-ul-umarā Ḥājī Kamāl; and had made ‘Umr Khān, son of Sultān Hūshang their leader; and to 4 add to the guitar of music, Shāhzāda Maḥmūd Khān, son of Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī was advancing towards Sārangpūr with five thousand horsemen and thirty elephants. On hearing this news Sultān Maḥmūd held a consultation, and it was decided that A’ẓam Ḥumāyūn who was, 5 the nursery of the empire, should occupy himself in the guarding and arranging of the fort, and Sultān Maḥmūd should himself come out of it, and taking up a position in the centre of the country arrange for its protection.

---

1 The name and description of this man is, as I have written them in the text, in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. But Firishtah lith. ed. has Naṣr Khān the dawātār of Sultān Hūshang, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 200) has “Noosrut Khan the officer he had lately been removed from Chundery.”

2 The word is ملاط in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has ملاط.

3 The word here also is ملاط in the MSS., in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

4 The words appear to be طنبر. A طنبر is a kind of lute or guitar with a long neck. I do not know the meaning of the phrase, but it appears to be a proverbial saying to express “to add to the other difficulties.” Firishtah has no analogous phrase.

5 The word is درجة in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but it is درجة in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. According to the dictionary درجة means a groove, a nursery, an orchard. درجة in the text-edition.
In accordance with this intention (Sultān Maḥmūd) turned his face of determination in the direction of Sārangpūr; and sent Tāj Khān and Maḥṣūr Khān in advance of himself. As Sultān Ahmad had left Malik Ḥājī ‘All at the fort of Kanbal to guard the road and keep it open, Tāj Khān and Maḥṣūr Khān, who had arrived there before Sultān Maḥmūd, fought with him. The latter fled and took the news to Sultān Ahmad, that Sultān Maḥmūd had come out of the fort, and was marching towards Sārangpūr. Sultān Ahmad sent a messenger to Sārangpūr (with the direction), that the Shāhzāda should, before the arrival of Sultān Maḥmūd, betake himself to Ujjain. After the arrival of the messenger Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān started from Sārangpūr, with great caution and vigilance, and came and waited upon Sultān Ahmad at Ujjain.

1 Malik Ishāq, the son of Quṭb-ul-mulk, the feudatory of Sārangpūr sent a petition to the Sultān; and asking for pardon for his guilt, wrote that Muḥammad Khān had left Sārangpūr, and had gone away to Ujjain on hearing the news of the advance; but Shāhzāda ‘Umār Khān had sent an army in advance of himself with the object of seizing Sārangpūr, and was himself following behind it. On becoming acquainted with the purport of the petition Sultān Maḥmūd was highly pleased; and drew the pen of pardon across the page of Malik Ishāq’s offences; and sent Tāj Khān in advance of himself to Sārangpūr and he himself also advanced in that direction. When Tāj Khān arrived at Sārangpūr, he comforted and re-assured Malik Ishāq and all the inhabitants and leaders of the bands of Sārangpūr of the Sultān’s rewards and favours. On the Sultān’s arrival after they had rendered homage, the Sultān conferred the title of Daulat Khān on Malik Ishāq and bestowed on him a standard and a 2 ṭās and a gold embroidered gābā (robe), and ten thousand gold tankas in cash and doubled his stipend. He also bestowed on the heads of the different groups and the residents of the city some horses, and fifty thousand

---

1 The name is ملك اسماعق in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is ملك اسماعق in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah. I have adopted ملك اسماعق.

2 The dictionary gives cup, goblet, dish and brocade as meanings of طالس. None of these meanings appears to be appropriate.
tankas to distribute among themselves. When he reached Sārangpūr, the scouts brought the news that Shāhzāda ‘Umr Khān had burnt down the town Bhīlsā, and had arrived at the boundary of Sārangpūr; and that Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī had also come out of Ujjain with thirty thousand horsemen and three hundred elephants, and was advancing towards Sārangpūr. Sultān Maḥmūd considered that it would be advisable to undertake the destruction of ‘Umr Khān in the first instance, and commenced an advance at the end of the night.

When there was a distance of six karōhs between the two armies, (he) sent a detachment as an advance guard, and they seized some prisoners from whom a knowledge of the condition of the enemy’s army could be obtained, and brought them to the Sultān who made an enquiry from them of the state of ‘Umr Khān’s army. He sent Nizām-ul-mulk and 1 Malik Aḥmad Šilāḥ, and a number of others, so that they might reconnoitre the jungle and the roads. He arranged the army in four detachments, and advanced early in the morning to attack ‘Umr Khān. The latter also becoming aware of Sultān Maḥmūd’s advance hastened to meet him; and having arranged his troops sent them to confront him. But he himself took up a position 2 on the top of a hill and there remained in ambush waiting for an opportunity. It so happened, however, that some one brought the information to Sultān Maḥmūd that ‘Umr Khān was hiding in ambush with some troops on the top of a hill. Sultān Maḥmūd with a well-equipped force advanced towards him. ‘Umr Khān said to the 3 soldiers who were with him: “It would be a reflection on their good name to fly from the son of a servant; and it is better to be slain than to baulk behind.” He then fell upon Sultān Maḥmūd’s army with the men who were united with him; but was taken prisoner, and was put to death by the Sultān’s order. His head was placed on the top of a lance and was shown to the army of Chandērī. The leaders and commanders of that army were amazed and thunder-

1 The name is Malik Ahmad Silāhdār in Firishtah. See note 3 on page 502, where also the name is Malik Aḥmad Šilāḥ in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, but Ahmad Silāhdār in Firishtah.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. has پس کورہ instead of کورہ سرہ; this is better; but as the MSS., and the lith. ed. have I have retained it.

3 One MS. has بسیمیятی but the other and the lith. ed. have بسیمیتی.
struck; and sent the following message, "Please cease the battle for this day; so that early next morning, we may wait on you and render homage to you anew." On this agreement, both the armies encamped for the night. (But) when night came on, the Chandéri army retired towards its own country; and when it arrived at Chandéri, the amirs joined together, and placed Malik Sulaimān, son of Malik Shēr-ul-mulk Ghūri, who had been the naib of 'Umr Khān, giving him the title of Sultān Shihāb-ud-din.

Sultān Maḥmūd detached an army for crushing him, and advanced himself to fight with Sultān Aḥmad. But the two armies had not yet met each other, when some of the pious men in the army of Sultān Aḥmad saw His Holiness the last of the Prophet, on whom be the benediction and salutation!, in a dream, as declaring that, "A calamity has descended from the sky, tell Sultān Aḥmad, that he should carry the goods of his safety out of this country." When they informed Sultān Aḥmad of this dream, he did not put much faith in it. (But) within the next two or three days a pestilence appeared in his army, so that the soldiers had no time even for digging the graves. Sultān Aḥmad now having no alternative, went back to Gujrāt by way of Āshtā; but he gave a promise to Shāhzāda Mas′ūd Khān that he would seize the country in the course of the next year, and would deliver it over to him.

Sultān Maḥmūd then went to the fort of Mandū, and having, within the course of seventeen days, re-equipped his army advanced to quench the flame (of rebellion) in Chandéri. When he arrived there Malik Sulaimān came out of the citadel with the amirs, and made brave efforts; but as they had not the requisite strength, they fled,
and again taking shelter in the citadel fortified themselves in it. But Malik Sulaimān died there quite suddenly.

The amirs selected another to be their leader and, making the necessary preparations for carrying on the warfare, came out of the citadel. They fought, but again had to flee and take shelter in the fort. When the period of the siege had extended to eight months, Sultān Mahmūd took advantage of an opportunity; and one night climbed over the wall of the fort; and after him other brave men did so; and the citadel was seized; and a large number became food for the sword. But one party fled and fortified themselves in a fort, which was situated on the top of a hill. After some days Ismā‘īl Khān (of) Kālpī obtained quarter, and brought them down from the fort. Sultān Mahmūd having arranged the affairs of that territory in the best way, and having allotted Chandārī as a jāgīr to Malik Muḥaffār Ibrāhīm, intended to return. But his scouts brought the news that Dūngar Sēn had come from the fort of Gwāliar; and had besieged the city of Narwar. In spite of the fact, that his army

1 The period is eight months in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firīshṭāh, and in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 204). It is seven months in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and in the Cambridge History of India.

2 The word is استئناف in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firīshṭāh. It is انئناس in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The dictionary meaning of استئناف is act of rising, getting up; another word استئناس means watching for, finding an opportunity. I think استئناس is more appropriate than استئناف and this is adopted by M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition.

3 One MS. has پیش instead of پیش. This appears to be a mistake.

4 There are some variations in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have منحصر شده; the other has منحصر شدن; and further on one MS. and the lith. ed. have انجامات را امان گرفته, while the other has منحصر شدن. I have accepted منحصر شدن. As to the other difference there is apparently not much to choose. I have adopted the readings of the first MS. and the lith. ed. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has امان گرفته instead of ان جماعت. Firīshṭāh gives the conditions on which quarter was granted.

5 Gwāliar is spelt جواليار in both MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but on previous occasions it was spelt جواليار and is so spelt here also in Firīshṭāh.

6 The name is شهر نور the new city, in one MS., and in the lith. ed. of Firīshṭāh. It is شهر نور the city of Narwar in the other MS., and شهر نور the city of Nūr or
was, owing to its being the rainy season and the long period of the siege,\(^1\) in much distress, Maḥmūd Shāh advanced towards Gwāliar by successive rapid marches. When leaving his own territory, he arrived near Gwāliar, he commenced to plunder and ravage the country. A body of Rājpūts came out of the fort, and engaged in a battle; but as they had not the strength to withstand the assaults of Maḥmūd Shāh’s army they fled, and entered into the \(^2\) aperture of the fort. Dūngar Sēn on hearing this news decided on a retreat and raised the siege, and fled to Gwāliar. As Maḥmūd’s object was to release Narwar from the siege, he did not occupy himself with besieging Gwāliar and returned to Shāḍīlābd.

In the year 843 A.H., (1439 A.D.), he commenced the erection of the tomb of Sūltān Hūshang, and the completion of the Jāma’ Masjid of Hūshang Shāh, which is situated near the \(^3\) Rām Sarāī gate, and

Naur in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, though later on, it is شهر نوا in it also. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205) has Nurwur. The Cambridge History of India, page 354, has “a town named Shahri-i-Nau, not now traceable”. The evidence in support of the reading Shahri-i-Nau appears to be good, but I think شهر نور or the city of Narwar is the correct reading. Narwar is situated on the river Sind opposite to Jhānsi, and would be on the way from Gwāliar. The Cambridge History of India (p. 354) calls Dūngar Sēn “Dongar Singh the Tonwār of Gwalior.” The name is Dūngar Sēn in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and also in the lith. ed. of Firishthah, but Col. Briggs has Dongar Sing. After Timūr’s invasion, Gwalior according to the Cambridge History of India, page 241, was held by the Tonwar Rājpūts, but the name of Tonwar does not appear in the list of the Rajpoot royal races given on page 63 of Tod’s Rajasthan, vol. I, the nearest approach to that name being the Tuars, which appears in the lists by the Kheechie Bard, and by the author (Col. Tod). It is true that the Imperial Gazetteer of India, vol. XII, page 441, agrees with the Cambridge History of India in saying that “After Timur’s invasion Gwalior was seized by the Tonwar Rajputs.” But Tonwar is spelt there as it indeed is on page 241 of the Cambridge History with the short a and not with the long a as on page 354. M. Hidayat Ḥassain has شهر نورا in the text-edition.

\(^1\) The MSS. have ب نوشان, and the lith. ed. has ب نوشان. Firishthah lith. ed. has ب نوشان. This appears to be the correct reading and I have accepted it.

\(^2\) The MSS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishthah all have ب نوشان. Bsoawax قلعة در اصدند.

\(^3\) The name of the gate is variously given. One MS. has دروازه رام سرای دو رازواع طی the Hārasūl gate. Another has what looks like دروازه رام سرای رام سرای gate.
had two hundred and thirty cupolas, and three hundred and eighty
1 pillars (minarets?); and these were completed in a short time.

In the year 2 845 A.H., petitions from the amirs of Māwāt, and
the great and holy men of the metropolitan city of Dehil came in,
rapid succession, to the effect, that Sultan Muhammad (son of Mubārak
Shāh) was unable properly to discharge the high and onerous duties
of sovereignty; and consequently the hands of the oppressors and of
turbulent men had come out of the sleeve of tyranny and oppression;
and there was nothing left of peace and quietness, except in name
and a story. As the tailor of faith and providence had sewn the
robe of sovereignty on the elegant stature of that asylum of
sovereignty, the generality of the residents of this country wish, that
they should place the collar of allegiance to him on their neck of submis-
ion and subjection with willingness and alacrity. In the latter part of
the year, Sultan Mahmūd advanced towards Dehil with a well-equipped
army. In the neighbourhood of the town of Hindaun, Yusuf Khān
Hindauni waited on him. "When he encamped in the village of 3 Panna,
Sultan Ahmad took up a position with Tughlaqābād at his rear. The

while the lith. ed. has دروازہ ابتدائی, Firishtah lith. ed. has دروازہ رامروی, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205) has the Rampore gate.

1 The MSS., and the lith. ed. have اصترافة, which according to the dictionary means a cylinder. The lith. ed. has سکون a pillar. The mosque according to
Firishtah lith. ed. has two hundred and eight inqādān; and according to
Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 205), "two hundred and thirty minarets and two hundred
and sixty arches."

2 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have 845 A.H., but Firishtah lith. ed.
has 844 A.H., and Col. Briggs has 844 A.H., 1440 A.D. The Cambridge History
of India, page 354, also has 1440 A.D. For an account of these transactions,
as given in the history of Sultan Muhammad Shāh of Dehil, see page 271 of
vol. I, Persian text, and pages 327, 328 of vol. I, English translation of this work.
The Dehil Sultan is here called Sultan Mahmūd Mubārak Shāh in one MS., and
in the lith. ed., and Sultan Muhammad Mubārak Shāh in the other MSS., and
in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, though in the Dehil section he was called Sultan
Muhammad Shāh. He was the adopted son of Mubārak Shāh and the correct
reading here should be Muhammad Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh. The Cambridge
History of India, page 354, calls him "Sayyid, Muhammad Shāh."

3 One MS. has پنہ Panna, while the other has what looks like تابتا, while the lith. ed. has پنہ Patna.
next day Sultān Maḥmūd divided his army into three detachments. He placed two of them under the commands of Sultān Qhiyāḥ-ud-din, and of 1 Ghaznīn K̲h̲ān who had the title of Sultān ʿAlā-ud-din; and sent them against Sultān Muḥammad’s army; and kept the third force of selected soldiers with himself. 2 Sultān Muḥammad sent out Malik Bahlūl Lūdī and Saiyid K̲h̲ān and Daryā K̲h̲ān and Quṭb K̲h̲ān and other commanders, and engaged them in battle. Up to nightfall, brave men experienced in warfare stepped out from both sides and gave proofs of their courage and bravery. In the end both parties sounded the drum of retreat and took up their positions in their original stations.

3 It so happened that on that very night Sultān Maḥmūd saw in a dream, that some audacious low men had risen in revolt in the fort of Māndū, and had brought the royal umbrella from the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, and raised it over the head of a man of obscure descent. In the morning there were signs of anxiety and 4 distress in him. At this time Sultān Muḥammad sent emissaries, and struck at the door of peace. Sultān Maḥmūd immediately agreed to a pacific settlement, and started on the journey back to Mālwa. On the way, news came to him, that as it had happened, on that very night a mob of the common people had raised the dust of disorder and disturbance in Māndū, but it had been quelled by the exertions and

---

1 He is called Qadim K̲h̲ān in one MS. and Ghaznīn K̲h̲ān in the other and Naṣrat K̲h̲ān in the lith. ed. Qadim K̲h̲ān seems to be the correct reading, see note 4, page 327, vol. I, English translation of this work, and I have adopted it.

2 One MS. has by mistake Sultān Maḥmūd.

3 Firishṭah agrees mainly as to the three versions of the reason of Sultān Maḥmūd’s return to Mālwa, though the lith. ed. says that he saw the revolt in the fort of Māndū in an ʿawāmā, happening and not in a dream. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 206) says that he saw it in a dream. But the Cambridge History of India, page 354, says that Maḥmūd readily accepted Muḥammad Sh̲āh’s proposed terms of peace, as he “had learnt that during his absence the mob had risen in Māndū, removed the gilded umbrella from the tomb of Hūshang, and raised it over the head of a pretender.” It has thus converted what Sultān Maḥmūd saw in a dream into a series of actual events.

4 The MSS. have تردد و بمرگی and بمرگی, and I have adopted it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has بمرگی in the text-edition.
management of Āʿẓam Humāyūn. It has, however, come under my notice that it appears in some history that news was conveyed to Sultan Mahmūd, that Sultan Aḥmad Gujratī was about to invade Mālwa; and for this reason Sultan Mahmūd came back. This version appears to be the most correct.

In short, Sultan Mahmūd arrived in Shādiābād on the 1st of Muḥarram 846 A.H.; and made the deserving men there partake of his gifts and benefactions. In the same year he laid out a garden in the land appertaining to the town of Naʿlcha; and built a dome and a few great palaces in it; and remained for some time in Shādiābād.

After a short time he repaired the casualties and the damages sustained by his army; and marched out towards Chitār with the determination of chastising the Rājpūts. At this time, news was brought to the Sultan of the arrogance of Naṣīr, son of ʿAbd-ul-qādir, the governor of Kālpī, who had assumed the title of Naṣīr Shāh, and had declared his independence; and letters had come from both the great men and the ordinary inhabitants of the country, that he had placed his foot outside the straight and strong path of the law of the Prophet, and was struggling on the path of heresy and oppression; and (they) were crying for justice from his oppression and tyranny. Sultan Mahmūd placed the destruction of Naṣīr Shāh in the forefront of his energies; and advanced towards Kālpī.

---

1 The name of the month is left out in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but is given as Muḥarram in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Of course the first day of Muḥarram is also the first day of the year. The year is 846 A.H., in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but is 845 A.H., in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and 845 A.H., 1441 A.D., in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 297).

2 One MS. has , instead of what I have in the text, which is the reading of the other MSS. and the lith. ed.

3 The sentence is long and rather clumsily worded.

4 The word  is omitted in one MS., and in the lith. ed.

5 The word  and the word  after  is omitted in the MSS. and the text-edition. It is in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and as it is required to make sense I have inserted it.

6 One MS. has instead of  , which occurs in the other and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, by mistake.
Naṣir ¹ (son of) ‘Abd-ul-qādir, having received information of the advance of Sultān Maḥmūd, sent ² ‘Ali Ḵān, his uncle, with many beautiful things and presents and various kinds of tributes, and submitted a representation to the effect, that “Whatever they have said in respect of me, is entirely false and a fabrication; and in order to decide this matter, if you will send truthful men and will find out the truth, you can mete out any punishment that I may deserve if even a small part of it be proved to be true.” Sultān Maḥmūd ³ did not grant an audience to the emissary for some days; and advanced stage after stage. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, he, at the suggestion of Ā’zam Humāyūn and other chief men of the state, drew the pen of forgiveness across the ⁴ page of Naṣir’s offences, granted permission to his emissary to make his kūrnish, accepted his tribute, and sending him letters containing counsel and precepts gave permission to ‘Ali Ḵān to go back; and turned towards the country of Chitār.

When he crossed the ⁵ river of Bhim, he sent detachments every day in different directions in the country of Chitār and devastated it and plundered and took the people prisoners, and pulling down idol temples, laid the foundations of mosques. He halted for three or four days at each stage. When he encamped at Kōnbhalmir, which is one of the greatest forts of that country, and is famous for its strength in the whole country of ⁶ Hindūstān, there the vakil of Rāy Kōnbhā, who was named Dēbā, fortified himself, and sent out troops

---

¹ Here also the name is Nāṣir ʿAbd al-qādir and the word or is omitted in the MSS., the lith. ed., and the text-edition.

² One MS. has has instead of Naṣir Ḵān’s or tutor and not his uncle.

³ One MS. has has instead of .

⁴ The word is only in one MS. before , but I have inserted it, as it is required to make the metaphor complete.

⁵ Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah call it the . There was a mentioned before, see page 481; but it cannot be identical with . Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 208) calls it the Bunas river.

⁶ Both MSS. have have , but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have . This is better, and I have adopted it. It would appear that according to the Tabaqāt and Firishtah it was the fort of Kōnbhalmir itself that Dēbā Rāy fortified himself in; but according to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 208)
to carry on skirmishes. It so happened, that they had built a grand
temple opposite to the fort, and had drawn a line of fortifications
round it, and had stored provisions and war materials in it. Sultan
Mahmud directed his energies to the capture of the fortifications round
the temple, and seized them in the course of a week. A large number
of Rajpoots became food for the sword, and others were plundered
and taken prisoners. Sultan Mahmud ordered that the buildings
appertaining to the temple should be filled with firewood and set on
fire, and he poured water and vinegar over the walls; and in the
winking of an eye, those grand edifices, which had taken so many
years to erect, were rent asunder and crumbled down. The idols
were also broken up, and given to the butchers (Col. Briggs adds
"of the camp"), so that they might use them as weights for their scales
for the sale of meat. The largest idol which had been fashioned in
the shape of a sheep, was converted into lime, and given with the

it was, "one of the forts in the Koombhulmere district." And he calls its de-

defendant Beny Ray. The Cambridge History of India, page 355, is delightfully

vague here, and says "he captured a fort and destroyed a temple, and advanced
to Chitor." It is curious that there is no mention of these incidents in Tod's
Rajasthan. On the other hand Tod (vol. I, p. 222) says that in S. 1496 A.D. (1440
A.D.), the kings of Malwa and Guzerat "at the head of powerful armies, invaded
Mewar. Koombho met them on the plains of Malwa bordering on his own state,
and at the head of one hundred thousand horse and foot and fourteen hundred
elephants, gave them an entire defeat, carrying captive to Chettore Mahmood
the Khilji sovereign of Malwa." We have no mention of this victory in either
the Tabaqat or in Firistath, but according to Col. Tod, Abul Fuzil mentions

it, and dilates on Koombho's greatness of soul in setting his enemy at liberty,
not only without ransom but with gifts. Col. Tod, also says that Mahmood
was confined for six months in Chettoore, that Rama Sanga's son gave Baber
the crown of the Malwa king, one of the trophies of the conquest, and finally that
there is a more durable record of the victory in the inscription on the triumphal
pillar of Chettoore, of which Koombho had the foundation eleven years after the
event, and which was completed in ten years.

1 One MS. and the lth. ed. have اب و سرکه, while the other MS. has اب و سرکه;
but Firistath lth. ed. has اب مسرکه. He, however, agrees with the Tabaqat
in saying that water was poured over the wall, but Col. Briggs says that cold
water was thrown on the stone images.

2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 209, footnote) says probably the figure was
one of a bull, for, as he says, there is no other instance of the image of a sheep
or a ram being treated as an object of worship by the Hindus.
pan leaf to the Rājpūte, so that they should have to eat of the object of their worship.

After he had done all this, he turned the bridle of his determination towards Chitōr; and after his arrival in that quarter, he seized, after some fighting, a fort, which was situated at the foot of the Chitōr hill; and slew a number of Rājpūte there. He was, after this, engaged in preparations for the siege of Chitōr, when the scouts brought the news, that Könbhā himself was not in the fort, but had on that day come out of it, and had gone away in the direction of the foot hills, which were situated in that neighbourhood. The Sultan started in pursuit of him; and sent several detachments separately in different directions after him. It so happened, that one of these encountered Könbhā, and a great battle took place, in which Könbhā was defeated; and entered the fort of Chitōr. Sultan Mahmūd detached one army to besiege the fort; and himself took up a position in the centre of the country, and sent detachments every day for ravaging, and laying the country waste.

He then summoned Ā'zām Humāyūn Khān Jahān, so that he might take possession of the country belonging to the Rājpūte, which was situated round about Shādībād. When Ā'zām Humāyūn arrived at Mandisör, he fell ill; and surrendered the deposit of life. Sultan Mahmūd on receiving this news became extremely disconsolate and sorrowful. He wept much, and in his great grief and distress wounded his face. On arrival in the fort of Mandisör, he sent the body of his father to Shādībād; and made Tāj Khān, who was the pay-master of the army, its commander; and returned to his own camp.

As the rainy season had now arrived, the Sultan resolved, that he should select an elevated position, and take up his quarters there; and after the end of the rains again go on with the siege of Chitōr. On the night of the 25th of Dhi-ḥijjah, 846 A.H. (April 24th, 1443 A.D.)

---

1 The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree, but Firishtah says نا ول تن جبیر را که در اطراف خند سرور را واقع است منصرف شود, i.e., so that he might occupy the part of the country around Mandisör, which was situated around Mandisör. The Cambridge History of India (p. 355) does not say that Sultan Mahmūd asked his father to occupy the country round Mandisör, but that the latter led an expedition against that place, and there fell ill and died.
Konbha made a night attack with ten thousand cavalry and six thousand infantry, but Sulthan Mahmud had arranged for the protection of his camp with such care and vigilance that he was unable to do anything; and a large number of 1 Rajpots were slain. The next night Sulthan Mahmud made a night attack on the army of Konbha, with an army in battle array. Konbha was wounded, and fled towards Chitor; and many Rajpots became food for the sword, and much booty fell into the hands of 2 the followers of Mahmud. The latter carried out the rites of offering thanks to God, and deferring the capture of the fort of Chitor to the next year returned to his capital of Shadiabad for protection and safety.

Towards the end of Qhi-bijjah of the same year, he planned the erection of a college, and a minaret 3 seven stories high, in front of the Hushang Shahi Jama Mosque.

In the year 4 849 A.H., an ambassador came from Sulthan Mahmud, son of Sulthan Ibrahim Sharqi, the ruler of Jaunpur, with gifts and presents of rare excellence; and after placing them before the Sulthan gave a verbal message to the following effect, "Naqir, 5 son of 'Abd-ul-qadir the governor of Kalp, has turned his face from the strict path of the law of the Prophet, has adopted the ways of heresy and heterodoxy, has given up the practice of fasting and prayer, and has made over Musalmans women to Hindu Nadikas so that they might teach them the art of dancing. As the governors of Kalkh have from the time of Sulthan Hushang, been nominees of the rulers of Malwa, it is right and proper, that I should in the first instance reveal all

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have راجپوت بسیار, but the other MS. has راجپوت بسیار.
2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بدست معصومي، but the other MS. has بدست لشکر سلطان معصوم.
3 The words are منصور هفتم منصور. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 210) has translated it "a beautiful pillar seven stories high." I have found that the dictionary gives face, aspect, a lofty building, tower, and palace among the meanings منصور, but none of these is quite appropriate. M. Hidayat Hosain has صلاة instead of منصور in the text-edition.
4 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have 849 A.H., but Firishtah and Col. Briggs have 847 A.H., and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 210) has 1444 A.D.
5 One MS. omits the word ین.
his circumstances to your right-thinking mind; but if you should not have the leisure to punish and chastise him, you may indicate the fact to me, so that I may chastise him in a way, that may be deterrent to others.” Sultān Maḥmūd said in reply, “The greater part of my army has gone to punish the rebels of Mandisōr, and as you have placed the defence of the faith in the forefront of your energies, may your undertaking be of good omen; and it has my approval.” In the same majlis he bestowed a robe of honour, and the usual money, which had become customary in that age and which had been paid to ambassadors, on the ambassador of Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, and granted him permission to return.

When the ambassador arrived at Jaunpūr, and reported (Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī’s) reply, Sultān Maḥmūd, on account of his great pleasure and joy, sent twenty elephants as a final present to the Sultān. He then advanced towards Kālpī with a well-equipped army, and expelled Naṣīr (son of) ‘Abd-ul-qādir from that country.

And Naṣīr (son of) ‘Abd-ul-qādir sent a petition to Maḥmūd Shāh to the following purport, “I have been obedient and submissive to your well wishers from the time of Hūshang Shāh to this day. Now Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī has, with violence and tyranny, seized this faqir’s territory. As you have always been my protector, now also knowing your high threshold to be the altar of my hopes, I have turned (my face) towards the country of Chandērī.” Sultān Maḥmūd sent ‘Alī Khān with elegant things and presents to Sultān Maḥmūd

---

1 The MSS. have مئات موات, and the lith. ed. has which all appear to be incorrect. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has مئات موات, and I have adopted it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain, however, has retained موات in the text-edition.

2 There is some difficulty about the meaning of the passage, which is written in one MS. as مبارک باشد كه قصد مقرب نموده اند. In the other MS. the word is substituted for مبارک, and the word امتص for the last two words. In the lith. ed. the conjunction is امتص and the sentence ends with the words مقرب, and both مبارک and امتص are omitted.

3 The expression in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah is خواجہ دار ازائندہ بیرون کرکٹ خواجہ دار ازائندہ بیرون کرکٹ I cannot find out the exact meaning of the word خواجہ دار ازائندہ بیرون کرکٹ. It would be noticed that it was used in two previous passages.
Sharqī; and begged him that "As Naṣīr Khān, son of 'Abd-ul-qādir, has, through your exertions and activities, repented of his evil acts, and has adopted the path of the law of the Prophet; and as he has from the time of the fortunate Sultān Hūshang been under our protection, it is hoped, that accepting and taking into consideration the purport of the text, 'that one who has repented of his sin is as if he had not sinned at all', he would draw the pen of forgiveness over his offences; and would deliver his country back to him." After the arrival of 'Ali Khān, Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī did not give any distinct reply, and passed the time by saying "may be and perhaps."

Maḥmūd Shāh Khaljī owing to his sense of honour and manliness, considered the protection of Naṣīr (son of) 'Abd-ul-qādir incumbent on his spirits, and started on the 12nd Shawwāl 848, towards Chandērī; and in the neighbourhood of that place Naṣīr Khān came and rendered him homage; and (Sultān Maḥmūd then) immediately advanced towards Erij and Bhāndir. When this news reached Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, he came out of the city, and encamped in the territory of Erij; and having seized Mubārak Khān, son of Junaid Khān, who was the hereditary ruler of that place, took him along with him. Starting from that place he encamped in the broken ground near the river Jamunā, to which there was only a narrow

1 The corresponding A.D. date is given by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 212) as January 8th, 1445 A.D., while the Cambridge History of India, page 355, gives January 12th, 1445, as the date on which Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī commenced his march towards Chandērī.

2 He is called Naṣīr Shāh in this place in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but more correctly Naṣīr Khān in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. M. Hidayat Ḥossain has Naṣīr Shāh in the text-edition.

3 The words ملائمت نیود and ملاقات کرد occur in one MS. after ملائمت نیود but not in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

4 The words from جو بن ناقف to بل ناقف do not occur in the MS., but are omitted from the lith. ed. There are slight differences in the MS. also; the initial ج is omitted in one and the name of the second place is differently spelt in the two MSS. In one it is پهندیر, which I suppose is Bhāndir, though there is no dot below the first letter, while in the other it is written as پهندیر, which is probably Bhadnīr. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is پهندیر, Thāndir. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 212) has Bhandere. The Cambridge History of India mentions Erij, but not Bhāndir.
passage, and where a hostile army could not come up to him; and
strengthened the position by the erection of works round it. Maḥmūd
Shāh leaving him alone there advanced towards Kālpi; and Maḥmūd
Shāh Sharqī becoming impatient also marched towards that place.
At this time the warriors of the Khaljī army attacked his base, and
took an immense quantity of booty. Upon this he turned round
with a body of his men, and engaged in a battle; and the fight and
slaughter continued till the evening. After the lord of the stars
(the sun) had set, the two armies returned to their original stations,
and remained there. After two or three days, as the rainy season had
already made its approach, Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī returned to
Fathābād after plundering and ravaging some villages appertaining
to Kālpi. He planned the erection there of a palace seven stories
high.

The raʿiyats and inhabitants of the town of Erij complained of
the oppression and tyranny of Mubārak Khān, son of Junaid Khān.
Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī sent Malik-ūsh-sharq Muẓaffar Ibrāhīm, the
governor of Chandērī, with a large army to Erij. When he arrived in
the neighbourhood, news came that Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī had
sent Malik Kālū to attack and destroy him, and had reached the village
of 1 Rātah. Malik Muẓaffar Ibrāhīm also turned to Rātah and after
they had met Malik Kālū fled. The inhabitants of Rātah came and
saw Muẓaffar Ibrāhīm; 2 he seized them all, and sent them to Chandērī;
and again advanced towards Erij. He learnt on the way that Sultān
Maḥmūd Sharqī had sent the major portion of his army to make a
raid on the territory of 3 Barhār, the Rāy whereof was a dependant
of Maḥmūd Shāh Khaljī. Malik Muẓaffar considered the guarding
of his (master's) dominions must have precedence over the conquest
of Erij, and advanced in that direction; and the Sharqī army, hearing

---

1 The name is written as رات in the MS., and زانه in the lith.
ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 213) calls it
Rohut. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the place, or the
incidents connected with it.

2 It is not at all clear why he did so. Firishtah does not mention the
incident.

3 The place is called Barhār in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and بارهار
Parbād in the other MS. It is not mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted پارهار Parbārah in the text-edition.
the news, turned back, and went to the town of Rātah. As the war was being prolonged, and Musalmāns belonging to both sides were being wounded and slain, ¹ Shaikh Jālaldah, who was one of the great men of the age, and was famous for revelations and miraculous acts, wrote and sent, with the concurrence of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Sharqi, a letter to Maḥmūd Shāh Khalji, on the subject of a peace; and by the exertions of His Holiness the Shaikh, the peace was effected in this way; that Sulṭān Maḥmūd Sharqi should at once make over the towns of Rātah and Mahōbah to Naṣīr Khān; and when four months should have elapsed after the return of Maḥmūd Shāh Khalji, he should deliver to him the territory of Kālpī also. The period of four months was mentioned for this reason, that in that time, the truth about his religion and creed would be disclosed; and on this agreement Maḥmūd Shāh Khalji returned to Shādībād.

In the ² year 848 a.h., the Sulṭān planned the establishment of a hospital, and he created an endowment, by the gift of some villages, for paying the charges of medicines and all the other things required for the sick. He also appointed Maulānā Faḍl-ul-lah ḥakim (physician), who had the title of Malik-ul-ḥukamāʾ for observing the condition of the sick and the insane.

On the ⁵ 20th of Rajb-ul-murajjab in the year 950 a.h., (Sulṭān Maḥmūd) advanced with the object of capturing the fort of Mandalgarh.

¹ The name is written as جايلدة in the MS., and as جايلدة in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, and جايلدة in the lith. ed. of Firishtaḥ. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 213) calls him Sheik Chand of Mālwa.

² Firishtaḥ lith. ed. gives 849 a.h., as the year of the foundation of the hospital. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 214) gives 1445 A.D., as the corresponding year of the Christian era.

³ This is one of the earliest mentions of the establishment of a hospital; and it certainly, as far as I know, is the earliest mention of a hospital for mental diseases. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 214) gives a description of the hospital, and mentions "apartments for maniacs"; but the Cambridge History of India, page 356, only incidentally mentions the building of the hospital.

⁴ The MSS. are incorrect here. One has مرض و جاندين, and the other مرض و مجانين. The lith. eds. of both the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtaḥ have the correct reading.

⁵ Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 214) gives September 11th, 1446 A.D., as the corresponding date. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, says Maḥmūd Khalji invaded the Rānā’s dominion in October, 1446 A.D.
When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Ranthambhôr, he transferred the command of it from Bahâr Khân to Malik Saif-ud-dîn; and marching by successive stages encamped on the bank of the river Benâres. As Ray Könbhâ did not possess the strength to meet him, he fortified himself in the fort of Mandalgarh; and on the 2nd and 3rd day, the Râjpûts sallied out of the fort, and exerted themselves bravely. But in the end, they came in with weakness and humility; and agreed to pay tribute. Sultan Khalîjî, owing to the exigencies of the time, agreed to a peace, and returned (to his own dominions).

In a short time, having newly equipped his army, he advanced with the object of capturing the fort of Biyâna. When he arrived within two farsangs of that place, 1 Saiyid Muḥammad Khân, the governor of the place, sent his son Aḥâd Khân to wait on him; and sent one hundred horses, and one lakh of tankas in cash as tribute. Maḥmûd Shâh having honoured him with a special robe of honour, gave him permission to go back. He also sent a gold embroidered qabâ (robe) and a head-dress decorated with gems, a gold belt and horses with saddles and bridles adorned with gold for Muḥammad Khân himself. The latter put on the qabâ, and opened his mouth in praise of Maḥmûd Shâh, and had the public prayer read and the coins struck 2 in his name. The Sultan on hearing this news returned from the place where he was. On the way he captured the town of 3 Alhanpûr which is situated near Ranthambhôr. He next 4 sent eight thousand

---

1 He is called Maḥmûd Khân in one MS. In the other he is called Maḥmûd Khân in one place and Muḥammad Khân in the other. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah call him Muḥammad Khân.

2 It appears from Firishtah that he did so by removing the name of the Bâdshâh of Dehlî. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, says Muḥammad Khân substituted the name of Maḥmûd Khalîjî for that of Ālam Shâh of Dehlî. As a matter of fact, the Sultan of Dehlî at this time was Sultan Ālā-ud-dîn, who was succeeded by Bahlûl Lûdi, and no Ālam Shâh reigned in Dehlî at that time.

3 The name of the town is variously given. The MS. have أَلْحَنْبُور Alhanpûr, and the lith. ed. has بَتْرُ Pahlîr, while the lith. ed. of Firishtah has نَوار Nawar. Col. Briggs has the fort (not the town) of Anundpooor, and the Cambridge History of India, page 356, cuts the Gordian knot by calling it “a minor fortress.”

4 Under Tâj Khân, according to Firishtah, Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India.
horsemen and twenty-five elephants, with the object of capturing the fort of Chitūr; and after taking one lakh and five and twenty thousand tankas from the Rāja of Kōtah in the way of tribute returned to Shādiābād.

In the year 854 A.H., 1450 A.D., 1 Gangdās, the Rāja of the fort of Chāmpānīr sent him tribute, and submitted that, "Sultān Muḥammad, son of Sultān Aḥmad, is besieging the hill of Chāmpānīr; as this slave has always carried his prayers to Your Majesty, he now hopes for aid and support." Sultān Maḥmūd turned his attention to give him help. On the way news came that 2 Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Muḥammad Gujrātī, had come towards Īdar, with the object of demanding tribute from the Rāja of that place. Sultān Maḥmūd considering him to be 3 weak, started towards 4 Bārāsīnūr. On hearing this news Sultān Muḥammad, as his 5 baggage animals had become lame and disabled, burnt his tents and other equipages

---

1 He is called Kankdās or Gangdās in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 215) calls him Gungadās. The Cambridge History of India which, on page 301, in the chapter about the history of Gujarāt, had Gangdās, calls him here, on page 356, Kanak Dās.

2 He is called Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Muḥammad Gujrātī in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but the other MS. has Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn son of Sultān Muḥammad Gujrātī. Firishtah lith. ed. has Sultān Muḥammad Shāh Gujrātī. Sultān Muḥammad Shāh died soon after the invasion of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālīj; and Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn succeeded him. This is probably the reason of the confusion in the names of the Sultān.

3 There is some difference in the readings here. One MS. has what looks like خرود صفيف. The other has خرود صفيف. It is omitted in the lith. ed. Firishtah has ما عاجز و ضعيف. It is rather far-fetched, but the reading may be ما عاجز و ضعيف in the text, the ما having been omitted by some scribe. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ابن خبرور ضعيف دانسته, which seems more appropriate.

4 The name is بارساينور, in one MS., and بار اسپنور in the other and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has what looks like مار استینور. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions this place. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has باراسبر in the text-edition.

5 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have چاهرونا بارسی. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has چاهراونی بارسکی. This appears to me to be correct, and I have adopted it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has چاهراونی بارسکی in the text-edition.
and retired towards Aḥmadābād. When Sūltān Maḥmūd received this information, he also turned back from the way, and encamped on the bank of the Mahindri. Gangdās came to him at this place, bringing with him thirteen lakhs of tankas in cash, and some horses in the way of tribute. Sūltān Maḥmūd bestowed on him a gold embroidered robe (qabād) in the same majlis; and gave him permission to go back; and himself returned to his capital of Shādlābād. On the way, he gave permission to Rāy Bīr, Rāja of Īdar, to go back, after bestowing on him, as a reward, five elephants and twenty-one horses and three lakhs of tankas in cash. He remained for a time at Shādlābād and occupied himself with the affairs of his dominions and army.

In the year 855-1 A.H., (1451 A.D.), he advanced with more than one hundred thousand horses to conquer Gujrāt and having passed 1 Ghāṭī Bawālī, besieged the town of Sūltānpūr. Malik ‘Alā-ud-dīn Suhrāb, who was the deputy of 2 Sūltān Qūṭb-ud-dīn for some days sallied out of the fort and fought bravely. (But) when he 3 became hopeless of receiving any reinforcement he, begged for quarter and joined Sūltān Maḥmūd. The latter sent his family and 4 children to the fort of Mandū; and made him swear that he would never turn his face from his master. He then gave him the title of Mubāriz Khān, and made him the commander of the army; and advanced towards Ahmadābād. On the way news came that 5 Sūltān Muḥammad had surrendered the deposit of his life; and his son Qūṭb-ud-dīn had taken his place. Sūltān Maḥmūd, in spite of the fact that his object was the destruction of the mansion of Sūltān Muḥammad’s government, owing to his great humanity, assumed

---

1 The name is written as گھانی ںولی, and گھانی ںولی in the MSS., and as گھانی ںولی in the lith. ed. Finishtah lith. ed. has گھانی ںولی. I have not been able to find the name elsewhere. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted گھانی ںولی in the text-edition.

2 But see below where it will be seen that Sūltān Muḥammad was yet alive.

3 گشت in one MS., and in the lith ed.; but گشت in the other MS.

4 ہیال اور اطغفار را in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and ہیال اور اطغفار را in the other MS.

5 One MS. inserts ہیال اور اطغفار را ہیال اور اطغفار را ہیال اور اطغفار را ہیال اور اطغفار را after Sultan Mahomed, while the other quite erroneously substitutes Sultan Mahomed for Sultan Mahomed.
mourning; and in accordance with a custom of the time distributed pān and Sharbat (betel and sweet drinks) to the amīrs and learned men in his army. He also wrote a letter to Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, offering him condolences on his father's death, and congratulations on his accession. At the same time, however, he laid waste the town of Barōda, and left no stone unturned in the matter of plundering and seizing the inhabitants. He made prisoners of some thousands of Musalmāns and Kāfir; and after halting for some days in that town, advanced towards Ahmādābād.

At this time, Malik ʿAlā-ud-dīn Suhrāb, who had been waiting for a time and opportunity, fled and went to Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn. It would appear, that when he took the oath, and engaged that he would not be false to the salt of his master, he had his old (original) master in his mind; and owing to his great regard for his salt had abandoned his family and children. Sultān Maḥmūd marched by successive stages, and encamped at 2 Kaparbanj, which was situated at a distance of 25 karōhs from Ahmādābād. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn halted at the village of Khānpūr, which was three karōhs from Kaparbanj. For some days the two Bādshāhs confronted each other; and on the night of 3 the last day of Šafar in the afore-mentioned year, Sultān Maḥmūd mounted his horse with the determination of making a night attack, and came out of his camp. But he missed the way, and remained all night seated on his horse in an open plain. Early in the morning he placed the army of Sārangpūr on his right wing, and entrusted the command of it to his eldest son Ghīyāth-ud-dīn; and nominated the amīrs of Chandīrī to the left wing and arrayed it under the command of 4 Qadam Khān, who was his younger son.

1 There are differences in the readings here. The MSS. have, with slight variations, the reading I have adopted; the lith. ed. has a very imperfect reading.

2 مركبة Sarkaj in the text-edition.

3 The date is 26th of the Tābaqāt and Firishtah. as applied to a month means towards the close of, and in respect of a particular day means the last day. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 217) gives the 1st of Sūffar, 856, as the date of the proposed night attack and gives the 10th of February, 1453, as the corresponding date of the Christian era. Both the date and the year of the Hijrī era and consequently the date and the year of the Christian era are incorrect.

4 غرنی خان in the text-edition.
He placed himself in the centre of the army and commenced the battle. Sultān Qutb-ud-din also placing the army of Gujurāt in battle array advanced to the (battle-) field. The vanguard of Sultān Qutb-ud-din’s army fled before the vanguard of Sultān Mahmūd’s army, and joined Sultān Qutb-ud-din. Muẓaffar Khān, who was one of the great amīrs of Chandērī, separated himself from the left wing of Sultān Mahmūd’s army, and attacked the right wing of Sultān Qutb-ud-din’s army; and its soldiers being unable to withstand the attack turned their faces in flight. Muẓaffar Khān pursued them as far as Sultān Qutb-ud-din’s camp; and his men stretching their hands to plunder and ravage entered the treasury in the camp, and loading all their elephants with treasure sent them at once to their own camp. When the elephants returned, and they wanted to lead and send them a second time, they heard that a detachment of Sultān Qutb-ud-din’s army finding Shāhzāda ¹ Qadām Khān’s troops to be weak and in distress had attacked them, and as they were unable to withstand them, they carried away their lives ² on one foot (i.e., with much difficulty). Muẓaffar Khān withdrawing his hand from plunder went into a corner. Sultān Mahmūd was amazed at seeing his army dispersed and his left wing routed, and stood with two hundred horsemen on the field of bravery, and acting as an expert archer, as long as he had any arrows left in his quiver, gave proof of his great courage. At this time Sultān Qutb-ud-din came out of the corner, in which he was concealed, with a detachment in battle array and confronted Sultān Mahmūd. The latter having exerted himself to the utmost retired to his camp, with (only) thirteen men. Sultān Qutb-ud-din considered this victory a great gift of God, and did not engage in pursuit. Eighty-one elephants and an immense quantity of booty fell into his hands.

Sultān Mahmūd remained on horseback in his place till nightfall. When five or six thousand horsemen had collected round him, he started for Mandū at midnight. On the way, his army was badly harassed by kōlis and bhiles. Sultān Mahmūd did not, from the time of the rising of the sun of his greatness and up to the end of the period

¹ ندي خان in the text-edition.
² The MSS. have بيك يا and the lith. ed. has بيك يا، I cannot find the meaning of بيك يا; بيك يا of course means one foot.
of his reign, suffer any defeat, except this. When he arrived at Mandu, and the damages sustained by his army had been repaired, he appointed Sultan Ghiasuddin, who was his true-born son to raid the town of Surat, which had been founded on the bank of the Tapri, and was one of the famous ports of Gujarat. Sultan Ghiasuddin returned after having ravaged a number of places pertaining to Surat. It so happened that (at this time) information of the deceit and treachery and hostilities of Nizam-ul-mulk, the vazir, and his sons, reached Sultan Mahmud; and by his order they were punished.

In the year 857 A.H., 1453 A.D., Sultan Mahmud confirmed his determination to conquer the country of Marwar; but as he was not assured in his mind from the side of Sultan Qutbuddin, he thought it advisable that he should, in the first instance, conclude a treaty with the latter; and after that undertake the conquest of Kanhva's dominions. He kept this hidden in his mind, and gave orders for the equipment of his army; and went from Shadiabad to the town of Dhur. He sent Taj Khair from that place with a well-equipped army to the border of Gujarat, so that he might introduce the matter of the treaty. Taj Khair wrote letters to the vazirs of Sultan Qutbuddin; and sending them by the hands of eloquent emissaries, conveyed the message, that disputes and hostility between the two sides were a cause of injury to the people; and peace and amity the cause of safety and prosperity. After much discussion Sultan Qutbuddin expressed his consent to a treaty of peace, and great and pious men from both sides having intervened, strengthened the treaty by engagements and oaths. It was settled, that the Qutbi army should plunder and ravage such parts of Kanhva's dominions as were contiguous to Gujarat, and Mahmud Shah should take possession of the country of Mewar and Ajmir and all the neighbouring countries; and whenever necessary either of the parties should not refuse to aid and help the other.

---

1 Firishtah lith. ed. agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 218) says that "Gheisoood-deen, with the right wing of the army, fled to Surat, where he plundered the country" etc.

2 The word خدیربی appears to be required after بعصہ اتفاق, but does not appear either in the MSS., or in the lith. ed. It is in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and I have inserted it in the text.
In the year 858 A.H., 1454 A.D., Sultan Mahmud advanced to punish the rebellious Rajputs, who had raised the standard of recusancy and revolt in the territories of Harautt; and made many Rajputs in the town of Maholl food for the sword; and having seized their children and families sent them to Mandu. From that place he advanced towards Biyana; and when he arrived near it, and as Daud Khan, the governor of Biyana sent much tribute, and came in the way of loyalty and sincerity, he left the territory in his possession. He also, by his excellent exertions, changed a dispute, which had existed between Yusuf Khan Hindaunt and the governor of Biyana, into friendship and attachment. At the time of his return, he left the government of the forts of Rantambhor and Harautt in the charge of Qadam Khan who had the title of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din; and spread the shadow of peace and hope on the residents of Shadiabad.

In the course of the same year, Sikandar Khan and Jalal Khan Bukhari, who were among the great amirs of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din Bahmani Dakini, sent petitions and incited Sultan Mahmud to seize the fort of Muhur, which was one of the great forts of Berar. The Sultan advanced towards Muhur by way of Hushangabad. Sikandar Khan came and waited on him in the neighbourhood of

---

1 The name is written as مادوتني in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is written as هاروتي. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 219) has Kerowly. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, does not give the name of the country, but calls the people the “Hara Rajputs”.

2 The town is called مهرولي in the MS., and مهرولي in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has مهرولي Mahott. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the name.

3 The word which I have translated as “dispute” is written in the MS. as نقاري, نقاري, نقاري. In the lith. ed. it is نقاري, and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is نقاري. None of these words have any meaning in the dictionary which is quite appropriate. I believe “dispute”, “railing at”, than the “dandying words”, which is the meaning of نقاري as the nearest. M. Hidayat Hosain has retained نقاري in the text-edition.

4 Both MSS. have Sultan Qiyas-ud-din. This is incorrect. Sultan Qiyas-ud-din was the title of the elder son. Qadam Khan’s title was ‘Ala-ud-din. Firishtah lith. ed. has نداري خان Fidai Khan instead of Qadam Khan; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 219) has Fidw Khan.

5 The MSS. have از راه هرشنگا باد instead of از دار الملك هرشنگا باد.
Maḫmūdābād. When he laid siege to Māhūr, Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn came with an army, as numerous as the stars and as splendid as the sky, to aid the besieged garrison. Sultān Maḫmūd finding that he had not the strength to meet him turned back. The pen, perfumed with musk, has narrated these incidents clearly and in detail, in the section about the Bahmani Sultāns.

At the time of his return news came from the 1 enemies, that Mubārak Khaṇ, the ruler of Asīr, had invaded the country of Baklānā, which is situated between Gujrat and the Deccan, and owed fealty and allegiance to Maḫmūd Shāh. The latter, considering it incumbent on his spirit to protect and favour the ruler of the country, turned the reins of his determination in the direction of Baklānā; and sent Iqbal Khān and Yūsuf Khān in advance of himself. Mubārak Khān came with a large army to oppose, but fled after a massacre. Sultān Maḫmūd returned to Shādiābād, after raiding some villages and towns in the territory of Asīr.

In the year 858 A.H., news was brought to Sultān Maḫmūd, that the son of Rāy Bābū, the Rāja of Baklānā, wanted to come to him; but Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr had invaded his country, and was laying it waste, and was preventing him from coming. Sultān Maḫmūd sent Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn on wings of speed to put him (Mubārak Khān) down. When the news reached the latter, he turned back and went to his own country. A son of Bābū came with much tribute, and received favours; and having obtained permission to return, went back proud and happy to his own country; and Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn went towards Rantambhōr.

About this time, the Sultān advanced towards Chitōr. Kōnbhā met him in the way of affability and gentleness, and sent a quantity of coined gold and silver as tribute. As the coins bore Kōnbhā's

---

1 The word is مترددين in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and مترددين in the other MS. The only meaning of مترددين that can at all apply is enemies, but even that is not appropriate. مترددين cannot be found in the dictionary. Firštah leaves out the words مترددين in the corresponding passage; and gives the full name of Mubārak Khān as Mirān Mubārak Shāh Fāroqī.

2 One MS. has زوجه فرسناد. The other has زره نفره مسکوك پیش فرسناد. Both these readings are partly incorrect. The reading in the lith. ed. appears to be correct and I have retained it.
stamp, they became the cause of an increase of Maḥmūd’s wrath; and he returned them; and his men stretched their hands in the way of plunder and rapine; and did not leave a vestige of cultivation and population. He also appointed Manṣūr-ul-mulk to lay waste the country of Mandisōr. And with the object of leaving thānadārs there, he wanted to found a town of the name of Khaļjpūr in the centre of the country. On hearing this, Kōnbhā came in a state of distress and humility and sent a message to the Sultān, that he was prepared to send any amount of tribute that the latter might demand, and after that would never transgress the path of devotion and loyalty on the condition that the Sultān would abandon the project of building Khaļjpūr. As the rains were approaching, Sultān Maḥmūd took as much tribute as pleased his heart, and turned towards Shādīābad. After remaining there for a time, he again advanced in the year 859 A.H., 1454 A.D., with the object of conquering the country of Mandisōr. On arriving in that neighbourhood, he sent detachments in different directions, and himself took up a position in the centre of the country. Every day news of a fresh victory came to him, and he performed the rites of offering thanks to God.

It so happened that one day a petition came from a detachment, which had been sent in the direction of Hārauti, to the purport that, the beginning of the rising of the sun of Islām in the country of Hindūstān was from the horizon of Ajmir, and His Holiness the most learned of the sects 2 Shaikh Mu’in-ud-din Ḥasan Sanjari was at rest in that place; and now as it had come into the possession of the Kāfirīs, there was no vestige left there of Islām or Musalmāns. As the purport of this petition was received, Sultān Maḥmūd turned in the direction of Ajmir that very day; and after successive marches,

---

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 221) says in a note that Chittoor was never subjugated by the kings of either Guzerat or Malwa; and therefore Sooītan Mahmood did not return the tribute, because the coins bore Koombho’s stamp, but because he did not consider it to be large enough. It appears to me that Sultān Maḥmūd did not admit the independence of Rānā Kōnbhā, who was paying tribute off and on; and, therefore, resented the fact that the tribute sent contained coins which bore the Rānā’s stamp; and he was probably also dissatisfied with the amount of the tribute.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 357, calls him Shaikh Mu’in-ud-din Chishti.
encamped opposite the tomb, which was the receptacle of light, and asked for help from the spirit of the Khwājah, may his tomb be sanctified! (He then) ordered the bakhshī (pay-master) of the army, that he should, in concert with the amirs, reconnoitre round the fort and distribute the batteries. At this time 1 Gajādhar, who was the commander of the garrison, sallied out with a body of renowned Rājpūts to give battle. He was, however, unable to withstand the assaults of Maḥmūd’s troops, and retired again into the fort. After that bloody skirmishes were carried on for four days. On the 5th day, Gajādhar again came out with all his troops, and was slain in the full swing of the fight. A body of Maḥmūd Shāh’s soldiers, being mixed with those who were fleeing, got inside the gates; and the conquest of the fort fell to the lot of the Musalmāns. In every lane there lay heaps of Rājpūts that had been slain. Sultān Maḥmūd, having carried out the rites of offering his thanks to God, attained to the honour of circumambulating the grave of the great saint; and made plans for the erection of a grand mosque. He conferred the title of Saif Khān on Khwājah Na’mat-ul-lah, and entrusted the rule of the fort to his charge. He made the attendants of that holy place happy by bestowing rewards and stipends on them; and then returning towards the fort of Mandalgarh, encamped after successive marches on the bank of the river Banās. He nominated amirs to different points round the fort. Kōnbhā also sent out his army from the fort dividing it into three detachments. The division, which confronted Tāj Khān, and that which was opposed to ‘Alī Khān, fought with arrows and lances and there was 2 a great battle; and a large number of Maḥmūd

1 The name is written as Kajādhar, in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed.; and as Gajādhar in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. This latter is of course correct. Gajādhar is a corruption of Sanskrit Gadādhar, i.e., one who bears the mace. Col. Briggs has got Gungadhar Roy, which may be derived from Gangādhārā—a name of Siva—meaning one who carries the goddess or river Gangā. The Cambridge History of India, page 357, has Gajānhar, which has no meaning at all. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained Kajādhar in the text.

2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 223, footnote) suggests that this was the battle which was commemorated as a great victory obtained by Rana Koombho over Sooltan Mahmood on the superb column which the former erected; but there is very little similarity between this battle and the victory claimed
Shāh’s troops were slain, while an innumerable host of Rājpūts became food for the sword. When the sovereign of the stars turned his face from the arch of the fourth heaven towards his private chamber (*i.e.*, the sunset), the two parties took up their quarters in their respective stations. In the morning, the amirs and vazirs collected in the royal pavilion, and submitted that as during that year the troops had been fighting repeated campaigns and the rainy season was near, it would be fitting and proper, if he would rest and repose for a few days in the capital city of Shādiābad, in order to repair the damage and injury to the army; and make after the rains, with a fully equipped army, a king-like attempt to capture the fort. Sultān Mahmūd returned and rested for some days.

On the 26th Muharram 861 A.H., 23rd December, 1456, the Sultān marched with a great army to capture the fort of Mandalgarh. In the neighbourhood of Mewār, the armies of Nāgor and Ajmir and Hārauti came and joined him. From that place they marched together to besiege Mandalgarh. On the way, wherever they saw a

by the Rājpūts. According to the Rājpūt Annals, the victory took place in 1440 A.H., while the date of this battle was 1455 or 1456, 15 or 16 years later; while to take one of the incidents, Sultān Mahmūd was said to have been taken prisoner, and kept in confinement for six months, and then released; see note 6, pages 512, 513. There is no mention of this in the Musalmān histories; and it is scarcely possible that such a thing should have occurred without being noted.

The Cambridge History of India, page 357, does not mention this battle at all, and the account given by it is entirely different. According to it, “the siege was opened and the approaches carried up to the walls. On October 19th, 1457, the place was carried by assault, with great slaughter, etc., etc.” There is no mention of Rānā Kŏnbdā and of his army; and instead of the retreat mentioned by Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah, we have Sultān Mahmūd advancing towards Chitor, and sending columns in different directions to harass the Rājpūts and to reduce them to subjection. Later on, however, on page 361, when giving a summary of the qualities and achievements of Sultān Mahmūd it says “The more famous column of victory at Chitor is said to commemorate victories over Mahmūd of Gujārāt and Mahmūd of Mālwa. If this is so it, ‘like some tall bully lifts its head and lies’.”

1 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah read طاق نقل چهارم the arch of the fourth heaven or sky, and I have accordingly adopted it; but the reading in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt جهارم which has the same meaning, sounds very well, and I had a mind to retain it.
temple, they razed it to the ground. On their arrival at their destination, he gave orders to cut down all the trees from the roots and having pulled down all structures, left no trace of cultivation or population. Then they commenced the siege, and carrying the batteries beyond the ditches, took them close to the wall of the fort. In a short time, the citadel was captured by the help of Divine Providence. A large number of men were taken prisoners, or ¹ were slain. The Rājpūts took shelter in a second fort, which was situated on the top of a hill, and felt proud of its strength and protection. But as the water of the reservoirs above the fort had failed owing to the concussion of the cannon, and the water, which had been stored in the first fort had fallen into the hands of Maḥmūd Shāh’s troops; owing to the want of water cries of weeping and anguish rose from all sides, and the garrison crying “thirsty”, “thirsty”, begged for quarter; and agreed to pay a sum of ten lakhs of tankas as tribute; and coming out ² with an assurance of safety, surrendered the fort. This great victory appeared on the stage of events, on the ³ 1st Dhl-hijjah in the year 871 A.H. Sultān Maḥmūd performed the rites of offering praise and thanks to God in a spirit of great humility and submission; and entering the fort on the following day, demolished the idol temple, and used the materials for the construction of a Jāma’ Mosque. He appointed a Qāḍī (judge), a Mufti (judge or one who issues fatwas or decisions), a Muḥtasib or censor of public morals, a Ḳhaṭīb or a reader of prayers, and a Muqaddan or one who calls worshippers to perform the Namāz at fixed hours; and having arranged the affairs of that neighbourhood in the best way, advanced on the ⁴ 15th Muḥarram in the year 862 A.H., in the direction of Chitār.

¹ One MS. and the lith. ed. have قتل, while the other MS. has قتل, below.
² One MS. and the lith. ed. have بَيْلَاتُ، while the other MS. has بَيْلَاتُ, below.
³ Firishtah lith. ed. has the 25th Dhl-hijjah 862 A.H., as the date of the victory, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 224) has Zeehuj 20, 861 A.H., 8th November, 1457.
⁴ Both MSS. have 15th Muḥarram 862 A.H., while the lith. ed. has 15th Muḥarram-ul-ḥarām in the year 892, which is manifestly incorrect, as to the year. Firishtah lith. ed. has 15th Muḥarram, 863 A.H., and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 224) has 16th Mohurrum, A.H. 862, December 4th, 1457.
When he arrived in that neighbourhood, he sent Shâhzâda Sulṭān Ghiyâth-ud-din to raid and ravage the countries of Kilwârah and Dilwârah. The Shâhzâda laid the country waste, captured many prisoners, and returned under the wings of help and safety. After some days Shâhzâda Qadam Khân and Tâj Khân were nominated to attempt the capture of the fort of Bûndi. When the Shâhzâda arrived in the vicinity of the fort, the Râjpûts came out of it and commenced a fight. They exerted themselves to the best of their ability, but being in the end routed, became food for the sword; and a number of them having thrown themselves into the ditch were taken prisoners. On the first day of the attack they captured the fort by the strength of their arms, and their bravery and courage. The Shâhzâda having offered thanks for this great gift in the best way, left one of his trusted chiefs in that place; and with victory and triumph, returned to the capital city of Shâdiâbâd in the foot steps of his father and patron.

In the year 863 A.H., 1458 A.D., (the Sulṭān) 3 again mounted to punish and chastise the Râjpûts. When he encamped in the village of Ahâr, he appointed Sulṭān Ghiyâth-ud-din and Qadam Khân to raid the countries of Kilwârah and Dilwârah. They ravaged that country, and also raided the country round Kônîbhalmir. When they waited on their father, and Sulṭān Ghiyâth-ud-din dilated on the praise of that fort, Sulṭān Maḥmûd advanced the next day towards it. On the way he demolished temples and traversed the different stages. When he encamped in the vicinity of Kônîbhalmir, he mounted his horse one day, and went to the top of a hill which was situated on its eastern side, and reconnoitred the city. He then declared that the

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Kilwârah and Dilwârah, while the other MS. has Kilwârah and Malwârah.
2 The text-edition has فان خان.
3 One MS. omits the words بناديب و غوشال راجپوران سواري نامد و جوهر نام دانديب کلوراپ بنوارا نامد نامد نامد and has instead بنار نماذج کلوراپ بنوارا نامد نامد نامد and then as in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
4 One MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have موقع اهار جناب، but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 225) has the town of D'har.
5 The name is variously written as Qadam Khân, Fidâî Khân, and Fidwî Khân.
capture of the fort would not be possible without a siege lasting some years. The next day he started from that place and advanced towards Dungarpur. When he encamped on the bank of the Dungarpur reservoir, 1 Rāy Syām Dās, the Rāja of the place fled, and took shelter in the foot-hills; and coming out again from that place in great humility and distress gave a tribute of two lakhs of tankas and twenty-one horses. The Sultān then returned to his capital of Shādībād.

In Muḥarram 866 A.H., September 1461 A.D., he advanced by rapid stages to conquer the country of the Deccan at the instigation of 2 Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī. 3 When he crossed the river Narbada, the scouts brought the news, that Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asir, had surrendered the deposit of his life. And Ghāzi Khān, his son, who bore the title of ‘Ādil Khān, had taken his place. In the beginning of his rule he had stretched out his hands of tyranny from the sleeve of oppression, had unjustly ordered 5 Saiyid Kamāl-ud-din and Saiyid Sultān to be slain, and had laid waste the houses of the victors. After some days their brother named Saiyid Jalāl-ud-din came to Sultān Maḥmūd praying for justice. The latter, in order to help him, determined to chastise ‘Ādil Khān, and with this intention marched towards Asir. ‘Ādil Khān in his helplessness and humility sent one of the grandsons (descendants) of Quṭb ‘Ālam

1 He is called Rāy Syām Dās in one MS, and Rāy Sām Dās in the other, and Sāmī Dās in the 1st ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Rāy Sām Dās, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 225) has Shaun Das. I have adopted Syām Das, as it is nearest to the Sanskrit name.

2 Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree; see also page 87 in the account of Nizām Shah Bahmanī, from which it would appear, that the invasion was at the instigation of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī; but the Cambridge History of India, page 357, says that Humāyūn Shāh caused Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī to be assassinated; and it was at the instance of his family, who escaped to Māndū, that Sultān Mahmūd Khalji invaded the Deccan.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 358, dismisses the matter of the advance on Asir, with the rather inadequate and misleading statement, "composed a recent quarrel with ‘Ādil Khān II of Khāndesh."

4 Both MSS. have ظلم, but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have ظالم.

5 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 225, 226) has "Syud Kumal and Syud Sooltan, two of the most respectable and holy persons of the age," but I cannot find his authority for doing so.
Shaikh Farid-ud-din Mas'ud Shakarganj to wait on him, and sending some tribute, prayed for the pardon of his offences. As Sultan Mahmud knew that the arrow of the plan of no conqueror of forts had ever reached the battlements of the strong bastions of Asir; and besides the real object of this expedition was the conquest of the Deccan, he drew the pen of forgiveness over the volume of 'Adil Khan's offences; and having given him some advice, turned towards the country of Berar and Elichpur.

On his arrival in the town of Balapur, his scouts brought the news that the vazirs of Nizam Shah had summoned and collected the troops from the different frontiers; and having drawn two crores of tankas from the treasury, had disbursed it, in the way of help to their expenses, to the amirs and the commanders; and they had come out of the city of Bidar with a large army and one hundred and fifty elephants of mountain-like size; and were waiting for the appearance of secret hidden in the providence of God, may His greatness be glorified! Sultan Mahmud, on hearing this news, put his troops in order, and by repeated marches arrived within three farsangs of Nizam Shah. 2 The vazirs placed the eight year old Nizam Shah

---

1 The eight years old son of the tyrant Humayun Shah, who had in the meantime succeeded him.

2 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. has وزراء نظام شاه مشت ماله را سوار کردن and the lith. ed. has the same reading as the first MS., with the difference that it has وزراء instead of وزراء. I have adopted the reading of the first MS. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 226) says that the young king was placed on an elephant; but the use of the word عائلان bridile, shows that this is not correct. The account of the battle as given in the Cambridge History of India, page 358, is somewhat misleading. It is said there that, "when the two armies met, that of the Deccan got some slight advantage, but the precipitate action of a slave named Sikandar Khan, who had charge of the person of the child king, decided the fate of the day." As a matter of fact the Deccan army gained a decisive victory and the Malwa army fled and was pursued for two karoha, and Sultan Mahmud's camp was plundered; and the fate of the day was not decided by the precipitate action of the person in charge of the child king; but as so often happened in other battles, was due to the victorious troops having dispersed in search of plunder, and Sultan Mahmud coming out of ambush with a body of fresh troops at the psychological moment. The person who took away the young king towards Bidar was not, according to the Tabaqat and Firishtah, Sikandar
on a horse; and raising the royal umbrella over his head placed the bridle of the horse in the hand of Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk. The command of the left wing was entrusted to Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, and of the right wing to Khwājah Maḥmūd Gilānī, who had the title of Malik-ut-tuğjār. When the two Bādshāhs arrived in front of each other Malik-ut-tuğjār acting with great quickness fell on the left wing of Sultān Maḥmūd’s army; and both Mahābat Khān, the governor of Chandērī, and Zahir-ul-mulk, the væzir, who were the commanders of it were slain; and a great defeat fell on the Mandū army, so that it was pursued to a distance of two karōhs; and Sultān Maḥmūd’s camp was plundered.

At this time Sultān Maḥmūd, who had betaken himself to a corner, and was waiting for an opportunity (saw that) most of the Dakinīs were engaged in plundering, and Nizām-ul-mulk was standing with only a few men round him, appeared with twelve thousand horsemen from behind Nizām Shāh’s army. Khwājah Jahān Turk, who was the leader of the centre of the army, turned round; and seizing the bridle of Nizām Shāh’s horse turned towards the city of Bīdar. The tables were now turned; and the men who had gone away in search of plunder were deprived of the beautiful capital of their lives.

Malka-i-Jahān, the mother of Nizām Shāh, having suspicion of deceit and treachery, left Mallū Khan to guard the city of Bīdar, and went away herself to Firūzābād, taking her son with her. From that place she sent a letter to Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī, and asked for his help and reinforcements. And Sultān Maḥmūd followed on and besieged Bīdar. When the people having run away gathered round Nizām Shāh at Firūzābād, and the news was received that Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī, who had determined to help Nizām Shāh with a huge army, would be soon arriving; Sultān Maḥmūd, having held a consultation, decided in the end, that as the air had become hot, and the month of Ramadān had drawn near, it would be best and

Khān, but Khwājah Jahān Turk. It is true that in the letter, which Nizām Shāh or his mother or his ministers wrote to Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī they said that Sikandar Khān and Khwājah Jahān carried him off to Bīdar; but not , till an arrow from Sultān Maḥmūd’s army hit the elephant on which Sikandar Khān was riding, and the animal became unruly, so that Sikandar Khān’s action can scarcely be described as precipitate (see note 1, pp. 87–89).
most proper, that he should defer the conquest of the country till
the next year, and should then return, and with this pretext, he
started on the following day for his own territory.

Again in the year 867 A.H., 1462 A.D., as he had the conquest of
the Deccan in his mind, he again equipped his army, and encamped
at Naṣratābad Na‘lcha; and he was still there, when a petition of
Shirāz-ul-mulk the ūthānadār of the fort of Kehrla arrived with the
information, that Niẓām Shāh Dākīnī had sent Niẓām-ul-mulk with a
large army to attack the thāna of Kehrla; and on the way news came
that Niẓām-ul-mulk Turk, having arrived, had attacked the fort of
Kehrla; and also that when Niẓām-ul-mulk had arrived in the
neighbourhood of the fort, Sirāj-ul-mulk was intoxicated, and had
no notice of what was happening; but his son came out of the fort,
and after putting up some fight fled. Niẓām-ul-mulk, owing to
his great pride and haughtiness, did not occupy himself in arranging
the affairs of the place. Sultān Maḥmūd, on receiving this news,
sent Maqbul Khān with four thousand horsemen in the direction of
the fort; and himself advanced towards Daulatābad to have his
revenge. On the way, the adherents of the Rāy Sirkaja and the
vakils (representatives) of the Rāy of Jājnagar brought five hundred
and thirty elephants as tribute. Sultān Maḥmūd bestowed robes of
honour and rewards on them, and gave them permission to return.
When he encamped in the village of Khalifa-ābād, one of the servants

1 Both the MSS. have نمرت آباد نلمچه; but the lith. ed. has only نلمچه; while Finishtah lith. ed. has الظفر آباد نلمچه. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) has Nalcha. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the incidents connected with Kehrla.

2 This is the version of Nizām-ul-mulk's proceedings in the Tabaqāt, both in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Finishtah has a different account. According to him, Nizām-ul-mulk entered the fort with the troops which were fleeing, and took possession of it, but was murdered the same day by some Rāpjūt foot soldiers. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) makes the matter clearer, by saying that "the place had fallen into the hands of Nizam-oool-Moolk; but that he, having exercised excessive tyranny towards the inhabitants had been put to death by a party of Rajput infantry." The Cambridge History of India, page 359, mentions the fact of Nizām-ul-mulk's occupation of Kehrla but does not mention his death.

3 The word is written مرکزہ in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Finishtah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) has Surgooja.
of the Amīr-ul-muʿminīn (the amīr of the Musalmāns) Mustanjad Billāh Yūsuf bin ʿAbbāsī brought for him a mandate conferring imperial rule, under a robe of chieftainship from Egypt. In his great joy and delight he carried out the rites of welcoming the servants of the Khalīfa, treated them with great honour, and bestowed on them horses with jewelled saddles and bridles and embroidered robes of honour.

When he arrived on the frontier of Daulatābād (they) informed him that Sulṭān Maḥmūd Gujrātī had come out of his capital and was advancing towards the place. Sulṭān Maḥmūd advanced towards the fort of 1 Mālkōnda; and having raided and ravaged some villages and hamlets returned to his capital of Shādīābād by way of Gōndwāra. He rested there for some days; and sent some troops under the command of Maqbul Khān in Rabī‘-ul-āwwal in the year 871 A.H., to plunder and 2 ravage the town of Elichpūr. When they plundered the city after occupying the surrounding country, the governor of the place after a part of the night had passed, collected his neighbours such as Qāḍī Khān and Pir Khān, and with fifteen hundred horsemen and innumerable foot soldiers came out to fight. When Maqbul Khān got this news, he despatched the booty and other goods and his equipments with one body of troops and he selected and kept the most useful men with him, and appointed 3 some detachments

---

1 Col. Briggs says in a note in vol. IV, page 229, of his History, "I am not aware of any town in Berar bearing this name; and the Teloogoo termination, conda, renders it likely to be an error of transcribers. It may be in Mulkepoor which lies in the direct route of the King's retreat."

2 One MS. substitutes ساخبته for بناخته.

3 The reading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. appear to be incorrect. The MSS. have پرائی چندوالی, and پرائی چندوال. The reading in Firishtah is پرائی چند چندوالی. This appears to be the correct reading, and I have adopted it. As to the incidents connected with Elichpūr, Firishtah agrees generally, with the exception pointed out in the preceding note. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 229) quotes an account of the incidents from what he calls "the best authenticated history I have seen", without, however, giving its name. It agrees generally with the Šabqat and Firishtah. In this account, however, it is stated distinctly what is perhaps implied in the other accounts, viz., "The enemy, as he anticipated, attacked the army for the sake of plundering the camp-equipage, etc.; and at the very
for engaging in a battle; and himself remained in ambush. When
the two parties engaged each other Maqbool Khan came out of ambush,
and Ghazi Khan fled towards Elichpūr. Maqbool Khan pursued him
to the gate of the city. On the way twenty of the notable leaders
were slain and thirty were taken prisoners. Maqbool Khan returned
from that place victorious and triumphant to Maḥmūdābād (i.e.,
Kehrla).

In Jamādi-ul-āwwal 871 A.H., January 1467 A.D., the ruler of
the Deccan sent a man of the name of 1 Qāḍī Shaikhān to the capital
city of Shāhdābād for effecting a treaty of peace; and after much
interchange of views peace was concluded on these 2 terms: that
the ruler of the Deccan should leave the country of Berār as far as
Elichpūr in the possession of Sulṭān Maḥmūd; and the latter should
not henceforward cause any damage to the country of the Deccan.
A treaty of peace was written containing these terms and received
the agreement of the amirs and great men and divines of the kingdom.
In the month of Jamādi-ul-ākāhir in the aforementioned year, a robe
of honour and the usual remuneration was bestowed on the ambassador
Shaikhān; and 3 Mashir-ul-mulk was sent with him so that the treaty
and the agreement might be confirmed in the presence of each other.

moment they expected to be crowned with victory, Mukbool Khan charging
with his cavalry on the rear of the assailants gave them a total defeat.”

1 The name is قاضي شيخان in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and قاضي شيخان in the other MS. It is not mentioned by Firishtah, who says the rulers of the Deccan and Mālwa sent their emissaries to meet together and does not mention the names of those emissaries.

2 The terms are slightly different according to Firishtah lith. ed., which says that the ruler of the Deccan should leave Sulṭān Maḥmūd in possession as far as Elichpūr and of the country of Gōndwāra and Baqālī, as far as Kehrla; and Sulṭān Maḥmūd should cause no injury to the country of the Deccan. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 230) says that “it was agreed, according to some historians, that Kehrla should be retained by Malwa, and that it should be considered as the southern limit of the kingdom; while others have asserted, that Elchepoor was ceded to Malwa on condition of the King refraining from invading the Deccan in future.” The Cambridge History of India, page 359, says that Maḥmūd’s possession of Kehrla was confirmed, but the integrity of Berar, with that exception, was maintained.

3 The name is Mashir-ul-mulk and Shēr-ul-mulk in the MSS. and Sharf-ul-mulk in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned anywhere else. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has شهزوم the text-edition.
After some days Sultān Maḥmūd ordered that the accounts of the offices should be kept according to lunar dates, and these dates should be written instead of the solar dates; and from the year 871 A.H. the lunar dates were entered in the accounts of all offices.

In the month of Rabī‘-ul-awwal of the aforementioned year, 1 Shaikh Nūr-ud-dīn, who was one of the most learned men of the age arrived in the neighbourhood of Mandū. Sultān Maḥmūd went as far as the Hauḍ-i-rānī, the rānī’s tank or reservoir, to meet him; and they embraced each other at the heads of their horses, and the Sultān showed him great honour and respect.

In Dhi-hiǧjah of the aforesaid year Maulānā ‘Imād, an emissary of Saiyid Muḥammad Nūr Bakbsh came and waited on Sultān Maḥmūd. He brought the patched garb of the Shaikh as a gift of good omen. The Sultān considered the arrival of the garb a sign of good fortune, and welcomed the arrival of Maulānā ‘Imād-ud-dīn with gratitude; and owing to his great pleasure and happiness kissed the 2 garb, and opening his hand of liberality and lavishness, made all the learned men and Shaikhs and honoured men of the country, who were present in the assembly, delighted and fortunate.

In the month of Muḥarram 872 A.H., August 1467, 3 swift messengers, who could race with the wind, brought to the notice of

1 The name is Shaikh Nūr-ud-dīn in the MSS., and also in the lith. ed., and the place of his arrival is Madīn Mandū, in one MS. and Mandu in the other; while it is Mandiser in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. calls the man Shaikh ‘Alā-ud-dīn and the place of his arrival, the neighbourhood of Shādlābād Mandū.

2 One MS. has instead of خرقه را پرشیده instead of خرقه را پرشیده by mistake. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has, however, retained خرقه را پرشیدہ in the text-edition.

3 Firishta and Col. Briggs agree generally, but the Cambridge History of India, page 359, says that Muhammad III of the Deccan tampered with the loyalty of Maqbūl Khān, and the latter surrendered the fortress to the son of the Raja when Maḥmūd had imprisoned; and it also calls Tāj Khān and Ahmad Khān Maḥmūd’s sons. I cannot find any authority for these statements. In the genealogy of the kings of Mālwa, on page 713 of the History, Ghiyās-ud-dīn is shown as the only son of Sultān Maḥmūd I, though we know that there was at least one other son, Qadam Khān or Fidā Khān, also known as Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn. It may be that the name of the only son of Sultān Maḥmūd,
the Sultān, that Maqbūl Khān, of perverted destiny, had ravaged the town of Maḥmūdābād, which is now celebrated as Kehrla, and had applied to the ruler of the Deccan for protection; and had also made over some elephants, which had for administrative purposes been kept with him to the Rāyzāda of Kehrla; and the latter had taken possession of the town; and had put all Musalmāns, who had been residing in the fort, to death. He had also made a tribe of Gōnda join him, and had by their help closed up all roads. Immediately on hearing this news, Sultān sent Tāj Khān and Aḥmad Khān to put down this rebellion; and he himself also encamped at N’alcha on the 20th Rabī’-ul-ākhīr of the aforementioned year; and after a few days he started towards Maḥmūdābād. News reached him on the way that Tāj Khān and Aḥmad Khān had reached that place on the 1 Dussehra day, which is a great day of the Brahmins, after making a forced march of seventy karōhs. When they were informed that the Rāyzāda was at his meal, Tāj Khān said, “It is not the act of a brave man to attack an enemy, when he is unaware of his danger.” He therefore stopped his horse there, and sent a man to the Rāyzāda and gave him notice. The latter withdrew his hand from his food, and took up his arms and with his men came out to give battle. Such great exertions were made by the two parties, that nothing greater can be imagined. In the end most of the Rāyzāda’s men became food for the sword; and he himself fled with head and feet bare; and sought the protection of the Gōnda. The elephants which had been with Maqbūl Khān and other booty and the town of Maḥmūdābād again came into Sultān Maḥmūd’s possession. When the report of Tāj Khān reached Sultān Maḥmūd he was extremely delighted. He appointed Malik-ul-umarā Malik Dāūd to chastise the tribe who had given shelter to the Rāyzāda. When this news reached them, they sent the Rāyzāda under confinement to Tāj Khān.

After the victory Sultān Maḥmūd marched towards Maḥmūdābād; and encamped on the 6th of Rajab-ul-murajjab, in the town of Sārangpūr. At that place, after a few days Khwājah Jamāl-ud-dīn

who became a ruler of Mālwa is given in the genealogy; but the names of five sons of Ḥūshang Shāh, none of whom ascended the throne, are given.

1 One MS. has, by mistake, روز صهرا.
Astrābādi came as an ambassador from the honoured 1 Mirzā Abū Sa'id with fine presents and gifts. Sultan Mahmūd was very pleased and delighted on his arrival, and made him happy with royal favours, and gave him permission to return. He also sent various 2 presents of the articles of Hindūstān, such as different kinds of silk and linen fabrics, and some 3 slave girls skilled in dancing and singing, and some elephants and some eunuchs and a few Shārīks and talking Tūjis (parrots) and some 'Arab horses in charge of Shaikhzāda 'Alā-ud-din in company with Khwājah Jamāl-ud-din. The Sultan then remained (for some time) in Shādībād.

In the year 873 A.H., 1468 A.D., a petition came from Ghāzi Khān, to the effect that the zamindārs of Kachwārah had placed their feet outside the high road of allegiance. Immediately on its arrival, Sultan Mahmūd taking the difficulties of the entrances and exits from the country into his consideration, planned the erection of a fortress in the centre of the country, which was completed in the course of six days. It received the name of Jalālpūr and 4 Mirzā Khān was placed in charge of it.

On the 8th Sha'bān of the aforementioned year 5 Shaikh

1 Ruler of Transoxiana, third in descent from Timūr, and grandfather of Babar.

2 One MS. inserts 3 سوختات تعفن قبلي after the other has چند کنیز خاص چند کنیز چنگال دارد گوینده چند کنیز بزرگ و گونده. The first is the correct reading and I have adopted it. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 232) says that “dancing women, and singers mounted on elephants superbly caparisoned, together with a number of Indian and Abyssinian slaves for the soraglio.” He calls the shārīks, meinās, but this is not correct. The dictionary describes shārīko as a species of talking bird, a grackle, a nightingale. In Bengali sūks and sūrīs are said to be two kinds of talking birds, the former being supposed to be the male and the latter the female; and as far as I know the shārīk is a variant of sūrī; the sūf being the sūk or parrot. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the presents, but otherwise generally agrees with the text.

4 The name is 3 ملیخ خان in one MS., and in the lith. ed. It is 3 ملیخ خان in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah; and Meer Khan in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 233). The name is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India. M. Hidayat Hosain has 3 ملیخ خان in the text-edition.

5 The name is Shaikh Muhammad Farmālī in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah; but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and the Cambridge History of India have Shaikhzāda Muhammad Qarmālī (p. 360).
Muḥammad Farmali and Kapūr Chand, son of the Rāja of Gwāliar came as ambassadors of Sulṭān Bahālūl Lūdī, the Bāḏshāḥ of Dehli, and waited upon the Sulṭān Maḥmūd, in the neighbourhood of Fatḥābād; and offered the presents which they had brought. They also submitted the following by word of mouth; "Sulṭān ᪓usain Sharqī does not keep his hand from me. If his Majesty the Sulṭān comes to the neighbourhood of Dehli to help and reinforce me, and removes from me the disturbance created by him, I shall make over the fortress of Biyāna with its dependencies as tribute at the time of his return; and whenever the Sulṭān would advance in this direction I shall send six thousand horsemen, with necessary equipments, to wait on, and accompany him." Sulṭān Maḥmūd said, "Whenever Sulṭān ᪓usain should advance towards Dehli, I shall with great rapidity betake myself to you and support you." Upon this agreement he conferred great favours on the ambassadors, and bestowed on them valuable robes of honour, and bade them farewell.

On the following day he started from that place, and advanced towards his capital of Shāhābād. As the air was extremely hot on the road, his health fell out of equability and his illness became greater day by day, till on the 19th Dḥi-q'adah in the year 873 A.H., May 26th 1569, he passed away in the country of Kachwārah from the waste country of the world to the happy land of the after life. The period of his reign was thirty-four years.

Couplet:

Although with grandeur to the sky he lifts the throne,
To the grandeur of the burial, at last, he carries his all.

---

1 The readings in the MSS. are از حسد اعتدال and in the lith. ed. با اعتدال. I have adopted the first reading, while in the text-edition it is از حسد اعتدال.

2 The Cambridge History of India (p. 360) gives June 1st 1469 as the date of the death. Firishtah agrees with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that the Sulṭān died in the country of Kachwārah; but the Cambridge History of India, page 360, says he expired shortly after his arrival at Mandū, or as it always wrongly calls it Māndū.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بجا لحسد, but the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has بجا لحسد, which would of course mean to the well or pit of the burial; this last has been adopted in the text-edition.
The similarity between the age of Sultan Mahmūd at the time of his accession with the period of his reign is not without a certain singularity and curiosity. His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunction, Amir Timūr Gūrgān also ascended the throne of the empire as a matter of permanence in his 36th year, and the period of his reign was also 36 years; and after his death 36 of his sons and grandsons were living and in their places.

2 An account of Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din, son of Sultan Mahmūd Khalji.

When Sultan Mahmūd Khalji passed away, his eldest son Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din sat on the throne of the empire; and putting out the hand of liberality and lavishness from the sleeve of generosity and beneficence, made all the sections of the people satisfied and grateful. He distributed the gold, which had been scattered over his umbrella, among men of culture and other deserving people. He confirmed the territory of Ranthambhūr which have been already allotted to him, to his younger brother, who bore the title of Sultan 'Alā-ud-din and was known as Qadam Khān. He, in order to please him, also bestowed on him certain other parganas, which had been in his

---

1 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has حَيى تَأَيِم بَردِنُد, another has حَيى تَأَيِم مَقَام بَردة انُد; while the lith. ed. has حَيى تَأَيِم بَردة انُد. Firishtah lith. ed. has no corresponding passage. The second reading has been adopted in the text-edition.

2 There are differences in the heading also. One MS. has what I have got in the text, the other has ذَكْر سُلْطَان فِياث الْدِين خَلْجِي, while the lith. ed. has only ذَكْر سُلْطَان فِياث الْدِين.

3 Firishtah has, he made, Fidi Khān, his brother, happy by conferring on him شهر نو Shahr-i-Nau, and certain other parganas, which he had in his possession in the time of Sultan Mahmūd Khalji; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 236) calls the brother Fidwī Khan, but agrees with the Tabaqāt in saying that Runthunbhor was conferred on him, to be held in perpetuity. The Cambridge History of India, page 361, says that "his next brother Tāj Khān was confirmed in his fiefs, and received the title of 'Alā-ud-din, and his younger brother Fidā Khān was permitted to retain Ranthambhor and other districts." Neither the Tabaqāt nor Firishtah mention Tāj Khān as a son of Sultan Mahmūd Khalji; and they say that Qadam Khān or Fidi Khān had the title of Sultan 'Alā-ud-din.
possession in the time of Sultān Maḥmūd. He made Shāhzhāda 'Abd-ul-qādir his heir, after conferring on him the title of 1 Nāṣir Shāh; and entrusted the duties of the vazārat to him. He conferred on him the umbrella and palanquin and polished still-ball as ensigns of royalty; and a jāgir of twelve thousand horsemen. He also gave orders to the Khāns and amīrs, that they should go every morning to salute him, and come to the palace in attendance at his stirrups. When he had finished the festivities and rites of the accession, he sent for the amīrs one day, and said, “As I have spent 34 years at the stirrups of my father in labours and expedition, it now comes to my mind, that I should endeavour to guard what has come to me from my father, and should not give myself the trouble to acquire more; and should open the 2 door of peace and rest, and pleasure and enjoyment on me, and those depending on me. It is better to keep the territories in peace and quiet, than to strike one’s hand on those of others.” He commenced to endeavour to collect musicians; and they came to his threshold from all directions. He filled his seraglio with 4 beautiful slave girls and daughters of Rājas and zamindārs; and in this matter made very great exertions. He taught an art and a profession to each of the beautiful girls; and taking their fitness into consideration, taught some the arts of dancing and singing; and others those of reading and recitation and playing on the flute; and a small number the art of wrestling. He had five hundred Abyssinian slave

1 Firishtah and Col. Briggs say that the title of Sooltan Nasir-ood-Deen was conferred by Gheis-ood-Deen on his eldest son, and he was made heir-apparent and vazir. The Cambridge History of India, page 362, says that Sultān Ghiyās-ud-din “associated him with himself in the business of government.” It appears, however, more correct to say that the Sultān left the government entirely in his hands.

2 One MS. has امانش, incorrectly, for امانش. The lith. ed. has عرشت before عرشت. This appears to me to be better than either of the two other readings, and has been adopted as correct.

3 One MS. has و امانت دشتن، and both MSS. have و بیاین. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted the first reading.

4 One MS. and the lith. ed. have کنیرن ماحب جمال, while the other MS. has کنیرا ماحب جمال.
girls dressed in male attire, and arming them with swords and shields gave them the name of the Habtewash band. He also called five hundred Turkí slave girls in the Turkí dress as the Mughul band. He also trained five hundred slave girls, who were distinguished for the strength of their genius and the keenness of their intelligence, in various kinds of learning; and he had one of them join him every day at his meals. He selected a number of them, and entrusted various affairs of state, such as the office of demands, and the watching of receipts and expenditure of the country, and the supervision of various factories, to them.

1 He also established a market in his harem, so that whatever went to the market of the city for sale was also sold there. Altogether sixteen thousand slave girls were collected in his harem; and 2 each one of them had every day two silver tankas and two mans of grain; and in equalising this allowance he acted with the greatest meticulousness, so that Ráni Khurshid who was the highest of the members of the seraglio and had great love for him, and great authority in all affairs, also had two mans of grain by lawful weight and two tankas. He had also ordered a servant that he should place every day cooked food at the mouths of the holes of mice and rats. He had also ordered his officers, that when he offered thanks for the gifts of the great and holy God, and when the benefits, which the great God had showered on him, came before eyes, they should give fifty tankas by way of thanks-offering to deserving men; and 3 should not suspend it during

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 362, says, “A replica in miniature of the great bazar in the city was erected within the precincts of the palace, and was filled with the artists, artisans and craftswomen of the harem.” This does not convey the meaning of the statement in the text.

2 Firishtah agrees, but he adds غیر سرداران و منصبداران i.e., except sardârs (chiefs), and mansabdârs; but this does not agree with Tabaqât according to which even Ráni Khurshid had the usual allowance. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 236) gives each of them “two seers of grain and two tankas of copper.” The Cambridge History of India does not give the exact amount paid to each woman, but adds (p. 362), that “the king himself regulated with meticulous nicety the pay and allowance of all, even to the quantities of grain, fodder, and meat allotted to the various animals employed or domesticated” in the harem.

3 The reading is doubtful and the meaning is obscure. The readings in MSS. are و معطى ندادرند و نجواب معطى ندادرند which are clearly incorrect.
sleep. 1 He also ordered that to each person young or old to whom he might speak anything outside, they should give one thousand tankas in the shape of a reward. Most of his time was passed in pleasure and enjoyment. After a watch of the night had passed, he girded the belt of service, in the middle of his life, and occupied himself with the ceremonies of worship; and rubbed his forehead in the dust of humility and poverty; and entering by the door of humility begged for the grant of his object and desires from the great and holy God.

He had given an order to one who was near him, that he should bring to his notice at a fitting place, whatever might take place in his kingdom, and any petition that might come from any frontiers (of his kingdom). If in any affair of the country, there was doubt among the vazirs they used to write a statement of the facts and send it to the palace, and he wrote a fitting reply and sent it to them. It is stated that Sultan Bahlul Lodi the Badshah of Dehli raided the 2 town of Alhanpur, which appertained to the Sultan's of Malwa: and great injury was done to the residents of the town. No one could place his foot of daring forward and bring this matter to the notice of Sultan Ghiyas-ud-din. In the end by the advice and counsel of the vazirs, Hasan took advantage of an opportunity one day, and reported that Sultan Bahlul used to send every year the whole of the profits, in the form of tribute and salami (bonus) to the fortunate Sultan Mahmud Shah; and it was now being heard that he had committed an act of audacity, and his troops had stretched the arm of plunder and rapine to the town of 3 Alhanpur. On hearing this news, he immediately sent an order to Sher Khan, son of Muazzzaf Khan,

The lith. ed. has this seems to be the correct reading, and has been adopted. M. Hidayat Hosain, however, has retained the first reading.

1 The meaning of the payment of this large reward is not clear. It is not clear also what is meant by . Does it mean outside the harem?

2 Both MSS. have , but the lith. ed. has . Firištah has in the corresponding passage . Col. Briggs has Runthun-bhore, and the Cambridge History of India, page 361, has Pālampur near Ranthambhor. The fact that Sultan Ghiyās-ud-din did not attack Bahlūl Lodi when the latter invaded Malwa, but ordered Sher Khan to do so is given in the Cambridge History of India, as an illustration of his being averse to war. I think it was due to his laziness and inertia.

3 Here also the MSS. have .
the ruler of Chandērī, that he should take the armies of Bhīsa and Sānrangpūr with him, and proceed to chastise Sūltān Bahūl. After receiving the order, Shēr Khān collected his troops, and advanced towards Biyāna. As Sūltān Bahūl saw that he did not possess the strength to meet Shēr Khān, he abandoned Biyāna, and went to Dehli. Shēr Khān pursued him, and advanced towards Dehli. Sūltān Bahūl then, by offering terms of peace and making presents, turned him back and the latter then rebuilt 1 Alhanpūr and then came back to Chandērī. They narrate that every night he placed some gold mōhurs under his pillow, and every morning he gave them away to deserving people. 2 He had ordered seventy slave girls, who had memorised the holy Qurān, that at the time when he changed his clothes they would finish the Qurān and 3 blow their breath on the garment. In respect of the beauty of his belief and simplicity, they narrate that one day a man brought to him a hoof of an ass, and said, “This is a hoof of the ass of Jesus.” He ordered that they should bestow on the man fifty thousand tankas, and he bought the hoof. To make the story short, three other men, who brought three other hoofs also sold each of them for a similar sum. It so happened that another man also brought one in, and the Sūltān gave orders for giving fifty thousand tankas to him. One of the attendants of His Majesty said, “Perhaps the ass of Jesus had five legs, so that such a sum is being paid for the fifth hoof.” The Sūltān said that perhaps this man is telling the truth, while one of the others may have brought a wrong

1 See notes 2 and 3 on page 546. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 238) calls the place Lallipoor. The year of Bahūlī Lūdī’s invasion is not given in the Tābaqāt. Firishtah says it was in 889 a.h., while Col. Briggs has 887 a.h., and 1482 a.d., as the year (vol. IV, p. 237).

2 This is mentioned by Firishtah also, but he says that there were one thousand and not seventy slave girls who had memorised the Qurān and they recited it together when he changed his clothes.

3 This means that each of the slave girls used to blow on the garment after reciting three-sevenths of each pārāh of the Qurān (the Qurān being divided into thirty pārāhs or parts) in order to render the garments of the king pure, blessed or holy.

4 This story is mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, see page 363, but while the Musalmān historian mentions it as an illustration of the Sūltān’s ḥiya, the English historian calls him the “crowned fool”.
hoof. He had also ordered those who were near him, that when he was engaged in pleasure, or was occupied in talking with worldly people, they should bring a piece of cloth before him to which he gave the name of a shroud; and he, taking alarm, would perform his ablutions anew, and having prayed for pardon again occupy himself in worship. He had also told the members of his harem with great emphasis, that they should wake him up for the night prayer; and (if necessary) dash water on his face. If it so happened that his sleep was heavy, they pulled him out by force and wakened him. And if he was engaged in any festive function, and did not rise on receiving one or two intimations, they, according to his orders, caught his hands, and lifted him up. People never said a word in his majlis, which was contrary to the law of the Prophet or which would cause pain. And he never saw (partook of) any intoxicating drinks. One day they had made an electuary for him, and had spent a lakh of tankas on it. He ordered that they should tell him the name of the ingredients, and it then appeared that there were three hundred and odd drugs in one diram of nutmeg. The Sultan said, “This electuary cannot be used by me,” and ordered that it should be converted into a morsel of fire. Someone said, “Let it be bestowed on someone else.” He said, “Alas! that I should prescribe for another, what I do not consider right for myself.”

2 At one time one of the neighbours of Shaikh Mahmud Na‘mān, who was one of the companions of the Sultan, came to him from Dehli; and said, “I have come remembering the promises and gifts of the Sultan, so that by your intervention, I may get from him the wherewithal for the marriage of my daughter.” The Shaikh said, “I am prepared to pay myself the amount you require.” He replied “I will not take it from you, I wish that I may partake of the gifts of the Sultan, and my respectability may thereby be increased. The

---

1 The matter of the electuary is mentioned by Firishtah and his account agrees with that in the text.

2 This is preceded in the lth. ed. by the words حكایات عربية; a strange story; but these words are not found in either MS. The Cambridge History of India, page 383, gives this story also, but omits most of the particulars. The man is described as a beggar from Dehli, but the reason of his journey is not mentioned, nor is Shaikh Mahmud Na‘mān, who engineered the fraud.
Shaikh insisted, but the other did not agree. At last the Shaikh said, "I recommend those who come to me on the ground of the greatness of their ancestors, or on their own excellences. You do not possess either of these qualifications. With what qualities shall I praise you?" The man replied, "I have brought myself to you, you act according to your own intelligence and wisdom." The Shaikh took the man with him to the audience hall of the Sultan; and he told him to take a handful of the wheat which the men were weighing there for the faqirs. When the Shaikh met the Sultan, that man was also behind him. The Sultan said, "Who is this man?" He replied, "This man has memorised the holy Qur'an. He has brought a handful of wheat as a present, on each grain of which he has finished the Qur'an." The Sultan said, "Why did you bring him here? I should have gone to him." The Shaikh said, "He does not possess such a position or qualifications, that the Sultan should go to him." The Sultan said, "If he is not fit for it, his present is priceless." As the Sultan insisted, the Shaikh settled that the man should bring his presents to the Jama' Mosque on the following Friday. When they had finished their prayers, the Sultan ordered that the man should mount the pulpit, and throw the grains of wheat in the lap of the Sultan's skirt, and the Sultan favoured him with a variety of gifts.

1 They have narrated, that one day the Sultan said to his intimates, "I have collected some thousands of beautiful women in my harem; but I have not yet found a person such as my heart desires." Of the men who were present one said, "Perhaps the men who were employed in this service were not perfect in discerning a beautiful person. If this slave is employed in this work, it is likely that he should find a person, that may be agreeable to the Sultan." The Sultan said, "What do you consider a beautiful person?" He said, "It is one, each part of whose person, which comes to the beholder's sight, deprives the latter of the desire to see any other part; for instance if he sees her figure, he becomes so fascinated with her, that he has no desire to see her face." The Sultan was pleased with

1 This is also preceded by the word حكاية, story, in the lith. ed., but the word is omitted in both MSS. This story is also narrated by Firishtah; but it does not appear to be mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.
this judgment of his about a woman's beauty. The man then took leave of the Sultān and went round the country. But although he cast his eyes over all the world, he did not find what he wanted. However he arrived at a place, where he saw a young woman, who went walking gracefully. Her gait and figure enchanted him. When taking great care he cast his eyes on her beautiful face, he found something much better than what he wanted. He remained there for some days and, by such trickery as he knew, took her along; and placing her in the service of the Sultān made him happy. He told the Sultān that he had bought her for so many thousands dirams.

After some days, the father and mother of the young woman became acquainted with this matter; and knew that a man, who had stayed in the village for some time, had taken away their daughter. Having sought a clue to his name and country, they came to the Sultān praying for justice. They happened to meet him at the crossing of two roads and begged for justice. The Sultān knew that they were complaining about that particular young lady. He did not take a single step from the place where he was; and ordered that men learned in the law should be directed to attend there. Then he asked them to pass on him the sentence directed by the law of the Prophet. The complainants, on becoming acquainted with the truth of the matter, submitted that their complaint was for this reason that that man had taken away their daughter. As she had now become an inmate of the harem of Sultān, it was a matter of honour and happiness to them, more specially as she had become a Musalmān, and had left their faith; and they were now pleased and satisfied.

Then the Sultān told the learned men, the woman has now become my lawful wife; but for the time that has passed, you should carry out in respect of me whatever might be the order of the law. If I deserve to be put to death, I shall hold you absolved for causing my death. The learned men said that whatever is done without knowledge is pardoned in the law; and is absolved by penitence. In spite of this decision, the Sultān was repentant about this; and forbade his servants to seek for and produce any women.

1 In the year 887 A.H., 1482 A.D., there was a conjunction of

2 These conjunctions are mentioned by Firishtah also. He, however, says distinctly that he took the account from the Tabaqāt, and also says that
planets; that is Saturn and Jupiter became contiguous and near to each other in degree and minute in the sign of Syrpio, and the \(^1\) five stars were also collected in one sign of the Zodiac. The evil caused by these conjunctions appeared in most countries; and specially in Khaliji territories there was much \(^2\) disturbance, as will clearly be seen from the account of Nasir Shāh.

In the year 889 A.H., 1484 A.D., an ambassador came from the Rāy of Chāmpānīr, and submitted a petition to the following effect: "When in former times \(^3\) Sultān Mahmūd, son of Sultān Ahmad besieged Chāmpānīr, Sultān Mahmūd Shāh came to help and assist the slaves; and \(^4\) released us from the siege; and now Sultān Mahmūd Gujratī has come and is again besieging Chāmpānīr. If your Majesty considering our ancient relations of servitorship to you, would advance to release us, it would be the cause of an increase of your protection and bravery. A sum of one lakh of tankas would be remitted to your officers as a contribution towards your expenses." When the report reached Sultān he collected his troops, and came and took up his residence in the palace of Na'īcha. The next day he sent for the learned men and the Qādis to his majlis and asked them for a ruling on this point. "A Musalmān Bādshāh has besieged a hill of a Kāfir. Is it allowed to me according to the law of the Prophet that I should

the coming of Bahūl Lūlī and the destruction of Alhanpur or Pālanpur was among the effects of these conjunctions. They do not appear to be mentioned either by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

\(^1\) The five stars are Mercury, Venus, Jupiter, Mars, Saturn.

\(^2\) The MSS. have and the lith. ed. has اختلفي اختلفي; while Firishtah in the corresponding passage has اختلفي. This last seems to be the most appropriate word, and I have adopted it.

\(^3\) So in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. As a matter of fact the correct name of the son of Sultān Ahmad was Sultān Muḥammad. Probably Sultān Mahmūd, who ascended the throne in 862 A.H., and was contemporaneous with Sultān Mahmūd Khalījī, who reigned from 839 A.H. to 873 A.H., is meant, but he was the son of Sultān Muḥammad and grandson of Sultān Ahmad. Firishtah lith. ed. mentions the fact of Sultān Qhiyāth-ud-dīn's march to Na'īcha, but he does not mention the particulars of the previous siege. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the matter.

\(^4\) One MS. has, by mistake, خلاص بود instead of خلاص بودن.
advance to aid the Kāfirs?" All the learned men said, "It is not allowed." Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din then bade farewell to the ambassador from Chāmpānī; and went back to his own capital.

When old age overtook the Sultan, disputes commenced about the possession of the kingdom between Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din and Shujā'at Khān, who had the title of Sultan 'Alā-ud-din; and in spite of the fact, that they were twin brothers, things came to such a pass, that they made attempts on the lives of each other. Rānī Khūrshid, the daughter of the Rāy of Baglāna who was the chief inmate of the harem of Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din, took the side of Shujā'at Khān, and wanted to turn Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din against Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din. This matter will be described in the account of Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din.

To be brief, Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din lost the bridle of power and fled from Mandū; and having taken up a position in the centre of the kingdom, brought over the amirs to his side; and coming back besieged the fort of Mandū. Sultan 'Alā-ud-din having given encouragement and comfort to a body of five thousand Gujārts made vain efforts. In the end, the Ghiyāth Shāhī amirs opened the gates; and invited Nāṣir-ud-din into the fort. When Shujā'at Khān saw that Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din had entered by the gate, he went and took shelter with

---

1 One MS. has شجاع خان . Firishta’s account of the quarrels between two brothers is somewhat more detailed. He says they began in 903 A.H., 1491 A.D., when Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din had become old and decrepit. Rānī Khūrshid attempted to have Nāṣir-ud-din seized; whereupon in 905 A.H., he fled; and seeing that the Rānī was still bent on his destruction, he took up a position in the centre of the country, and amirs and soldiers came, and joined him; and he assumed the emblems of royalty, and advanced and besieged the fort of Mandū. As he had acted as his father's vazir for years, people knew him. They opened the gates of the fort and brought him into it without the opposite party knowing anything about it. Shujā'at Khān or 'Alā-ud-din fled to his father’s palace, but he and the Rānī were dragged out; and he and his son were butchered like so many sheep. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 239) gives a similar account, but he adds that Nasir-ood-Deen was admitted into the fort by the Tarapoor gate, on the 24th of Rubbee-oos-Sany, A.H. 906, October 22nd, 1500 A.D.; and also that Alla-ood-Deen and all his children and all his family were put to death. The account in the Cambridge History of India, page 363, is somewhat different in some particulars.

2 One MS. has بعد مرافق سانخته and دلیاسا کرده; this is followed in the text-edition.
his father; and after some days, when the foundations of the palace of the Nāṣir Shāhī rule became stronger, Shujāʿat Khān and his sons were summoned to the Sultān’s presence and were beheaded. On the 9th of Ramaḍān in the year 906 A.H., Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn was attacked by the disease of dysentery, and joined the vicinity of God. Some say that Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn killed his father by giving him poison. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn sent a message to Rānī Khūrshid that she should make over to the treasurer all the treasures of the Sultān which were in her possession, otherwise she would suffer much trouble. The Rānī having regard to his probable harsh treatment, brought over all the treasures and property which were hidden and concealed in the harem; and made them over to the Nāṣir Shāhī agents.

The period of his (i.e., Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn’s) reign was 2 thirty-two years and seventeen days.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN NĀṢIR-UD-DĪN.

Historians are agreed that the birth of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn took place during the reign of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji. Maḥmūd Shāh and Ghiyāth Shāh in their great joy arranged festive entertainments; and for one month kept the bed of pleasure and enjoyment spread out. In thanks-giving for this great gift, the ordinary raʿiyats generally, and men of wisdom and deserving men specially, were made participators in the board of their benefactions and the tables of their favours. Astrologers, who knew the stars, reported that the Shāhzāda was born with a happy fortune, and in an auspicious moment; and would get perfect nurture and full education from the nurse of the age; and will be supreme and unrivalled in all the various arts, and the different cultures and education. On the 7th day after the birth, he was produced before the great and holy men, and received the name of ‘Abd-ul-qādir. Both in the time of his youth and in that of his manhood, the marks of royalty and empire were patent.

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 240) thinks that the accusation is false, as Nāṣir-ood-Deen had “been already crowned by his father’s consent”, but the fact, that many of the important nobles rebelled against Nāṣir-ud-dīn, would lead one to infer that the accusation had some foundation.

2 Firishtah and Col. Briggs make it thirty-three years.
and clear and bright on his forehead. When he reached the years of discretion, and excelled all his contemporaries in the matter of the duties of leadership and chieftainship, Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din made him his heir apparent; and entrusted the duties of the vazūrat to him. His younger brother, Shujā'at Kháñ, although outwardly he did not forget any of the minutiae of agreement, still being hostile to him in spirit, got a number of men to combine with him. One day he represented in private to Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din that "A number of audacious, low men have collected in the service of Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-din, and are inciting him to seize the kingdom. It is better to remedy an event before it actually occurs." He made so many insinuations, that the intention of seizing the Shāhzāda and of imprisoning him became impressed on the Sulṭān’s mind. But as the marks of nobility and the token of sovereignty were evident in his countenance, his paternal affection induced him to apply the ointment of kindness and favour on the wound of his heart, and make him more powerful. He accordingly ordered that the pay-master of the kingdom should send orders to the amīrs and to heads of all bands, that they should go every morning to offer their salutation to Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-din, and should attend at his stirrups to the palace gate.

Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-din now took up all the affairs of state permanently in his own hand; and appointed his own gūmāshtās (his agents) everywhere. As he allotted the management of the Khālsa parganas (i.e., parganas in the direct possession of the sovereign) to Shāikh Ḥabīb and Khwājah Suḥail sūnuchs, 2 Yakān Kháñ and Amman and Mūnjā Baqāl, who had before this been the officers in charge of the Khālsa complained to Rāni Khūrshid, who was of a mannish disposition. The latter as she was inclined towards Shujā'at Kháñ, and her mind was not free from evil towards Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-din, reported (to the Sulṭān) through Shujā’at Kháñ that Malik Maḥmūd kōtwāl and

---

1 One MS. has the text I have adopted, while the other omits the word Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din, and the lith. ed. hās ژوزی در خلوت غیبت شاه بعوش مانند.

2 The names in the MSS. are as I have given them here. The lith. ed. omits Amīn. Firasṭrah lith. ed. hās مکنش خان، موتی خان. The names are not in any other history that I have seen.
1 Sev Dâs Baqâl, who were the heads and chiefs of the rebels and traitors, have become specially attached to Sultan Nasir-ud-din, and have made the lease of certain mau’das appertaining to his jâgir the pretext of their visits to him. Sultan Ghiyâth-ud-din summoned Malik Mahmûd and Sev Dâs, and, without asking them any questions and making any enquiries, killed them; and ravaged and destroyed the people in their houses.

2 After this, Sultan Nasir-ud-din withdrew his hands from the duties of the vazîrat, and did not for some days attend to salute the Sultan. Râni Khûrshid and Shujâ’at Khan, having got an opportunity through the exerptions and management of Yakân Khan and Mûnja Baqâl, spoke words full of interested suggestions in the garb of disinterestedness, and, having stretched their misappropriating hands to the treasury, with a composed mind took upon themselves the full management of the affairs of the government. Owing to his great age, Sultan Ghiyâth-ud-din agreed to their doing so. But as he had heard from disinterested, persons that Râni Khûrshid and Shujâ’at Khan wanted to calumniate and falsely accuse Sultan Nasir-ud-din, he waited to see their further proceedings. As Shaikh Habib-ul-lah and Khwâjah Suhail knew that Mûnja Baqâl was the prime mover in all this mischief and disturbance, they waited for an opportunity, and killed him; and fled and went to the harem of Sultan Nasir-ud-din. Râni Khûrshid narrated this story to Sultan Ghiyâth-ud-din with much exaggeration and embroidery; and on hearing of this occurrence, the flame of the wrath of the Sultan blazed up; and he sent a number of men with Yakân Khan that they might seize the murderers and

---

1 The name is Sev Dâs, and the lith. ed. has Sâm Dâs.

2 The account of the intrigues and fighting between Sultan Nasir-ud-din and his partisans on the one side, and Shujâ’at Khan and Râni Khûrshid and their adherents on the other, which extends over several pages in the Tabaqât, is dismissed in the course of some twenty lines by Col. Briggs on pages 238, 239 of vol. IV of his history, and also in some lines in the Cambridge History of India, page 363.

3 One MS. has ورئوز, and the other مهمات، while the lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. I have adopted مهمات. In the text-edition, however, it is مهمات. 
bring them out from the house of Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din. When he gave these men permission to go, he told them that they were on no account to forego any of the minūtiā of respect and honour towards Nāsir Shāh.

At this time Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhail mounted their horses from Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din’s palace, and rode away to the open country. On the way they went on saying, “We are going to the house of the Qādī. Whoever wishes to make any complaint about the murder of Mūnja Baqāl, let him appear there.” Yakān Khān and the other amīrs on arriving at the Nāsir Shāhī darbār sent a message. The reply came, “Shaikh Ḥabīb-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhail did not kill Mūnja Baqāl under my orders, and I do not know where they are gone.” Yakān Khān did not accept this reply, and for three days kept the harem of Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din under guard. When the Sulṭān knew that the murderers had fled, and giving further trouble to his son was wrong, he sent Mashir-ul-mulk and Manhī Khān to him; and sent him a message to say that, “If my son’s heart has not been aggrieved and the dust of pain has not clouded the seat of his mind, he should, as in former days, come to me, for I have no more strength to endure the pain of separation and estrangement.”

Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din, notwithstanding a hundred reasons for caution, obtained the honour of kissing the feet of his benefactor and father; and the father and the son washed off the dust of disturbance from the pages of the age with their tears. And Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din again became zealous in the Sulṭān’s service; and every day saw fresh signs of the Sulṭān’s affection towards him. He planned the building of a palace for his residence in the vicinity of the Ghīyāth Shāhī palace, so that he might always, when he wanted to do so, have the honour of waiting on his father. Rānī Khurshid took advantage of an opportunity one day, and said to the Sulṭān; “Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din has erected for himself a house close to the Jahān-numā palace; and

1 One MS. has مبادرنا, the other has ببادرنا, while the lith. ed. has مبادرنا.
2 The name is مهنه خان, Mahni Khān, in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is مصتفي خان, Mustah Khān, while in the lith. ed. of Firistah it is مصتفي خان, Muntah Khān.
3 Firistah makes the matter clear by saying بوجود بيم حبس وقيد وخمرة, i.e., in spite of fear of imprisonment, etc.
he apparently intends to act treacherously." Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din without any consideration or deliberation ordered Ghulab Khan, kotwil, in the year 905 A.H., to destroy completely the Nasir Shahi palace. Sultan Nasir-ud-din started the same night, with a body of his adherents, in the direction of Dharr, which is situated in the forest of Kishun. Shaikh Habib-ul-lah and Khwaja Shuail came there, and waited on him. Rani Khurshid and Shujaat Khan sent an army in pursuit of him, without giving any information to Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din of their having done so. But Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din sent Tatir Khan, so that he might, after conciliating Nasir Shah bring him back to the city. Tatir Khan left his men in the village of Bakankali; and went in company with Malik Faqil-ul-lah Badhe, Mir Shikar, to Sultan Nasir-ud-din, and gave him his father's message. The latter wrote a petition which he gave to Tatir Khan, and directed him that he should go and read it to the Sultan, and bring his reply. The well-intentioned Tatir Khan went on wings of speed to Shadiabad, and reported the substance of the petition to Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din. But he had not yet received any reply, when Rani Khurshid, who had very great influence on the mind of the Sultan, sent an order to the pay-master of the empire, that he should appoint Tatir Khan to attack and destroy Nasir-ud-din. When Tatir Khan became acquainted with these facts, he came down from the fort, and advanced towards Barah.

The army which had been sent to attack Nasir Shah was on arrival at Bakankali puzzled and amazed about the result of their acts. (They knew) if they decided to fight, they had reason to be afraid that when the turn of Nasir Shah came, each one of them

---

1 One MS. has by mistake Qadri instead of Qadri.
2 Firishtah explains that Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din, had, on account of his great age, lost his sense and intelligence.
3 The name appears to be Bakankali, Bakankali in the MSS. and Bakkakali in the lith. ed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has Kankaana, i.e., in some secret place. Kankaana is adopted in the text-edition.
4 I cannot make out whether Maha or Maha is the name of a place or otherwise.
5 See note 3 above. At this place one MS. has Bakankali, in the village of Bakankali, while the other has Kankaana. The lith. ed. has Bakankali, in the village of Kankaana.
would receive capital punishment; and if they went back to Mandū they were afraid of punishment by Rānī Khūrshid in the immediate future. They were still wandering in the plains of amazement when they heard that Sultan Nāṣir-ud-dīn had left that place and had marched to and encamped in the town of 1 Thahnah. At this station, Malik Mahta and Malik Haibat, who were among the great amirs of 2 the Ghīyāth Shāhī state came and joined him; and the power and splendour of Nāṣir Shāh were much increased. From that station he moved to the town of 3 Rājāwiyyah; and Maulānā ‘Īmād-ud-dīn Afṣīl Khān and a body of the zamīndārs 4 of that neighbourhood joined him there. He stayed there for a few days on account of the pleasant nature of the air, and the freshness and verdure of the fields: and had, with the consent of the amirs the royal umbrella raised over his head, on the day of the ‘Īd-i-fitr (the festivity of the breaking of the fast); and distinguished the amirs and divines and heads of groups by bestowing valuable robes of honour on them.

At this time news was brought to him, that Shujā'at Khān’s troops had started from the village of 5 Bakankālū with the intention of giving battle; and had arrived in the village of 6 Kandūyah.

1 The name looks like Tahnah or Natnah in the MSS; and Bhallah in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Hūsain has Ĥastah in the text-edition.
2 One MS. has دوارة غياث الدين شاهي while the other and the lith. ed. have دوارة غياث شاهي.
3 The name is راجوارية, in both MSS., while the lith. ed. has Ajarnah; and the lith. ed. of Firishtah has جاجية Jadilah. M. Hidayat Hūsain has اجابية Ajāiyah in the text-edition.
4 The reading in one MS. is زين الدين داران ان ناحية which I have adopted. The other MS. has زين الدين Albanah and the lith. ed. has رکبتة Rākhtah instead of رکبتة. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has بعض ان ناحية, some zamīndārs.
5 The name is here written كنکنثر Kankātū in one MS. and بكکنثر Bakkālū in the other, and كنکنثر Kankānū. Firishtah lith. ed. has here كنکنثر Kankānū.
6 The name appears to be كندوبه Kandūbah in the MS., and كندوبه Kandūbah in the lith. ed. In later passages it is written كندره Kandūyah in the MS., and I have adopted that name. Firishtah lith. ed. has كندوره Kandūhar.
Nāsir Shāh sent 1 Malik Malhū to chastise them. As the star of his fortune had become resplendent over the horizon of greatness, when the two armies met the breeze of victory and triumph blew over the plumes of Malik Malhū’s standard; and the enemy fled and went to Mandū; and Malik Malhū joined Nāsir Shāh’s camp at Rājāwiyah, with much booty. On the 16th Shawwāl in the year 905 A.H., 1499 A.D., he marched from that station towards the town of 2 Ajūd. Mubārak Khān and 3 Himmat Khān now came and joined him. And when he arrived in the town of Sundarsī, Rustam Khān, the governor of Sārangpūr, came and waited on him; and brought some elephants and much other property as a tribute. After his arrival at Ujjain, amirs and faujdārs and thānadārs came to his threshold in great numbers. Rānī Kjurshid and Shujā’at Khān (now) in fear of their lives, reported to Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, that Nāsir Shāh had arrived at Ujjain, and all the amirs and thānadārs had turned to him; and the fort of Shādībād would be besieged in the near future.

Ghīyāth-ud-dīn sent ‘Shaikh Auliya and Shaikh Burhān-ud-dīn as ambassadors, and sent the following message through them, “It is a long time since I have placed the bridle of the work of government in the grasp of my son’s hand of power. If acting in a spirit of sincerity and attachment, he would send away the mob of common people, which has collected round him, and would come and wait on me, the affairs of the empire would again be entrusted to his penetrating intellect and judicious consideration. At that time, if he considers it advisable, he can allot the territory of Ranthambhōr to Shujā’at Khān, who stands in the relation of a son to him; and the flame of disturbance and revolt should be extinguished by the waters of peace.” Nāsir Shāh did not bind himself by any reply; and towards the end of Dhī-qa’dah of the aforesaid year, marched from the town of Ujjain to the town of Dhar; and halted there for some days. About this time

---

1 That is the name in both MSS. and in the lith. ed., but Firishtah lith. ed. has Malik Mahmūd.

2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have the reading I have in the text; but the other MS. has instead of بفوجه قصة اوجود كشت اوراو موجود كشت اوجود Ajūd for Ajūd in the text-edition.

3 The name is of the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not name these men.
news came that \(^1\) Yakān Khān had come down from Shādiābād, with three thousand horsemen, with the intention of giving battle. Immediately on hearing this news, Malik \(^2\) 'Atān was sent with five hundred horsemen to the village of Hānspūr. Yakān Khān receiving information of this advanced towards Hānspūr. After a fight between them, Malik 'Atan was victorious; and \(^3\) one hundred brave men out of Yakān Khān's troops, who knew men, were slain. Malik 'Atan seized eighty horses and much booty, and returned to the town of Dhār. Yakān Khān with the men who had escaped the sword fled and entered the fort. After a few days, Yakān Khān, at the incitement of Rāni Khrūshēd and Shujā'at Khān, again came out of the fort with a body of men whom he had got together, with the determination of fighting another battle. Immediately on hearing this news, Nāṣir Shāh nominated Khwājah \(^4\) Suhail and Malik Mahta and Malik Haibat and Miyān Jiw to attack and crush Yakān Khān; but as soon as the eyes of the latter fell on Nāṣir Shāh’s troops, his foot of firmness and stability slipped; and he fled without attempting to fight; and, in short, wherever the two sides met, the breezes of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Nāṣir Shāh’s standards.

On the 22nd of Dhīl-hijjah-ul-harām of the aforesaid year, (Sūltān Nāṣir-ud-din) took up his quarters in the Jāhān-namā \(^5\) palace at

\(^1\) See note 2, page 554. Here the name is without any dot above or below the first letter in one MS. and in the other MS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has as before, and describes him as the or the cause of all disturbance and dispute I have adopted

\(^2\) He is so called in both MSS. The lith. ed. has . The name of the village is Hānspūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; Hānsapūr in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat.

\(^3\) The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have . I do not understand the exact meaning of these words. Firishtah simply has .

\(^4\) The names are as I have got them in the text in one MS. There are slight differences as regards the second and the fourth in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not give the names, though he mentions the second attempt.

\(^5\) One MS. has , while the other MS. and the lith. ed. have .
Na'lcha. At this station his spies brought the news, that Sultan Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, in his old elegant person, intended to come, in order to comfort and counsel his son (i.e., Nāṣir-ud-dīn); and in order to carry out this intention he had moved from the capital, and had taken up his residence in the centre of the kingdom; and he would move from the place at a moment which the astrologers had selected; and after trying to please his son’s heart he would return to Shādīkhān. Nāṣir Shāh was pleased and delighted on hearing this news; and waited in expectation of the joy-giving arrival of his father; but Shujā’at Khān, with the advice of Rānī Khūrshid, had the Sultan’s litter taken up and had it carried towards Na’lcha. When they arrived at the Dehli gate, and as age and senility had overcome the Sultan, he asked those who were near him, where they were taking him to. Some of them informed him of what had happened. He said, “I will go another day. You should turn back to-day.” The servants having no alternative turned back. When Rānī Khūrshid heard that Sultan Ghīyāth-ud-dīn had returned from the way, she knew that this had happened at the incitemont of Nāṣir Shāh’s well-wishers. She summoned the men into her presence, and having used harsh words towards them demanded the reason of their action. They said that the Sultan had returned according to his own wishes; and no one else had any hand in the matter.

Shujā’at Khān, then with the advice and consent of Rānī Khūrshid repaired the broken and ruined parts of the fort, and distributed the bastions (among his commanders). Nāṣir Shāh also advanced from his position, and arranged batteries round the fort. Everyday numbers of men were slain from each side. Sultan Ghīyāth-ud-dīn sent the ablest of the judges, Mashīr-ul-mulk, to arrange for peace; but, as he did not get a reply like what he wanted, and was afraid of Rānī Khūrshid, he remained where he was. As the siege became close, and the garrison was in great anxiety and distress owing to the non-arrival of grain and other necessaries; and bearing in mind the purport of the text, that change is best even though it may go against us, directed their attention to this, that the office of the Sultan

1 The actual words are صفة عرض مالك. I cannot find out the exact meaning of the first two words.
be fixed on Nāsir Shāh. Amongst the amīrs, who were still in the fort, Muwāfiq Khān and Malik Faḍl-ul-lah, Mir Shikār, (chief huntsman) availing themselves of an opportunity betook themselves to the service of Nāsir Shāh. The latter bestowed a lakh of tankas on Muwāfiq Khān. When Rānī Khūrshid and Shujā’at Khān received information of this, they dismissed ‘Ali Khān from the charge of the fort; and made over the guarding of the fort and the government of the city to Malik Piyārā, on whom they conferred the title of ‘Ali Khān. They also sentenced 1 Muḥāfiẓ Khān and Sūrajmal to death. The amīrs and the great men and all the residents of the city became heartbroken on seeing this punishment; and sent petition to Nāsir Shāh, and prayed for permits of protection. After a few days the siege was carried on to such a point, that among the garrison, nothing was left of any grain except the name; and many people came out of the fort on account of the famine.

Nāsir Shāh mounted his horse on the night of 18th Safar in the year 906 A.H., with the object of capturing the fort. When he arrived close to the fort, the men in the bastions came up and shot arrows and musket shots; and many active and brave warriors were wounded. In the end Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din advanced towards the bastion of seven hundred steps. Dilāwar Khān Jangjū to his great honour, managed to get into the fort. Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din also entered the fort. Shujā’at Khān, with a number of trusted men, came out on a turret of the fort, and exerted himself, and showed great bravery. Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din, in his own elegant person, shot many arrows; and 2 many men fell under his arrows of fate. As reinforcements reached Shujā’at Khān time after time, and brave warriors belonging to Nāsir Khān’s army received wounds, the latter thinking it advisable to return came out of the fort to his own camp. He bestowed much favour and kindness on the men who had exerted themselves, and offered their lives in his service; and comforted them by bestowing new robes of honour, and enquired about their health and condition.

1 Firishtah explains كه از ملوطن سلطان ناصر الدين خلج ميدانست, i.e., whom they knew to be partisans of Sulṭān Nāsir-ud-din Khuljī.

2 The actual words are مردم خرد بر سرد قضا او رنند. The meaning is not very clear, but I think my translation is correct. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has مردم خرد نگی قضاء او در گشتندت.
After some days, the sons of Shēr Khān, son of Muṣaffar Khān, the governor of Chandērī came and joined the camp of Nāṣir Shāh with one thousand horsemen and eleven elephants. In the first majlis after their arrival, Nāṣir Shāh conferred the title of Muṣaffar Khān on the elder, and As‘d Khān on the second son. Owing to the arrival of the army of Chandērī, new vigour and strength, appeared in the men of the army. At this time some men in the garrison of Mandū, who had the charge of guarding the 1 Mālpūr gate, sent a notice to the besieging army, that if Nāṣir Shāh’s troops came in that direction, the fort will come to his possession without any difficulty or trouble. Sūlṭān Nāṣir Shāh sent Mubārak Khān and Shaikh Ḥabib-ul-lah and Muwāfiq Khān and Khwāja Suhail and a number of others on the night of the 24th of Rabī‘-ul-ākhir of the afore-mentioned year. Shaikh Ḥabib-ul-lah told them, that if they succeeded in capturing the fort, he would send his ring, that they might know that the fort had come into their possession. When the amirs reached the gate, the citizens, in concert with Zabardast Khān son of Hazbar Khān who had charge of the silākhrāna (armoury) of the fort, slew the keeper of the Mālpūr gate and opened it; and Nāṣir Shāh’s men galloped into the fort.

Shujā‘at Khān with his army in battle array advanced to fight, but was unable to do anything; and fled and got into his own house, and then taking his family and children with him retired into the harem of Sūlṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din. Shaikh Ḥabib-ul-lah, then according to previous arrangement, sent his ring; and brought Nāṣir Shāh in. He reached the Mālpūr gate in a moment and got into the city. The amirs hastened to wait on him, and offered their congratulations. Some foolish men set fire to some of the palaces and mansions of Sūlṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din, 2 without any order from Nāṣir Shāh; and they seized and brought Shujā‘at Khān and Rānī Khūrshid and some other persons; and having commenced to plunder and ransack the city devastated it for two days. Sūlṭān Ghiyāth-ud-din then made up his mind and formed a determination, and moved from the place to the palace of Sarsatī and took up his abode there.

1 One of the MSS. has بلالپور instead of مالپور. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, calls it the Bālapur gate.
2 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بی امر ناصر شاهی, while the other MS. has بی انصوبار و حکم ناصر شاهی.
On the 3rd day, which was 1 Friday the 27th of Rabi'-ul-akhir of the afore-mentioned year, Sultan Nasir-ud-din sat on the throne of the empire and 2 made over Shujâ’at Khân and Râni Khurshid to custodians. He sent Malik Mahta to Na’lcha (to bring) his 3 second son, who was known as Miyân Manjha; and making the latter his heir, conferred on him the title of Sultan Shihâb-ud-din. He allotted to him the Safa Bâgh, which was situated near the palace of Sultan Ghâyath-ud-din as his residence. The same day the Khuda was read in the name of Nasir Shâh; and pearls and other gems, which were showered over his umbrella, were distributed among deserving men. Yakân Khân and Amman and Muḥâfiz Khân Jadid and Mufarraj Pidar Ḥabshi and other men, who had been hostile to him, were punished with death; and some men were brought away from under the sword, and were kept in imprisonment. According to the established custom he confirmed fiefs 4 on the men who had sided with him. He conferred on Shaikh Ḥabib-ul-lah the title of ‘Ālam Khân; and to Khwâjah Suhail to whom he 5 had given the pargana of Āshâh, he gave the post of Sipahsâlîri (office of commander-in-chief). On the 3rd of Jamâdi-ul-akhir of the afore-mentioned year, Sultan Nasir-ud-din was honoured by being allowed to do homage to his father and benefactor Sultan Ghâyath-ud-din. The latter took him into his arms, and wept a great deal, and kissed his head and face; and on giving him permission to retire, bestowed on him the cap of state and the

1 Firishtah lith. ed. gives the same day and date. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 240) also has Rubbee-oos-Sany 27, A.H. 906, October 25, A.D. 1500, as the date of Sultan Nasir-oos-Deen's accession. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, has October 22nd, 1500.

2 Niẓâm-ud-din does not appear to mention the execution of Shujâ’at Khân but Firishtah mentions it. See note 1, page 352. Col. Briggs says Shoujat Khan and "all his children and the whole of his family" were put to death. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, also says that Shujâ’at Khân was put to death.

3 NeitherNiẓâm-ud-din nor Firishtah gives any reason for the selection of the second son as the heir-apparent in preference to the eldest son, or whether the latter was dead or otherwise disqualified.

4 One MS. inserts before 5 One MS. omits and, and the other has  بَرَّةٌ كَهْ دَافِعَةُ دَابِرَةٌ ٌ
robe of woven hair, which he used himself to wear on the days of public audience and other auspicious days; and placing the royal crown on his head made over to him the keys of the treasury, and offering him felicitations and congratulations bade him adieu.

On the 16th of Rajab of the afore-said year, he bestowed on Sultan Shihab-ud-din the same fur cloth robe and the cap of state, and also gave him twenty elephants and one hundred horses and eleven royal umbrellas, two palkis and also a standard and a kettle-drum and a red pavilion and twenty lakhs of tankas for his household expenses.

After a few days Muqbil Khan, the governor of Mandesor fled owing to his extreme misfortune; and Mahabat Khan, in whose charge he was, was sent immediately that he might seize and bring him back, with the threat that otherwise he should expect the thunderbolts of punishment. Mahabat Khan made great exertions, but (being unsuccessful) went and joined Sher Khan (the governor of Chanderd). Ali Khan and some other men of evil destiny, who were suspicious and afraid owing to their evil deeds, also went and joined Sher Khan. The latter marched from the neighbourhood of Na'icha and advanced towards Chanderd. Sultan Nasir-ud-din sent Mubarak Khan and Alam Khan to Sher Khan, so that they might, in any way that they could, reassure him. Although they gave him words of sage counsel, he spoke rare words in answer to all their arguments; and wanted to imprison both of them. On the pretext that he was going to consult

---

1 The lith. ed. has قبله قبله كلا دولت before قبله قبله كلا دولت which, however, is printed as قبله قبله كلا دولت in it. The MSS. omit قبله قبله كلا دولت, though they mention it a little later. I have therefore retained it. قبله قبله كلا دولت appears to mean made of woven cloth of hair, and Firishta explains the importance of sanctity of this robe by saying في بابن سيد محمد نور بكش, i.e., appertaining to Saiyid Muhammad Nür Baksh.

2 Firishta says تمرود وزيد, but like Nasir-ud-din, he gives no reason for this. Col. Briggs quotes in a note (vol. IV, p. 241) some of the intrigues and fighting between Nasir-ood-Deen on the one side, and Shoojat Khan and Rany Khoorsheed on the other, from the Muntukhib-oot-Towareekh; and says these are not mentioned by Firishta, although as a matter of fact they are. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, says that the amirs declined to believe that Sultan Nasir-ud-din "had ascended the throne with his father's consent", and, therefore, rebelled. Firishta does not say that Muqbil Khan was in charge of Mahabat Khan. He however agrees with the text in saying that he was sent to bring the latter.
with his mother, he came out of the pavilion, and made over Mubârak Ḳhân and 'Ālam Ḳhân to his own men. The latter seized Mubârak Ḳhân, and slew two of his servants. 'Ālam Ḳhân took the opportunity to get to his horse; and with great quickness came out of the camp, and reported the matter to Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din. The latter left his son Sultan Shihâb-ud-din, in charge of the government of the fort of Shâdiâbâd; and took up his quarters, on the 9th Sha'bân of the afore-mentioned year, in the Jaḥân-numâ palace at Na'ilcha. When Shēr Ḳhân arrived in the fort of Ujjain, he again, at the instigation of Mahâbat Ḳhân turned back to give battle, and came to Dībâlpûr, and plundered the town of Hindiah. Immediately on hearing this, Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din marched forward, and took up his residence in the palace of Dhâr.

At this time they brought the news that Sultan Ghiyâth-ud-din had passed away from the waste place of the world to the popular land of after-world. According to one statement he was poisoned at the instance of Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din. 1 It is a matter of experience that a parricide never attains to old age and never becomes successful. Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din ruled for 2 eleven years. Therefore the allegation of his attempt on the life of his father may be a mere calumny, but knowledge is with God alone.

In short, Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din wept much at the death of his father, and was in mourning for three days. 3 On the 4th day he

---

1 Firishtah gives the same reason for disbelieving the guilt of Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din; but he is not so positive as Nizam-ud-din as he prefixes the word شاید perhaps, to the sentence about Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din's innocence. Col. Briggs thinks that it is not just to accuse him of that crime; while the Cambridge History of India (p. 364) says that the poison was "administered, as it was generally believed, by his orders." One would have thought, that seeing that the father was so weak in body and mind, and so helpless, it would be futile and unnecessary to cause his death; but there is the fact that some of the nobles rebelled, because they believed that Nāṣir-ud-din had not ascended the throne with his father's consent.

2 Both MSS. have 13 years, but the lith. ed. has 11 years. Firishtah lith. ed. has many years. As Nāṣir-ud-din's reign lasted from 905 to 916 A.H., the reading in the lith. ed. is correct and I have retained it.

3 Firishtah lith. ed. agrees generally with the text as to the Sultan's proceeding against Shēr Ḳhân. Col. Briggs however (vol. IV, p. 241) says
started on his march; and Shēr Khān in fear of his life turned back to his own country. 'Ain-ul-mulk and some other sardārs separated from him and joined the camp of Nāsir Shāh. The latter pursued Shēr Khān, and the latter turned back in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr to engage him; and after doing so, fled. He could not stand firm in Chandērī itself, and went away to the country of Erij and Bhāndīr; and the dust of the disturbance settled down; and Sultān Nāsir-ud-din went to Chandērī. When some days had passed, the Shaikhzādas of Chandērī sent a letter to Shēr Khān, saying, that as most of the Shādiābād troops had dispersed, and had gone away to their jāgīrs; and as, owing to the rains, the amirs would not be able to assemble quickly, if he would come to Chandērī, and the men of the city, should in conjunction with him come out in great numbers, it was probable that they would be able to seize Sultān Nāsir-ud-din; and even if he should escape, the city could be conquered in a very easy way. Shēr Khān without any delay marched out and arrived within six karōhs of Chandērī. Sultān Nāsir-ud-din became acquainted with the consultations of the Shaikhzādas, and appointed Iqbāl Khān and Mallū Khān with a well-equipped army and mast elephants to get rid of Shēr Khān; and sent two lakhs of tankas in cash with them to defray their expenses. They had not yet gone two karōhs, when Shēr Khān relying on the statements of

that Sheer Khan's adherents "wrote to him that the King had retreated to Mando on account of the rains." This is not correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, says that, "After an unsuccessful attempt to crush this rebellion, and another attempt, equally unsuccessful, to conciliate the rebels, he took the field against them." This also is incorrect, if Nizām-ud-din and Firishtah are correct. Neither of them speaks of the first unsuccessful attempt to crush the rebellion.

1 Both MSS. have وهم جان، which I have adopted, but the lith. ed. has بیم جان.
2 The MSS. have Nāsir Shāh, and Nāsir Shāhī; and the lith. ed. has Nāsir-ud-din.
3 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have إطلاع نموذة, which does not appear to be quite correct. Firishtah lith. ed. has إطلاع بانن, which is better, and I have adopted it. In the text-edition. M. Hidayat Hossain has retained إطلاع نموذة.
the Shaihkzādas came forward to meet them; and after the arraying of the troops the two sides fought bravely. In the midst of the struggle, Shēr K̄hān happened to receive a wound, became disabled, and got the fruit of his rebellion. 2 Sikandar K̄hān was killed in the battle-field. Khwājah Suhail and Mahābat K̄hān placed the wounded Shēr K̄hān in a box (some sort of howdah) on the back of an elephant and took the way of flight. As Shēr K̄hān died on the way, they buried him, and went on in their flight. Iq̄bāl K̄hān returned after pursuing them for some distance. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din was delighted and pleased on hearing this news; and went to the battle-field, and 3 from there sent Sikandar K̄hān to Chandērī, so that he might expose Shēr K̄hān’s body on a gallows. He placed the bridle of the government and defence of that territory in the grasp of power of 4 Bihjat K̄hān; and marching by successive stages arrived in the pleasant town of 5 Sa’dulpūr. There some men reported to him, that Shaihk  Ḥabib-ul-lah, 6 who had the title of ‘Ālam K̄hān, intended to act treacherously, and was waiting for an opportunity. Sultān

1 The words in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are نبی غاز خود کرد. The other MS. incorrectly omits the verb کرد; but in either case the meaning is rather obscure. I think, however, my translation is correct. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage omits this semi-moral observation.

2 It is not stated who he was. Firishtah in the corresponding passage says: که عدالت ای قوم نورد. Firishtah agrees generally with the text in respect of the battle and the incidents preceding and following it; and so do Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India.

3 Firishtah differs slightly, and says that the Sultan went to the battlefield, exhumed Shēr K̄hān’s body, and sent it to Chandērī, so that it might be suspended from the gallows there.

4 Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 242) calls him Himmut Khan; and the Cambridge History of India, page 364, has Bihjat K̄hān.

5 Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 242) calls the place Adilpoor. It is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

6 The actual words are نسبت عالم خان in both MSS. and in the lith ed. I do not actually understand the meaning of the word نسبت in this context. Firishtah has in the corresponding passage شیخ حبيب الله المخاطب بعالم خان which is perfectly clear, and I have translated the passage accordingly. M. Hidayat Hossain has retained the reading of the manuscripts, but refers to a variant ملقب instead of نسبت in another MS.
Nāsir-ud-din imprisoned him, and sent him to Mandū, in advance of himself.

On the 10th Sha'bān 907 A.H., he entered the fort of Shādīābād attended with victory and triumph. He then occupied himself with pleasure and dissipation, and most of his time was spent in the drinking of spirituous liquor. In his drinks, he ordered his father's amirs to be murdered owing to a suspicion of their treachery; and he supported and favoured his own men. His immorality and tyranny reached such a pitch, that one day, when drunk he was asleep on the bank of a reservoir. By accident he fell into it. His attendants, who were watching him, brought him out of the water. When he came to his senses, he asked who had taken him out. Four slave girls told him, "We performed this service." He ordered all four of them to be executed. He had heard from the chief men of Ujjain (apparently the reservoir was in that city and this incident occurred there), that that reservoir or tank was the Kaliyādah. He 2 planned the erection of a palace there, in the Bāgh Fīrūz, of such grandeur, that people, who had travelled over the inhabited fourth part of earth, never saw anything like it. Gradually his desire for building reached such a point, that out of the seventeen krōrs of Mālwa money, which had come to him by inheritance, he spent five krōrs on different structures.

On the 22nd Dbi-qu'dah 908 A.H., he came to the town of Na'lcha with the intention of destroying the country of 3 Kachwārah. And

1 Firishtah narrates this incident in greater detail. According to him, the Sultān rolled into the water, and the four slave girls pulled him out, some seizing hold of his hands, and the others the hair of his head. They also put him into dry clothes. When he recovered his senses he complained of headache, and the slave girls, hoping for a reward, told him what had happened, after the usual prayers and praise; he flew into a rage, drew his sword, and cut down the poor and helpless slave girls. And then Firishtah indulges in three couples, expressing the woes of the hapless women, and their having their revenge on the day of resurrection.

2 Firishtah does not mention the erection of the wonderful palace and the other buildings.

3 The name is written as كهحوارة كه حوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كه حوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهحوارة كهح
when by successive marches, he arrived in the town of 1 Āgar, he
found the air of that place to be pleasant, and built a lofty and 2 noble
palace there; which is now one of the wonders of the age. He remained
in that town for some time; and sent his troops in different directions,
and having chastised the rebels and taken tribute from them, returned,
to his capital).

In the year 909 A.H., 1803 A.D., he again moved in the direction
of 3 Chitōr; and when he arrived in the centre of the country, the
Rāja of Chitōr and all the zamīndārs sent tribute. 4 Bhawānīdās,
the son of Shevādās, who was a near relation of Rāyal Chitōr brought
his daughter as tribute. Sulṭān Nāṣir-ud-dīn gave her the title of
Rānī Chitōr, and bestowed many favours on Bhawānīdās. In the
course of the Sulṭān's return, scouts brought the news, that
Nizām-ul-mulk Dakīnī had invaded the country of Asir and Burhānpūr.
As Dāūd Khān, the ruler of Asir, had always sought the protection
of Nāṣir Shāh, the latter sent Iqbāl Khān and Khwājah Jhān to Asir
and Burhānpūr. Nizām-ul-mulk then turned back and returned to
his own country. Iqbāl Khān had the public prayer read in Asir
and Burhānpūr in the name of Nāṣir Shāh, and returned to the capital
city of Shādiābād Mandī.

In the year 5 916 A.H., 1512 A.D., Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-dīn raised
the standard of rebellion at the instigation of some of the amīrs of

1 The name is written as اکر and اکر in the MS., and اکر and اکر in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 243) calls the place Akburpoor. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the place here but later on (p. 367) it calls it Āgar.

2 One MS. omits the word علی after.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 243) all have Chittoor, but the lith. ed. of Firishtah has Jaipur. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, says the Sulṭān in 1503 "led a marauding expedition into the dominion of the Rānī", but does not mention the place.

4 He is so described in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed., but the lith. ed. of Firishtah calls him جیونداس کے قرائے ترتیب راوا داشت. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 243) has "Baja Jemundas, one of the subordinate rays." The Cambridge History of India has not mentioned it. Firishtah lith. ed. says the daughter of Jhūndās was named Rānī Jaipur; but Col. Briggs says that she was afterwards dignified with the title of the "Chittoor Queen."

5 The Cambridge History of India, page 364, gives 1510 A.D., as the year of the rebellion.
perverted destiny; and came out of the fort of Mandū. The amirs of the frontier districts mostly joined him, and he marched from the town of Na’Icha to the town of Dhār. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din arrived there with a body of his special troops; and from that place he advanced towards Dhār, with the intention of giving battle. Sultān Shihāb-ud-din, considering that his father’s followers were weak, advanced to engage him; but in the end, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Nāṣir Shāh’s standards. Sultān Shihāb-ud-din fled towards Chandārī. The brave warriors in Nāṣir Shāh’s army pursued him; and were about to take him prisoner, but (on account of) fatherly love and paternal affection (he) forbade the men from further pursuit.

On the following day he marched from that station and went forward. When Sultān Shihāb-ud-din arrived in the town of 1 Sipri, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din sent a number of wise men to him, so that they might instruct him, and lead him from the by-path of error to the high-road of guidance. But as the way of righteousness was hidden from his side and the veil of negligence and of the love of splendour had been drawn down on his eyes, he never gave a reply that might be of any use. On the following day he sent a reply, “At present his shame and self-abasement prevent his acquiring the good fortune of waiting on Your Majesty. If a small part out of the many portions of the empire be bestowed on this slave; he would after a few days honour himself by rendering homage.” When the men who had been sent knew that it would be impossible to bring about an interview, they came back and reported the matter. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din said, “Verily we are for God, and verily we shall return to him.”

Hemistich:

The soil devoured the seed that in hope of thee I sowed.

He then sent a farman to Ranthambhōr to summon Ā’zam Humāyūn, his younger son. The latter came on wings of speed and steps of eagerness and waited on his father near Chandārī. Sultān

---

1 The name of the place is written as میں in one or two places in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but as میں in other places. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, also has Sipri. Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) both have “Dehly” instead of Sipri. This of course is incorrect.
Nāṣir-ud-dīn started from Chandéri on the following day; and advanced to the town of Siprī. At that station, he ordered the attendance of the amīrs and the great men of the city; and said, “As Shihāb-ud-dīn has made undutifulness and revolt the return for paternal love, I am removing him from the position of the heir apparent; and I am making my son Āʿzām Humāyūn my heir.” He then gave him the title of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh, and bestowed a robe and the crown of the empire on him; and returning from the town of Siprī resided for some days in the village of Behishtpūr. As the temperature of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn was high, and as in spite of the fact of its being the winter, he got into cold water and remained in it for a moment, his health immediately turned from the normal; and various diseases and ailments with mutually opposed results attacked him. Although the physicians tried to effect a cure, they had no success.

Couplet:

3 Oxymal, by fate’s decree, increased his bile,
The oil of almonds dryness produced.

Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, seeing that his condition was unsatisfactory sent for Mahmūd Shāh, and the amīrs and the great men of the country to his presence; and opening his lips to give utterance to counsels and precepts said: “4 As the great and holy God has selected this excellent

---

1 The name is بہشت پور in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and نہب پور in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) has Burtpoor. The name of the place is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

2 Firishtah’s account agrees with that in the text, but he surmises that the fever was caused فروش شراب يا فهمات اختلاف و نصرف هوا i.e., from excessive drinking or from infection of the humours of the body or the influence of the air. Col. Briggs’s account (so far it goes) agrees with that in the text. The Cambridge History of India, pages 364, 365, gives two accounts of the manner of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn’s death. The first agrees with that in the text. According to the other he suspected many of his nobles to be secretly in correspondence with Shihāb-ud-dīn, and threatened them, so that they became apprehensive and poisoned him. I have not seen this said anywhere else.

3 A mixture of honey and vinegar prescribed for the bile.

4 Firishtah does not ascribe any speech to the Sultān, and considering the latter’s disposition and habits, and his condition at the time, it is not likely that he could make such a sensible and eloquent address. However, as it is there, I have translated it.
son (of mine) from the entire people of the world, and has entrusted the bridle of the affairs of all people to his grasp of power, it behoves him, that he should not place his foot out of the high-road of worship of, and submission to God; and should not become subject to lust and sensuality; and should write the text of ‘love to the people of God’ on the leaf of his mind and the page of his heart. He should also not withhold the favour of God from the people, as it has not been withheld from him. He should also shorten his hand from the skirts of the oppressed. He should not in his public audiences give way to hesitation and weariness; and should not close the path of approach of the oppressed to him; and should properly listen to their words. He should not also, in administering justice and equity, allow any difference between the weak and the strong, and the high and the low; so that he may not become ashamed on the day of the judgment. He should also treat with honour and respect all Saiyids who are the fruits of the garden of the prophethood and of the emissary of God; and should make the high society of the learned, who are the heirs of the prophet, green and fruitful by the beneficence of the clouds of his rewards. He should also consider it right and proper to refrain from the society of stupid and foolish men, who are satisfied with husk of words; and are ignorant and unmindful of the purity and greatness of saints. He should also lay the foundation of houses of piety and goodness, which are the effects of one’s good fortune, in all parts of the dominions. In short, he should devote all his energy in carrying out the wishes of God; and in the administration of the affairs of the state always take counsel (with wise men).” Shâhzâdah Maḥmūd Shâh and the great men of the kingdom were in great pain and anguish on hearing this speech. (The Sultân) then, with a true determination and a right resolution made repentance of all his sins and iniquities in the presence of the learned men, and after a moment accepted the summons of the just God. The period of his reign was eleven years and four months and twenty ¹ three days.

Couplet:

From the cold earth, rose this palace grand;
But as you make it warm they tell you “rise”!

¹ Firishthah lith. ed. has eleven years and four months and three days and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) has eleven years and four months.
As this world of dust has such foundations weak,
Soon should it be scattered to the wings, and ruin be.

An Account of Sultan Mahmud Shāh, Son of Nasir Shāh.

On the 1st day of Ṣafar in the year 917 A.H., Mahmūd Shāh, the son of Nāsir Shāh, ascended the throne of the Khalji empire, in the village of Behishtpūr, with an auspicious and triumphant fortune and at a happy time. The rites of thanks-offering and of wave-offering having been performed, each one of the great men of the age was made happy with royal beneficence; and from the same majlis sent the coffin of Nāsir Shāh to the fort of Shādiābād.

3 Sultan Shihāb-ud-din on becoming acquainted with the event (Ḥādiṭha, i.e., probably his father's death), betook himself from where he was by rapid marches, to Naṣratābād Nālcha. Muḥāfiz Khān Khwājah Sūrā and Khwās Khān shut the gates in his face. On the following day, he sent a message to them, by one of his immediate attendants, that if they would act in friendship with him, it was certain, that the loosening and fastening of the affairs of the state would be entrusted to their wisdom. Muḥāfiz Khān and Khwās Khān said, "As the ordinance of the empire, has been recorded in

1 Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India gives the date of the accession.

2 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has بطالع فرخزدا فربور و زمانی سعادت اثر for فرگیل فرخزدا. Thus I have adopted. The other MS. substitutes بطالع فرخزدا فربور در زمانی سعادت اثر for فرگیل فرخزدا.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 365, says "Shihāb-ud-din, on hearing of his father's death, returned to Mālwa and marched on Māndū, but Mahmūd II outstripped him and arrived there first, and when Shihāb-ud-din reached the city, the gates were shut in his face." Thus appears to me to contain more than one inaccuracy. There was no race between the brothers; and it was the gates of Nālcha and not of Māndū that were shut in Shihāb-ud-din's face by Muḥāfiz Khān, who was the governor of the former place and not of the latter. It is true that Col. Briggs also says that the gates of Mando were shut in his face and Muḥāfiz Khan refused him admission. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) also says that immediately after this the Prince "fled to Ascer", and says nothing about his defeat by Jāwāsh Khān. The Cambridge History of India appears here to follow Col. Briggs and does not refer to the Tabaqāt or Firishtah at all.

4 Both MSS. omit اسم after يقین; but I have retained it.
the renowned name of Maḥmūd Shāh, in the office of destiny and fate, the best course is that you should join the camp (of Sultan Maḥmūd); and should change the sullenness and roughness of a strange man for the purity of friendship.” 1 Sultan Shihāb-ud-din becoming despondent retired towards Kandāsah. 2 When Sultan Maḥmūd knew that Sultan Shihāb-ud-din had gone away towards Mandū, he marched by successive stages and took up his residence in Jāhān-numā kiosk of Naʿlcha, on the 2nd Rabīʿ-ul-awwal of the afore-mentioned year.

From there he sent 3 Jāwāsh Khān with a detachment of troops to crush Sultan Shihāb-ud-din, and he sent eleven elephants with him. He then went to the fort of Shādiābād, on a date which had been selected by the astrologers, and at an auspicious moment on the 6th Rabīʿ-ul-awwal, had the golden throne, encrusted with gems and pomegranate-colour rubies, in the open plain near the audience hall, and 4 had twenty-one other thrones raised around it, and Maḥmūd Shāh ascended the throne of the Khalji Sultāns from the east of the

1 One MS. omits the whole sentence from ʿShād to ʿṢalṭān. The name of the place is Kandūhah in the MS. which has the sentence, and Kandūyah in the lith. ed. Firishtah is very brief here and does not mention the place.

2 There is much difference in the readings. One MS. has Sultan Muḥammad āʿz Naṣṣir shāh Sultan Muḥammad Waqf Shād kā Sultan Muḥammad Waqf shāh, and the lith. ed. has Sultan Muḥammad ʿUmar Waqf Shād kā Sultan Muḥammad ʿUmar Waqf shāh. The reading in the first MS. is manifestly incorrect, and there is not much to choose between the other two, but on the whole I think the reading of the lith. ed. is the best.

3 The name is ʿJāwāš Khān in one MS., and in several places in the other. In the latter it is ʿJāwāš Khān in one place. The lith. ed. has ʿJādūsh Khān. The expedition against Sultan Shihāb-ud-din is not mentioned by either Firishtah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

4 I have translated the text as it is in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but I am very doubtful about its correctness. I cannot understand the reference to the twenty-one thrones, and also to the rising of Maḥmūd Shāh from the east of the throne of the empire. As regards the rising of Maḥmūd Shāh from the east the reading from Firishtah is a great improvement. It is ʿAftāb Dāwūt Muḥammad shāh ʿaz Taʾaqī Serār Ǧāhān Dādī ʿAllāwā Kāshf. Probably the correct reading of the Tabaqāt was something like this. As to the twenty-one thrones, I cannot hazard any explanation.
throne of the empire. The amirs and the great men of the city and the notabilities of the kingdom stood in their proper places. Each one of them received such distinction as was suitable for his position; and some of the amirs were honoured with titles; and seven hundred elephants, which were 2 in the environs of the fort came into use.

After a few days a report came from Jāwash Khān, to the effect, that as the star of the good fortune of Sultān Shihāb-ud-din had fallen into the abyss of ruin, he did not listen to all the friendly advice and the wise precepts which were given to him; and came forward to give battle. And this helpless one (i.e., he himself) advanced to chastise him, placing the great good fortune of His Majesty in the vanguard; and at the first onset Sultān Shihāb-ud-din's foot of firmness slipped from its place, and he fled. The bearer of his umbrella was slain, and the umbrella fell into our hands. He himself fled to the country of 3 Asr. As the rainy season had now come, Sultān Mahmūd Shāh summoned Jāwash Khān back. The latter returned to the fort on the last day of Rabī'-ul-awwal, and received many favours.

Sultān Mahmūd, now having his mind at rest in respect of Sultān Shihāb-ud-din, entrusted the management of the affairs of the kingdom to 4 Basant Rāy, to whom the post of the vazārat of Nāṣir Shāh had belonged. Basant Rāy, 5 owing to his great pride and ignorance,

1 I have adopted the reading in the MS. That in the lith. ed. is امرآ و ارگان و أكبُر و معافِر مالگي 2 The MSS. have بیدرود تلخه but the lith. ed. has بِرِردِرود تلخه. I have adopted the former. The meaning of نصر در آمد is not at all clear. The corresponding passage in Firishtah is more intelligible. It is مَفْتَحَتْ زَنْجَرِ نِيلٍ كَدَمْ در تَلخه 2 بِرِدَ بِعَفْهَاء مَخْمَل و زَنْجَرِ آرَاسَهُ بِلِدْرَاد حاضر ساکث i.e., and seven hundred elephants which were in the fort were brought to the darbār, adorned with housings of velvet and gold tissue.

3 The findAll اسپر 4 Basant Rāy, but in other places اسپر Basant Rāy. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) has Buswunt Row and the Cambridge History of India (p. 365) has Basant Rāi. 5 The name is written in various places in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah as نسبت رایي Basant Rāy, but in other places as بنست لطیف Basant Rāy. The Cambridge History of India, page 385, however, says, he retired to the fortress of Asr.
did not maintain the usual relations towards the army, and did not leave out any minutiae of meanness and mischief-making; and having adopted a harshness of behaviour did not show proper respect towards the amirs and sardars. The latter, having availed themselves of an opportunity, killed him in the audience hall on the 7th Rabī‘-ul-θānī. Naqd-ul-mulk, who was of the same religion as Basant Rāy, and the latter’s colleague in service, fled into the harem of the Sultān. Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khān talked together, and said, “Unless the kingdom is purified of the contamination of the existence of this impure one, he will always be in ambush for taking revenge for Basant Rāy.” They sent the following message to the Sultān by Ṣadr Khān and Afḍal Khān, “Nothing has been done, and nothing will be done by these loyal slaves, except in the way of a sincere desire for Your Majesty’s well-being, and it must be clear to your illuminating wisdom, that as the affairs (of the kingdom) have not been well arranged, the act of leaving the threads of the administration in the grasp of people who are strangers to us in creed and religion, is (likely to be) the cause of disorder in the conduct of government. It has probably been submitted to Your Majesty by some of your well-wishers, what kind of treatment Basant Rāy meted out to the amirs and to your other loyal adherents. His sole object was, that your old servants might become heart-broken; and they and their retainers might be

been the minister of Nāṣir Shāh also. The Tabaqat says he did not show the usual courtesy towards the army, and left out no minutiae of according to the MSS. and, according to lith. ed., of, appearing to mean little-

ness or meanness; and ḳāva‘ī means mischief-making. I have adopted ḳāva‘ī in the translation. Firishtah says the other amirs became hostile to him lest he become too powerful (مباشر تقرب و نسلت بهم رساند).

Col. Briggs says he was a personal favourite of the King, and had attended him from the period of his birth; and he also says that the conspirators declared that he had laid a scheme to overturn the government. The Cambridge History of India, page 385, is satisfied with saying that the Muslim nobles resented his holding the high office of minister.

1 One MS. has quite incorrectly جانبد سیلاه جانبد شاہ instead of جانب سیلاه.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. also calls him Naqd-ul-mulk; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) has Nizam-oool-Moolk. He is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

3 It is مخصوصان instead of Mukhtas Khān in the text-edition.
dispersed. This was in fact disloyalty on his part; and we your loyal servants, in a body, removed him out of the way. Naqd-ul-mulk is also following in his footsteps. If it be your noble order, the world might be purified of the contamination of his existence.” Sultan Mahmūd in his weakness and helplessness sent Naqd-ul-mulk to the amirs; but he ordered that he might be exterminated, and no injury caused to his life or property. When they brought Naqd-ul-mulk, the amirs, acting in a body, expelled him. Sultan Mahmūd was aggrieved at these proceedings of the amirs, and at their domination: and the purity of his heart was changed to resentment.

Muhāfiz Khān, eunuch, the combination of whose disposition was made up of malice and wickedness, 2 owing to his longing for the vazūrat, reported (to the Sultan), in private, words that were not true in respect of the amirs. It so happened, that one day availing himself of an opportunity, he represented to the Sultan, that Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khān wanted to raise one of the (other) sons of Nāṣir Shāh on the throne. Sultan Mahmūd, simply on hearing this news, became anxious; and wanted to punish the two ministers. But afterwards acting with patience and calmness, he set about making enquiries and investigations.

When Muhāfiz Khān saw, that his words had not produced any result, he grew more insistent in his calumnies; and every day made use of harsh words, till one day Sultan Mahmūd ordered some people,

---

1 Firishtah says that to this extent they tried to please the Sultan.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. is not explicit about Muhāfiz Khān’s motive; and neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India says what his motive was. Firishtah and Col. Briggs say nothing about Muhāfiz Khān’s intrigues against Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl Khān; but they say that he quarrelled with the Sultan and used unmanners language towards him. After some fighting the Sultan had to leave Shādiābad; and Muhāfiz Khān then brought Shāhīb Khān out of the fort, and raised him to the throne. According to the Tabaqāt this happened sometime afterwards, i.e., after the rebellion of Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khān and the death of Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn, and the submission of a petition by Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khān. The Cambridge History of India mentions the intrigues of Muhāfiz Khān and the rebellion of Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khan, etc. (p. 365).

3 The reading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. is از إمامة but I think the meaning is about or in respect of the amirs.

4 مقصور خان in the second MS.
that they should slay Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan, when they come, according to custom, to make their salute.

And when things came to such a pass, one of the eunuchs, who was on special terms with Mukhtas Khan, reported to him what was happening. Mukhtas Khan immediately went and informed Iqbal Khan; and an hour had not yet elapsed when a man came to summon Mukhtas Khan and Iqbal Khan. 1 Mukhtas Khan hastened without any delay to wait on the Sultan; and Iqbal Khan remained occupied with the affairs of state. Mukhtas Khan, seeing that things were not as on previous occasions, 2 returned, and came to Iqbal Khan; and they went away to their respective houses. Muhaffiz Khan then reported to the Sultan that Mukhtas Khan and Iqbal Khan had gone away to their houses, so that they might collect their retainers, and raise one of the Shahzadas to the 3 Sultanat. He suggested that it would be advisable to go there and seize them; 4 and not defer what should be done today to tomorrow.

Couplet:

Time 5 takes off from the man,
Who to tomorrow delays today's work.

Sultan Mahmud believed the words of that 6 deceitful traitor, and advanced towards the houses of Mukhtas Khan and Iqbal Khan. The latter fled with a hundred horsemen and foot soldiers, and came out of the fort on the side of 7 Qadinpur, on the night of the 24th Rabil-ul-Thani. They rode all night, and in the morning reached the village of 8 Sarabah, near the Narbada river. From that place

---

1 One MS. by mistake omits the whole sentence from مخلص خان to مشغول نود.
2 One of the MSS. has برم امدة instead of برمگلته.
3 One of the MSS. has بسرتنت instead of بسرتنت.
4 One MS. omits the words from گار اموار to ناژاردند.
5 The word in the MS. and in the lith. ed. appears to be یبیر جرای which may be derived from یبیر to break off.
6 One MS. omits the word مکار.
7 One MS. and the lith. ed. have قاضی بریر but the other MS. has غازی بریر.
8 Firshah and Col. Briggs do not name the village. They narrate the facts of the rebellion of Mukhtas Khan (whom they call Makhfous Khan) and Iqbal Khan after the narrative of the rebellion of Muhaffiz Khan and the raising
they sent Naṣrat Kān, son of Iqbal Kān, on the 25th of the month in the direction of the country of Asir, to bring Sultan Shihāb-ud-din. Early the next morning, Sultan Mahmūd sat on the masnad of rule in the audience place; and conferring the title of Khwājah Jahān on Muḥāfiz Kān entrusted the office of the vazārat to him. He then conferred the titles of Majlis-i-Karim on Afḍal Kān, and of Dastūr Kān on Jāwash Kān, and sent them to put down Mukhtāṣ Kān and Iqbal Kān.

When Naṣrat Kān, after traversing various stages, arrived in the presence of Sultan Shihāb-ud-din, the latter in his great joy and happiness, started on the following day from the country styled “the Mumtāz”, which is a name for the territory of Bījāgarh and Kharkūn; and in his great eagerness he traversed thirty karōhs in one day and night. It so happened, however, that the heat was so great, that fish were scorched in the depth of the sea, and fiery natured salamanders were drowned in their own sweat, and Sultan Shihāb-ud-din fell ill and his condition became abnormal, and on the 3rd of Jamād-ul-awwal he accepted the summons of God.

Couplet:

There is the way of non-existence, which none who exists,
Will e'er the danger of traversing escape.

And some say that he was poisoned at the instigation of Sultan Mahmūd. Naṣrat Kān, dressed in blue (mourning) garments, and taking the corpse with him came to Sarābah, where the Khāns were assembled. When he arrived there, Mukhtāṣ Kān and Iqbal Kān, in great sorrow and distress, sent the dead body to the fort of Shādi-

of Shāhīb Kān to the throne by the latter. According to Firishtah lith. ed. Iqbal Kān and Mukhāṣ Kān went themselves to Asir, and held the umbrella over the head of Shihāb-ud-din; and after his death they raised the umbrella over the head of his son, and gave him the title of Sultan Hūshang. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 250) agrees generally with the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but he says, contrary to the other historians, that it was Medny Ray, who had acquired an undue influence over the Sooltan, who persuaded the latter that Yekbal and Mukhsoos Khan “were carrying on a treasonable correspondence with the King of the Deccan”; and at his instigation the Sooltan ordered the former to be put to death. The Cambridge History of India, page 385, also does not mention it, though it says that they fled to the Narbada. M. Hidayat Hosain has الکتاب Sarāiyah in the text-edition.
They gave the title of Hūshang Shāh to the adopted son of Sūlṭān Shīhāb-ud-dīn, and held the umbrella over his head; and raising the dust of disturbance, started from that country towards the centre of the country of Mālwa.

Couplet:

Jāmī! it is better that at this stage you adopt the view,

That from the deaths of others, you fear your own.

After the arrival of the dead body, the Sūlṭān wept much, and deposited it in the earth. He carried out the customary rites of mourning, and gave alms to deserving people. After finishing them, he sent Nizām Kham to reinforce Dastūr Kham. Nizām Kham traversed the stages on wings of speed and joined him. Then joining their forces, they attacked Hūshang; and the latter fled, and took shelter in the hills of Bahār Bābā Hājī.

While these things were happening, petitions came from Iqbal Khan and Mukhtās Kham, to the effect that, “Nothing has ever been done by these ancient hereditary slaves except rendering loyal service to your Majesty; and Muhāfīz Kham, owing to his envy and ill-will, having spoken interested and malicious words has turned your noble heart against your old servants. They hope that the truth about the disloyalty and wickedness of Muhāfīz Kham and of his acts will be revealed to your just mind. They also believe that some of your other loyal servants, will, in their disinterestedness, attest in private

---

1 Both MSS. have adopted son, but the lith. ed. has son. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, also has son.

2 The meaning and appropriateness of the couplet are not very clear. Also the first word is either جامی, which is the name of the celebrated Persian Sūfī poet who was a native of Jām, or جامی a place. I think Jām is better.

3 Firishtah lith. ed. has بکونهٔ کریم خان fled to the hills. He goes on to say that after some time Iqbal Khan and Makkūs Kham joined the service of Sultān Maḥmūd, and were received with favour. Somewhat contrary to this, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 250) says, that after some slight opposition, “the prince and his minister (apparently Yekbal Khan) threw themselves on the King’s mercy.” On the other hand, the Cambridge History of India, page 365, says that “Hūshang took refuge in Sehore, but the leaders convinced the king that they were loyal at heart.”

4 The phrase is حرام زادگی, in the MSS., and حرام خواری in the lith. ed. In the text-edition it is نا دولت حرامی و حرام خواری. 

---

ābād. They gave the title of Hūshang Shāh to the adopted son of Sūlṭān Shīhāb-ud-dīn, and held the umbrella over his head; and raising the dust of disturbance, started from that country towards the centre of the country of Mālwa.

Couplet:

Jāmī! it is better that at this stage you adopt the view,

That from the deaths of others, you fear your own.

After the arrival of the dead body, the Sūlṭān wept much, and deposited it in the earth. He carried out the customary rites of mourning, and gave alms to deserving people. After finishing them, he sent Nizām Kham to reinforce Dastūr Kham. Nizām Kham traversed the stages on wings of speed and joined him. Then joining their forces, they attacked Hūshang; and the latter fled, and took shelter in the hills of Bahār Bābā Hājī.

While these things were happening, petitions came from Iqbal Khan and Mukhtās Kham, to the effect that, “Nothing has ever been done by these ancient hereditary slaves except rendering loyal service to your Majesty; and Muhāfīz Kham, owing to his envy and ill-will, having spoken interested and malicious words has turned your noble heart against your old servants. They hope that the truth about the disloyalty and wickedness of Muhāfīz Kham and of his acts will be revealed to your just mind. They also believe that some of your other loyal servants, will, in their disinterestedness, attest in private
to the truth of these words." When the purport of these petitions became known to Sultān Maḥmūd, some of the Sultān's servants said that, "The object of Muḥāfīż Khān in making the insinuations was, that he should be able to act independently in carrying out the affairs of the state; and the turn of the vazārat would not come to him, if Mukhtaṣ Khān and Iqbal Khān were there. In fact, his whole energy had been devoted to this, that he might place a new face on the affairs; and having brought one of the sons of Nāṣir Shāh out of prison, he should assign the name of the Sultān to him; and should himself be the loosener and fastener (sole dictator) of all affairs."

Sultān Maḥmūd, who had no caution and foresight in his acts, ordered that when Muḥāfīż Khān comes to make his salute, he should be seized, and kept under guard, and should, after investigation, be punished. When the adherents of Muḥāfīż Khān informed him of the truth of what had happened, he appeared in the precincts of the audience hall, with his retainers, on the following day, which was the 18th Jamādi-ul-āwwal. After a little while Sultān Maḥmūd summoned him to his private chamber. He went there, and gave harsh replies to his words. Sultān Maḥmūd, in great anger and bravery, marched out with few followers from among his servants and a body of Abyssinians; and that wicked man fled out of the palace; and taking possession of the outer building raised the standard of revolt. He brought Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, son of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn; and besieged Maḥmūd Shāh in his palace. He was about to seize the latter, when he came out in the middle of the night, and started towards the town of Ujjain. From that place he summoned Dastūr Khān and the other amirs to his presence, after giving them assurances of his favour. That very night when Sultān Maḥmūd started in his flight, Muḥāfīż Khān bestowed the title of 1 Sultān Maḥmūd on Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, and placed him on the throne. After some days, Dastūr Khān arrived in Ujjain; and after him, Mukhtaṣ Khān and Iqbal

---

1 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say, that he received the title of Sultān Maḥmūd. It shows a lack of imagination in Muḥāfīż Khān that he could not give him any other title. It must have been very confusing to have the same name for both the Sultāns. Firishtah and Col. Briggs do not appear to mention the title which was given to Sāhib Khān. In fact he is always called Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān in the histories. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, says that Sāhib Khān was proclaimed king under the title of Maḥmūd II.
Khān joined the Sultān. Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, on hearing this news, summoned Sadr Khān and Afdal Khān; and he had engagements and promises with them confirmed by very strong oaths.

On the 5th of Jamādi-ul-āwwal, he left the fort of Shadīābād in charge of Mawadab Khān and marching to the town of Na’lcha, made it his camp; and with the concurrence of Sadr Khān, ordered that a third part of the wages of the soldiers should be paid to them in cash from the treasury, to enable them to make the necessary preparations for the march to Ujjain. Sultān Maḥmūd marched from Ujjain to Dībālpūr; and after a watch of the night, the commanders, who had their families in Mandū mounted their horses, and started for the camp of Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān. The next day Sultān Maḥmūd marched from Dībālpūr in the direction of Chandīrī; and writing an account of what had happened, sent it to Bihjat Khān. The latter wrote in reply, “This slave is bound to obey him, who should have the capital city of Shādiābād in his possession.” Sultān Maḥmūd on receiving this reply became amazed and anxious about his future. He halted in the village of Behishtpūr and held a consultation. Some of his adherents said, “We should take shelter in the fort of Ranthambhūr.” The opinion of others was, that they should ask for help from Sultān Sikandar Lūdi. Sultān Maḥmūd declared, “It appears in my mind that we should wrap up our feet in the skirt of patience; and should wait for the rising of the stars of good fortune; it appears that it is right to take shelter in the fort of Ranthambhūr for a time, as it is imaginable that we should have help and support. It appears improper, however, on my side, to ask for help from my equals.” And cutting off the chain of hope from all created things, he waited for the appearance of what was in the womb of fate.

After a few days, Mēdīnī Rāy, who was distinguished by great bravery and experience, came from his thāna and joined him. Bihjat

---

1 The readings are slightly different. One MS. has علائی مرکز گردنید. This appears to be the best reading. The other MSS. have علائی مرکز گردنید. This does not appear to be correct. The lith. ed. has علائی مرکز گردنید instead of علائی مرکز گردنید, and omits the را after پیمان, in the reading in the first MS.

2 The name is موردنگان in one MS. and موردنگان in the other, and موردنگان in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Hossain has خودن خان in the text-edition.
Khān becoming aware of the impropriety of his (previous) acts, sent 1 Sharzah Khān, his son, to attend on the Sultān; and the latter, feeling that he was now more powerful, determined to march to Mandū. After some time news came that Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān was advancing towards Chandērī. When he encamped in the village 2 Shahrāi, the parties thought it advisable that they should arrange their troops the next morning, and await the blowing of the wind of victory and triumph. It so happened, that after the passing of one watch of the night, 3 Afḍal Khān mounted his horse, and came to Sultān Maḥmūd’s camp; and a little more than half the army, acting in concert with him, also joined Sultān Maḥmūd’s camp. Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān and Muḥāfiz Khān, in great terror and confusion, set fire to their camp, and fled. On the 4th day they arrived in Naṣratābād, and opened the hand of lavishness for squandering the treasures, and occupied themselves with guarding and arranging the fort.

Sultān Maḥmūd performed the rites of offering thanks to God, and advanced towards Shādīābād. When he arrived in the village of 4 Sirsiah, the adopted son of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn and his amīrs, who had fortified themselves in the foot-hills of Bahār Bābā Hājī.

---

1 The name is Sharzah Khān in both MSS. Col. Briggs calls him Shirza Khan, governor of Chandērī. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has Siddat Khān and the Cambridge History of India, page 366, has Shiddat Khān.

2 The name of the village is Shahrāi and in the MSS, and Sirsia in the lith. ed. The name does not appear in Firishtah or in Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India, though they all mention the battle which took place there. M. Hidlayat Hosain has adopted Shahrāi in the text-edition.

3 Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs mentions the defection of Afḍal Khān from Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān’s camp. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, mentions it, but its account differs in some particular from that in the text. In the first place, it says that the armies met in the evening. This is correct, if it means that the armies came near each other in the evening; but it certainly is not correct if it means that the armies engaged each other in the evening. Then it says, that Afḍal Khān deserted, “taking half of the army with him.” This is very indefinite, as it does not say half of what army he took with him. The Tabaqāt is quite definite, and I presume it is correct that he took all his own army and half of Malik’s army.

4 The village is called Sirsiah in both MSS., and Sirsa in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in either Firishtah or in Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.
came to Sultan Maḥmūd and obtained a promise of safety. Then by successive marches Sultan Maḥmūd encamped in the town of Sirsiaḥ; and on the next day which was the 17th of Ramaḍān in the year 917 A.H., he advanced to Ẓahdibābād, the seat of the throne, with his army in battle array. On both sides the ranks were arrayed, and the field of slaughter was arranged. Shāhzāda Şahib Khān, acting with bravery, attacked Sultan Maḥmūd’s army. At this time an elephant advanced towards Sultan Maḥmūd; and he shot an arrow aiming at the breast of the filbān with such force, that it came out of the latter’s back. At this time Mūdīn Rāy with a body of his Rājpūts utterly routed Şahib Khān’s army, wounding the latter with their lances and jamaḥars (a kind of dagger). The Shāhzāda being unable to withstand them fled; and some of his men took shelter in the fort; and a number concealed themselves in the caverns, which are to be found in the neighbourhood of Ẓanū. Sultan Maḥmūd pursued them as far as the Haul-i-Khās (special reservoir), and encamped there.

The Shāhzāda occupied himself with the defence and other arrangements of the fort; and endeavoured day and night to secure it against attack. Sultan Maḥmūd, owing to his natural kindliness sent the following message to him, “As the relation of brotherhood is between us, and the observance of the relation of kinship is one of our duties, natural morality induces me that I should bestow on you whatever place you may ask for; and you may take away as much property as you can carry away, and may go away without any objection from me. So that for no reason whatever the blood of

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 366, gives November 28th (15121) as the date of the battle.

2 One MS. has فراوان حمله اورده, but the word فراوان does not occur in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

3 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have و گوهری در ژابه که در حوالی مندو واقع است مختفی شدند, with the difference that the MS. has by mistake از حوالی instead of در حوالی. The other MS. has و در ژابه و ژابه که در حوالی مندو واقع است مختفی شدند. The reading in the lith. ed. appears to me to be the most correct and I have accepted it. In the text-edition it is گوهری در ژابه که در حوالی مندو واقع است - مختفی گشند.
Musalmāns may not be spilled.” Shāhzāda Şahib Khān, being proud of the strength of the fort, did not agree. Sūltān Muḥammad then seized the environs of the fort, and made great efforts in carrying on the siege; till on the 16th Shawwāl of the afore-mentioned year (the troops) by the exertions and endeavours of Maulānā ‘Imād-ud-dīn Khurāsānī and other brave soldiers entered the fort about the beginning of true dawn; and attacking the men in a bastion fought hand to hand with them; and in the winking of an eye mingled the blood of the followers and adherents of the Shāhzāda with the dust of wretchedness. The Shāhzāda and Muḥāfīz Khān taking with them a quantity of precious gems, fled by the path of the seven hundred steps; and on the 4th day joined the camp of Sūltān Muẓaffar in 1 the town of Barōda, one of the dependencies of Gujrat. Sūltān Muẓaffar considering the arrival of the Shāhzāda an honour, did not leave out a single minutia in the rites of hospitality. He promised that at the end of the rainy season he would take possession of the country of Mālwa, and divide it among the brothers.

From that place they went to Chāmpānīr. 2 One day the Shāhzāda happened to go to the house of Yādgār Mughul, who was celebrated as Surkh Kulāh (the red cap), and had come to Gujrat, as an ambassador from Shāh Isma’īl Saftī. There were high words among their servants, which ended in a scuffle. A report spread among the common people, that Yādgār Surkh Kulāh and his men had taken the Shāhzāda of Mandū as prisoner. Men belonging to the army of Gujrat, coming in crowds, killed some of the retainers of Surkh Kulāh. The Shāhzāda, from shame and ignominy, turned his face towards the kingdom of Astr, without taking leave of the Sūltān. He with three hundred horsemen encamped at the village of 3 Lōrgān, which is distinguished as the boundary of Astr. Lōdhā the governor of the

---

1 Both the MSS. have در قصب برود گجرات, but the lith. ed. has در قصب برود از گجرات I have adopted the latter reading. M. Hidayat Rossain has در قصب برود گجرات in the text-edition.

2 One MS. omits the word بر and also the word روزی.

3 The name of the village is written as لورگان in the MS., and as نورگان in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in either Firaiṭah or in Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. In the text-edition it is لورگان.
town of Kanduyah, having received information of this, came with great quickness and attacked him. Šāhib Khān fleeing from him sought shelter with the ruler of Kāwil, which is in the Deccan. As affectionate relations existed between Sultān Mahmūd and the ruler of Kāwil, the latter kept himself back from helping the Shāhzāda, but allotted a few villages as a contribution towards his expenses.

After that, as disturbances disappeared from the kingdom, and disorder was changed into order, Sultān Mahmūd took his place on the dais of peace and tranquillity. Governors and thanadārs and revenue officers went to the different divisions and districts for the organisation of the kingdom. Mēdini Rāy wanted to become all powerful, and to remove the amīrs of Ghīyāth Shāh and Nāsir Shāh out of the way; and in pursuance of this wicked purpose he began to speak ill of the amīrs; and in private he slandered everyone, till one day he submitted (to the Sultān), that Afdal Khān and Iqbal Khān had sent letters to Shāhzāda Šāhib Khān, and wanted to re-awaken the disturbances which had been put to sleep. Sultān Mahmūd imagining these interested words to be disinterested, ordered, that when Afdal Khān and Iqbal Khān should come to make their salāms they should be slain. On the following day, when they, in accordance with the usual custom, came to make their salāms, both of them were seized and torn joint from joint.

Sikandar Khān, the governor of Satwās, and Fatḥ Jang Khān Shērwānl, seeing this audacity and violence of Mēdini Rāy fled and went to their jādīrs. Sikandar Khān rebelled and took possession.

1 The word is written as مکاتيب, in the MSS.; and مکتیب in the lith. ed. This last appears to me to be the best and I have retained it. In the text-edition it is مکاتيب.

2 The name is written as سواتس, and اوتاس, and اوتاس in different places in the MSS. and the lith. ed. Firashtah lith. ed. mentions Sikandar Khān, and his rebellion; but does not, as far as I can make out mention the name of his jādīr. Col. Briggs in one place (vol. IV, p. 251) calls him "Sikundur Khan of Bhilas"; but this is apparently a mistake, for it was Munesr Khān, who was sent against him, and not Sikandar Khān, who was a jādīdāsr of Bhilas. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, calls 'Sikandar Khān, governor of Satwās. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted ملاقات in the text-edition.
of the country from Kanduyah to Shahahabād, and drove out the revenue officers of the Khālsā. Sultan Mahmūd came down from the fort of Mandū, in order to put down this rebellion, on the 5th of the month of Jumādī-ul-Ākhir of the year 918 A.H.; and took up his residence in the Jahān-numā palace at Na’īcha. He entrusted the office of the vazārat to Médini Rāy. He sent men to Bihjat Khān, governor of Chandēri, and other āmirīs, and summoned them. Bihjat Khān in spite of the relationship of Khānazādi (being a slave by descent), fearing (what Médini Rāy might do to him), wrote an excuse about the near approach of the rainy season. Sultan Mahmūd affected to overlook this; and wrote to Mansūr Khān, the feudatory of Bhilsā to advance and put down Sikandar Khān. Mansūr Khān collected his troops and advanced to attack Sikandar Khān; but when he arrived in the neighbourhood of the latter’s country, his spies brought him the news, that Sikandar Khān had collected an immense army; and had also got the Rāys of Gondwāna to join him. Mansūr Khān halted there, reported the facts to Sultan Mahmūd, and asked for reinforcements. Médini Rāy wrote in reply, that if he was guilty of procrastination and delay in seizing Sikandar Khān, he would become liable to suffer from the chastisement of the Sultan’s wrath. Mansūr Khān on receiving this order, became amazed and anxious about his future; and returned and joined Bihjat Khān. Sanjār Khān who had been nominated to reinforce Mansūr Khān also went and joined the latter.

Sultan Mahmūd on hearing these news started from the capital, came to Dhār, and performed the pilgrimage to the tomb of Shāikh Kāmāl-ud-dīn Mālwī. He then sent Médini Rāy with a large army and fifty elephants, from the town of Dibālpūr, to put down Sikandar Khān; and himself went to Ujjain. Médini Rāy, on arriving at

1 Firishthah lith. ed. describes the country as but he does not say that Sikandar Khān took possession of it. He says that he had possession of it. Col. Briggs on the contrary says, "He occupied the country lying between Kuhndwa and Shahabad"; and about the last-named place says in a footnote "probably Shahpoor". The Cambridge History of India does not mention what territory Sikandar Khān seized.

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

3 In text-edition it is Tujjar Khān instead of Sanjār Khān.
Satwās stretched his hand for plunder and devastation; and the unalloyed pleasure of Sikandar Khān having thus become disturbed, he, in his helplessness, sought the path of peace; and through the intervention of Ḥabīb Khān came to Mādinī Rāy. The latter went to Ujjain, and obtained the pardon of Sikandar Khān's offences. Sultān Maḥmūd drew the pen of pardon across his offences and allotted (confirmed) his rank and jāgīr. Sultān Maḥmūd then marched from Ujjain and came to the town of 1 Āgar. There a petition or report came from the dārōgha (superintendent) of the fort of Shāḍīlābād to the effect, that a body of low people had risen in revolt on the night of the 25th Ramaḍān; and had raised the umbrella, which they 2 had brought from the tomb of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, over the head of a man of obscure descent; and had stretched their hands to plunder the city; but that by the good fortune of His Majesty he (the dārōgha) had seized the head and ringleader of the mob; and the men had been punished. The Sultān sent an order containing expressions of favour and encouragement to the dārōgha; and himself went towards 3 Bahār Bābā Ḥāji.

From that place he sent a letter giving encouragement and promising favour to the Bihjat Khān by the hand of Bherdās; but as his all-seeing eye was besmirched with the dust of misfortune, he sent an improper reply; and sent men to Kāwil that they might bring Shāhzāda Ṣāḥib Khān, making him their leader. He also submitted a petition to Sultān Sikandar Lūdī, to the purport, that Maḥmūd Shāh had entrusted the bridle of loosening and fastening and of defending and regulating the kingdom to the hands of Kāfīr; and had placed his foot of submission outside the path of the 4 Musta'fā (the chosen one, Muḥammad) to whom be the salutation; and has

---

1 See page 570 and note 1 on the same page. The Cambridge History of India, which does not mention the town at the place referred to on page 225, mentions it here (p. 306), and calls it Āgar.

2 One MS. has oorḍa and the other brāsparsha. The lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. I have inserted oorḍa. In the text-edition it is brāsparsha.

3 See page 581.

4 One MS. has by mistake mustarbh instead of mustarbh and also has theālam instead of theālam. The lith. ed. has theālam and theālam after theālam.
made the followers of Islām wretched and miserable, and the Kāfirs and Rājpūts dear and honoured. 1 If a detachment of his victorious army should arrive in these parts, the public prayers would be read in the name of that Bādshāh, who is the asylum of the faith; and 2 his coin would be current in the country. When Bherōdās came and reported all this, Sultān Maḥmūd collected troops, and after one week marched from Bahār; and encamped in the village of Shikārpūr. On the following day, he sent Mukhtās Khān with a large army to Chandīrī, in advance of himself.

About this time news came that about the middle of Muḥarram-ul-ḥarām in the year 919 a.h., Sultān Muẓaffar Gujṛātī had encamped in the town of Dhār, with a large army and five hundred elephants; and was occupying himself with hunting, in the environs of the village of Dilāwarah. Although Rāy Pithārā and the other amirs, who were in the fort of Mandū, sent a message to him, in their distress and weakness, by some trustworthy men to the effect that at this time, when Sultān Maḥmūd was engaged in attending to the administration of his kingdom, his (i.e., Sultān Muẓaffar’s) intention of invading it appeared to be altogether remote from the rules of bravery and humanity. He did not at all listen to it with any idea of good will and acceptance; and sent Nizām-ul-mulk Sultānī with a large army to the neighbourhood of Na’lēha. The latter arrived at the Hauḍ-i-Rānī

1 The facts of Bihjat Khān’s sending for Shāhzāda Šāhīb Khān, and also asking Sultān Sikandar Lūdī to send an army, and promising that the public prayers would be read in his name appear to be rather inconsistent; but Firishṭāh explains that if Sultān Sikandar Lūdī would help to place Šāhīb Khān on the throne, the Khaṭba would be read in his name as the suzerain or overlord.

2 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has وسمکه ایشان ایشانرا ساخت شابع خواهد شد instead of شابعی شابع شد, and the other has the same except that the words وسمکه ایشانرا شابع مارب ہے while the lith. ed. has وسمکه ایشانرا شابع مارب ہے. I have adopted the first reading. In the text-edition the reading is the same except that ساخت ایشان را instead of ایشان را is used in place of ایشان را instead of ایشان را.

3 I suppose this means Bahār Bābā Ḥāji.

4 The inroad of Sultān Muẓaffar is only incidentally and briefly mentioned by Firishṭāh and Col. Briggs. The Cambridge History of India (p. 387) also mentions it, and adds that “Muẓaffar was recalled to Gujarāt by domestic disturbances.”

5 Son of Mādīnī Rāy.
(the Râni's reservoir or tank), but returned from there. At the time of his return, a 1 body of men came down from the fort and attacked him. Nizâm-ul-mulk turned round and slew some of the men; and the others sought shelter in the fort. Sultan Mahmûd on receiving this terrible news, became distressed in mind, and anxious and amazed; and did not know in what direction he should attempt first. Suddenly while he was extremely distressed, news arrived that Sultan Mu'azzafar Gujrâti had turned back, and had gone back to Gujrat by way of 2 Dahûd. Sultan Mahmûd having performed the rites of offering thanks to God, placed the destruction of Bihjat Khân in the forefront of his energy.

After some days, news came that Sikandar Khân had again raised the standard of rebellion and a flag of violence; and had taken forcible possession of some villages belonging to the Khâlsa (i.e., lands in direct possession of the Sultan). Sultan Mahmûd deputed the governor of the town of 3 Kandûyah named Malik Lîdhâ to punish him. 4 Malik Lîdhâ advanced towards 5 Satwâs. After the two sides had met, the dust of disturbance and warfare continued from morning till evening. In the end Sikandar Khân being unable to withstand him,

---

1 One MS. has جمعي, and the other مزوک. The lith. ed. has neither, or any similar word.
2 ۰ in the text-edition.
3 About Kanduyah see page 558 and note 6 on the same page. Firishtah has at this place حاکم کند سی و مالک بوده. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 254) calls him "Mullik Lado, the governor of Kuhndwa." In another place Firishtah lith. ed. calls کند سی ومیں کندویہ. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, does not give the name of the governor, but calls him "a loyal officer who had endeavoured to reduce him to obedience."
4 The Cambridge History of India, page 367, describes the incident in a single sentence, which owing to the necessity of too much compression or from error conveys ideas which are totally different from the facts, as narrated in the Tabaqât and by Firishtah. The sentence (a part of which I have already quoted in the proceeding note) is Sikandar Khân had defeated and slain a loyal officer who had endeavoured to reduce him to obedience. Malik Lîdhâ was neither defeated nor slain by Sikandar Khân. On the other hand he defeated Sikandar Khân; and he was assassinated by a man probably a soldier in Sikandar Khan's army, who had a private grudge against him.
5 سیوہ in the text-edition here, but سوہ in earlier on, see note 2, page 587.
turned his face in flight. Malik Lödhā’s troops pursued him, and were engaged in plundering. At this time, a man whose family had been taken prisoner, came up to Malik Lödhā, on the pretext of kissing his feet, and stabbing him in the side with a poisoned dagger destroyed the capital of his life. Sikandar Khān on hearing this returned, and drove Malik Lödhā’s men before him; and took six elephants and many horses as booty; and returned triumphant and victorious to Satwās. When this news came to Sultān Maḥmūd, he considered the destruction of Bihjat Khān of primary importance, and advanced towards Chandērī. On the way news was brought to him, that about the middle of Dhil-hijjat-ul-harām, Shāhzāda Šāhīb Khān had arrived at Chandērī from Gondwāna; and Bihjat Khān and Mansūr Khān had gone forward to meet him; and had proclaimed him as the Sultān. Sultān Maḥmūd halted at the village of Sājanpūr, and occupied himself with collecting troops.

After some days news came that Sa’īd Khān Lūdī and ‘Imād-ul-mulk had encamped at a distance of five, karōhs from Chandērī with the army of Dehli from the side of Sultān Sikandar to reinforce Šāhīb Khān. Sultān Maḥmūd on hearing this news became extremely disheartened, and thought it advisable to return to his own place (i.e., I suppose Mandū). On the way, he summoned the amirs to his presence; and got them to strengthen their promises and engagements by oaths. But in spite of their oaths and the renewal of their engagements, when a part of the night had passed, Sadr Khān and Mukhtās Khān, who were truthful amirs, fled towards Chandērī. Maḥmūd Šah sent a body of men in pursuit; and himself encamped

---

1 Firishtah describes him as يکی از شکر و سکندر خان که عیالش اسیر شده بود, i.e., one of Sikandar Khān’s soldiers whose family had been made prisoner.
2 One MS. omits by mistake the words from سرخ ملک لودها برقشت.
3 The name is Sājanpūr and Sājan in the MSS., and Sijanpūr in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. The latter says in the corresponding passage that Maḥmūd “retired to Hisās and remained for some time in that neighbourhood.”
4 One MS. omits Khān after Sa’īd.
5 One MS. has by mistake محرمت instead of مقرر.
6 One MS. has دیوانگان, Mukhtās Khān.
7 The epithet truthful is probably used ironically.
in the town of 1 Sirönj. On the 1st of Safar he passed through the inhabited part of the town of Bhilsā; and encamped on the bank of the neighbouring river. When his army went past the gate of the town the agent of Mansūr Khān, in concert with a body of the low or common people of the town, plundered those who had fallen behind. On hearing this news the spirit of the bravery and self-assertion of Sulṭān Maḥmūd came into motion; and he gave an order, so that in a moment his men seized the citadel, and slew that body of men of evil destiny. The citizens were plundered owing to the 2 wickedness of those men; and their wives and children became subject to the misery of slavery.

The Sulṭān having halted in those parts for some days for hunting, 3 Shāhzāda Sāḥib Khān and Bihjat Khān, considering this delay to be a very great boon, sent Malik Maḥmūd with a large army towards Sārangpur. Jhujār Khān, the agent of the feudatory of Sārangpūr, fought with and defeated him. Malik Maḥmūd fled, and did not rest till he had arrived at Chandērī; and Jhujār Khān seized much booty, and returned to Sārangpūr. At the time when the detachment under Malik Maḥmūd returned fleeing, Sa’īd Khān Lūḍī and ‘Īmād-ul-mulk sent this message to Bihjat Khān “The promise had been given, that when the 4 victorious Sikandari troops should arrive in the 5 territory of Chandērī, the public prayers would be read in the great name of the Sikandar of the age (i.e., Sulṭān Sikandar Lūḍī); and the Dirahams

---

1 The place is so called in the MSS., and also in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

2 One MS. has by mistake سرعت instead of شروط.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 367, omits the events between the proclamation of Shāhzāda Sāḥib Khān as Sulṭān, and the sending of the force by the rebels to Sārangpūr. It mentions the latter event, but does not give the name of the commander of the force or that of the agent of the governor of the place who defeated him. Firishtah lith. ed. also mentions the incident and he gives the name of the commander of the fort as مصمد نام شخص، i.e., a man of the name of Maḥmūd; but does not give the name of the agent of the governor who defeated him. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 254, 255) calls the commander of the force “one Mahmood Khan” but says “he was alarmed at the approach of the King’s army” and “fled disgracefully.”

4 One MS. has منصرلا but the other and the lith. ed. have منصره.

5 One MS. omits باطلا.
and Dināres would be struck and 1 imprinted with the name of that sovereign; but up to the present day no sign of these things has shown itself." As they 2 did not get a reply such as they wanted, they marched from the village of Shahrāī, and halted at a place fourteen karōhs further back. From that place they sent a report of what had happened. Sulṭān Sikandar sent a farmān recalling them. When Sulṭān Sikandar’s army, annoyed at what had happened, went towards Delhi, Sulṭān Maḥmūd being expectant of receiving the grace of God, planned a hunting excursion. At this time, one day in the course of the hunting a spy submitted a report, that Khwājah Jahān and Muhāfiz Khān had marched away towards Shādiābād with a large army. Sulṭān Maḥmūd returned from the place where he received the report; and deputed Ḥabīb Khān and Fakhr-ul-mulk and 3 Hēmkaran to put down and crush Muhāfiz Khān. Ḥabīb Khān and the other amīrs arrived at Na’lcha on the 16th Rabī‘-ul-θānī. It so happened that Muhāfiz Khān had arrived there three or four hours before them; and a battle having taken place, he, owing to the ill luck which always follows a rebel, was killed; and his head having been cut off, they returned with victory and triumph to their own camp. Shāhzāda Sāḥib Khān, on hearing this news was full of grief and sorrow; and shut the door of the entrance and exit of the Khāns before his face.

Bihjat Khān and Sadr Khān thought it advisable, that with the intervention of the learned men and Shaikhs, they should ask for the pardon of their own offences, and should pray for one out of the

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have مسكوكinstead of ملهك، which is the correct word.

2 One MS. has by mistake للشنيدن instead of للنغناد. Firishtah explains that public prayers were read in Sulṭān Sikandar’s name in Chandīrī, but as about forty thousand Rājpūta had assembled in Sulṭān Maḥmūd’s army, Sulṭān Sikandar recalled the force which he had sent, and which, according to Firishtah, consisted of twelve thousand horsemen.

3 The name is written with slight variation in the MSS. and in the lith ed., but looks like Hamikaran. Firishtah lith. ed. gives the name of Ḥabīb Khān and Fakhr-ul-mulk, and adds many of the Rājpūt amīrs. Hamikaran or Hēmkaran was apparently one of them. Col. Briggs mentions the name of "Hubeb Khan" alone. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, says, briefly "an attempt of Muhāfiz Khān to return to Māndū was defeated."
many districts of the kingdom for Shâhzâda (Sâhib Khân). They then went together to Sâhib Khân and submitted these proposals to him. He said, "This has been recurring to my mind for a long time. I have been sorrowful and unhappy at the coming of Sultân Maḥmûd’s army; but praise be to God! that this danger has passed away." Bihjat Khân then, with the advice of the amîrs, sent Shaikh Aûliyâ to the Sultân’s camp; and prayed for the pardon of their offences; and asked for a place to help in the expenses of the Shâhzâda. 1 Sultân Maḥmûd, considering this to be one of the supernatural mercies and indubitable blessings, made over the fort of Râîsin and the villages of Bhîlîsâ and Dhamînî to the Shâhzâda; and gave him for his immediate expenses 2 ten lakhs of tankas and also twelve elephants, and sent far-mâns promising favour to Bihjat Khân and 3 the other amîrs and Khâns. He then gave permission to the emissaries of Bihjat Khân to return; and sent a body of his own servants with them. When Shaikh Aûliyâ and the other emissaries arrived in the neighbourhood of Chandârî, Bihjat Khân sent his son Sharzah Khân to welcome them; and met them on their arrival with honour and respect. When he learned the purport of the far-mâns, he sent the far-mân for the government of Râîsin and Bhîlîsâ to Sâhib Khân by the hand of Sharzah Khân; but kept the ten lakhs of tankas in cash and the twelve elephants with himself. Some strife-mongers said to Shâhzâda Sâhib Khân, that Bihjat Khân had determined that on the morning of the Æd-i-ﬁtr (the Æd of the breaking of the fast) he would seize him and some of his immediate adherents in the Nimâdzâh; and 4 he had accordingly sent Shaikh

1 One MS. omits Maḥmûd after Sultân.
2 Firishtah lith. ed. has تّلگز سیلا, and Col. Briggs has copper tankas. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, has, a substantial amount without further definition.
3 There are slight variations in the readings. The reading I have adopted is that in the lith. ed. One MS. omits امرا, and the other has خراحان و امرا.
4 The meaning is not clear. On the whole it appears that Bihjat Khân did all this, but why he should have strengthened the engagement with Shaikh Aûliyâ or should have sent for some troops is not very clear, if he was arranging matters secretly to secure Sâhib Khân on the day of the Æd. Firishtah does not make matters clearer, as he says that Sâhib Khân betook himself to Sultân Sikandar Lûdî immediately on hearing that Bihjat Khân wanted to make him a prisoner. Col. Briggs does not refer to the matter at all. The Cambridge History of India, page 367, says that "The retention of the money by Bihjat
Aūliyā to the camp, and had strengthened the promises and engagements with oaths; and had sent for a body of troops. On hearing this news, a great fear and terror came on the Shāhzāda; and he spent all day in thought and anxiety; and on the night of the 9th Ramaḍān, he without thinking of his ultimate fate chose to tread an unknown path; and betook himself to Sultān Sikandar’s army, which was on the frontier (of Mālwa). When this news reached Maḥmūd Shāh, he on the 19th Shawwāl came to Chandīrī. 1 Bihjat K̲hān and the great men of the city hastened to welcome him, and made their excuses. Maḥmūd Shāh drew the line of pardon across the page of their offences and distinguished each one of them by conferring robes of honour and by giving rewards. He stayed there for some days, and having arranged the affairs of that neighbourhood went back to the capital city of Shādiābād.

Then at the wicked instigation and by the evil counsel of Mēdīnī Rāy he struck the merciless sword at the amirs and sardārs; and making each of them suspected and accused of offences not committed by them brought them into the place of punishment. Gradually things came to such a pass, that the disposition of Maḥmūd Shāh turned from all the amirs, and in fact from all Musalmāns. He placed the mark of dismissal on the forehead of the old officers who had formed a faithful band, and had been entrusted for years, under the government of Ghiyāth Shāh and Nāṣir Shāh, with all matters of revenue: and appointed the helpers and confederates of Mēdīnī Rāy in their places. Owing to these acts, most of the amirs, sardārs and public servants became broken hearted, and holding the hands of their relatives and families chose to exile themselves from their country. The fort of Shādiābād, which had at one time been the home of learning and contained men of wisdom, and Shaiḵhs, became the residence of 2 Kāfirs. Things finally assumed such a shape, that all offices and

K̲hān excited the apprehensions of Muhammad, who believed that he was about to be betrayed to his brother.”

1 I suppose that the Sultan and they all considered that the flight of Šāhib K̲hān had offered them a very easy way out of many difficulties.

2 The word is written as كوراوان in the MSS. and كوران in the lith. ed. I cannot find any meaning of كور or كور that would suit the context. The nearest meaning of كور is a class of gipsies in India, and of كور the blind. In
ports in the government of Maḥmūd Shāh, even down to those of a darbān (door-keeper) or fulbān, (elephant-keeper) were given by Mēdīnī Rāy to his own agents. There did not remain in the service of Sultān Maḥmūd more than two hundred men belonging to the class of Musalmāns. And 1 even Musalmān and Saiyid women 2 were taken by the Rājpūts, and were turned into slave girls. They were taught the art of dancing, and were made to join the akhāras (dancing clubs). They even took possession of the singing women of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din.

Sultān Maḥmūd although he saw the power and violence of the Rājpūts was powerless. And as the custom among the people of Hindūstān is, that when they send away one of their servants, or bid adieu to a guest, they give him pān (beetle leaf), Sultān Maḥmūd sent a vessel filled with pān made into packages for chewing to Mēdīnī Rāy by the hand of Ārāish Khān; and gave him a message, that after that he had permission to leave (the Sultān’s service); and he should go out of his (the Sultān’s) kingdom. The Rājpūts replied, “We forty thousand horsemen have up to this day performed loyal and devoted service; and have never committed any fault. We have done praiseworthy service. We do not know what fault has been committed by us.” When Ārāish Khān took this reply, the Rājpūts assembled in the house of Mēdīnī Rāy, and determined that they should remove the Sultān; and place Rāy Rāyān, the son of Mēdīnī Rāy, on the throne. Mēdīnī Rāy said, “At the present moment the

the corresponding passage in Firishtah, the word is کاتوئن, which is all right and I have taken it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted گوازان or gipsies in the text-edition.

1 Firishtah lith. ed. says that ‘Ali Khān, one of the old amīrs, who was the governor of the city was exasperated by the domination and violence of the Rājpūts, and he assisted by the people of the city took possession of the fort when Sultān Maḥmūd had gone on a hunting excursion attended by his Rājpūt servants. When they returned they besieged the fort, and ‘Ali Khān had to evacuate it. He was pursued and was seized and executed. This is mentioned also in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 258), but he changes the name of ‘Ali Khān to Ghalib Khān. The Cambridge History of India does not mention these incidents.

2 One MS. has شدند in place of شده, and then leaving out the following words as far as استئنالی راجوری, substitutes for them صطلال معمور ابین امررا دیده by طاقت شد.
sultānāt of Mālwa is in reality in our possession. If, however, Maḥmūd Shāh does not remain as a buffer, Sultān Muẓaffar Gūjrātī will come galloping along and will seize the kingdom. Therefore we should, in every way that may be possible, endeavour to please our master."

Then Mēdinī Rāy with other Rājpūts waited on the Sultān, and standing in the place of those who prayed for pardon submitted, "It is not 1 concealed from your world-adorning wisdom, that from us (who are your) slaves, nothing 2 but loyalty and service has been shown. By the grace of God we slew with great torment Muḥāfiz Khān, who was a great enemy of the Sultān. Although man is steeped from head to foot with sins and offences, still no offence has been committed by us, which might throw dust over, and cause pain to Your Majesty's gracious mind; and even supposing that owing to human frailty a harsh deed should have been perpetuated by us, we hope that, with your innate generosity and natural inclination to forgive, you will grant us pardon for it; and after this, nothing will be done by us that would be contrary to your wishes and pleasure." Sultān Maḥmūd whether willingly or otherwise acted with politeness, and abandoned the idea of a conflict on this 3 condition, that he would make over all the posts in the different offices, according to previous custom, to the old Musalmān officers; that Mēdinī Rāy would not give his men any right of interfering in the affairs of state, and they should send out Musalmān women from their houses; and should shorten the arm of oppression. Mēdinī Rāy owing to the exigencies of the time accepted the conditions; and tried hard to please the Sultān. But 4 Sālbāhan, who was the vazīr, refused to obey, and refused to give up his wicked acts and evil practices.

1 One MS. has محذف while the other and the lith. ed. have مخفف.
2 Both MSS. have بعد, but the lith. ed. has بعد.
3 The same conditions are mentioned by Fīrishtāh, lith. ed., but the word ملك is inserted after ملك in it. Col. Briggs mentions them also with some variations. The Cambridge History of India (p. 368) mentions only one condition, viz., that about the keeping of Muslim women by Rājpūts as concubines, which it describes as the greatest offence in the eyes of the Musalmān.
4 The correct transliteration of the name as in the text is Sālbāhan; but the correct transliteration of the Sanskrit name is Sālibāhana. Col. Briggs transliterates the name as Salb'han, but in a note has Salvavanh. The Cambridge History of India, page 368, has Sālibāhan. In the text-edition it reads .
Sultān Maḥmūd with great bravery, in spite of the fact that he had not more than two hundred Musalmāns in his service, determined in consultation with some of his special adherents, that when he should return from hunting, and Mādīnī Rāy and Sālbāhan should receive permission to go to their houses, they (i.e., those adherents) should, at the time of their returning, cut them to pieces. The next day he went out hunting, leaving the men, who had been chosen for the work, at their places. Returning from the hunting, he went into his private chamber and gave permission to Mādīnī Rāy and Sālbāhan to go home. At this time those men came out of ambush, and wounded Mādīnī Rāy and Sālbāhan. The last named was killed on the spot; but as Mādīnī Rāy’s wounds were not fatal, he was carried to his house. The Rājpūts on hearing this news, prepared themselves and collected in Mādīnī Rāy’s house with the object of causing an injury to Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter, on hearing this, with very great bravery and courage came out of the palace with only 16 Musalmān horsemen and a few foot soldiers in order, so to say, to suffer martyrdom; and prepared to fight. Some thousands of Rājpūts came forward and commenced an attack. One of the Pūrābīya Rājpūts, who was noted for his bravery, placed his foot firmly on the battlefield, and threw a weapon at the Sultān. The latter carried it and cut the assailant asunder. Another Rājpūt threw his javelin at the Sultān. The latter caught it on his sword; and cut him into two from his

1 Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally with the text, as to the attack on Mādīnī Rāy and Sālbāhan, the subsequent attack by the Rājpūts on the palace, and the Sultān’s great bravery in repelling it. It appears, however, that the first attack on the palace was made without consulting or asking the permission of Mādīnī Rāy. They also say that although the Sultān was deficient in intelligence, he had no equal in bravery; and also that when the Rājpūts asked for Mādīnī Rāy’s permission to make a second attack, (Col. Briggs says, they asked him to head it) he told them to desist from it. The Cambridge History of India, page 368, says, that the Rājpūts “were defeated, chiefly owing to their fear of provoking the intervention of Muzaffar II of Gujerāt.” This is certainly not correct. The Rājpūts were defeated in a fair fight, although the odds were very much in their favour. They were, however, forbidden by Mādīnī Rāy from making a second attack, for fear chiefly of provoking the intervention of Sultān Muṣaffar of Gujerāt, which is very different.
waist. The Rājpūts on seeing this fled, and collected together, and wanted to advance in a great crowd to slay the Sultān.

When Mēdīnī Rāy became acquainted with this resolution, he said, "Māhmūd Shāh is my benefactor, if his men wounded me by his order, what business is it of yours? If the shadow of his greatness be not over our head, Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī would completely destroy us." The Rājpūts went back to their houses at the word of Mēdīnī Rāy, and the tumult subsided. That night Mēdīnī Rāy sent a humble message to the Sultān saying, "As during the whole of my life I have never done anything but wish for your welfare, and act faithfully to my salt, I have carried my life in safety from the wounds. If in reality, the affairs of the kingdom can be better regulated by my being put to death, I have no objection even to that." Māhmūd Shāh said, "I have arrived at the conclusion, that Mēdīnī Rāy is a loyal servant of mine. Owing to his great devotion to me, he kept the infuriated Rājpūts back yesterday from creating disorder and disturbance. I shall heal his wounded heart with the ointment of favour and graciousness."

After some days, when ¹ Mēdīnī Rāy's wounds had healed, he came with five hundred armed horsemen to make his salām; and thenceforward he came every day in the same way to make his salām. Māhmūd Shāh, on account of his great courage and bravery, treated him in the same way as before, and reassuring him sent him to the office, so that he might attend to the affairs of state. When a considerable time elapsed with the Sultān acting with gentleness and courtesy; and he saw that there was nothing left to him of rule except the name, he in the months of the year 920 A.H., came out of the fort of Mandū on the pretext of going out hunting. He took with him ² Rānī Kaniyā, who was the most beloved of his harem, ³ and the large body

---

¹ There are variations in the readings. One MS. has زخم أو منديل كردي the other has ميديني رأى in place of زخم أو. The lith. ed. has a different reading زخم أو منديل تبديل بصنع كردي. In the text-edition it is زخم أو منديل

² The name is written in the MSS. as راني كبارا رانی کنیا and in the lith. ed. See, however, note 2, page 302, from which it appears that she was called Rānī Kanākrā in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari.

³ The sentence is left incomplete in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. In the corresponding passage, Firishtah has به بانه شکار راجپوتانرا بردو بسار فرموده.
of Rājpūts, who used always to accompany him as his guard and always went about surrounding him. The Sulṭān said in private to the superintendent of the stables, who was an old servant of his, "I shall go out hunting tomorrow; and I shall make the Rājpūts run so much in pursuit of the game, that when they would arrive in the camp they would have no sense or power of movement left. When midnight should have passed, you should make \(^1\) three very swift horses ready outside the camp; and should inform me." On the following day he went out hunting and when the evening came, and the Rājpūts went to sleep owing to much fatigue, the superintendent of the stables, in accordance with the orders, brought out three specially selected horses and informed him. Māhmūd Shāh relying on the Divine aid and help went up to the horses, and all three of them turned to the open country, which was quite unknown to them. \(^2\) After traversing many stages and passing many places, when they arrived in the town of Dahūd, which was on the boundary line of Gujrāt, Qaisar Khān, the thanadār of Sulṭān Muẓaffar Güjrātī, carried out the customs of welcoming him, and performed the rites of hospitality. He presented pavilions and all necessary articles; and wrote a report to Sulṭān Muẓaffar; and made him acquainted with the fact of Sulṭān Māhmūd's arrival. When the news reached Sulṭān Muẓaffar at Chāmpānīr, he carried out the customs of offering thanks to God; and he sent Qaisar Khān and Tāj Khān and Qawām-ul-mulk and other great amirs to welcome Sulṭān Māhmūd. He also sent 'Irāqī horses and some elephants and articles of the tōshakkhāna (ward-robe), red curtains, articles of farāshkhhāna and other equipages which are required by Sulṭāns. He himself advanced some stages to welcome the guests. Afterwards when the conjunction of the \(^3\) two beneficent planets and the meeting

---

\(^1\) One MS. has س مرسسي, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. omit the word مرس.

\(^2\) For another account of the flight of Sulṭān Māhmūd, and of his reception by Sulṭān Muẓaffar, and the subsequent events, see the section about Gujrāt, page 302 onwards.

\(^3\) Jupiter مشر، and Venus زهرة, \(i.e.,\) here the two Sulṭāns.
of the two luminaries took place in one majlis and on one throne, Sultān Muẓaffar observing the customs of generosity and the rites of liberality made wise inquiries and presenting royal gifts placed (soothing) ointment on his wounded (spirit).

After some days, 1 Sultān Muẓaffar advanced into the country of Mālwa with a well-equipped army; and when he arrived near Dhār, Rāy Pithōrā strengthened the fort of Mandū, and busied himself with measures of guarding it. Mēdīnī Rāy and Silhādī went to Chitōr with some thousands of Rājpūta, and sought the protection of Rānā Sānkā. Sultān Muẓaffar besieged the fort of Mandū, and distributed the batteries. After some days Rāy Pithōrā approached him with humility, and after asking for safety prayed for fourteen parganas for his own jāqir. Sultān Muẓaffar in his great kindness granted his prayer. On the following day Pithōrā again sent a message saying, “As we have committed many evil deeds, and fear and alarm have come upon us, if you would retire with your army for a distance of three karōhs, we would take hold of the hands of our wives and children, come down from the fort, and surrender it to anyone whom you may order.” Sultān Muẓaffar accepted the prayer of that deceitful band, and took up a position three karōhs behind his former station. Then it became clear, that Rāy Pithōrā was merely wasting time, and waiting for the arrival of 2 Mēdīnī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā.

The Sultān then, acting with hostility and violence, returned (to his former camp); and surrounded the fort like the centre of a circle. At this time news was brought that Mēdīnī Rāy and Silhādī had given large sums to Rānā Sānkā, and promising him more were bringing him with all the zamindārs of the neighbourhood to aid and reinforce them, and they had arrived near the city of Ujjain. Sultān Muẓaffar sent Āzām Humāyūn ʻĀdil Khān, the ruler of Astr and Burhānpūr, who was his nephew (sister’s son) and son-in-law, and Fath Khān and Qawām-ul-mulk to chastise and punish Mēdīnī Rāy

---

1 Niẓām-ud-dīn does not say what Mēdīnī Rāy did to meet Sultān Muẓaffar, Firasṭah and Col. Briggs do so in some detail. For another account of the siege and capture of Mandū as given in the history of Sultān Muẓaffar in the section of the Ṭabaqāt about Gujrāt, see pages 303, 304.

2 In the text-edition it is Rānā Sānkā instead of Mēdīnī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā.
and Rānā Sānkā; and devoted his energy to the capture of Mandū fort. It so happened that a man came and represented, “The hill (on which) the fort is built can be climbed by an easy path, and Rāy Pīthōrā has got only a small number of men there. As tomorrow is the day of the Holi festival, the Rājpūts will be occupied in their houses with play and amusement. If on that day you return to your camp, after fighting at the other batteries, and after that send a detachment by that path and keep another detachment ready to help and reinforce it, it is possible that the fort would come into your possession.”

Sultān Mużaffar liked his advice, and strengthened him with promises of favour and reward. On the 13th Šafar in the year 924 A.H., 1529 A.D., the soldiers of the Gujrat army commenced to fight from the different directions, and made many brave assaults. The Rājpūts also exerted themselves almost beyond their power. The Gujrat army beat the drum of retiring just before the afternoon, and returned to their batteries. The Rājpūt sardārs as they had made very great exertions, and as it was the day of the Holi, left a few men in the bastions and rested in their houses. When half the night had passed, Tāj Khān and ‘Imād-ul-mulk with a body of great warriors commenced to climb the hill along the agreed path, with that guide in front of them. Tāj Khān also ascended it by another path. ‘Imād-ul-mulk, on arriving near the rampart, found that the Rājpūts were asleep, and had no knowledge of the coming of the enemy. Immediately his men made a ladder of farangī lances, which enabled a body of them to climb to the top of the rampart. When these men saw, that the sleep of death had overpowered the Rājpūts, they very silently put their feet on the ground and opened the gate. When the gate was being opened, the Rājpūts came to the place. The warriors who were outside the gate made an onset and got inside the fort and cut some of the Rājpūts into pieces; and those who escaped the sword fled.

---

1 Firishtah does not give the date, but simply says in the beginning of the year 924 A.H. The date is not given in the section of the Cambridge History of India about Mālwa, but is given as “February 23rd, 1518, the day of the Hindu festival of the Holt”, in the section about Gujarāt (p. 319).

2 Both the MSS. have ذنمی فرنگی, i.e., of French or European lances. I have not been able to find out what these special lances or spears were like.
When this news reached Rāy Pithōrā, he sent Shādi Khān Pūrabiya with five hundred Rājpūts, in advance of himself, to put down ‘Imād-ul-mulk. He himself followed Shādi Khān with some thousands of Rājpūts. The Gujrāt warriors coming within bow-shot pierced the men who were coming along in front of Shādi Khān with their arrows; and they on receiving those life-scorching wounds fled like wounded pigs. About this time Sulṭān Muẓaffar Gujrāti entered the fort by the same route. When the eyes of the garrison fell on Sulṭān Muẓaffar’s standard, they returned to their houses and performed jauhar. (This is) a practice of the Rājpūts, that in times of discomfort and distress, they set fire to their houses, and put their wives and children to death, and burn themselves. They call this practice jauhar. Hosts and crowds of Gujrāti warriors entered the houses and residences and committed a general massacre. It has been correctly ascertained, that during that night and a part of the following day nineteen thousand Rājpūts were slain; and so much booty and so many prisoners fell into the hands of the army of Gujrāt, that the 1 accountant of the age confessed his weakness and failure in computing them.

When with the strength of Divine help, the victory was attained; and the Rājpūts, who had been unfaithful to their salt, had received their reward, Sulṭān Maḥmūd came, and offering his congratulations, asked quickly, “What does the lord of the world order me?” Sulṭān Muẓaffar, in his 2 greatness said, “May the rule of Mālwa be of good omen to you.” He left Sulṭān Maḥmūd in the fort of Shādīābad, and returned immediately to his camp. On the following day he raised the standard of departure from that station towards Ujjain with the object of punishing Rānā Sāṅkā. When he arrived at the fort of Dhār, they brought him the news, that Ādil Khān and the amirs had not yet gone beyond the town of Dībālpūr Banhariya, when Rānā Sāṅkā, on hearing the capture of the fort, had fled and gone to his own country; and had traversed a distance of twenty-seven karōhs, taking Mēdīnī Rāy and Silhadī with him. Sulṭān Muẓaffar, on hearing this news, carried out the practice of praising, and offering

1 A figurative way of saying that the booty and prisoners were beyond computation. One MS. has by mistake روز instead of پژکار.
2 One MS. has by mistake بنگکی instead of پژکی.
thanks to God; and summoned 'Ādil Khān and the amīrs. Sultān Maḥmūd waited on Sultān Muẓaffar at this station, and submitted; “If your Majesty would go to the fort of Shāḏībād, and would exalt me by remaining there for one day:

Couplet;

On that side, your greatness would suffer no less,
On this side it would give me nobility great.”

Sultān Muẓaffar left his camp at Dhār, and went himself to the fort of Shāḏībād. Sultān Maḥmūd carried out all the duties of hospitality, and offered suitable tribute. After the majlis and the entertainments were over, Sultān Muẓaffar went over the buildings and the gardens and then went back to his camp. From there, accompanied by victory and triumph, he started on his journey to Gujrāt.

Sultān Maḥmūd, on account of his great affection and devotion, 1 attended on him for some stages. Sultān Muẓaffar then bade him farewell, and left Āṣaf Khān Gujrāṭī with some thousand horsemen to help and reinforce him; and 2 asked to be excused. Sultān Maḥmūd taking up his abode in the fort of Shāḏībād, in concert with Āṣaf Khān, sent letters of encouragement and favour to the amīrs, sardārs and his own soldiers and summoned them. The amīrs and his own servants came to Māndū from the various places where they resided with happy and joyful steps; and when his army assembled round him, he, with the advice and concurrence of Āṣaf Khān, advanced to attack 3 Hēmkaran, who had fortified himself in the fort of Kākrūn, on behalf of Mēdinī Rāy. On becoming aware of

---

1 The words in one MS. are مبايعت همزاء رفات. In the other MS. a word which looks like مشابهات is written in place of مبايعت; the word is clearly مشابهات in the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Fīrishtah. مشابهات means willing, wishing, desiring. I consider مبايعت the best reading, and have adopted it. In the text-edition مشابهات has been adopted.

2 The words are مذر خواست in the MSS., and بدر خواست in the lith. ed. There are no corresponding words in the lith. ed. of Fīrishtah. I do not know what reason there was for Sultān Muẓaffar for asking to be excused. I suppose it was a mere matter of courtesy.

3 He was called Bhīm Karan in the Gujrāt section of the Ṭabaqāt, vide page 307 and note 1 on the same page. M. Hidayat Ḥossain has بيمكرن in the text-edition.
this, Mêdimi Rây said to Rânâ Sânkâ, "All that I have, is in the fort of Kâkrûn. I came to you, praying for your help, with the object that you would deliver over the country of Mâlwa to me, after thoroughly purifying it. But now things have come to this pass, that they are taking away from me whatever I have." The daring and boorishness of Rânâ Sânkâ having come into motion, he came out of the fort of Chitôr with some thousands of blood-thirsty Râjpûts, and advanced towards Kâkrûn. When this news reached Sultân Maîmûd, he owing to his great courage and bravery, abandoned the path of prudence and caution, and raising the siege of Kâkrûn, advanced to meet Rânâ Sânkâ in battle. He marched most of the days, and it so happened that on the day on which the battle was to take place, he had traversed a very long distance, and had halted at a distance of seven karôhs from Rânâ Sânkâ. When this news reached the latter, he sent for his amîrs, and said, "It is best that we should attack the enemy at this very moment, for they have come a long way and have no strength to move or exert themselves. If we advance fast and quickly, they will have no time to array their troops; and our work would be done with ease." All the Râys and Râjpûts praised and attested to the correctness of this declaration; and they mounted and advanced with their troops in good order.

When they arrived near Sultân Maîmûd's camp, 4 the troops of the latter came one by one or two by two (i.e., in very small bands) into the battle, in the way which Rânâ Sânkâ had predicted; and were immediately made martyrs. Because they fought without being properly marshalled, thirty-two sardârs among the old and

---

1 One MS. has كار بحاجي رسوده while the other has كار بحاجي رسوده. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. which is كار بحاجي رسوده.

2 The words in the MSS. are جمعت و جاهليت. The words in the lith. ed. are جمعت. These are obviously incorrect.

3 Both MSS. have نوج راست كردن. I have adopted this, though the lith. ed. is equally good, if not better.

4 Firsihtah lith. ed. says, that Agaf Kân and the other amîrs said, that they should not engage the enemy that day, but Sultân Maîmûd Kbalî, i.e., who was destitute of intelligence, did not accept their advice.
trusted men became martyrs; and of the Gujrat army, 1 Aṣaf Khan and five hundred horsemen drank the sharbat of martyrdom; and a great defeat fell on Sultan Mahmud's army. The latter, however, who was extremely brave and courageous, stood in the field of chivalry with two or three horsemen; and when the Rajput troops advanced against him, he galloped on his gray horse, which was as swift as the wind and the lightning; and dived into the Rajput army, which was like a sea of swords and spears. He received a hundred and more wounds on his armour; and as he wore two suits of armour, fifty of those wounds passed through the inner armour and reached his body. In spite of his having received so many wounds, he did not turn his face from the enemy. When he fell off the back of his horse on the ground 2 the Rajputs recognised him, and carried him to Rana Sankà. Every one of them poured forth their praises and eulogies; and offered to sacrifice themselves in his honour. Rana Sankà stood before him, with his arms crossed on his breast, and carried out the duties of service and attendance, and arranged for the treatment of his wounds. When the Sultan regained his health, Rana 3 Sankà prayed that he should be exalted by the Sultan by bestowing his crown on him. Sultan Mahmud made over the crown, decorated with pearls and other precious stones (Yawāqīt, which means both rubies and sapphires). 4 Rana Sankà then sent ten thousand Rajput horsemen with him, and sent him to Mandû; and himself went back to Chitor.

1 It may be noted that in the section about Gujrat, it was the son of Aṣaf Khan, and not Aṣaf Khan himself who was said to have been slain, vide page 307. In the corresponding passage here, Firishtah agrees with the Tabaqat that Aṣaf Khan with five hundred Gujratí horsemen was slain, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 283) says, as in the Guzerat section, that "Aṣaf Khan's son and almost the whole of the Guzeratties were killed."

2 Firishtah also says that the Rajputs recognised him, but one would have thought that, as he had fought with such bravery he would be the cynosure of all eyes, and there would be no necessity or difficulty for recognising him.

3 This appears to be a rather extraordinary prayer, but Firishtah says that as on the day of the battle, all Sultan Mahmud's baggage had fallen into the hands of Rana Sankà and of the Rajputs, and they did not find Sultan Hushang's among the other articles, he asked for it, and Sultan Mahmud got it and gave it to him. The Cambridge History of India, page 369, says the Rana compelled Mahmud "to surrender all his crown jewels."

4 Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. say that Sultan Mahmud was sent to Mandû with an escort of ten thousand horsemen; but Firishtah lith. ed. and
It will not remain concealed from the minds of intelligent men, that Râna Sânkâ’s act was on a higher level than that of Sultân Muzaffar. The latter gave help to one who had sought shelter with him; but Râna Sânkâ having captured an enemy in battle gave him back his kingdom. No act similar to this wonderful one is known up to the present day. In short, on hearing this news, Sultân Muzaffar sent a large force to reinforce Sultân Maḥmûd; and sending an affectionate letter applied ointment to the wounds of his heart; and showed great kindness towards him. The Gujrât troops remained in Mâlwa for a long time; but after the rule of Sultân Maḥmûd had acquired a certain amount of strength, the latter sent a letter to Sultân Muzaffar, in which he renewed his protestations of gratitude; and prayed that, as his government had assumed a desirable aspect, Sultân Muzaffar should recall his troops. The latter did so; but after the departure of the Gujrât army, Sultân Maḥmûd’s weakness became evident and patent. He was bereft of nearly the whole of his territory. Râna Sânkâ seized a portion with violence and tyranny; and Silhâdi Pûrâbiya brought the country from the boundary of Sârângpûr as far as Bhilsâ and Râlsin under his control, and became independent. Sikandar Khân was in possession in the neighbourhood of Satwâs and its dependencies. So that of the kingdom of Mâlwa only a tenth part remained in the possession of Sultân Maḥmûd; and he remained with

Col. Briggs reduce the number of the escort to one thousand horsemen; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 263, footnote) says (without giving any authority for making this statement), that Sooltan Mahmood was conveyed in the first instance to Chittoor, where the place of his confinement is still shown; but he was released on recovery from his wounds. In the same note Col. Briggs contrasts the chivalrous conduct of Hindoo princes, “in their behaviour to Mahomedans in general, with the sordid, cruel, and bigotted conduct of the latter” to the Hindoos. This is correct; but I do not know whether the story of Sultân Maḥmûd being taken to Chitôr, like the other story of Râna Kûnbhâ’s defeating Maḥmûd of Gujrât and Maḥmûd of Mâlwa, and keeping the latter as a prisoner at Chitôr, has any foundation in fact.

1 Nişâm-ud-dîn shows himself superior to all communal prejudice by the eulogy on Râna Sânkâ’s conduct; but it appears to me that the latter rather marred his proceedings by demanding the surrender of the Mâlwa Crown Jewels.

2 The name is written سواس and مواس in the MSS., and مواس in the lith. ed.; but we have already found that the jâqir of Sikandar Khân was Satwâs.
twenty thousand horsemen in Jāwar. Although Rānā Sāṅkā possessed the power of taking possession of the entire country of Mālwa, still having the fear of Sultān Muẓaffar before his eyes he restrained himself, (kashidah 'inān būd, which may literally be translated as: he kept a tight hold on his bridle).

It so happened that at this time, when Sultān Muẓaffar passed away, and the enemies (of Sultān Maḥmūd) acquired power and strength, the violence of Silhādi extended beyond all measure. So in the year 926 A.H. (1519 A.D.), Sultān Maḥmūd having collected an army, advanced towards the country of Bhilā. Silhādi marched to the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, and fought with him. Sultān Maḥmūd’s army was routed, but he himself stood firmly in the field of bravery with twenty horsemen; and coming within bow-shot fought with the greatest courage and boldness till some of the renowned warriors in Silhādi’s army fell on the dust of destruction at his hands; and things came to such a pass that Silhādi escaped by flight. Sultān Maḥmūd pursued him for a part of the way, and separating (seizing) twenty-four elephants returned to Mandū. After that Silhādi came forward in a spirit of submission and friendliness, expressed his contrition, and sending some beautiful things and presents in the way of a tribute, asked for pardon for his past conduct.

And during the year 932 A.H., 1525 A.D., Sultān Muẓaffar accepted the summons of the just God, and the business of the

---

1 The name is Jāwar in the MSS., and Khāwar in the lith. ed. I have not found it mentioned anywhere else. The Cambridge History of India, page 368, says that Maḥmūd’s authority now extended only to the neighbourhood of the capital. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has لشكر يا لشكری in the text-edition.

2 One MS. has لشكر instead of لشكر.

3 Firsiṭḥā’ī and Col. Brigg’s (vol. IV., p. 264) accounts agree generally with the text; but they say that Sultān Maḥmūd rallied the few men who were with him, when Silhādi’s troops were engaged in plundering, and after defeating the latter pursued them to Sārangpūr, and took possession of it, together with twenty-four elephants. Silhādi made no attempt to recover Sārangpūr and remained content with Bhilā and Rāṣīn.

4 The word is written استعفاف in the MS., and استعفاف in the lith. ed. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. In the text-edition it is استعفاف.
government devolved on Sultân Bahâdur. 1 Chând Kâhân, son of Sultân Mużaffar came to Sultân Maḥmûd; and the latter, as he was bound by ties of gratitude to Sultân Mużaffar, showed the greatest respect to Chând Kâhân, and left no minutiae of friendliness and generosity unobserved. Raḍî-ul-mulk, who was one of the trusted amîrs of Sultân Mużaffar, fled from Gujrât, and waited on His Majesty Firdûs Makâni 2 Bâbar Bâdshâh; and devoted all his energies to the object, that the rule of Gujrât might be transferred to Chând Kâhân; and in order to carry out this purpose, he came from Âgra to Mandû; and after consulting with Chând Kâhân went back to Âgra. When this news reached Sultân Bahâdur, 3 he sent a letter to Sultân Maḥmûd, to the effect that it appeared strange that the ungrateful wretch, considering the affection and devotion, (which he owes to me), should desert me; and going to Chând Kâhân should endeavour to create a disturbance. After some time Raḍî-ul-mulk again went to Mandû and then returned to Âgra. On this occasion Sultân Bahâdur did not send any message at all, but prepared to chastise Sultân Maḥmûd.

As it had become clear to everybody that Sultân Maḥmûd would get no help or reinforcement from Gujrât, and did not himself possess such a force that he would be able to meet an enemy with strength and power, Ratan Sên, son of Rânâ Sânkâ advanced into Mâlwa with great force. It happened also that at this time Sultân Bahâdur arrived near the boundary of Mâlwa with the object of punishing some of his refractory subjects, and chastising those disturbers of peace. Sultân Maḥmûd, in his perplexity and distress, summoned Mu'în Kâhân, son of Sikandar Kân, from Satwâs, and Silhadi to his aid. When they waited on him, he conferred the title of Muşnad 'Alî on Mu'în Kâhân.

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, page 369, describes Sultân Maḥmûd's conduct as characterised by incomprehensible folly and ingratitude. I cannot agree to the charge of ingratitude. He had reasons to be grateful to Sultân Mużaffar, but he could not refuse to give an asylum to Chând Kâhân without being accused of ingratitude. He should, however, have accepted Sultân Bahâdur's accession, and should not have allowed Raḍî-ul-mulk to come to Mandû and intrigue against Sultân Bahâdur; but by all accounts he was as weak mentally as he was brave in battle.

2 One MS. has by mistake Humâyûn Bâdshâh.

3 There are various slight differences in the readings, and the meaning is not quite clear; but the reading and the translation I have adopted appear to be correct.
and bestowed on him a red pavilion, which is specially reserved for a Bâdshâh. He also gave some parganas to Silhâdi, and tried to please him. Mu‘în Khân, who was really the son of an oil-seller but whom Sikandar Khân had adopted as a son, fled from Sultân Mahmûd, and joined Sultân Bahâdur in the village of Sanbal; and made the complaint of his benefactor, a choice subject of talk in the majlis.

When this news reached Sultân Mahmûd, he sent Daryâ Khân to wait on Sultân Bahâdur, with the following message, "The rights of nurture of your dynasty are incumbent on me; and as the distance between us has become less, I wish to appear in your presence, and offer my congratulations on your accession." His emissary disclosed by winks and gestures, that his master was abashed and ashamed, owing to his having given an asylum to Chand Khân; and had not the hardihood to come. Sultân Bahâdur comforted him, and said, "I have no sorrow about Chand Khân; and will not trouble your master about making him over to me." He started from that place, and by successive marches arrived and encamped on the bank of the river Karkhi. After five days Ratan Sën, son of Râna Sânkâ, and Silhâdi Pûrâbiya waited on Sultân Bahâdur at this station; and both of them made complaints about Sultân Mahmûd. Ratan Sën received permission from the same place; and went to Chitôr. Sultân Bahâdur then marched from there and encamped in the village of Sanbal; and waited for the arrival of Sultân Mahmûd; but as the latter had come to know that repeated complaints had been made about him to Sultân Bahâdur, he marched from Ujjain towards Satwâs, on the pretext of chastising the servants of Sikandar Khân.

It so happened that while hunting he one day fell off his horse, and his right arm was broken and being now disabled and powerless he returned to the fort of Mandû; and commenced making preparation for defending it. Sultân Bahâdur then by successive marches advanced towards Mandû. At every station servants of Sultân Mahmûd

---

1 The actual words are تحمف مجلس كرمانيد.
2 Firištah lith. ed. also has Karkhi. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 267) has Gurchy, and says in a footnote "this is certainly a mistake."
3 The MSS., which have some lines before this, have here, by mistake, in the text-edition.
separated from the latter and entered his service. In the town of Dhār, Sharzah Khān, who was a great sardār, also came and joined him, and when he arrived at the town of Na'lcha, he besieged the fort and distributed the batteries, and himself took up his residence in Muḥammadpur. Sūltān Maḥmūd fortified himself in the fort of Mandū with three thousand men, and every night he went over to inspect all the bastions, and then took his rest in the college of Sūltān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn. But when he came to know that the men in the fort were hostile to him, and had obtained promises from Sūltān Bahādur, he moved from the college and came to his palace. He then arranged things for a festive gathering, and occupied himself with play and pleasure. When his well-wishers spoke to him about this, and inquired whether it was the time for pleasure and enjoyment, he said, "As these are my last breaths, I wish that they should pass with joy and in the fulfilment of desires."

On the 9th of Sha'bān in 3 the year 937 A.H. (May 25th, 1528), at the time of the true dawn, the standards of state of Bahādur Shāh arose above the horizon of the fort of Mandū. At the same moment Chānd Khān, son of Sūltān Muẓaffar, descended from the fort, and took the path of flight. Sūltān Maḥmūd armed himself, and with a small body of followers met Sūltān Bahādur; but finding that he had not the power to withstand him, and considering that the slaughter of the inmates of his harem should precede his own death, advanced towards the palace with about a thousand horsemen. His men leaving their horses (outside), entered the palaces; but Sūltān Bahādur's troops had (already) surrounded them. Sūltān Bahādur sent a message to the

1 The readings in the MSS. appear to be انفاس باریسین اقبالش بارهلش و انفاس با سهی. None of these appear to be correct. The reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah انفاس و اپسین is correct and I have adopted it.

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have طرب و شوق. Firishtah lith. ed. has the more commonplace عیش و عشرف.

3 See note 5, page 353, as to the day. The date according to the Christian era is given by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 268) as May 20th, 1526 A.D.; but March 17th, 1531, is the date in the Cambridge History of India, page 369, of the capture of Mandū by Bahādur Shāh.

4 One MS. has by mistake مصرم instead of مارد. The other MS. has شد.

5 One MS. has by mistake خود instead of گوایید. The other MS. has گوایید.
effect that there was protection and safety for Sultan Mahmud and the inmates of his harem, and his amirs; and no one would interfere with anybody’s honour or property. Some of the men, who were specially near to Sultan Mahmud, kept him back from killing the members of his family; and told him, that the Bidadar of Gujrat although he might be bad to him, his badness would be better than the goodness of others. (They also said), that there was a strong belief, that when he would go and meet Bahadar Shahi, the latter would again entrust the rule of the country to him. While this was going on, Sultan Bahadar had entered the palace of Sultan Mahmud and had taken up a position with his amirs on the terrace of La’l Mahal; and sent a man to summon Sultan Mahmud. The latter left his sardars in the palace and himself came to Sultan Bahadar with only seven of his sardars.

The Sultan, (that is Sultan Bahadar) showed him every respect and honour, and they embraced each other. After sitting down, Sultan Mahmud used a little harsh language; and after that the two Sultans remained silent till the end of the meeting. But it is narrated, that the effects of a change in Sultan Bahadar’s disposition made its appearance. The words which were used in that majlis were these, “I have given an assurance of safety to the Mahmud Shahi amirs. Let them go and settle down in their residences; to

1 One MS. has عمال غائب, the other has no corresponding word; while the lith.
ed. has مععل.

2 One MS. leaves out Sultan Mahmud, and the lith. ed. Maumud.

3 One MS. has by mistake a mistake; and then adds also that he.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. has instead of آدم, صلاخان ميمود بادر آدم.

5 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 268) says, “Bahadur Shah was disposed to treat him kindly, and even to restore to him his government; but the irritability of Sooltan Mahmood’s temper and his pride combined hurried him away so far, that he abused Bahadur Shah grossly to his face.” The Cambridge History of India is silent about the interview between the two Sultans in both the sections about Gujrat and Malwa.

6 One MS. omits by mistake the words from.
everyone who is in the harem of the Sultān, I have given assurance of
safety." He then ordered the ushers and heralds to drive the people
out of the palace; and after a moment, he left Āsaf Khān, with one
hundred silāhdars (troopers) to guard Sultān Maḥmūd; and himself
went inside the palace. On the next day, which was the 10th Sha'bān,
Sultān Bahādūr also gave the seven men, who had come with Sultān
Maḥmūd, assurances of safety; and gave them permission to go away.
On Friday the 12th Shaʿbān, the public prayers were read in the name
of Sultān Bahādūr from the pulpits of the capital city of Shāḏībād.
On the night of Saturday chains were put on Sultān Maḥmūd’s feet;
and he and his seven sons, the eldest of whom had the title of Sultān
Qhiyāṭ-ud-dīn, were made over to Āsaf Khān, and Iqṭāb Khān so that
they might be taken to the fort of Chāmpānīr, and kept there in
imprisonment.

On the night of the Shab-i-barāt (the night consecrated to the
memory of forefathers), which was the 14th of 1 Sha’bān, Rāy Singh,
the headman of the 2 Māls made a night attack on the camp of Āsaf
Khān and Iqṭāb Khān, with 3 two thousand Bhils and Kolis. Sultān
Maḥmūd had at that very moment finished the prayers of the Laylat-
ul-barāt (same as Shab-i-barāt), and placed his head on the pillow,
when the noise and tumult commenced. When he woke up, he cut
the chains on his feet. At this time, the guards made a martyr of
him, as they were afraid that he might escape; and disturbances
might again appear in the country.

Couplet:

What 5 a dog’s trick it is, of the evil doing sky,
That it makes the tigers the prey of dogs.

1 One MS. omits چہاردهم شعبان.
2 Both MSS. have مالبا. The lith. ed. has بانیها. Neither Firishtah nor
Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the name. The Māls
is a local name of the hilly country. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has مالیہ باد
Mahlāshbād in the text-edition.
3 One MS. has ۵۵ thousand.
4 The MSS. have incorrect readings. One has در ملکت پیدا ایم and the
other has ملکت برہد. In the text-edition it is to ملکت پیدا ایم.
5 One MS. has the correct reading یاری سک سک باری، the other has یاری
بازی سک while the lith. ed. has باری یادی.
THE SULTANS OF MALWA

On the morning following that night Asaf Khan and Iqbal Khan made preparations for putting him in a shroud and burying him; and buried him on the bank of the reservoir of Dahud. His seven sons were kept in imprisonment in Champanir.

The period of his reign was twenty years and six months and eleven days.

2 AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF SULTAN BAHADUR.

After the death of Sultan Muzaффar, the country of Malwa came into the possession of Sultan Bahadur; and most of the amirs of Sultan Muzaффar came to him. As Silhadi Purabiya had entered the service before all the other amirs, sarkars of Ujjain and Sarangpur and the fort of Rasain were allotted to him as his jagir. After the rains, the Sultan went to see Burhanpur. Bhupat the son of Silhadi was with him. As signs of turbulence and recusancy became apparent from the circumstances of Silhadi, the Sultan at the time of his return sent Amin Na sĩr to bring Silhadi to him, and he (Silhadi) passed the time by various tricks of delay; till in the town of Dhar he was seized by the talons of fate, as has been written in the section about Gujrat. Sultan Bahadur advanced towards Ujjain, in order to chastise

---

1 Both MSS. omit.

2 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS., but one of the MSS. adds the word Gujrat after Sultan Bahadur. The lith. ed. omits the word حكومت.

3 One MS. omits.

4 He is called in both MSS. in this place; but about the various names by which he was called, and the result of his mission to summon Silhadi, see page 356 and note 2 on the same page, in the section about Gujrat.

5 The readings are somewhat different, and the meaning is not quite clear. One MS. has در قصبه دهار بحسن قضا كنفرنار شرد. The other has the same reading but the word بحسن is written as بحسن. The lith. ed. has HAR instead of Dhahr, which is of course incorrect; but otherwise agrees with the reading in the second MS. The corresponding passage in Firsihtah is perhaps somewhat better. Silhadi was not killed at this time. It cannot therefore be said, that he was seized by the talons of destiny or fate. He certainly incurred the wrath of Sultan Bahadur; but جنگ فصب or the battle of wrath has hardly any meaning. جنگ فصب or talons of wrath is certainly better.
all the Pürabiyas. Silhadi's son fled from Ujjain; and went to Chitōr. Sultān Bahādur bestowed Ujjain on 1 Daryā Khān Mandōwāli; and advanced to Rāisin. On the way he left Ḥabib Khān at Āshīr; and Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, at Sārangpūr; and went and besieged the fort of Rāisin. When the period of the siege was protracted, and unknown images appeared on the pages of the world, Silhadi of evil destiny, after he had become a Musalmān performed jauhar, and met his death. This matter has been narrated in detail in the accounts of Sultān Bahādur in the section about Gujrāt. Sultān Bahādur, having entrusted Rāisin, and the neighbouring districts, to Sultān 'Ālam Kālpīwāl, returned to Gujrāt. He then left Ikhtiyār Khān in charge of the government of the fort of Mandū; and advanced towards Chāmpānīr.

In the year 940 a.h., 1533 a.d., he collected troops, and advanced to conquer Chitōr. 2 After besieging it, he, owing to certain matters, made an amicable settlement, and returned to Ahmadābād. In the year 941 a.h., he again collected troops, and besieged Chitōr. After the conquest of Chitōr, he fled, in the neighbourhood of Mandisōr before His Majesty Jinnat Ashīānī Humāyūn Bādshāh; and retired to Gujrāt, as has been narrated in its place.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF THE DEPUTIES OF HIS MAJESTY JINNAT ĀSHĪĀNĪ, MUḤAMMAD HUMĀYŪN BĀDSHĀH.

When the country of Mālwa, and in fact the country of Gujrāt also came into the possession of the servants of the powerful Chaghtāī government, His Majesty, after the conquest of Gujrāt, left Mīrzā 'Askarī and Yādgār Nāsir Mīrzā in Gujrāt; and himself went to Mandū. After one year 3 Divine jealousy came into operation. The Mīrzās and all the amīrs abandoned Gujrāt without any war having taken place; and went towards Āgra. These events have been mentioned in their own place. His Majesty, Jinnat Āshīānī also, for reasons of

1 Firishtah calls him Daryā Khān Lūdī; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 270) has Budr Khān, having joined the preposition به to در and omitting يا.
2 One MS. leaves out by mistake the words from بعد از معاصرة to به اهداباد سرگشت.
3 The words are دیگر الی Divine jealousy, or probably Divine wrath.
state, left Málwa; and went away to Ægra. For the period of one year the country of Málwa was in the possession of the Chughtáí rulers.

1 An account of Mallú Khán, Qádir Sháh.

When owing to the death of Sultán Bahádur, there was disorder in the country of Gujrát, and the country of Málwa remained without a ruler: at about that time His Majesty Jinnat Āshíífí turned the bridle of departure from Ægra towards the country of Bangála. Mallú Khán, son of Mallú Khán gave himself, in concert with the amírs of Málwa, the title of Qádir Sháh. He brought the country, from the town of Bhilsá to the vicinity of the Narbada river into his possession; and divided it among the old amírs. Bhúpat Ráy and Púran Mal, the sons of Silhádí came back from the territory of Chitáuír, and took possession of the fort of Ráisín, and its neighbourhood. The power and grandeur of Qádir Sháh increased day by day; and the zamindárs of all the surrounding country acknowledged allegiance to him, and sent him tribute every year.

And gradually things came to such a pass, that Shér Khán Afgán, at the time when His Majesty Jinnat Āshíífí was engaged in trying to effect his destruction, sent a farmán to him from Bengal,

---

1 There are slight differences in the headings in the MS. One has ذکر ملول خان قادر شاہ and the other has ذکر قادر شاہ. The heading in the lith. ed. ذکر دلوار سلطان بادر گجراتی ملول قادر شاہ is certainly incorrect.

2 Firishtah, Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India all generally agree about Mallú Khán's rise to power, but Firishtah says زور اورہا بعد یک سال از تصرف اللکھ برادر خرد را سلطان قادر نامید and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 271) also says that "he retook all the country lying between the Nurbudda and the town of Bhilsá after a struggle of twelve months against the Dehly officers"; while the Cambridge History of India, page 369, says, he "reduced to obedience other sief-holders in Málwa." As regards Bhúpat and Púran Mal, Firishtah lith. ed. says, they came out of the fort of Jaipúr, and took possession of the fort of Ráisín and that neighbourhood; and they admitted their allegiance to Qádir Sháh and sent him tributes. Col. Briggs agrees to the latter statement, but says they came marching from Chitáuír. The Cambridge History of India does not say anything about them.

3 Firishtah lith. ed. describes him as Shér Sháh Afgán Súr; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 271) curiously calls him Sheer Shah, Poorby Afgan, King of Bengal.
with his seal affixed to it, to the following purport; "As the Mughals have come into (invaded) the country of Bangāla, 2 I pray that following the path of sincerity, you should either yourself advance towards Agra, or sending an army create a disturbance in the neighbourhood of that city so that the Mughals might return from this country.” Qādir Khān also wrote a reply to the farmān; and sent it, after affixing his seal to it. Šaif Khān Dīhlavī, who was in his service, and always in an unceremonious way told him the truth without mincing matters, represented, “Shēr Khān has so many retainers, and such splendour, that it is permissible for him to affix his seal on the face (of a farmān).” Mallū Qādir Shāh said in reply, “5 How does it matter. The great and holy God has now placed the bridle of the defence of this great country in the grasp of my power. If he does not observe the rules of courtesy, it is not necessary that I should show honour to him.”

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have 2 مهیر بروئی گرد़ which appears to me to be better than either of the other readings.

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have از طریقہ اخلاق مستدعی است which I would translate as “the path of sincerity demands.” In any case the language of the farmān does not, in my opinion, quite justify the statements in the Cambridge History of India, page 370, that the language used by Shēr Khān was “too peremptory for the occasion.” It should be stated however that Firishtah says that Qādir Shāh was angry, but it would appear that this was not on account of the language, but because Shēr Khān had sent a farmān and not a letter. According to Firishtah, Qādir Shāh said to his munshī “do thou also write a farmān and affix the seal to it.” It is difficult to say whether the statement in the Cambridge History of India, that Qādir Shāh “returned an insolent reply” is correct. I do not know what the language of the reply was; but Shēr Shāh was angry, that the reply was in the shape of a farmān. It appears that Šaif Khān Dīhlavī who, was one of Qādir Shāh’s courtiers, objected to the latter’s sending a farmān in reply to Shēr Shāh; but Qādir Shāh thought himself to be in every way Shēr Shāh’s equal. It appears also that communications from superiors and masters were sealed on the top or face of the paper. In this case both farmāns were sealed on the face of the paper, so that both Shēr Shāh and Qādir Shāh arrogated to themselves a superiority over the other.

3 There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have اپنے چہ دخل دارد. I have accepted this and have translated it in the text. The other MS. has اپنے چہ دخل دارد, i.e., what harm is there in this.
When Qâdir Shâh’s farmân came under Shêr Khân’s eyes he removed the impression of the seal from the paper, and preserved it in the scabbard of his dagger; and said, “If the great God so wills, I shall ask him the reason of this rudeness in my presence.”

The country of Mâlwa remained in the possession of Qâdir Shâh, till the time when Shêr Khân, after conquering and acquiring dominion over the country of Hindûstân, advanced to conquer Mâlwa; and when by successive marches, by way of 1 Khîrâr he arrived near Sârangpûr, Saif Khân Dêhlavî who was a 2 servant and courtier of Qâdir Shâh said, “The safest course is this, that as a mighty Bâdshâh has come into the country and the strength to withstand him is lacking, you should go on the wings of speed and on the steps of eagerness, and meet him without giving (previous intimation).” Qâdir Shâh considering this opinion to be right, went rapidly from Ujjain to Sârangpûr, and appeared in Shêr Khân’s darbâr. When the chamberlains informed Shêr Khân of his arrival, he summoned him to his presence, and distinguished him with special favours. He dressed him in a robe of honour; and asked him where he had taken up his quarters. Qâdir Shâh 3 said in reply, “The abode of his slave is the dust of your threshold.” Shêr Khân was pleased with this reply, and bestowed on him a red pavilion and an audience tent, and a special bedstead, and sleeping robe, and articles for the wardrobe. He halted for one day at Sârangpûr, and then advanced towards Ujjain. On the way he gave orders to 4 Shujâ‘at Khân, that he should keep special watch on the dear guest and should give to him from the government (stores) whatever he might require.

1 The name is Khîrâr in one MS. and Khîrâ in the other. It is Kharâr in the lith. ed.

2 Both MSS. omit the and منصوب between and توكر and مصاحب but as it is in the lith. ed., I have retained it.

3 Firishtah does not credit Qâdir Shâh with giving the poetic and polite reply attributed to him by Nîshâm-ud-dîn. According to Firishtah he only said بان جامی, or such and such a place. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 272) says, he had a secret conference with Sheer Shah, which does not appear to be correct.

4 One MS. has Shujâ‘ Khân instead of Shujâ‘at Khân. The same MS. has by mistake از مهمات مرگز خرد خبردار باشد. Shêr Shâh’s language appears to have been ironical.
When he arrived in the district of Ujjain, Shēr Khān gave him as a matter of unconsidered hurry, the sarkār of Lakhnautī in exchange for the country of Mālwa. He also ordered that Qādir Shāh should send his family and dependants to Lakhnautī and should himself remain in attendance on him. Mallū Khān brought his family and children to the city of Ujjain, and took up his residence in a garden which was located between the camp and the city. One day he was going from his residence to wait upon Shēr Khān, when he saw, on the way, that a number of Mughals of Gwāliar were engaged in cutting earth with their spades, and working the earth in properly constructing the bastions of the fort which (Shēr Khān's officers) always built round his camp. Mallū Khān considered in his mind, "If I accompany Shēr Khān, he will of course order me to do similar earth work", and he determined on flight, and was engaged in thinking how he he should manage it. Shēr Khān, becoming cognizant of this, said to Shujā'at Khān "From some improper acts, which have been committed by Mallū, it has come into my mind, that I should chastise and punish him; but as he came and made his submission to me without being sent for, it was right that I should please him. Now that he has come to this place, do not say anything to him, so that he might go away." Mallū finding an opportunity fled. When Shēr Khān received this news, he sent a detachment in pursuit; and he mounted himself and after going a part of the way stopped; and the amirs who had been sent in pursuit, went a part of the way, and then returned. Sikandar Khān Sawāsī lest he should also escape was made over to jailors.

Mallū Khān's rule was for six years.

1 Firishtah explains, that contrary to the expectation of Qādir Shāh Shār Shāh, being tempted to keep Mālwa for himself gave him the sarkār Lakhnautī. I am not quite sure about the meaning of the expression, which is used by Niṣām-ud-dīn also; but I suppose it has the meaning I have given it in the text. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 272) says, Sheer Shah "conferred on him the district of Lucknow as a residence". The MSS. also have in place of sarkār Lucknow and the lith. ed. also has sarkār Lucknow; but Firishtah lith. ed. has sarkār Lakhnautī, and the Cambridge History of India, page 370, has "the government of Bengal". In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted Lucknow.
They say that when Mallū Khān fled, Shēr Khān said this hemistich, and Shaikh 'Abd-ul-ḥai, son of Shaikh Jamāl, who was one of his courtiers, said the second hemistich.

Couplet:
You see how Mallū the tricky slave behaved to me,
Did not the Prophet say, no good in stupid slave.
As this couplet is not destitute of wit, it has been inserted here.

An account of Shujaʿ Khān

When the country of Mālwa came into the possession of Shēr Khān, he halted for some days in the town of Ujjain, and occupied himself in arranging and regulating the affairs of that Sūbah. He gave the towns of Ujjain and Sārangpūr to Shujaʿ Khān, who is generally known by the name of Sajāwal Khān, and entrusted the government of the whole country of Mālwa to him: He appointed Ḥāji Khān Sultānī to Dhār and the neighbouring country. Natū Khān was appointed to the sarkār of Hāndiyah and that neighbourhood. He then advanced towards the fort of Rantambhōr. After a few days news came that Naṣr Khān, the son of Sikandar Khān, brother of Sikandar Khān, who was in imprisonment had come forward to attack Natū Khān. Shujaʿ Khān collected his men and advanced

---

1 This anecdote and the couplet are also mentioned on page 169 of the second volume of the English translation in the history of Shir Khān's reign.

2 The heading is differently given. One MS. has ذكر حكومت شجاع خان. The other MS. omits the words حكومت; while the lith. ed. has ذكر شجاع خان with نائب شجاع خان in the text-edition. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ذكر شجاع خان or an account of Shujaʿ Khān.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 370, says, "And retired from Mālwa, leaving behind him as viceroy Ḥāji Khān and Shujāʿat Khān as governor of Satwās." This statement agrees with that on page 168 of this volume; but the statement made in the Ṭabaqāt and by Firishtah at this place is different.

4 بنر خان Banū Khān in the text-edition.

5 The text is a translation of the reading in the MSS.; but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have نصير خان بن سکندر خان معرفت بیشنگ شجاعت خان. This may be the correct version, as there is no mention of what Natū Khān did to meet the attack. On the other hand even the lith. ed. (though not Firishtah) says that Shujāʿat Khān advanced to Satwās and Hāndiyah, which he would not have done, if he had been attacked himself.
towards Satwās and Hāndiyah. After the two sides had met, Naṣīr Ḵān entered into a compact with some of his 1 retainers and courtiers, that they should devote all their energies to seize Shujāʿ Ḵān alive, in retaliation for Sikandar Ḵān, so that the latter might perhaps in this way obtain his release. Then after the flames of slaughter and destruction had blazed up, Naṣīr Ḵān and some of his servants, gradually 2 with great patience, brought themselves close to where Shujāʿ Ḵān was, and seizing him by his collar, and the hair of his head went back towards their own army. In the meantime Mubārak Ḵān 3 Sarwānī coming to know of what had happened, betook himself to where Shujāʿ Ḵān was, and fighting bravely released him. He fought so hard, however, that one of his legs was severed below the knee joint; and he fell off from his horse. Naṣīr Ḵān's soldiers wanted to cut off his head from his body; but Rāja Rām Shāh of 4 Gwāliar, who was in the service of Shujāʿ Ḵān, in concert with some Rājpūts, advanced to help Mubārak Ḵān Sarwānī, and carried him off (from the field). 5 Naṣīr Ḵān did all that was required of him in the way of bravely exerting himself, but in the end victory and triumph showed their face to Shujāʿ Ḵān. Naṣīr Ḵān fled, and went into the country of Gōndwāna.

As Shujāʿ Ḵān had 6 six wounds on his face and his arms, they lifted him, and carried him victorious and triumphant, 7 to his own

1 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have نوگراتف مصاحب without any conjunction between the two words.

2 The words in the MS. and in the lith. ed. are تحلیل نموده, the meaning of which is not quite clear.

3 The word is سروالی in one MS. and سروالی in the other and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has سروالی. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted سروالی Sirēnī.

4 The word is جالب and جالب in the MS. and جالب in the lith. ed.

5 One MS. omits by mistake the words from روی نموده to نصر خان.

6 One MS. has by mistake بر روا instead of بر روی. Firishtah has five or six wounds.

7 The readings are somewhat obscure. The MSS. have بجا در اوردن, which has some meaning but which does not say to what place he was carried. The reading in the lith. ed. is در حضرت او بردن, i.e., carried him into his presence; but this also leaves out the name of the person into whose presence he was carried. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has در خا در اندامخته بدابر بردن. This
place. They had not yet bound up his wounds, when a letter came from Ḥāji Khān Sultānī to the purport, that Mallū Khān had come from Bānswālah with a large force to attack him; and that a battle was a matter of today or tomorrow. Shujā' Khān seated himself that very day and in the condition in which he was in a sukhasan and advanced to reinforce Ḥāji Khān; and with only the night intervening (i.e., on the following morning) Shujā' Khān came up with one hundred and fifty horsemen in the vicinity of 1 Kumli Mawāsah. He awakened Ḥāji Khān from his sleep, and the same moment without any delay began 2 the battle, and defeated Mallū Khān. The latter fled in great distress and wretchedness, and went away to Gujrat; and 3 did not again gird up his loins.

The power and splendour of Shujā' Khān increased day by day; and gradually he brought the whole of Mālwa into his possession. When Shēr Khān passed away in the neighbourhood of Kālinjar, and the duties of the sultanat devolved on Islam Khān. The latter, although he was still displeased with Shujā' Khān, but as 4 Daulat Khān Ajīyālā, who was the adopted son of Shujā' Khān, was a great favourite would be perfectly clear if we knew what in this place means, or for what word it is printed by mistake. He could not very well have been thrown into a pit or a well, and then taken to his camp. It would be all right if meant some kind of conveyance, or the word was a misprint for some words which meant a conveyance of some kind. As it is, it makes confusion worse confounded. M. Hidayat Hosain has to the army camp, in the text-edition.

1 The name is written with some little variation in the MSS. and the lith. ed. The MSS. have and the lith. ed. has. The name is not mentioned by Firishtah or by any other historians as far as I know. M. Hidayat Hosain has in the text-edition.

2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 273) says that Kadur Shah was defeated in a night attack, but this does not appear to be correct.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have, but the other MS. has which is of course incorrect.

4 Firishtah calls him Daulat Khān without any suffix. He is called Daulat Khān Ajyāra in the Cambridge History of India, page 370, but on the next page the suffix is printed as Ajyāra instead of Ajyāra.
of 1-Islām Khān, in order to please the son, did not withdraw the appearance of outward favour from the father; and showed him all esteem and regard; and placed the reins of the affairs of the entire country of Mālwa in the grasp of his powerful hand. This state of things continued till one day a man of the name of ‘Uṯmān Khān in a state of drunkenness came into Shujāʿ Khān’s audience hall, and repeatedly spat on the carpets. When the farrāš (the man who looks after carpets, etc.) forbade him, ‘Uṯmān jumped up, and struck the farrāš with his fist. There was much noise. The farrāš told Shujāʿ Khān what had happened. He ordered, “First, he was drunk, second, he came into the audience hall, and third, he struck the farrāš with his fist.” He said that both his hands should be cut off. ‘Uṯmān Khān came to 2-Gwāliar, and complained to Islām Khān. After some time, Shujāʿ Khān came to Gwāliar to attend on Islām Khān. One day ‘Uṯmān Khān went to wait on Islām Khān, and complained about what he had suffered. Islām Khān was angry with him, and said, “You also are an Afghān; go and have your revenge.”

They say, that on hearing this news Shujāʿ Khān became aggrieved at 3-Islām Khān’s proceedings; and spoke unseemly words. While these things were happening, one day one of Shujāʿ Khān’s intimate friends came and informed him, that ‘Uṯmān Khān was sitting in a blacksmith’s shop, and was sharpening his knife; and speaking absurd words. Shujāʿ Khān in his great pride was not restrained by these words, till one day when, riding on his sukhaśan, he went to the fort of Gwāliar, to offer his salāms to Islām Khān. When he came by the Hatiyāpūl gate, he saw that ‘Uṯmān Khān was seated in a shop

---

1 The name is written Aslim Khān here in both MSS. and Aslam Khān in the lith. ed., but as he has been called Islām Khān in previous and succeeding passages, I have kept that spelling.

2 This is apparently the Gwāliar in the Punjab hills. Firishtah calls it Gooliar kā dar al-mulk Sālim Shāh Afghān sor Bīrīd.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have the name as Salim Khān here, but I have retained Islām Khān. Firishtah lith. ed. says Shujāʿ Khān became angry and spoke unseemly words about Shēr Shāh. This can scarcely be correct, as he had no grievance against the latter. On the other hand, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 274) says that Shooja Khan merely said, “Sulim Shah is a fool for his pains.”
wrapped up in an old mantle. Shujā' Khān wanted to enquire from him about the matter on the way. But 'Uthmān Khān suddenly jumped up from the platform of the shop, and wounded Shujā' Khān. The silāhdārs, or armed retainers, who were accompanying the sukhāsan, immediately seized him. They saw that he had an iron hand, rudely fashioned, which he had firmly fixed in the place of the severed hand; and with that badly fashioned hand, he had thrown a dart. The silāhdārs killed him on the spot; and turning back the sukhāsan of the Khān took him to his residence. The wound was on his left side; but as 'Uthmān Khān's hand had no strength, it was only skin deep.

When Shujā' Khān was wounded, and 'Uthmān Khān got his deserts, there was a noise and tumult among the men in the camp. Islām Khān, on receiving the news, sent the great men and the chiefs of the state, to make enquiries. He wanted also to come and visit him. But Shujā' Khān had understood, that his sons and other near relations suspected that ('Uthmān's) audacity was due to the instigation and encouragement of Islām Khān. He, therefore, had regard to their fearlessness, and did not approve of Islām Khān's coming to him, and sent the following message, "This slave is a slave of your

---

1 The readings are different here and are all more or less unintelligible.

One MS. has سمت بیچیده. The lith. ed. has سمت بیچیده. Firishtah lith. ed. has in the corresponding passage خود را بکدر برده بیچیده and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 274) has "wraped up in an old mantle." This latter would be all right, if it meant a mantle, but I cannot find that it has this meaning. However, for want of anything better, I have adopted it.

2 Here again the readings are somewhat different. Both MSS. and Firishtah lith. ed. have جمله ضریبی. جمله ضریبی, while the lith. ed. has ضریبی جمله. The latter appears to be incorrect, but I cannot find any meaning of جمله which would suit the context. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 247) has, "With the blade of a sword." M. Hidayat Hosain has با ان دست ناقص جمله ضریبی اندماخته, i.e., struck a blow with his useless artificial hand, in the text-edition.

3 One MS. has Shujā' before Khān.

4 One MS. has بی پاکی بی اکنی instead of بی پاکی. بی اینکی.

5 The pronoun ایشان is in the third person, although is also used in the same sentence. There are also differences in the readings. One MS. has که بندگا خام پدر ایشان است and the lith. ed. has که من بن خام پدر ایشان. Shujā' Khān's message
father, and has never excused himself from death or from being slain; he was among the thirty persons who first joined your father and planted the standard of your greatness, as is known to everybody. And even now if he carries his life in safety from this danger, he may be of use to you. This slave does not wish to give you so much trouble that you should come down from the fort and over all this distance; and indeed these inquiries and favours have been the cause of much distinction to this slave, and have greatly exalted him."

As Shujā' Khān was one of the great pillars of Islām Khān's government, and had the rights derived from having performed much service, Islām Khān, in spite of the fact that he had understood from his words what he was saying (or rather, what he meant), waited patiently that day, but on the following day he went to enquire about him. This faqīr (the author) has heard from some men, who had relations of friendship with Shujā' Khān, and were present in that majlis, that Fath Khān, the uncle-in-law of the sons of Shēr Khān, who was so well known for his great strength that no one could seize and twist his hand by intertwining his fingers with his own, (this is a favourite test in India even now), when he saw Islām Khān enter Shujā' Khān's pavilion alone, wanted to remove him out of the way, and held a consultation in this matter by signs and gestures with Miyān Bāyazīd, son of Shujā' Khān, who afterwards assumed the title of Bāz Bahādur; and Miyān Bāyazīd also concurred with him in this matter. Shujā' Khān, becoming aware of this, sent Fath Khān away to collect the things required for the tribute (which had to be placed before Islām Khān); and after a moment said farewell to Islām Khān. He told the latter distinctly that after this, he should not take the trouble to come again, for he said, "This slave apprehends lest the rights acquired by long service be destroyed; and the standard of greatness, which has been raised by enduring so much trouble and difficulty, be brought down at once."

to Islām Khān as given by Firishtah agrees generally with that in the text, but according to Firishtah, Shujā' Khān was one of the six and thirty and (not five and thirty) men who planted the standard of Sulim Shāh's (or Shēr Shah's) greatness.

1 One MS. has by mistake حاضر instead of حاضر.
THE SULTANS OF MALWA

After some days, when 1 Shujā' Khān bathed, and alms and charity were distributed to deserving people; he one day mounted his horse and went to make his salām to Islām Khān. The latter bestowed one hundred and one horses and one hundred and one packages of various stuffs of Bangāla as rewards to the Khān. But as Shujā' Khān found out from his manner and behaviour, that these cajolries were filled with enmity, he passed the day in any way that was possible, and then coming back to his quarters spoke to his servants, that they should load his camp equipages. The people of the city thought that as that camping ground had become dirty, he wanted to remove to another place. But when all his men had loaded up everything he armed himself, and then ordered that they should beat the drum of departure. He then mounted his horse, and took the road to Sārangpūr. Islām Khān, on seeing this, became angry, and detached a body of soldiers to pursue him; and collecting his army he himself also advanced towards Sārangpūr. On arrival at that place Shujā' Khān commenced to equip his men; and when he heard that Islām Khān was coming, some of his men tried to persuade him to fight with the latter. He, however, said, "Islām Khān is the son of my late master and benefactor; I shall never fight with him; and I shall not allow that any one of my people should have such an intention in his mind." After the arrival of Islām Khān in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, Shujā' Khān came out of the city, and sending the families and dependants of his men in advance, went away in the direction of Bānswālāh.

Islām Khān took possession of Mālwa, and leaving 'Isā Khān Sūr with twenty-two thousand horsemen in the town of Ujjain, returned to Gwāliar. Shujā' Khān, although he had the power and the necessary force, never caused any damage to the country of Mālwa. As Islām Khān (at this time) advanced towards Lāhōre, on account of the rebellion of the Niyāzīs, Daulat Khān Ajīyālā, who was a favourite of Islām Khān, and an adopted son of Shujā' Khān, prayed for the pardon of the guilt of the latter. Shujā' Khān then came and rendered

1 Apparently in those days, people did not bathe when they were ill or had a wound.
2 The word is جدل in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but it is جدل in the other MS.; the latter reading is adopted in the text-edition.
homage to Islâm Khân, who drew the pen of forgiveness across the page of his offences; and bestowed Sârangpûr, and the country of Râisîn, and some other Maḥals (estates) on him. He also gave him one hundred and one horses and much stuff and a gold ewer and basin, and granted him permission to return. When Shujâ‘ Khân went to his jâgîr, and Islâm Khân, after a considerable time, passed away by natural death; and the saltanat was settled on Mubâriz Khân ‘Adalî; the latter, 1 either on account of ancient acquaintance, or on account of the relationship of his being the husband of one of his wife’s sisters, conferred the entire country of Mâlwa permanently on him. Shujâ‘ Khân then conferred the government of Ujjain and the parganas in its neighbourhood on Daulat Khân Ajîyâlâ; and Râisîn and Bhilsâ on his youngest son 2 Malik Muṣṭafâ, who was (afterwards) appointed to accompany Râja Bir Bal and Ḥâkim Abû-ul Fath in the Yûsuf Zâ‘ expedition and was killed there. He gave the government of Hândiyâh and Āshta to Miyân Bâyazîd; and himself took up his residence in Sârangpûr. When a long time had passed in this way, and disorders took place in the saltanat of Dehli, and everyone became independent in the corner in which he was, Shujâ‘ Khân passed away by a natural death. 3 The period of the government of Shujâ‘ Khân was 12 years.

4 AN ACCOUNT OF Baz Bahâdur, SON OF SHUJA‘ KHÂN.

After the death of Shujâ‘ Khân, Bâyazîd, his eldest son, betook himself to Sârangpûr, and took possession of all his father’s property and retainers. As Daulat Khân Ajîyâlâ, owing to the proximity of

---

1 One MS. omits the first and substitutes the second. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has Nisbat Sâbîq Aslîf. I find that one of the meanings of Aslîf in the dictionary is “the husbands of a man’s wife’s sisters.” I have taken the word to mean this in this passage.

2 Malik Mîṣṭafî in the text-edition. The clause corresponding to “who was (afterwards) appointed to accompany . . . . . . and was killed there” is omitted in the text-edition.

3 According to Firishtah he died in 962 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 275) gives 1554 A.D. as the corresponding year, but the Cambridge History of India, page 371, places his death in 1555, after Humâyûn had regained the empire.

4 One MS. omits Ibn Shâjam Khân.
his position to Islām Kān, was respected and honoured by all men, and every one was desirous of him (i.e., of his rule), Miyān Bāyazīd gave encouragement and made promises of favour to a number of men, and sent his mother to Daulat Kān, so that she might bring about some amicable arrangement. In the end they came to this decision, that Daulat Kān should be in possession of the sarkārs Ujjain and Mandū and some other states; and Sārangpūr and the Khālsa Mahāls of Shujā' Kān (i.e., the estates which he held in his own possession, without the intervention of jāgīrdārs), and the sarkārs of Hāndiyāh and Kōtlī Birāh and the country of Bhīlwārah should belong to Miyān Bāyazīd; and the sarkārs of Rālsīn and Bhilsā and other Mahāls, which were situated in that neighbourhood, should be in the possession of Malik Muṣṭafā. After that Miyān Bāyazīd, intending to act treacherously, went towards Ujjain, and told people that he was going to wait on Miyān Daulat Kān to console with him. Daulat Kān, whose death was imminent, was unconscious of the (intended) treachery, and was killed. His head was sent to Sārangpūr, and was suspended from one of the gates.

After that he took possession of most of the territory of Mālwa. He had the royal umbrella raised over his head, and gave himself the title of Bāz Bahādūr Shāh. After arranging the affairs of that side he advanced towards Rālsīn. Malik Muṣṭafā, who was distinguished by much courage and strength, met him and after some warfare was defeated. Bāz Bahādūr then entrusted (the government of) Rālsīn and Bhilsā to his own men, and advanced towards Kadrūlā. As

1 One MS. has ملعز by mistake instead of ملعز.
2 The distribution given above appears in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The only difference is that one MS. has کو مکسی پریہ while the other has کو مکسی براہیا جیاہما. The lith. ed. has کو مکسی پریہ instead of کو مکسی براہیا جیاہما. Firishtah lith. ed. has a somewhat different distribution. According to him Daulat Kān and Malik Muṣṭafā got the territory mentioned against their names in the text; but Miyān Bāyazīd had Sārangpūr and Siwās (Satwās) and Sirōhī and Barāhima and Bhīlwārah and the Khālsa Mahāls of Shujā' Kān. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 275) has practically the same distribution.
3 The name is بار گذاشت in the MSS. The lith. ed. has کو روا لا کدر ولا instead of کو روا لا کدر ولا. The name is, however, written further on. The name is not quite legible in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but looks like کو روا لا. Two or three lines further down the name is distinctly کو روا لا.
that place was in the occupation of a band of Miyānas (Miyāna Afghāns) and he did not meet with such treatment from them as he desired; he slew a number of their sardārs, who were accompanying him, by throwing them into wells; and then advanced to fight the rest of that band. They fortified themselves, and did not show themselves at all backward in fighting with him. Fath Khān the uncle-in-law of Bāz Bahādur, some account of whom has been given before, received a cannon ball here and was killed. In the end Bāz Bahādur took possession of Kadrūlā, and came back to Sārangpūr.

After sometime, he advanced with a well-equipped army, with the object of conquering Garh Katinkah. When he arrived in that country, Rānī Durgāwatī, who was the wife of the Rāja of Katinkah, and after his death ruled the country, collected the Kōndwān and commenced a battle at the head of the Ghātī (pass). As the Rānī's infantry were more numerous than ants and locusts, they surrounded the men from all sides of the Ghātī. Bāz Bahādur in distress and dismay took the path of flight, and all his suite and equipages fell into the Rānī's hands. Many of his best men remained there. He himself, with very great trouble, betook himself to Sārangpūr, and began to repair the damages and losses in his army.

As he had undergone much hardship, he now desired that he should spend some days in pleasure. He collected musicians and singers from every place where they were, and occupied himself all day and night in (sensual) pleasure and enjoyment.

4 Then in the months of the year 5 967 A.H., when the desire

The place is not mentioned by Col. Briggs, but it is called Kelwāra in the Cambridge History of India, page 371. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted كدوارة.

Firishtah and Col. Briggs do not say that it was the sardārs or Miyānas who were thrown into the well. Firishtah says وچین بعضي سدران ان سلوك ناهمواري نمردن; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 277) says, "Having met with opposition from some of his officers", etc.

The word is پھو in the text, and Gīrāl in Firishtah lith. ed.

Firishtah explains: "اکثر بقتل انقدر; i.e., most of these men were slain.

The sentence begins with تا انکھا, but as it would hardly be possible to begin a paragraph with "Till in the, etc." I have begun it with "Then, etc."

The MSS. have سبوع مسیعین و نمسیمانه, i.e., 977 A.H. which is incorrect. Firishtah lith. ed. has نمان وقتل و نمسیمانه, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 278)
of conquering Mālwa found a place in the head, which touched the sky, of His Majesty, the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī, may God perpetuate the shadow of his kindness over the people! he sent Adham Khan and Pir Muḥammad Khān and Ṣādīq Khān 1 and Qiyā Khān and Shāh Muḥammad Khān Qandahārī and his son 'Ādil Muḥammad, and Muḥib 'Alī Khān and a number of others from among his servants to effect it. The great amīrs advanced towards Sārangpūr by successive marches. When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the village of Kaitūr, which is one farsukh from Sārangpūr, Bāz Bahādūr rose from the company of the singing women, and marched forward to fight with brave men. Although a large number of Afghāns, who had performed many feats of arms and seen much fighting, were collected together in his service, yet as good fortune was not his guide, he fled after 3 a little fighting; and that country came into the possession of the servants of the triumphant greatness (i.e., the empire of Akbar). The details of this battle, 4 and the remaining battles, which took place in Mālwa, have been narrated, distinctly and in detail, in the history of His Majesty, the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī. May God perpetuate His benevolence and favour on the people and may God prolong the days of his life to the day of resurrection!

Bāz Bahādūr had a wife Rūmpatī by name, 5 who loved him and was enamoured of him; and in the verses which he composed in the Hindi language he often inserted her name. He had a great passion for the society of women and the company of musicians.

He ruled in the country of Mālwa for a period of sixteen years. After his flight from the country of Mālwa he went to Gujrāt. He next has in the latter end of the year 968 A.H., 1560 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 371, has 1561.

1 One MS. omits Qiyā Khān.
2 The name is written ḫiṭṭar in one MS. and the lith. ed., and in the other MS. Firisztah does not give the name of the place, but says, when the Mughal army got to one karōh from Sārangpūr; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 278) has “within a short distance of his capital, when he collected his troops around Sarungpūr, but they had hardly time to join, before the Moguls were within two miles of the place.”
3 One MS. omits the word 2.
4 The same MS. omits the conjunction 3 and.
5 It is not quite clear whether the author means that Rūmpatī loved Bāz Bahādūr and was enamoured of him, or vice versa.
went to the Rānā, who was the ruler of the fort of Kōnbhalmīr and Chitōr from Gujrāt; and from there, he went and waited on His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī, and was enrolled in the band of his servants. He remained in that service for several years, till he surrendered the deposit of his life. The country of Mālwa is up to the present day in the possession of the Viceroy of this daily increasing power.

SECTION IX. 1 THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF KASHMĪR.

From the year 2 747 A.H. to the year 995 A.H., 249 years 3 was the period of the rule of the Muslimān Sultāns in the country of Kashmir. 4 The beginning was from Āl-i-Ṭāhir.

5 Let it not remain concealed that the country of Kashmir was always in the possession of Rājas, who ruled 6 one after another, till the year 750 A.H., which was in the time of the rule of 7 Rāja Sirdēv

---

1 The heading in the text is that in the lith. ed. The headings in the MSS. are غلبة حكام كسرى بقرة and غلبة حكام سلاطين نفر, which are both incorrect.
2 As regards the chronology of the Muslimān Kings of Kashmir, see page 100 of J.A.S.B., vol. LIV (1885), where Mr. C. J. Rogers working back from 795 A.H., the date of the death of Kutub-ud-Dīn, places the accession of Shams-ud-Dīn or Shāh Mīr in 743 A.H. This differs from the year in the text by four years.
3 The words from MT do not occur in one MS. The other MS. and the lith. ed. have them with slight variations. I have adopted the words in the first MS., but in the text-edition the last sentence (see note 4 below) is omitted.
4 This sentence is written as ابتداء از آل طاهر in one MS. It is not to be found in any other MS. or the text-edition.
5 In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain inserts the heading سلطان شمس الدين آل طاهر above this line and not a page or so later as in the translation.
6 One MS. has by mistake از بی ام از بی ام instead of از بی بکر.
7 The name is written as Sirdēv and Sirdōvā in the MS. and Sirdōvā in the lith. ed. Firishta's ed. has Sirdōvā, Sirdōvā, Sirdōvā. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 451) has Sena Dew, and the Cambridge History of India, page 277, has Sinha Deva. According to Jorānāja's Chronicle, line 129, Rājā Shīmhādeva died in his 77th year after reigning for fourteen years and three days less than six months and was succeeded by his brother Sūhādeva. It was in
a man of the name of Shāh Mīr, who described his ancestry as follows: Shāh Mīr, son of Tāhir Āl, son of a Karshāhab, son of Nekrūz, and referred the end (or rather the beginning) of his ancestry to Arjun, who was of the Pāṇḍu; and the history of the Pāṇḍu is mentioned in the Mahābhārat, which has been translated by the order of His

his reign, that many people came from distant countries in quest of service.

1 The name is Shāh Mīr in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. It is Shah Meer in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 451), but it is Shāh Mīrā in the lith. ed. of Firīshṭāh, and in the Cambridge History of India. In the books in the somewhat imposing list of the Bibliography, page 650, to Chapter xii of the Cambridge History of India, vol. III, which deals with the history of the kingdom of Kashmir, there is only one mention of the name of the man; and this is on page 130 of the Introduction in Sir Aurel Stein's translation of Kālhana's Rājatarāṅgini, vol. I (1900). In this place he is called Shāh Mīr, so it is difficult to find where Sir Wolseley Haig, who compiled the account in the Cambridge History of India got his authority for calling him Shāh Mīrā.

In the J.R.A.S., vol. L (1918, pp. 451–468) there is a paper called "The Chronology and Genealogy of the Muhammadan Kings of Kashmir", which is also mentioned in the Bibliography and which is also written by the same author, Lt.-Col. T. W. Haig. In this paper he says, "My materials chiefly consist of the Tabaqāt-i-Akbari, Colonel Jarrat's excellent translation of the Āin-i-Akbari, and Firīshṭāh's history." But as regards Firīshṭāh he says that he "is little more than a copyist of Nizām-al-Dīn Ahmad" and yet he has adopted the Shāh Mīrā of Firīshṭāh in preference to the Shāh Mīr of Nizām-ud-Dīn. It may be mentioned that very probably there are MSS. of Firīshṭāh, in which the man is called Shāh Mīr, for Col. Briggs, as remarked above, calls him Shah Meer.

In Jonaraja's Chronicle, already referred to in the preceding note, the name occurs in line 137 and in different lines further down. It is there written as दशमेर, so that Shāh Mīr is in every way more correct than Shāh Mīrā. I cannot find anything distinct about his being a descendant of Arjuna, but one of his ancestors is called (l. 132) Pārtha who was like another Pārtha (a name of Arjuna) (राजा) यह पार्थ: . It is also stated that it had been said there that the descendants of Kuru Śāha would rule the empire of Kashmir (l. 135).

2 The ancestry given in the text is given with slight differences in Firīshṭāh and also by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 452); but the latter in a footnote says "it is surprising that a person of Firīshṭāh's sagacity should have overlooked the evident absurdity of the pedigree." The Cambridge History of India, page 277, describes him as "an adventurer from Swāt"; and Firīshṭāh says he came in the dress of a faqir. In the text-edition بن ال شاشب has been retained between بن كوشاشب طاهرال.
Majesty, the Khalifā-i-Ilāh, and has been called the Razm Nāma, who came and became a servant of the Rāja; and having served him for a considerable period, acquired some credit. When Rāja Sirdēv died, 1 his son Rāja Rañjan made Shāh Mīr his vazīr; and left the charge of the work of the government with him. He also entrusted the guardianship of his son who had the name of 2 Chandar to him. When Rāja Rañjan died, 3 Rāja Adwan or (Aūdan) who was a relation of his came from Qandahār, and sat on the seat of authority; and made Shāh Mīr, who was still the guardian of Chandar, son of Rāja Rañjan, his vakil (representative or agent). He placed reliance on his two sons, one of whom was named 4 Jamshīd, and the other 'Ali Shēr;

1 The name is Rāja Rañjan in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and Rāja Rañjan in the other MS. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 452) calls him Raja Runjun the son and successor of Raja Sena Dew. The Cambridge History of India, page 277, however, says that the authority of Sinha Deva was overthrown and he was slain by Rainchan, a Tibetan, who had been in his service. This is correct, for according to Jonarāja, line 147 et. seq., the Bhōpta (which is the name uniformly given to the Tibetan inhabitants of the Indus region) Rifcanā usurped the throne of Kashmir. See also page 408 of Stein's Rājatarangini, vol. II. The name should be spelt as Rinchān and not Rainchan, as in the Cambridge History of India. He is said to have reigned for three years and eleven days less than two months.

2 The name is written as Ḍrāsīr in both MSS. but it is in the lith. ed. It is also Ḍrāsīr in Jonarāja, line 221. I do not know whether it is a transformation of the Muslimān name of Haidar or an indigenous name.

3 The name is written as Rāja Adwan or Rāja 'Audh in the MS. and the lith. eds. of the Ṭabaqāt and Fīrishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 452) calls him Anund Dew. The Cambridge History of India, page 277, has Udayana Deva. Col. Briggs says he came from Kasghar, and the Cambridge History of India says he had found an asylum in Kishtwār, which appears from the Āin-i-Akbari (Jararat's translation, vol. II, p. 310, footnote 7) to have been situated in "the Kashmir state latitude 33° 18' 37" north, longitude 75° 48' east, near the left bank of the Chenab." Qandahār from which he is said, according to the text to have come must be taken to mean here and elsewhere the ancient Gandhāra and not the modern Qandahār.

4 He is called Udayanadeva in Jonarāja, line 223. He, however, appears to have been a mere figure-head, who acted entirely as Kōtā Dēvi, who possessed all the power, ordered him. See line 226:—वरिष्ठालोकर कोटा देवी शासितार्थी। राजा देवनाम तददित्रं शासितार्।

4 Jonarāja calls them बच्चर and बच्चर, but elsewhere Jamshīd is called अशर. He also says that Udayanadeva gratified them by giving them, the government of Kramarājya and other districts.
and made them men of authority. Shāh Mīr had two other sons also, one called ¹ Shēr Āshāmāk, and the other named Hindāl; and they also aspired to greatness.

When Shāh Mīr and his sons became powerful and turbulent, Rāja Adwan Dēv was annoyed with them in connection with certain matters, and forbade them to come to his house. Shāh Mīr and his sons, having taken possession of all the parganas of Kashmir, made most of the servants of the Rāja join them, and they acquired fresh strength and power day by day. Rāja Adwan also became weaker till in the year ² 747 A.H. he passed away, and his widow ³ Kōpā Dēvi took his place, so that she might rule with absolute power. She sent a message to Shāh Mīr, to raise Chandar, son of Rāja Raftān to power. Shāh Mīr did not agree with this, and did not obey her. So she advanced with a large army, but was taken prisoner; and the purport of the hemistich:

When death to the prey has come, it to the hunter goes, became apparent. ⁴ After that she accepted Shāh Mīr for her husband and became converted to Islam. They passed one day and night together. The next day Shāh Mīr seized and imprisoned her; and having raised the standard of the empire, and having had the public

¹ The name is written differently and not very legibly. It is شیر اسماعیل in MS. and شیر اسماعیل in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has شیر اسماعیل. The name is not mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India (at this place), but further on is referred as Shīrāshāmāk.

² Firishtah also gives the same year; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 453) has 727 A.H., 1326 A.D. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the year.

³ The name is written كونای دیوی and كونای دیوی in the MSS., and كونای دیوی in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has كونای دیوی. Col. Briggs (p. 453) has Rany Kowlia Devy and the Cambridge History of India (p. 277) has Kota Devi. Gopā and Kōwlā (Kamālā) have some meanings in Sanskrit but Kota has none. Gopā Devi, it will be remembered, was the name of the wife of prince Siddhārtha, or the Gautama Buddha, and it is quite probable that it should have been the name of the queen of Rājā Udayana. As it happens however, the name is Kotā Devi in Jumārāja, line 214, etc.

⁴ There are variations in the readings. I have adopted that in the lith. ed. These in the MSS. are defective. One is شاه میرزا قیصر کرده شوهری و شاه میرزا قیصر کرده اسلام اورد and the other is شاه میرزا قیصر کرده اسلام اورد.
prayers read and the coins struck in his own name, gave himself the
title of Sultān Shams-ud-din. As the commencement of the appear-
ance of the Ḥanafī religion in the country of Kashmir was from
his time, the beginning of the section about Kashmir has been made
from that time.

1 An account of Sultān Shams-ud-din.

In short, when Sultān Shams-ud-din attained to sovereignty,
he discontinued all the customs of oppression and tyranny, which
had continued from preceding ruler. Having assured his mind from
(the attempts of) the enemy, he rebuilt anew the whole kingdom of
Kashmir, which had been devastated by slaughter and rapine of
Diljū; and gave a written assurance to the raʿiyats that he would not
take from them a larger revenue than the sixth part of the produce.

Verses:

The standard of the Bādshāh, the cherisher of the faith,
Cast its mighty shadow over all the world;
The messengers of the sky conveyed
The news of his justice to countries all.
The body of disturbance became weak and thin,
The house of oppression into ruin fell.

As the acclamation of the bravery and the good name of Sultān
Shams-ud-din became noised about in all directions, he occupied him-
self in the work of the government according to the rites of the parties,

1 The heading in the text is that of one MS. The other MS. omits the
heading altogether. The lith. ed. inserts حكومت after ذکر.

2 Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally. The Cambridge History of
India (p. 277) is rather eloquent about the atrocities and tyranny of the Hindu
rulers. They were very probably bad enough, but the Cambridge History
of India does not give any authority for its diatrise: and is altogether silent
about the plunder and slaughter by Diljū which was the chief cause of the
exactions and tyranny of the Rājas.

3 Like the Ṭabaqāt Firishtah calls him the Mīr Baghshī (or pay-master
general) of Qandahār, but Col. Briggs calls him the chief of Kashghar. He is
called Daljū in the Āin-i-Akbārī (Jarrat, vol. II, p. 387, note 1) and Zuljū by

4 The Ṣaṭṭhānīs of the ancient Hindu kings.
and seized a body of the Lún tribe who had become hostile to him in Kishtwár and meted out punishment to them.

They say that Diljú was the Mir Bakhshí (pay-master general) of Qandahár. He came with all the army to Kashmir, and turned the whole of the country upside down; and Rája Sirdév, having collected a large sum of money as assessment from his subjects, sent it as a tribute to Diljú; and then secluded himself in a corner; and this ruined the entire country of Kashmir. And as Diljú could not stay there owing to excessive cold, he returned to Qandahár.

After he had acquired stability and firmness, he left all affairs to Jamshíd and 'Ali Shér, his two sons, and occupied himself with repose and worship, and he passed away. The period of his reign was three years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÁN JAMSHÍD, SON OF SULTÁN SHAMS-UD-DÍN.

When Sultán Shams-ud-dín accepted the summonses of the just God; and Sultán Jamshíd ascended the throne with the concurrence of the chief men of the state, he always took every precaution (to guard himself) from 'Ali Shér, who during their father's lifetime had

---

1 These are the old Lavanaas, for an account of whom see Stein's Rajálaránqí, vol. II, p. 306.
2 Firistah lith. ed. and the Cambridge History of India, page 377, say he reigned for 3 years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 454) makes it 23 years by mistake. According to Jonarâja the exact period was three years and five days (see l. 315).

Firistah mentions here a matter of some social and official importance which I have thought it necessary to note. He remarks that in the days of the past, a person who commanded a certain number of men (of Kashmir) made two communities great, one Chak and the other Bákri; he decided that the one and the soldiers of that country should be (selected) chiefly from these two classes. This is also mentioned by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 99) who, however, transliterates the names as Chakks and Mákars.

I find that the Chaks were called the Cakreás or Cakras in the Kashmir Chronicles. Kájí Chak, who was the first of Chaks to rise to some eminence, was mentioned as Káñcan Cakreás and elsewhere Káca Cakra. I am not so sure about the name of the Mákrs in the Chronicles but they were probably the Margsá.

3 One MS. omits the name Sultán Shams-ud-dín.
acted jointly with him in all affairs. In fact, the two were always trying to effect the destruction of each other. When Jamshid's soldiers collected round Ḍāl Shēr, and raising him on the throne sat down at 1 Wallpūr, which is a famous city, Jamshid marched against them with his army and summoned them in the first instance with mildness and courtesy, and tried to have an amicable settlement. Ḍāl Shēr turning his head from the proposals of peace, marched on wings of speed, and made a night attack on Jamshid's army, and defeated it. When Sūltān Jamshid after suffering the defeat, heard that Wallpūr was unoccupied (by Ḍāl Shēr's troops), he, with the intention of devastating it, advanced towards it. Ḍāl Shēr's soldiers, who had orders to guard and defend it, met him in battle; but most of them were slain. In the meantime, when Ḍāl Shēr, 2 after his victory arrived in those parts, Sūltān Jamshid seeing, that he had not the strength to meet him, fled to the country of 3 Kamrāj; and

1 The name cannot be made out distinctly in either the MS. or in the lith. ed.; but appears to be Wallpūr or Wanpūr. 'Firishtah' lith. ed. has Madnpūr; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 455) has Mednypoor; but I cannot find either Wallpūr or Mednypūr as the name of any well-known city in Kashmir. Probably Utpalpura is meant (see Jonarāja, l. 323), or Avantipura (see Stein's Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 460). In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hossain has Danīlūr.

2 Both MSS. have and I have adopted it; but the lith. ed. has būllūr. Both have Kamrāj; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 455) has Gujraj. I find Kamrāj and Kamrāz mentioned in Stein's Rājatarangini. Kamrāj, is Abū-l-Faḍl's Western half of the Kingdom (pp. 436, 494) and Kamrāz or the territorial division the old Kramarajya and consisting of 18 parganas (p. 494).

Madava Rājya I find is written in Sanskrit as मादव-राज्या. It appears that according to the general prevailing notion Maraz comprises the districts on both sides of the Vitasā above Srinagar, and Kamrāz those below. In Akbar's time the old parganas of Uttar Loolu Hamal and Mach'pur were embodied in the aust parganā of Kamrāz (see Jarrat's Ain-i-Akbari, vol. II, p. 371). In Moorcroft's and Baron Hügel's list, the parganā Kamrāz includes Uttar Hamal and Mach'pur. Owing to frequent changes of pargana divisions, the extent of the pargana Kamraz has also varied from time to time (vide Stein's Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 436, note 2). I have inserted Kamrāj in the text instead of Karaj. Haig does not mention Kamrāj either in the Cambridge History of India or in his paper in the J.R.A.S., vol. L (1918).
his vāzīr Sirāj, who had the defence of Srinagar in his charge, summoned 'Ali Shēr from the city of 1 Uchh and made Srinagar over to him. Jamshīd, after this catastrophe 2 did not again gird up his loins; and after ruling for 3 one year and two months passed away.

4 An account of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn.

When Sultān Jamshīd passed away, his 5 younger brother, who had the name of 'Ali Shēr, assumed the title of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn and sat on the throne. He conferred full powers on his younger brother Shēr Āshāmak. In the beginning of his reign there was great plenty; 6 but towards the end there was a great famine, and an immense number of people perished. 7 He got hold of a body of Rasturis, who had become hostile to him and had gone away to Kishjawār, by various devices, and bringing them into Kashmir imprisoned them. He raised the standard of his power and laid the foundation of 8 a city, which he called after his own name, near Yehiyypūr. Among the rules

---

1 The name is أوجة in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but اجودية in the other MS. Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs mentions the place, I cannot find anything about Uchh or Ayodhyā.

2 The readings are somewhat different. One MS. has كمر مست, the other has apparently by mistake كمر مست, while the lith. ed. has كمر مست, i.e., lived for a short time. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has كمر مست. I have adopted كمر مست.

3 Jonarāja makes this period one year and ten months (l. 338).

4 The heading in the MS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has در ذكر حكومت سلطان علاء الدين.

5 One MS. and the lith. ed. have كهرش but the other MS. has كهر.

6 One MS. has by mistake شمدند for فرواونی بسبار; and omits the sentence from تلف شمدند to ودر اخر. The famine is mentioned by Jonarāja (l. 358).

7 Firishtah also says this but does not mention the name of the tribe. I cannot identify it in Jonarāja.

8 I cannot identify the name of the city which appears to be بیر Yehiyypūr in the MS. and بیر which may be anything in the lith. ed. Jonarāja, however, says the Sultān built a bridge near Sūryapura (see l. 340), probably a printer's mistake for Sūryapura, and made Jayapīḍapura his capital (l. 357).
promulgated by him was one, that an unchaste woman should not inherit her husband's property.

The period of his rule was twelve years and eight months and thirteen days.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN 3 SHIHĀB-UD-DIN, SON OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DIN.

When Sultān 'Alā'-ud-din had traversed the stages of life, his younger brother, who had the name of Shēr Āshāmak attained to the saltanat after him. He was a man of resolution and bravery, and had pleasant manners and morals. Any day on which a report of a victory did not come from some direction, that day he did not count as one of the days in his life, and on such a day marks of pain appeared on his countenance. He made over the demarcated country to the old mālikās (owners); and marched with his army to the banks of the river Sind. They say that when the ruler of that country came and

---

1 Both the MSS. have انگر نبود. The lith. ed. has eni. This is better and I have retained it.

2 This agrees with Jonarāja (l. 359).

3 He is called माशासंहो in Jonarāja, so that whatever the correct pronunciation of the name might be there can be no doubt as to what he was called. Shirasama, as has been pointed out, means a little milk-drinker, and was probably a childish nickname.

4 This fact is mentioned even more emphatically by Jonarāja, who says that any moment in which he did not gain a victory he counted as lost for nothing, and who further expatiates on his ambition for victory, and his numerous expeditions, which were as dear to him as a young wife is to an old man, and which neither cold nor heat nor evening nor night nor hunger nor thirst could interfere with. Neither a fawn-eyed fair one, nor the pleasures of wine nor the moonlight could charm his mind like a military expedition. No river was difficult to cross, nor any mountain difficult to climb nor any desert impossible to traverse (lines 365 to 368).

5 in the text-edition.

6 The word is بشر which means the outer skin, the surface, and also humanity and constitution. Probably the word complexion would best express the meaning.

7 According to Jonarāja his first expedition was towards the north, and he entered Udabhashapura (Waihand or Und) on the Indus, the capital of Gandhāra (l. 372-etc.). It appears to me that when Nizām-ud-din and Firishtah speak of the residents of Qandahār being in terror of him they refer
engaged him in battle, he was defeated; and the residents of Qandahār and Ghaznīn were always in terror of him. He marched as far as 1 Aṣhtnagar, which is now known as 2 Aṣhnagar and 3 Peshāwar; and slew an immense number of his enemies. He had gone as far as the 4 foot-hills of the Hindūkush, (but) on account of the hardships of the road, he, after undergoing much privations, returned. He then made an encampment on the bank of the river Sutlej. The Rāja of 5 Nagarkōṭ, who had ravaged some of the estates appertaining to Dehli, and was returning, rendered homage to the Sultān on the way; and having surrendered to him the whole of the vast quantity of the booty which he had seized, made his submission to him. The ruler of 6 Tibet also waited on him, and prayed that the Sultān's army might not cause any injury to his territories.

After he had conquered all the surrounding countries he took up his abode in his capital. He made his younger brother, whose name

not to the present Qandahār, which was far away. As Udabhāḍapura was the capital of Gandhāra, they may very well have called it Qandahār. The ruler of Sindhu (Sind) gave his daughter in marriage to him (l. 374). In line 377 Gajinapurī (Ghaznīn) is mentioned as being frightened on hearing the lion-like roars of the lion-king's army. Then he marched southwards and refreshed his tired horses by (bathing them in the cooling) waters of the Satadrā or Sutlej (l. 382).

1 The name looks like اشتنكر in the MSS. and the lith. ed. has اشتنكر and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 458) has Ashnuggur.

2 The name here looks like باشت نكر in the MSS., and as Naṭir in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has باشت نكر. Col. Briggs does not give the more recent name. I have not been able to identify the place.

3 The name is written as باشت نكر in the MSS., and as باشت نكر in the lith. ed.

4 I have not been able to find anything about his marching to the Hindūkush mountains in Jonarāja.

5 The encounter with the Rāja of Nagarkōṭ appears to be referred to in the somewhat curious lines (383, etc.) according to which the Rāja Udakpati is said to have pillaged Dhili (दिल्ली), which may be a misprint for दिल्ली, but I have not been able to find any account anywhere in Jonarāja of Rāja Udakpati or any connection between him and Nagarkōṭ.

6 The MSS. have تبت, and the lith. ed. has تبت, little Tibet.
was Hindāl, his heir; and he banished 1 Ḥasan and his brother, who were both his legitimate sons, towards Dehill, at the dictation of another wife of his who had ill-feeling with their mother.

He founded two cities called 2 Lachmīnagar and Shīhābpūr; and then passed away.

The period of his rule was twenty years.

3 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QUṬB-UD-DĪN, SON OF SHAMS-UD-DĪN.

When Sultān Shīhāb-ud-dīn rolled up the bed of his life, his brother, who was named Hindāl, succeeded him on the throne. He was possessed of pleasant manners and morals; and made very good arrangements for compliance of his orders. He sent a 4 sardār of the name of Loār for the conquest of the fort of Loharkōt, which was in the possession of some of the amirs of Sultān Shīhāb-ud-dīn. After several great battle had taken place between the two sides, the sardār

---

1 Firishtah calls them Ḥasan Khān and 'Alī Khān. There is no mention, anywhere, of the reason for their banishment. Jonarāja (l.438) says:

राजी तद्विषादिविसा तता देशा प्रौढितः।

�भावयर्थयः स्वदेशितः राजविवाहः परामितः।

2 I cannot find anything about Lachmīnagar or Shīhābpūr; in the text-edition the former is लाजमिनागर Lajhminagar.

3 The heading in both MSS. is as I have in the text. The heading in the lith. ed. is दक्खू हकमेद फँदल बी शीम्स दिलवी. The name Quṭb-ud-dīn has been transformed by Jonarāja to कुब्रजीव, Kumbhadīna (l. 462).

4 The readings here are somewhat different and obscure. One MS. has लोरा नाम सरदार रा. This I consider the best reading and have adopted it. The other MS. has ल्होरा नाम सरदार रा and the lith. ed. has सरदार रा (indistinct). Firishtah lith. ed. has दर अखर सुल्तन सरदार रा which cannot be correct, as this is stated in the beginning of the account of the reign. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 460) following Firishtah says, “In the latter part of his reign he deputed an officer.” The Cambridge History of India, page 278, says, “A rebellion of some of his predecessor’s officers obliged him to send an expedition which was successful, for the recovery of the fortress of Loharkot.” I can find no authority for the statement that the expedition was successful. Both the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah say that the commander sent by Quṭb-ud-dīn was slain.

As to the position, etc. of the fort of Loharkōt (Loharakōṭa) or the castle of Lohara which the expedition was sent to conquer, see Rājatarangīni, vol. II, p. 293. बुद्ध्दश is the name of the sardār in the text-edition.
was slain. And he sent for his nephew Hasan, son of Shihāb-ud-dīn, from Dehlt; and wanted to make him his heir and successor; but envious people made him repent of this decision and incited him to seize him. One of the amirs of the Sultan, who was named 2 Ray Rawal, informed Hasan of this; and 3 he fled to Loharkot with Hasan by way of Kashmir. After that the zamindārs seized both of them; and sent them to the Sultan. Ray Rawal was executed, and Hasan was cast into prison.

In the later years of his life two sons were born to the Sultan. One was called 4 Sikār and the other Haibat Khān. Both these sons were young when the Sultan 5 passed away from the world.

The period of his rule was fifteen years and five months.

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have بَرْ كُفْنَ to seize him; but the other MS. has بَرْ كُفْنَ أَوْ بَرْ كُفْنَ أَوْ بَرْ كُفْنَ to slay him, which appears to be a mistake; this, however, has been adopted in the text-edition.

2 The name is written as رَأْيِ راوِل in one MS. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. it is رَأْيِ راوِل. Firishtah lith. ed. has by mistake رَأْيِ راوِل. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 460) has Ray Rawul. The Cambridge History of India, page 278, does not mention his name, but calls him a Hindu courtier. Both Niğām-ud-dīn and Firishtah say that the Sultan attempted to seize Hasan at the instigation of envious people. Col. Briggs (loc. cit.), however, says, "He became so popular as to excite the King's jealousy"; while the Cambridge History of India says his "impatience exceeded his gratitude, and he conspired with a Hindu courtier against his patron."

3 There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have وَبَا حَسَنٍ اِزْراَعَ كُسْمَرُ نْوَارُ شَدَّةُ بَلْوَرُ هُوَ رَفَنَ. With this difference that the lith. ed. has نْوَارُ in place of نْوَارُ شَدَّة; this is adopted in the text-edition. The other MS. omits the first word, from which it would appear that Hasan alone fled to Loharkot, but this is not correct as this MS. as well as the other and the lith. ed. also say that the zamindārs seized both of them and sent them to the Sultan.

4 The name is سِكَّار, and سِكَّار in the MSS. and سِكَّار in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has شَكَّار. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 461) has Sugga and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, Sakār or Sankār. It appears from Jonarāja, line 531, that he was called Šringāra and (not Sikandar, as suggested by Haig on p. 454 of the J.R.A.S., vol. L, 1918), of which Sikar, etc., are corruptions. The other was named Haibat Khān according to the MS., etc.; and Haibata according to Jonarāja, line 533.

5 Firishtah lith. ed. gives 796 A.H., as the year of his death, while Col. Briggs has 799 A.H., 1396 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 279,

In concert with the vazirs and amirs he sat in his father’s place; and taking up the management of affairs into his own hands,

has 1394. Firishtah also says that Mr Saiyid ‘Ali Hamadānī came to Srinagar in the reign of Qutb-ud-dīn; was received with great honour and respect; and many people of the country became his true disciples. Firishtah also says that, according to Mirza Haidar Dughlat’s book, he remained in Kashmir for a little more than forty days, and then went back to his cherished native place, but Firishtah thinks that the great Khānqāh, which was built by him in Srinagar, could not have been completed in forty days, and, therefore, if he remained there for only forty days its foundations alone might have been laid down in his presence and it must have been completed after his departure.

The statement of Firishtah about Mr Saiyid ‘Ali Hamadānī’s stay does not appear to be correct. From the Tarikh-i-Rashidi (Elias & Denison Ross, 1805, pp. 432, 433) it appears, that he was expelled from Persia by Timur and it appears from Mr. Beale’s account (Oriental Biog. Dictionary, p. 238) that he came with seven hundred Saiyids to Kashmir in 1380, and died in Pakhī in 1386. Mirza Haidar Dughlat in the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, however, says that Kutb-ud-dīn died in less than forty days, which is somewhat ambiguous, but which really probably means that he died less than forty days after the arrival of the Saiyid.

1 The heading in the MSS. is as I have in the text. That in the lith. ed. is different; it is ذکر حكومت سلطان سندر که سکا نام داشت. The Sanskritised form of the name as given by Jonarāja is वटक (l. 539).

2 According to Firishtah, however, Sikandar’s mother acted as the regent in the early part of his reign. I cannot find the mother’s name in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 462) calls her Soorat Rany, and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, Sirn. According to Jonarāja, however, see lines 539, 543, her correct name appears to have been Subhatā or Šobhā. She is called Subhatā Devī or Šrī Šobhā Mahādevī. She appears to have been an extremely stern, if not a cruel woman; for finding that her son-in-law Muḥammad Shāh (called राजपूत नवग ल in l. 540 in Jonarāja), was against her son, she caused him and his wife, her own daughter, to be murdered. At her instigation also, probably Rāy Mādārī, a leading nobleman caused prince Haibat Khan, Sikandar’s younger brother, to be poisoned. The name of the nobleman is Rāy Mādārī (with slight variations) in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 462) has “the prime minister Ray Makry” and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, has Rāj Mādārī, which however is incorrect, the correct transliteration being Rāy Mādārī. I cannot find any name in Jonarāja which
sent Rāy Mādari, the vazīr who possessed much power to Tibet. He conquered that country, and having collected a large army rebelled against his master. There was a battle in the neighbourhood of Bhimbar; Rāy Mādari was defeated and captured and thrown into prison, where he killed himself. Immense armies collected round the Sultān, and all the surrounding countries were conquered by him.

At this time, when His Majesty, the Lord of the Conjunctions, Amir Timūr sent an elephant for the Sultān the latter was very

has any resemblance to Rāy Mādari. There are two ministers mentioned by him called Uddaka and Sāhaka (l. 539); and it was Uddaka who killed Muhammad Shāh and his wife (l. 540), and poisoned Haibat Khān (l. 543), and afterwards killed his colleague Sāhaka (l. 545).

1 According to Firishtah Sikandar and Rāy Mādari distrusted each other. Rāy Mādari, becoming aware of Sikandar's feeling towards him, suggested that he might be allowed to march to conquer little Tibet, his object being that he might in this way be safe from the fire of Sikandar's anger; and Sikandar agreed, as he hoped that Rāy Mādari might be slain in the war. Accordingly Rāy Mādari invaded Tibet, and gradually conquered the whole country. Having in this way become very powerful, he rebelled against Sikandar. The latter marched against him and a battle took place near the boundary of the two countries. Rāy Mādari was defeated and fled, but he later fell into the hand of Sikandar's troops. He was thrown into prison; and after a time killed himself by taking poison. Jonarāja, however, says he cut his own throat in the text-edition is apparently a misprint.

2 The name of the place where the battle took place is written as Binbar in one MS. In the other it is not very legible but looks like Jazzar. In the lith. ed. it is written as بندر. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or any other historians as far as I have seen, except Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 463), who calls it, "the town of Nere". The battle, the flight of Rāy Mādari or Uddaka and his capture are mentioned by Jonarāja (l. 549 and the following lines), but I cannot discover the name of the place where the battle took place.

3 The MSS. do not give the number of the elephants, they are very imperfect. One has without any mention of the person for whom it or they were sent. The other is better; it has from which it would appear only one elephant was sent. Firishtah however says Timūr sent his emissaries with two elephants. Jonarāja also says that Timūr, whom he describes curiously enough as
proud of this fact, and sent a petition to the Lord of the Conjunctions, containing expressions of his devotion and service. He also wrote that he would wait upon His Majesty, whenever he might be ordered to do so. He sent back the ambassadors after showing them very great favours. When (the expression of) the relation of this attachment and service was reported to the Lord of the Conjunctions, the latter declared his friendship for him, and sent a robe of honour of gold embroidery with a horse and a jewelled saddle; and ordered

sent two elephants to the King of Kashmir, being afraid of the latter. The whole passage (lines 559, 560) is so curious that I have thought it best to quote it:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{तदैव दीर्घामधवाचाकार्या युजामु।} \\
\text{वेंद्र्वेत्रार्जु वधाना विजयों विस्तारित् वृष्णवम्।} \\
\text{ततः प्रस्तायम् वेंद्रार्जु कुमारपुरप्ये।} \\
\text{श्रीमान्ति गोविन्दी इतुपायनवचं चक्षः॥}
\end{align*}
\]

In another place Dehli was spelt as विली and here it is spelt as विली; and the comparison of Dehli with a widow, who being without a ruler had only poor and wretched ornaments; and a great world-conquerer Timūr being afraid of the King of Kashmir are extremely curious. I have looked in Jōnarāja for further references to Timūr but have not been able to find them.

Firishtah and Col. Briggs's account of the correspondence between Timūr and Sultān Sikandar agrees with that in the text; but they increase the amount of the tribute, which Timūr's rasfirs had stated would be required, to three thousand horses and one hundred thousand 'Alāi ashrāfs. The Cambridge History of India, page 279, does not say that Timūr sent any elephant to Sikandar; but it says (following the Zafarnāma) that his grandson Rustam and Mu'tamad Zain-ud-din who had been sent to Sikandar from Dehli as envoys (with what object does not appear) arrived and joined Timūr's camp near Jammū. They reported that they had been well received, and had been sent back with Maulānā Nūr-ud-din as the envoy of Sikandar. The latter was informed by Timūr's courtiers that Sikandar would be required to send thirty thousand horses and one hundred thousand golden Dirhams. This is perfectly correct, but the Zafarnāma does not use the word Dirham but the word-

\[
\text{صد هزار درست ز}.
\]

It is difficult to say which of these various accounts is correct. It may be noted that it is said in the Āin-i-Akbarī (Jarrat, vol. II, p. 387) that Sikandar-on his way to Taimūr's camp, heard that it was reported in the camp, that he was bringing a present of a thousand horses; and concerned at the untruthfulness of this report he went back and sent his excuses. In Rodger's account (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 101) it is said that Sikandar was informed by some of Taimūr's servants, that he must give at least three thousand horses and one hundred thousand ashrāfs.
that when the great standard should return from Dehil towards the Punjab, he should come and wait upon him. In accordance with this order, Sultân Sikandar started with much tribute to attend on him when His Majesty was advancing towards the Punjab from the Siwâlik hills. On the way he heard that some of the amirs of the Lord of the Conjunctions had said, that it was proper that Sultân Sikandar should bring a thousand horses as his tribute. The Sultân became distressed in his mind on hearing this news, and turned back and sent a petition, that as a tribute fit for the offering had not been got together, his departure has been postponed for a few days. His Majesty, on becoming aware of the circumstances, reprimanded the men who had said that Sultân Sikandar should present a thousand horses as a tribute; and having shown favour to the emissaries of Sultân Sikandar told them that the vazirs had made an altogether unreasonable demand, and the Sultân should come and wait upon His Majesty without any anxiety. When the Sultân heard this news from the ambassadors he came out of Kashmir with great pleasure with the determination to wait on His Majesty; but when he passed Bâramûla, he heard that His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunctions had crossed the river Sind, and had proceeded towards Samarqand. He then sent his ambassadors with much tribute to wait upon His Majesty, and turned back towards Kashmir.

And as he was extremely liberal, the learned men of 'Irâq and Khurâsân and Mâvarâ'-un-nahr came with hopeful faces to his threshold; and the Islamic religion became prevalent in Kashmir.

Verses:

His noble spirit such generosity proclaimed
That even to the hopeless despair forbidden became.
When Islâm such resplendence gained
His door the sacred shrine of high and low became.

Among the learned men he showed very great honour, to ¹ Saiyid Muḥammad, who was the chief of the wise men (of the age); and

¹ It is not quite clear who this man was. Was he Mir Muḥammad the son of Sayyid Ali Hamadâni, who led a batch of five hundred Sayyids into
made complete arrangement for breaking images and pulling down the temples of the Kāfirs. Among the temples there was a great one at 1 Bahārārah, which was dedicated to Mahādev. The Sultān had it demolished. Although they dug under it, and went down up to the water, they could not find its end. They also pulled down another temple which was at 2 Jakdar, and (when they did so) great flames burst out, which the Sultān (himself) saw. (It is said that) 3 Rāja Lalītādat Devharah had built it outside the sacred city

Kashmir in 1381, following his father who had led seven hundred the year before after the expulsion of the Sayyids by Timur 1 (See note 2, p. 432 of Tarīkh-i-Rashidī by Elias & Denison Ross).

1 The MSS. have Bahārārah, and the lith. ed. has Bahārārah without any dots so that they may be many different names. Firishtah lith. ed. has بحارة and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 465) has Punjhurara. There is a great deal in Jonarāja about the breaking of images, but I have not been able to find any mention of the demolition of the temples.

2 The MSS. have Jakdar and the lith. ed. has Jakat. Firishtah lith. ed. has which Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 465) has translated, “the temple dedicated to Jug Dew”. According to the A'in-i-Akbārī (Jarrat, vol. II, p. 364, note 3), this temple was at Parihāsapura, pronounced by the Kashmiris as Poruspūr. It was the ancient Parihāsapura which was built by Lalītāditya who reigned A.D. 723-760. It was, writes General Cunningham, situated on the river bank of the Jhelum near the present village of Sumbal.”

The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of the temple. سن پرر Sanpūr is the name of the place in the text-edition.

3 The name is written as in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah also has "Raja Bulnat"; and Mr. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 101) has Lilitāwat. The king referred to may be Lalītāditya Muktāpīṭa, who according to the Chinese Annals of the T'ang Dynasty sent an embassy to China in the reign of the Huien Tsang, A.D. 713-755. He did not live 1,100 years before the Iconoclast 1393-1450 A.D., but his name is the nearest I can get to Lilitāwat. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has زوج اللادات پش از ظهور اسلام دير پرر دين علطت مطمئن و استحکام دير ترس پرر ساخته بود. This does not throw much light on the matter except for the similarities of the name of the Rāja to that of Lalītāditya. The name Taraspūr is apparently a mistake for Paraspūr or Parihāsapura (see end of the preceding note).
of Dārāpūr; and had learnt from astrologers, that after one thousand and one hundred years, a Bādshāh of the name of Sikandar would demolish it and would break up the image of Mercury, which was in it. This matter he had caused to be engraved on a plate of copper, which he had put into a casket and had caused it to be buried under the edifice. At the time of demolishing it the inscription was discovered. The Sultān said, "Would that they had left this inscription on the face of the building, so that I should not have issued the order for its demolition." ¹ All spirituous liquors and duties were entirely abolished in his kingdom.

In his old age he suffered from a burning fever. He sent for Mirān Khān, Shāhī Khān and Muḥammad Khān who were his three sons, and gave them testamentary directions. He conferred the title of 'Alī Shāh on Mīrān Khān and bestowed the kingdom on him.

The period of his rule was twenty-two years and nine months and six days.

¹ The MSS. have و شراب و نم ذا which is incorrect. Firishtah lith. ed. has andaz ولیت اور از هیچکس خواند کا نیرو و خوان مسلمان شما نگیرند. It was natural that as zealous, not to say a bigoted Musalmān, Sultān Sikandar should have gone in for a dry Kashmir, but his reason for the abolition of the Tamagha cannot be so easily understood; nor the exact nature of the tax which he abolished. Col. Briggs translates Tamagha as export duties. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the prohibition of the use of spirituous liquor, or the abolition of the Tamagha; Rodgers (J.A.S.R., vol. LIV, p. 102) mentions that Sikandar prohibited the use of wine but says nothing of the abolition of the Tamagha. The word, as I have said elsewhere, means a stand or a seat; and I suppose it came to mean a tax because the payment of taxes was denoted by the affixing of a stamp.

² The names of the sons are as I have them in the text in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Mīr Khān as the name of the eldest, but the names of the other two are as in the Tabaqat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 466) has Ameer Khan and Shady Khan as the names of the two elder sons. The Cambridge History of India, page 280, has Nūr Khān as the name of the eldest, and Shāhī Khān as the name of the second. Jōnāraja, line 584, gives the names नृग सहस्रानां, महिषासुर and रविवारवात and they are described as मिह मर्म महाभारत ; and their mother is called मनोदुर, Piruja or Pirūz by another queen Sobhā Devi (l. 586).
AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ‘ALI SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR BUTSHIKAN, WHO HAD THE NAME OF MIRĀN KHĀN.

In spite of the fact that he was young, his greatness and an awe of him having found place in men’s hearts, the people of the country were obedient to him. In the early years he left the management of affairs to Siyah Bhat, who having become a Musalmān had been the vazir of Sultān Sikandar. During the period of four years in which he was the vazir, he perpetrated various kinds of oppressions and tyranny on the people. Most of the Hindūs left the country, and some killed themselves. When Siyah Bhat died of a hectic fever, the Sultān selected his younger brother Shāhī Khān, who was famous for his bravery and intelligence, for the post of vazir; and the latter took charge of all affairs. After that the Sultān made his locum tenens and directing his younger brother Muhammad Khān to obey him, left Kashmir with the object of travelling about; and went to the Rāja of Jammū, who was his father-in-law.

1 The headings are slightly different in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. omits the word Butshikan. The lith. ed. inserts the word حكومت before the name of Sultān ‘Alī Shāh. One MS. omits the ك before Mirān Khān. The lith. ed. substitutes و for ك. In the text-edition the heading ends with سکدر بنت شکن.

2 According to Firishtah the grandeur was of Sultān Sikandar, and the awe was felt for him, and not for the young prince.

3 The name is سکل بنت in the MS. and سکل بنت in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has سن بنت. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 467) has Seeva Dow Bhut. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 103) has Syah But; and the Cambridge History of India, page 280, has Sinha Bhat.

4 In the text-edition he is stated to have died of مرش دقن or tuberculosis.

5 One MS. rather unnecessarily and tautologically inserts کہ بھیجہاٹ، موسم بند.

6 One MS. has بنادر خوہد تو را. 

7 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have برسر راجہ جمو کہ خسر او بود رفت. Firishtah explains further by saying that he went to the Rāja of Jammū to bid him farewell برسر ودام. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 467) has “of travelling in foreign countries”. In all these there is no mention of a pilgrimage; but the Ain-i-Akbari, Jarrat, vol. II, page 387, says that ‘Ali Shāh set out for Hijāz; and Haig (J.R.A.S., vol. L, 1918, p. 455) says he “resolved to perform the pilgrimage to Makkah” ; and the Cambridge History of India,
At this time some interested persons made him repentant of his having made Shāhī Khān his successor. The Rājas of Jamnū and Rājauri, having gone to support ‘Ali Shāh, he again brought Kashmir into his possession, Shāhī Khān retired from Kashmir to Sālkōt. During this time Jasar Khākhar, who had been seized by the Lord of the Conjunctions (Timūr), but after His Majesty’s death had fled page 280, says, desired “in an access of religious zeal to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca.” Jonarāja also supports this, for although Mecca or Hijāz is not specifically mentioned, the anxiety of ‘Ali Shāh for नौपित, and नौपितमुख, are mentioned in lines 693 and 699; and in line 704 it is said निषेधनित तत्त्वम । नौपितमुख, प्रमोपित । His enthusiasm for pilgrimage, however, appears to have been very short-lived, for it appears from line 708 that the privations and the probable small result of the pilgrimage soon removed all his enthusiasm for it and the king of Madra (Jamī) took him back to Kashmir (l. 710). The new king Shāhī Khān was displeased at his brother’s return; and followed by the फ़्लाकुर he went away from Kashmir (l. 714). Then we come to Jasar called Jassratha by Jonarāja (l. 730). And in line 734, we read of the march of ‘Ali Shāh against Jasar, but it is said that his enterprise was censured by his army, which was astonished at his own poverty. Afterwards when he came to a place called Muddaravyāla, (l. 738), a messenger came from the Rāja of Madra telling him not to begin the war with the Khokhars, although there were great warriors in his army, as he (the Madrāj) alone knew the दुर्बर रसस्वत । ‘Ali Shāh was defeated. There is no mention, however, of Kavandhas or headless bodies. Zain-ul-‘Abidīn (जैनलोमाजिदिंग) entered first the hearts of the inhabitants and then the capital. पीराण वा शाकलाह दादाजिंद वियविवत (l. 751).

As to the general history of ‘Ali Shāh’s reign Fīrishtah agrees generally with the Tabaqāt, but he says that the Kāja of Jamnū and Rājauri reproved ‘Ali Shāh about his making Shāhī Khān his heir, and he repented of what he had done; and they sent troops with him to attack Shāhī Khān. The latter went to Sālkōt, and sought the help of Jasar Shaikha Khokhar. Then there was a battle. There is no mention of any headless body. ‘Ali Shāh was defeated, as his troops were fatigued after the long, rapid march, and the enemy did not give them any time to rest and recover. As to ‘Ali Shāh Fīrishtah says that according to one account, he fell alive in Jasar’s hands, and according to another, Shāhī Khān pursued him, and drove him out of the kingdom.

The Cambridge History of India, page 280, adds nothing new; but according to it, the final battle took place near the Tattakutī pass. I have not been able to find anything about this pass. There is a Tattakutī pass, which is almost due east to the entrance of the Lohara Valley, but it cannot be identified with the Tattakutī pass.
from Samarqand, coming to the Punjab had acquired great power. Shāhī Khān joined 1 Jasrat Khōkhar and having obtained reinforcements from him, brought them to attack ‘Ali Shāh. The latter advanced against Jasrat with an immense army, and a great battle took place and many were killed on both sides. They say that certain headless bodies had risen up and had moved about in the battlefield. It is a fixed belief among the Indians, that in any battle, in which ten thousand are slain, a headless body, which is called the Kabandh in 2 Hindi, rises and moves about. In the end ‘Ali Shāh having no strength (to continue the fight) fled; and Shāhī Khān entered Kashmir in pursuit of him. The men in the city rejoiced at his coming.

The period of the rule of ‘Ali Shāh was six years and nine months

3 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ZAIN-UL-‘ABIDIN, SON OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR BUTSHIKAN, WHICH IS ANOTHER NAME FOR SHĀHĪ KHĀN

Sultān Zain-ul-‘Abidin, after his brother sought a place on the throne of the empire. 4 Jasrat Khōkhar aided by the Sultān’s power brought the whole of the Punjab into his possession, although he could not conquer Dehlī. Tibet and the whole country which is situated on the bank of the river Sind came into the Sultān’s possession.

5 He made Muhammad Khān, his younger brother, a councillor and left the decision of all affairs to his judgement. He himself took great pains for ascertaining the truth in all cases and disputes. He cultivated the society of all classes. He had acquired much learning and skill in arts; and in his assemblies men of intellect, both Hindūs

---

1 جسرنة in the text-edition here is apparently a misprint for جسرنة.

2 One MS. has هندوي and the other has هندوي. The lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. كندية Kēndah in the text-edition.

3 The name of Zain-ul-‘Abidin appears to have been too much for the writers of the MSS. One calls him Sulṭān Zain-ud-dīn, and the other Sulṭān Al-Abidin. The lith. ed. has the name correctly, but it inserts the words ذكر حكومت before Sulṭān Zain-ul-‘Abidin.

4 The relation between Sulṭān Zain-ul-‘Abidin and Jasrat is somewhat differently expressed by Jonarāja (l. 760), विवश तस्व स्वतंत्र्य भूपवेदतन्त्व चत्राः | ज्ञातुरुप्तिप्रभणस्त्य भविष्यत्विधिर्ब्रह्माः |

5 This is rather finely described by Jonarāja, who says:

6 This is rather finely described by Jonarāja, who says:

7 भौरे धरा वरेन समी विकस्त्या शासनिवेद्या | नीलशिशुपादवांशोपि वर्चसर्नाय शीर्षरे | (l. 758).
and Musalmāns, were always present. In the science and art of music he had very great skill. No other ruler of Kashmir had the success which he had in settling and increasing the population, in expanding the cultivation, and in excavating canals and water courses.

Couplet:

To every one does not come that with the cloud of his resolution,
He can keep the young plants of his time verdant and green.

Wherever a robbery took place in his kingdom, there was a mulct or fine fixed from the chief men of that village; and for this reason robberies and thefts became completely unknown. In his time the writing of the rates of the prices of different commodities was ordered. These were engraved on thin copper plates and were left in all cities, to indicate that all customs of tyranny had been rooted out in the kingdom of Kashmir; and (to point out) that whoever came after him and did not act according to his practices, God and he would know (the effect of such conduct).

On the prayer of Śrī Bhat, who in the science of medicine was unrivalled in the age, and had received various kinds of favours from

---

1 This is the translation of the passage as it is found in the MS. and in the lith. ed.; but it is not at all clear how the fixing of the prices of commodities would remove all tyrannical customs. It appears to me that some words have been omitted here. Firishtah in the corresponding passage, has in addition to the fixing of prices, about which, however, the meaning of what Firishtah says is not at all clear, for what he says about it is: I cannot make out the meaning of the last two words. However, Firishtah goes on to say that he and his followers have engraved a statement in copper plates in every city and village which would be sufficient to eradicate all customs of tyranny and oppression.

2 This somewhat cryptic adjuration to his successors is thus expressed by Firishtah: गोळद्र नै तिखदारिम स्री नै नै नै नै कृत्र श्री बहादुर दस्तोर कार तक्र बनेंत सा गोवर्ग बाद. The name is in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and in the lith. ed. of the Tābaqāt. The name does not appear to be mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LI, p. 103) calls him Śrī Bihut. His correct name according to Jonarāja (l. 823) was विवस्वत सिवा भट्टा.
the Sultān, other Brahmans, who during the reign of Sultān Sikandar had, on the accusation of Siyah Bhat been banished, came back and took up their quarters in the temples, and places which had been allotted to them; and stipends were granted to them. The Sultān took an agreement from Brahmans, that they would not act in contravention of what was written in their books. After that he revived all their customs, such as the making of sectarian march, and the burning of women with their (dead) husbands, etc., which Sultān Sikandar had abolished.

He also excused the ra‘iyats from paying all fines and tributes, and all payments of grain (i.e., in kind). He issued an order that merchants bringing commodities from different directions should not hide them; and refraining from all wicked storing (cornering?) should sell them at a small profit. He released all persons who had been imprisoned in previous reigns. He allowed the treasuries of all countries, which were conquered, to be plundered; and assessed the revenue on them on the same scale as that of (the country round) the capital. He chastised the turbulent people, and kept a watch over them according to the necessary standard.

He showed favour to faqirs and the aged and helpless; and did not permit that they should perish. He never looked at the face of a strange woman or at another’s wealth with an avaricious and dishonest eye. In kindness to the ra‘iyats, he increased the length of the yard

---

1 Both MSS. have نقل تكنند. The lith. ed. has نقل نكنند. Takhelf Nmabnd. I do not know that عمل كردند semantics may do so; but عمل كردند is better. I have, however, retained نقل تكنند. In the text-edition it is نقل دکنند.

2 In this matter Sultān Sikandar was very much ahead of his time. Neither Akbar nor any other emperor ordered this and it was not till Lord William Bentinck’s time that the practice of Sati was abolished.

3 This is too vague. All fines were not abolished. As we have seen, the Sultān established one for putting down thefts and robberies. Firishtah is a little more definite. According to him بشکش و جرمانه و دیگر مصادرات که شکاداران از زیاد در فرند بِدنداخت. Even this is not precise; but if Firishtah is correct, it was the fines, etc., imposed by the provincial governors which were abolished.

4 The meaning of this is obscure. Firishtah makes it clear by saying که انوا بر عساکر قسمت می نمود, that is, he distributed it among the troops.

5 Only جوہر in the text-edition.
measure and of the chain beyond what had been customary. The necessary amounts for the Sultân’s household expenditure were provided for from the produce of the copper mines which had been discovered, and where miners were always working. As in the time of Sultân Sikandar images of gold, silver, copper and other metal had been melted down, and the metal had been coined, and there was depreciation of those coins, an order was passed that coins should be struck of pure copper that was produced from the mines, and should be made current.

The Sultân was so pleasant and affable in his ways, that when he was annoyed with anyone, and externed him from his kingdom, he did it in such a way that a man did not know, for what reason the Sultân had become annoyed with him; and it was the same in the case of anyone \(^1\) who was the subject of a bad augury. People lived in his reign in anyway, and followed any religion that they wished. Most of the Brahmans, who had become Musalmâns in the reign of Sultân Sikandar apostatized again, and none of the (Musalmâns) learned men had any power or hold over them. \(^2\) He brought a canal near the Mârân hill, and founded a city there, the populated portion of which extended over five karôhs. He also founded other cities, and settling learned and wise men and also poor men in them, was always careful to enquire about their condition. He did not try to hoard treasure, but in fact whatever came into his hand was spent on useful objects.

Couplet:

As the cash of life thou caus’st not keep,
Why over other cash should’st thou keep guard.

\(^1\) The words are و د ر باب هرک تفاول به برآم د هیچ نیان میشد the meaning of which is not at all clear. In the text-edition تفاول به می راند is a better reading.

\(^2\) I have not been able to identify the Mârân hill. Firiştah also has كرة ماران; but Col. Briggs does not appear to mention it. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 103) refers to this where he says, “The king brought a canal from the mountain; and built a city five kosa in circumference.” The Cambridge History of India, page 281, says “he founded a city, bridged rivers, restored temples and conveyed water for the irrigation of the land”, but neither it nor Rodgers makes any attempt to identify the locality. Jonarâja mentions Mandaragiri (l. 858) as a locality where he made the waters, which had hitherto been useless, useful and fruitful; and Nandâsâila (l. 860) as a hill from which he brought down a canal; but I have not been able to find out anything more about these places.
And in his time, a man of the name of Sultân Muḥammad was born, who was both a poet and a wise man. He could compose extempore verses in any form and meter he wished. He also immediately and without any consideration solved any literary difficulty that was propounded to him. The Sultân showed honour to the learned men of Islâm, and said, “They are my preceptors.” He also showed honour to Yogis on account of their poverty and austerity; and he did not look at the defects of any community. As he had great intelligence he immediately solved every difficult problem, in the solution of which other men were unsuccessful. Among such problems (there was the case of) a woman who had a grudge against one of her servants, and having killed one of her own children, threw the body into the servant’s house. Early the next morning, when the accusation fell upon the latter, she went to the Sultân praying for justice. The vazîrs, after much enquiry, confessed their inability to find out the truth of the matter. The Sultân himself turned his attention to its decision. He first of all summoned the servant, who had been accused, to his private chamber; and there threatened her in various ways, and left no stone unturned in the matter. As the woman was innocent of the act she made no confession of any kind. At last the Sultân said, “If you become naked, and in the presence of men go to your own house, that might be a proof of your innocence.” The woman cast her head down in shame, and said, “For me it is better to die than to act in this way. I consent to my punishment, but I cannot consent to behave in this way.”

The Sultân then withdrew his hand from her, and sending for the other woman, who was making the accusation, said, “If you are honest in making this complaint make yourself naked in the presence of men.” The woman ¹ without any hesitation wanted to become naked. The Sultân told her not to do so, and said, “The guilt of this act is yours, you made a false accusation against your servant;” and after they had struck her a few strokes, she confessed her guilt.

¹ The reading in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is as I have it in the text, except that the last word in the lith. ed. is ماأ ونشد and not شند.

² Both MSS. and the lith. ed. say that جرم ابن كاوسير. I think the first word should be معجم. In the text-edition جرم is retained.
The Sultan did not direct thieves and robbers to be executed, but he ordered that they should work every day with chains on their feet on public buildings, and should be supplied with their food. He also forbade all hunting, so that animals might not be killed. He did not eat any meat in the month of Ramadān; and, owing to his munificence, many performers of vocal and instrumental music came from various places to Kashmir. Among these was Mulla 'Udī, who was one of the poor pupils of Khwājah 'Abd-ul-qādir and came from Khurāsān. He played on the 'ūd (some instrument like a lute or a harp or a lyre) in such a way that it was a source of great pleasure to the Sultan; and he was exalted with various favours. Mulla Jamīl Ḥāfiz, who was unrivalled in versification as also in elocution, also received great favours from the Sultan. His drawings (naqqahāt) are celebrated to this day in Kashmir; and Ḥabib a maker of fireworks or of guns, who (first) manufactured muskets in Kashmir, lived in his reign, and had no rival in his art. The Sultan in concert with him wrote a book containing questions and answers; this work is of very great value. There were many dancers, rope-dancers and natwaks (actors?) in his time. There had also been men in Kashmir who sang one tune in twelve different modes or variations.

At certain times, when the Sultan wished to be gay and cheerful, he ordered that Rubābīs and Bins and other musical instruments

---

1 The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are بپواطلا. One of the meanings of بپواطلا in the dictionary is "without means". Finishtah in the corresponding passage omits the word بپواطلا.

2 Rodgers (p. 104) translates this sentence as "his name is a proverb in Kashmir for excellence in poetry." The word about which I am doubtful is naqsh, which ordinarily means a drawing. I wonder whether it means a tune here. The word occurs again a few lines further down, where one naqsh is said to have been rendered in twelve modes or forms.

3 The name is written as حبيب Habib in both MSS., and حب Jab in the lith. ed. Finishtah lith. ed. has حب جاب, and Rodgers also has Jab. The word is طناب بپان in the Ṭabaqāt, and يرسما بپان in the lith. ed. of Finishtah. Rodgers has "acrobate". The next word is تنوها in one MS., and تنوها in the other and بپها in the lith. ed. There is no corresponding word in Finishtah; and I cannot find تنوها or تنوها or تنوها in the dictionary. It may be that تنوها or تنوها is a corruption of the Sanskrit नुन, an actor.

4 A Rubāb is a four-stringed instrument in the form of a shortnecked guitar, but having a surface of parchment instead of wood. I cannot find بپ.
should be made of gold and adorned with gems. There was a very intelligent man of the name of 1 Sahum, who composed verses in the dialect of Kashmir, and in the 2 sciences and literature of India was the leader of the age. He wrote a book called 3 Zain Harb in which he narrated all the events of the Sultan's reign in detail. He had memorised the whole of the Shahnama; and he wrote a book called 4 Manik in the science of music, and dedicated it to the Sultan; and owing to this received many favours. The Sultan was himself

in the dictionary, but the name is a form of Sanskrit Vima, also a stringed instrument. Firishtah has Tanbur instead, which is a kind of lute or guitar with a long neck. Rodgers does not mention any of these instruments.

1 The name is سوم in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and صوم in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has صوم. Rodgers (p. 104) has Dasiim, but I think this is a mistake. He has changed the conjunction و into و and has prefixed it to the name صوم. It is in the text-edition. Neither Col. Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India gives the names of the various artists, though the latter mentions some of their achievements. Jonaraja, however, gives accounts of other achievements of the Sultan. Jonaraja died in the reign of Zain-ul-Abidin; and his work was continued by his pupil Srivara. I have not, however, been able to find any mention of these matters in their works. I have already noted the appointment of the Sultan's brother Muhammad Khan to be his chief minister. See page 652 of the text and note 5 on the same page. He appointed Tilakcaraya to a high appointment (l. 822). He conquered Gandhur, Sindhu and Madra (l. 828). He ordered the release of Maldeva, the Raja of Madra, who had been defeated and taken prisoner by Jasrat, the Khokhar (l. 829). He also defeated the Raja of Rupapuri and the king of Udabhanda pura (Waihand or Und), and Bhautabhi (little Tibet) (lines 830-2). I need not give further particulars.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have علم but the other has علم. صوم, صوم is in both MSS.; and in the lith. ed. it is صوم, صوم; and Rodgers has Zain Harab. I have adopted Zain Harab on the supposition that it means the war(s) of Zain.

4 The name of the book is Bana in one MS. and the lith. ed., and Manik, which may be Mabak or Manik or Miat as there is no dot above or below the third letter, in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has something different, viz., و بودی بک شاهنامه مروسو تعلم باد داشتی زنام کتابی در علم و موسیقی پنام شاه در عطر بسی به ضریر شاه هرواندیم so that according to him it was not Sahum but Budi But (Buddhi Bhatia) who wrote the treatises on music, and it was called Zain and not Mank. Manik has been adopted in the text-edition.
acquainted with Persian, Indian, Tibetan and other languages; and many books in the Arabic and Persian languages were translated by his orders into the Hindavi language; and the 1 Mahābhārata which is a most famous book, and the book called Rājatarāṅgini, which is the name of a history of the Bādshāh of Kashmir, were translated into Persian by his order.

The pardoned (late) Sultān Abū Saʿīd sent 'Arab horses and Bactrian camels from Khurāsān as presents to the Sultān. The latter was highly pleased at this, and in reply sent donkeyloads of saffron, 2 paper, musk, shawls and cups of glass or crystal and other wonderful products of Kashmir for the acceptance of the Khāqān (sovereign) who has since attained to Divine mercy. Sultān Bahlūl Lūḍi and Sultān Maḥmūd Gujratī sent the finest things of their respective kingdoms, and strengthened the relations of affection. The rulers of Mecca, the revered, and of Egypt and Gīlān and other countries also sent fine and beautiful presents, and maintained similar relations. The Bādshāh of Sind sent many equipages and other 3 things 4 with one of his servants, with an ode in praise of the Sultān. The latter was highly pleased on reading the ode. When Dūngar Sēn, the Rāja of Gwāliar, came to know the Sultān's great love for the science of music and singing, he sent two or three valuable treatises

1 The MSS. are very imperfect here. One of them leaves out the entire passage from ترجمه كروند to كتاب مهبارت. The other omits the words است و كتاب. The lith. ed. is more correct, but it and the second MS. both call the Rājatarāṅgini the Rājatarṅgi and describe it as a history of the Bādshāhs of Hind or India. Firishtah has Rājatarṅgini and calls it the history of the Bādshāhs of Kashmir.

2 The word is variously written. In the MSS. it is قطاس, and قطاس. In the lith. ed. it looks like قطاس. I cannot find any meaning of any of these words except "paper", which might be sent as a present. Rodgers (p. 105) translates the word as "pepper".

3 The lith. ed. has=Aśīrīn 1 पाली horses after आशियी; but as neither MS. has the word I have omitted it.

4 The MSS. and the lith. ed. appear to be imperfect here. The MSS. have بمصرب بكي بار تصدیق, and the lith. ed. has بمصرب بكي با تصدیق; neither of which makes sense. I think the correct reading should be بمصرب بكي از ملازم چرود با تصدیق, and I have interpolated the necessary words, which have been adopted in the text-edition.
on these sciences; and his son Rāja 1 Gōp Singh also after him kept the relations of sincerity and attachment intact. The Rāja of Tibet got hold of 2 two wonderful animals of an elegant shape, which are called Hāns in the language of the people of India, from the place called Mānsarwar, the water of which is subject to no change, and sent them to the Sultān. The latter was exceedingly pleased on seeing them. Among their other characteristics one was, that when milk mixed with water was placed before them, they separated the milk from water with their beaks and drank it and pure water was left behind.

The Sultān, in the beginning of his reign, made Muḥammad, his brother, his successor, and left all affairs in his charge. After his death he confided in his son Ḥaider in his place, and left all affairs in his charge. He also distinguished his two foster brothers, named Masʿūd and 3 Shēr, by great proximity to his person; but in the end they fell out, and Shēr killed Masʿūd, who was his younger brother, and in retaliation the Sultān had him executed.

The Sultān had 4 three sons, one, Ādam Khān, who was the eldest, but who always appeared wretched in the eyes of the Sultān, and Ḥāji Khān, and Bahrām Khān; he was the youngest of all, but had an extensive jāgīr. And he conferred the title of 5 Daryā Khān on a

---

1 The name is differently written. One MS. has کربند while the other has کرب سب، and the lith. ed. has کرب سب. The name can, I think, be only Gōp Singh or Kōb Sing. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ṣosain has adopted کرب سن.

2 Firishtah says the animals were called rājhans by the people of India, and the place, where they were obtained, was the haud called Sarwar and not maula called Mānsarwar.

3 One MS. calls the elder foster brother مائی Masēr by mistake, while further down it calls him شیر Shēr.

4 According to Jonarāja he had four sons by the daughter of the king of Madra, named respectively श्रीराज खान, श्रीवास खान, अभिनव खान and विश्वास खान (lines 855 and 856), of whom only the 1st, 2nd and 4th are named in the Persian histories. In the Rājahāngīrīt of Širvāna (1st taraqa, line 56) he is said, however, to have had only three sons, whose names are somewhat differently written, viz., श्रीवास खान, राज खान and विश्वास खान.

5 The MSS. have دریا instead of دریا. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have دریا Mullā Daryā.
man of unknown descent called Mullâ Daryâ, and placed him in charge of all affairs, and occupied himself with pleasure and enjoyment.

1 When Sri Bhat, who was the vazir, departed from the world, the Sultân dedicated, in memory of him, one krôr of the gold of Kashmir, which is equivalent to four hundred ashrâfis or gold mohurs, to his sons.

The Sultân was an adept in the (occult) sciences of the Yogi; and men had seen 2 his spirit leaving his body which is called 3 Simiyâ.

1 Shiva Bhatta, see note 3, page 653. I have translated this passage as it is found in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has, however, a different version, and Col. Briggs another, while Mr. Rodgers has a third and from it draws an inference which does not appear to be quite justified. The passage is not well connected with the context, and it is, therefore, difficult to judge whether Nîgam-ud-dîn’s or Firishtah’s version is more likely to be correct. In the Tabaqât it occurs just after the mention of the Sultân’s sons, but there can be no doubt that the man, who died and for the good of whose soul the money was paid, was Sri Bhat or Siva Bhatta, the vazir. In Firishtah also the passage occurs immediately after the mention of the Sultân’s sons; but here the person for the good of whose soul the gift is made is the Sultân’s foster brother Shärûd or Shârdû, though earlier he had been called Shêr. The foster brothers and their mutual quarrel and the execution of one of them had been mentioned by Nîgam-ud-dîn and Firishtah before the mention of the Sultân’s sons. Then the amount of the gift is 400 cows of solid gold. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 470, 471) calls the foster brother Sheeroo and the amount, 400 seers of solid gold. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. IV, p. 105) follows Firishtah and makes the amount a krôr pieces of gold, 400 camel loads. I think Firishtah is right as to the person for the good of whose soul the gift was made, for the vazir had not done anything for which his soul would require such a heavy ransom. As to the amount of the gift it would be useless to enter into any calculations, without knowing even approximately the weight of the value of the zar. Rodgers’s assumption is that the Sultân was extremely rich, and a sum of four hundred gold pieces would not be too high a sum for his gift for the salvation of his foster brother’s soul. Four hundred camel loads of gold would of course be another matter.

2 The words are in the lith. ed. and in one MS. In the other MS. they are rather indistinct. The other word, which is apparently the name given to it in the language of Yogi, is written as Simiâ and Simiâ in the MS. and Simiâ in the lith. ed. The same word occurs again, where it is called Simiâ in one MS., Simiâ in the other and Simiâ in the lith. ed. The word is not to be found in Firishtah, where, however, the Yogi is said to have said that he knew a science by which he could take the Sultân’s illness on himself, so that the Sultân would recover completely.

3 See the preceding note.
They say that on one occasion the Sultan became so ill that he was about to die; and people washed their hands (i.e., despaired) of his recovery. At this time a Yogi appeared in Kashmir; and said "I know the science of the transmigration of life; and excepting that there is no other treatment for the Sultan, who has contracted an extremely severe disease. The treatment is that I should separate my soul (or life) from my body, and should put it into the Sultan's body." The Sultan's attendants, considering this a great boon, took the Yogi with one disciple of his to the bedside of the Sultan, and left them there by themselves. The Yogi bringing out his soul out of his body, by a science, which he knew, put it into the Sultan's body after the latter's soul or life had become separated (from his body). He had previously instructed his disciple, to take his body, which would become lifeless, to the Asan, which is the name of the dwelling-place of Yogis, and to guard it. When the disciple came out, carrying the body of the Yogi, the Sultan's attendants hastened to the latter's side, and found him healthy in body; and they rejoiced exceedingly.

After some time the sons of the Sultan becoming hostile to one another rose in conflict among themselves. Adam Khan, who was the

---

1 See note 2, page 661.
2 One MS. has بْنَبَان, concealed, instead of alone or here by themselves.
3 One MS. has 

I prefer the first reading.
4 The word is Asan in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah. I wonder, however, whether it is not a mistake for Asram.
5 Firishtah has something of an anti-climax, where he says از اسم مک, and guards and drives away the evil spirit, i.e., and guard it from injury by dogs, cats and other animals. Firishtah also tries to explain the Yogi's power and says that the Yogi by their mental exercises probably acquire such powers; and gives instances of similar cures effected by descendants of His Holiness Khwajah Muhammad Husain Pârsâ; and says that the two cases may probably be placed in the same category but ends with the pious ejaculation of اللدأ علم بالضراب God knows the best!
6 It appears that they were misled by evil advices. See lines 60-64 of Srivara's Rajatarangini (canto I). It also appears that the Zain-ul-'Abidin being afraid of some catastrophe sent Adam Khan towards little Tibet (कुंतिबे) (I. 71).
eldest, left Kashmir; and with a great army invaded the country of (little) Tibet. He conquered the whole of that country; and brought an immense quantity of booty to the Sultan; and became the recipient of favours. ¹ Hajji Khan, under the Sultan's orders, marched to attack Loharkot. Owing to the intemperate behaviour of Hajji Khan, the Sultan always kept Adam Khan near him. At last, at the instigation of some of the people of Loharkot, Hajji Khan advanced towards Kashmir (i.e., the capital). Although the Sultan sent written and verbal messages to him that he should not come, they had no effect. Having no other alternative the Sultan left the city with the intention of engaging him in battle and encamped in the plain of ² Pallasil. Although Hajji Khan repented of his conduct, yet

¹ Lines 82, 83 say that when Adam Khan returned after conquering the Bhuttas, Hajji Khan marched to the Lohara mountain (Lohkoto according to Col. Briggs, vol. IV, p. 471), by the Sultan's order, and as the latter knew that two knives could not be placed in one sheath, he ordered their coming and going. Srivara then describes the way in which Hajji Khan's adherents incited him to return to Kashmir (lines 85–108); and in line 110 he says that the king quickly left the city with his army on hearing of his son's approach.

² The name of the place is written in the MS. as بيللا Yehel, and which may be anything; and ليل Till in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has بيللا Baill. In the text-edition it is بيللا. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 471) has Buleel and Rodgers has Pulpul. Srivara Panjdit calls the place where the two armies met and whence the Sultan sent a Brahmin as ambassador to Hajji Khan, पजिईणाआन (l. 117), but where that was I cannot find out, except that if it was on the route between Srinagar and Loharkot, it was somewhere to the east of the former place, and probably near the Pir Panjal range. The ambassador's message and speech are also given at some length (lines 119–128) and ending with the threat, "Your commanders would be slain like sparrows!" Hajji Khan's adherents were of course angry but he said that he would go and fall at his father's feet, and whether he was pleased or angry he could do to him whatever he liked (line 132 et seq). His adherents, however, adjured him to go on with what he had begun. They said, "Let us fight, if we are victorious, you get the kingdom. If we die, you die; wait only till we fight; if we are slain, do as you think proper." Hearing these words Hajji Khan was sunk in a sea of thought (l. 142). The Sultan on hearing what the ambassador had to say, ordered his army to begin the battle. After the battle had gone on for the whole day, Hajji Khan turned back (l. 164).

It appears, however, from the end of the first taraunga of Srivara's poem, that he calls it the जनवरवर्गमन् | So the name of the battle-field was
at the instigation of adventure-seeking men, he arrayed his army and marched to the field; and the battle went on from morning till evening. In the end, the army of Ḩāji Ḵān was defeated. Many deeds of bravery were performed by Adam Ḵān in the battle. Ḩāji Ḵān fled towards 1 Hirpūr and Adam Ḵān hastened in pursuit and tried to seize him; but the Sultān did not allow him to do so. Ḩāji Ḵān came from Hirpūr to 2 Bhimbar; and occupied himself with the treatment of the wounded. After the victory, the Sultān returned to Kashmir and ordered 3 the erection of a high minaret of the heads of his enemies and had the men belonging to Ḩāji Ḵān's army, who had been taken prisoners, put to death. He also inflicted great tortures on their families and descendants. On account of this most people separated from Ḩāji Ḵān, and came to Adam Ḵān.

Mallaśilā, but whether Pallaśilā and Mallaśilā are two places or whether Pallaśilā 1 is a mistake for Mallaśilā or vice versa, I cannot make out.

1 The name is written as نیشر بیور in the MSS. and بیور جرد و ناشر بیور in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has هیچه بیور and this has been adopted in the text-edition, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 472) has Heerpoor. Both Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India say Ḩāji Ḵān fled to Bhimbar, but according to the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah, he came to Bhimbar from the place mentioned in this passage. In Śrīvara, I, line 166, mention is made (apparently) of Adam Ḵān's ferocity in the neighbourhood of Śūrapura. It appears that Hirpur (Hirpūr) or Hurapor is the modern name of Śūrapura which is often described as the entrance station to Kashmir. I think, therefore, I will not be far wrong in calling the place Hirpūr.

2 The name is بیور in one MS. and بند in the other and نیشر in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. نیشر is adopted by M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition. It looks like بند in Banīr or Nābir in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 472) has Nere. Rodgers has Bhimbar and so has the Cambridge History of India. Śrīvara in his Rājatarangini (1st tarānga, l. 169) says पाश्चयास्म: गन्वरपिनिकरे सबिन नधन । I cannot find out where Citraheśa was.

3 As regards this, see Śrīvara's Rājatarangini, 1st tarānga, lines 171-174. It appears that बादशाह or merciful Sultān was दुर्बिर, and he was thoroughly dissatisfied with himself and his servants; it is not therefore likely that he should make a minaret of the heads of the slain, who are described as the सर्वस्वाभाषिकोरेण; though I cannot make out what the सर्वस्वाभाषिक was, that he made of the rows of the heads of the warriors who were killed in the battle. Was it a rest chamber, a sort of Valhalla? But even in that case the rows of heads would be a grisly decoration.
After that Ādam Khān ruled (the country) with full authority for six years. Later on there was a terrible famine in the country of Kashmir, so that a large number of men died of hunger. Owing to this the Sūltān became very sorrowful, and distributed most of the grain in the royal treasuries (granaries) among the people; and reduced the land revenue in some places to one quarter, and in others to one-seventh (of the fixed amount). And Ādam Khān having acquired

1 Firishtah says Ādam Khān was at this time declared to be the Sūltān’s successor, and he ruled for six years. Col. Briggs and Rodgers also say that he was made the heir to the throne. The Cambridge History of India does not say distinctly that he was declared to be the heir to the throne, but it says that he participated for six years largely in the administration of the kingdom. Sūrivara (I, l. 182) says योग्यराये दुधं तद्धूएं परशा हजारः.

2 The famine is described at some length by Sūrivara, I, lines 184-213; in fact the whole of the 2nd canto of the 1st tarākṣa which is called नविनवर्त दुर्लघ्नवर्ष is a description of the famine which occurred in the 28th year of the reign. He mentions the fact that the Sūltān fed the people with his own paddy, i.e., with the paddy in the royal granaries, but he does not appear to mention the reduction of the various demands.

There were, according to Sūrivara, heavy rains and great floods after the famine, though this is not mentioned by the Musalmān historians. The heavy clouds frightened the people as enemies are frightened by showers of arrow (I, l. 217), and the Vīnāstā (the Jhelum), the Ledar (the Lidar river), the Sindhu a tributary of the Vīnāstā, which flows into the latter at Prayāg or the Vīnāstā-Sindhu-Saṅgama, a place of considerable sanctity and the Kāśpatikā (the canal in Srinagar, now the Kutakul) and other rivers submerged the villages on their banks as if in a terrible rivalry of one another (I, l. 221). According to the Tarikh-i-Rashidī (Eliaś and Dennison Ross, p. 223) flows from the Zoji pass down towards the Jhelum and was called the Lār. Stein does not give any modern name for it, but says the two Sindhs are distinguished by the Indus being called the Buḍ Sind. He also says that the valley of the other Sind forms the district of Lār. The merciful Sūltān went round in a boat inspecting the damage caused by the rains and he greatly sympathised with the people in their privations (I, lines 239, 240). After that everyone was happy with a full harvest (I, l. 243).

8 How he acquired the power is not quite clear. Firishtah does not give any information, but he only says he acquired the power to plunder and ravage. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 472) says “At this time he deputed Ādhum Khan with a force to march and attack the fort of Gujraj”, which is not at all correct. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 106) begins with, “In his government of Kamrāj” Ādam Khān was very oppressive, but he does not say
power in the country of Kamrāj, committed various acts of oppression. And many people came to the Sultan, and complained against him. He refused to receive all farmāns which were sent by the Sultan; and finally collecting a large army marched to attack the Sultan; and halted at Qutb-ud-dinpur. The Sultan acting on the purport of the couplet;

Couplet:

Attack not an army, larger than on your own,
For on a lancet thou canst not strike thy fist.

satisfied him by various devices and sent him back to the country of Kamrāj; and sent for Ḥāji Khān with great quickness.

that the Sultan appointed Ādam Khān to that government. The Cambridge History of India, page 283, says "After the famine Ādam Khān was entrusted with the government of the Kamrāj district." But it appears from I, line 273 of Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, that his mind having become vitiated on account of his jealousy of his younger brother, he suddenly attacked the country; and from I, line 278, that one day being excited by the intoxication of being the Yuvarāja (heir to the kingdom) he went to the Kramarājya.

1 One MS. omits by mistake the words from Ṣawad-ud-din and Bāsir Murdām.

2 His and his followers’ atrocious acts are described by Śrīvara in I, lines 280–290; and it is said in line 291 that when the king’s messenger told his followers not to commit such oppression, they replied, “Let the king, if he is vexed, go on crying.”

Śrīvara says in I, line 293, that having collected and equipped his forces at Kuddadenapura (Qutb-ud-dinpur) he came to attack the Sultan’s forces at Jainanagara. Firmstah also mentions Qutb-ud-dinpur. I cannot however find anything about its situation. About Jainanagara or rather J(Z)ainanagari, it appears from Jonarāja, line 871, that Zain-ul-Ṣīdin carried the canal called Jainagārgā on which his new town Jainanagari was built (see the notes on pp. 111 and 112 of Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. I) as far as Rapasvāmin. This J(Z)ainanagari was not far from the capital.

4 The reading in the MSS. which I have accepted is زناد مشت ب نیشتر. The lith. ed. has زناد اکشت ب نیشتر.

5 I cannot find out what these devices were. Śrīvara (I, l. 297) also has بچھرلیاہ, i.e., by politic measures.

6 Śrīvara mentions the sending of the letter to Ḥāji Khān in I, lines 299–300. The letter contained a rather piteous appeal. रण चलनबनसे गवर्मेंत े सवा बिला।
Adam Khan on arriving in Kamraj advanced from there without any delay, and attacked Suyyapur. The governor of the place, who had held that position from before the time of the Sultan, came out and engaged him, and was slain; and the whole of the city was destroyed. The Sultan hearing this news, sent a great army to attack Adam Khan; and there was a great battle. Many were killed in both the armies, and Adam Khan was defeated. When the bridge which had been erected at Suyyapur across the river Bihat (Vitasta or Jhelum) broke down, about three hundred of the chief men on Adam Khan's side were drowned, as they were crossing the river in their flight.

Adam Khan crossed the river and saw a place (for resting) on that bank. The Sultan came out of the capital, and coming towards Suyyapur, comforted the ra'iyats. At this time Hajj Khan, in compliance with the farman which had been sent to him, arrived by way of Punch to the vicinity of Baramula. The Sultan sent his

---

1 Suyyapura, the modern Sopur, the chief place in pargana Zainagir, which lies a short distance from the point where the Vitasta leaves the Wular Lake is adopted by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text.
2 Both MSS. have تام شهر و ولادت رنگ but the lith. ed. has تام شهر و ولادت رنگ. I have omitted the words ولادت رنگ.
3 Srivara does not, as far as I can make out, mention the attack of Suyyapura by Adam Khan, and the latter's battle with the governor of the place; but he mentions the battle between the Sultan's and Adam Khan's armies (I, lines 304-306).
4 This is also mentioned by Srivara (I, l. 308).
5 The name of the place is and without any dots in the MSS. They cannot, therefore, be pronounced or translated with any certainty. In the lith. ed. it is بنگہ Banjah and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is بنگہ Panjah or Punjab, and this has been followed in the text-edition. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the place, and I cannot find any place like Banja or Punja near Baramula. In I, line 322, Srivara says that Hajj Khan arrived at this time at Parnotes, which (corresponding to the modern Punch, or Prunna, the Kashmiri form) seems to have been included in Lohara and have been situated in the lower valley of the Tehli (Tausi, vide Stein's Rajataraṅgini, vol. II, p. 433). Punch is sufficiently like Punjab which is the name of the place in Firishtah. I have accepted Punch.
6 This agrees exactly with Srivara (I, l. 323), Baramula being called Varahamula. The name is derived from the ancient Tirtha of VisQu Adi Varaha
youngest son Bahrām to welcome him. 1 A great affection grew up between the two brothers. Ādam Khān fled from the place where he was, and went to the Nilāb (the Indus) by way of 2 Shāhbang. The Sultān taking Ḥājit Khān with him returned to the capital, and made the latter his heir and successor. The latter girded up his loins in devotion to his father, and left no minuvic in his service unobserved. He recommended his own servants, who had been his companions and friends 3 during his travels in India, for all the high appointments in the government; and obtained these for them from the Sultān; and allotted to them fine jagirs. The Sultān gave him a jewelled gold belt from the Sultān; and was 4 always pleased with him.

1 Compare Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, I, line 324.

2 The name looks like Shāh Mank and Shāh Bik in the MSS. and Shāh Nīk in the lit. ed. Firishtah lit. ed. has Shāhzah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 473) has Shāhabād. In the text-edition it is Shāh Nīk. Rodgers says the Sultān with the aid of Ḥājit Khān drove Ādam Khān out of the valley, without mentioning the name of any place and the Cambridge History of India, page 283, says Ādam Khān “fled to the Indus”. It appears from Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, I, line 326, that he शाहमहासि लिम्बं मुनीये वर्षाविहरिः, i.e., crossing the Sindhu by way of  Śāhībaṅga arrived with his army in the country of the Lord of the Sindhu. It should be noted that the first Sindhu is not the Indus, but a tributary of the Viśasta and the second Sindhu is the Indus or the Nīl. The  Śāhībaṅga of Śrīvara appears to be identical with the large village of Shādīpūr which is opposite to the junction of the Viśasta and the Sindhu. Shādīpūr appears to be an abbreviation of Shīhāb-ud-dīnūr, but when and why it got the name of Shāhband or Śāhībāṅga is not clear.

3 There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has کد ای سفر هند کد ای سفر هند بان رناقت کرده بردند, while the other has کد ای سفر هند بان رناقت کرده بردند, while the lit. ed. has کد در سفر و حضر کرده بردند. The readings in the MS. are manifestly incorrect, but if the mistakes are corrected, they would mean, who were his companions and friends in his travels in India. The reading in the lit. ed. is more correct, but I cannot find any meaning of حضر.

4 Śrīvara describes at some length (I, lines 336–387) the various pleasant journeys of the Sultān and his son through the flower-adorned country, with musical and other entertainments and calls the canto, which is the fourth in his first taranī, the पुष्पोद्वापन, i.e., the description of the flower
At last Hāji Khān contracted dysentery owing to constant drinking, and there was great confusion in the government. The carnival. Then he adds another (the fifth) canto (I, lines 387–494), which he calls the असवरूपायात्मक, in the course of which he describes the Sultān's visit to the Kramassaras, now called the Kaonsar Nag a mountain lake two miles long situated at the foot of the highest of the three snowy peaks (15523 feet) and which is connected with the Indian deluge story, and the peak to which Vignau in his fish avadāra had bound the ship (nau) into which Durgā had converted herself to save the seeds of the beans from destruction (see Stein's Rājakarangīti, vol. II, p. 393). Then he has another canto (the sixth), which he calls the निरीक्षणार्थविद्या, which runs from line 495 to line 527. In this he first describes the excavation of the new lake called the Jainassaras near Padmapura, now called Pāmpūr, the chief place of the Vihi puryana, and the erection of a palace on its bank; and then describes the different presents sent to the Sultān by various princes; and finally the advent of artists and artisans who introduced various beautiful kinds of silk weaving. He next mentions the arrival of a राजकुमरिश्वर पवन, a Yavana rope-dancer (1. 528). After all this prosperity and advance came a period of adversity, line 534 et seq. There was hail, a comet made its appearance and continued to shine for two months, then the dogs were always whining, and there were eclipses of the sun and the moon both in the course of a fortnight. Then came the news (l. 576) of the death of his nephew, Śrī Kyāminda, lord of Sindhu, who was like a son to him, and who was killed in battle by Ebbarrāhima. Śrī Kyāminda may be Ekrām-ud-dīn and Ebbarrāhima was certainly Ibrāhīm; but I have not been able to find out who they were. According to Śrīvara (I, 1. 581) Zain-ul-Ābidīn was at this time remembering his departed friends, servants, and companions whom he loved like his own life, he knew himself like an elephant who had gone astray from the herd (वरोवत वासवा अत्तं वृक्ष प्राकारं जन्मं। वामवतवह्यक वृक्ष नित्यं॥)

1 Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says the Sultān was displeased with Hāji Khān on account of the latter's excessive drinking, and his not listening to the Sultān's admonitions; and the Sultān himself began to suffer from dysentery; and as the Sultān was displeased with Hāji Khān, the work of government remained unattended to. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 43), however, agrees with the Tabaqāt, and says that Hāji Khān and not the Sultān "was seized with a bloody flux" i.e., had an attack of dysentery. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India, however, follow Firishtah. The former says, "The king was seized with dysentery, and the latter more vaguely, "the king fell sick". A reference to Śrīvara (I, 1. 582) shows distinctly that the Tabaqāt and not Firishtah is correct. It is said there that राणवर्तु राजा।

सत्ताने अनुभविन्य तयापवालितविनासम्। The Sultān's admonitions are given in lines 585–599. In line 600 it is said that Hāji Khān promised not to drink again
1. amirs secretly sent for Ādam Khān. He came according to their suggestion; and saw the Sultan. The latter was displeased at his coming, and was annoyed with the amirs. In the end the brothers mutually agreed, and Ādam Khān was honoured. After some time, the weakness of old age overwhelmed the Sultan, and besides that he became ill. The amirs and the vazirs all in concert submitted to him that if the duties of the government be entrusted to one of the Sultanāzādas, this would be the cause of peace and good government in the country. The Sultan did not show any favour to this suggestion, and did not select any of his sons for the duties of the sultanat. Mischief-makers then intervened, and held various meetings. Bahram Khān acting treacherously and speaking in a mischief-making way made the two grown-up brothers hostile to each other. Ādam Khān, becoming suspicious, went and took up his residence in Qūtb-ud-dīnpūr. When the Sultan became extremely feeble, the amirs taking precautions against all disturbances did not allow his sons to come and enquire about his health; and sometimes they seated the Sultan with some trouble at an elevated spot; and had drums except by his father's orders; but going back to his own house he continued to drink (see l. 603).

1 See Śrivara's Rājatarāṅgini, I, line 604 मन्दिरं। दशम्रणार्यम्योषिन्यान्वितं।

8 There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have रजमदें अमद वर्ड; while the other MS. has दर रजमदें अमद वर्ड Frishtah in the corresponding passage says सल्तन अग्निज बांध नौ नम कुरा. Śrivara in l, line 606, says श्रीमत्त गो नाम नम।

3 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have बेहार छो। This appears to me somewhat imperfect.

4 This is somewhat differently stated by Śrivara in I, lines 626-27: राज्यारूढ़ता राज्यारूढ़ता। राज्यारूढ़ता राज्यारूढ़ता। राज्यारूढ़ता।

5 Śrivara in I, lines 630-33, says that the Sultan pointed out the bad qualities of his sons, and declared that he would not bestow the kingdom on any of them; but ने मति परें सत्ता। प्राचीनतार्थ। ने मति। i.e., after my death let him who has the strength get it.

6 One MS. has नवानो अमेव, but the other and the lith. ed. have नवानो।

7 This is mentioned by Śrivara in I, lines 685-689.

8 One MS. omits नवानो by mistake.
beaten to inform the people that the Sultān had recovered. By this plan they managed to keep the country on its feet (i.e., safe from disturbances). At last when the Sultān's illness became very serious, and he remained unconscious for a whole day and night, one night Ādam Kāhān came alone from Qutb-ud-dinpur to see him, and left his army outside the city, so that it may keep watch on Ḥājī Khān and other enemies. On that night Hasan Kachhi, who was one of the great amirs, had taken the promise of allegiance to Ḥājī Khān from the amirs in the audience hall of the Sultān. On the following day the amirs got Ādam Khān out of Kashmir by some plan; and summoned Ḥājī Khān with great promptitude. Ḥājī Khān came in compliance of the summons of the amirs, and took possession of all the horses in the Sultān's stables, and a large army collected round him; but on account of apprehensions of disturbances and the treachery of his enemy, he did not go inside the palace.

When Ādam Khān heard this news he became frightened; and retired to Hindūstān by way of Nāwil. Many of his retainers

---

1 Firishtah's account is slightly different. According to him Ādam Khān left his soldiers in the environs of the city and he himself passed the night in the audience chamber of the Sultān. Hasan Khan Kachhi also took the promise of allegiance to Ḥājī Khān from the amirs that same night in the audience chamber. The account of the behaviour of the three princes and of their movements, which agrees generally with that in the text, is given by Śrivara. I, line 717 et seq. Hasan Kachhi is described in line 724 as गर्भनवीनिषेधः or Hasan, the treasurer. He is also described as लतांजलि छौपदयन परान्, i.e., deceiving others blinded by his selfishness. Ādam Khān is said to have gone to Qutb-ud-dinpur (I, l. 725).

2 This is also mentioned by Śrivara. I, l. 728. I do not understand why so much importance was attached to the possession of the horses.

3 Śrivara, I, line 731, says he was unable to go to see his father for fear of treachery although he was anxious to do so (खोलिकित दृष्टिस्पर्शय). Zain-ul-'Ābidin died later (हात्या बिहोवतय यथास्वयम्, i.e., at midday on the 12th lunar day in the month of Jyāṛgha (I, l. 744).

4 I cannot find anything about this place. It is written like Nāwil in one MS. and Sarul in the other and Nāwil in the lith. ed. Firishtah has व मोहुल the well-known pass. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted Sarul in the text-edition.
separated from him. ¹ Zain Badr, who was one of the trusted chiefs of Ḥājī Khān, hastened in pursuit of him. Ādam Khān fought bravely, and having slain many of his near relations escaped. Ḥasan Khān, son of Ḥājī Khān, who was at ² Punch, came to his father; and the affairs of Ḥājī Khān were splendidly arranged.

The Sultān (i.e., Zain-ul-ʿAbidin) passed away from the world. ³ The period of his rule was 52 years.

AN ACCOUNT OF ⁴ Sultān Ḥaidar Shāh, son of Sultān Zain-ul-ʿAbidin, who had the name of Ḥājī Khān.

Three days after his father's (death) Ḥājī Khān took the latter’s place and assumed the title of Sultān Ḥaidar; and having ascended the throne in the manner of his father at ⁵ Sikandarpūr, which is

---

¹ I cannot find anything about him also. The name is written as انس بدر in the MS. and ابن بدر in the lith. ed. Firistah has ابن بدر زین لارک Zain Lārak. He is not mentioned by Col. Briggs or Rodgers or in the Cambridge History of India. In the text-edition ذین بدر Zain Lārak has been adopted.

² See page 667, note 5. It will be seen there that the name of the place was Parnotes. It will be seen also from Śrīvara, I, line 607, that one of Ḥājī Khān's sons hearing of the arrival of his uncle (i.e., Ādam Khān), wishing to fight with him left the capital, and went to Parnotes.

³ Niẓām-ud-dīn does not mention the date and year of Zain-ul-ʿAbidin's death. According to Firistah he died at the end of 877 A.H., in his 69th year. Col. Briggs has 877 A.H., 1742 A.D. The last-mentioned year is of course wrong, the figures having been transposed and 1472 being made into 1742. The Cambridge History of India, page 284, says Zain-ul-ʿAbidin died in November or December 1470. In this it follows Haig (a.R.A.S., 1918, p. 450). śrīvara, I, line 744, says that the Sultān in राष्ट्रव भीसमास भागारे जीवित रहे The month of Ḥaṭṭaḥa corresponds with June, July and not with November or December. It appears also from Śrīvara, II, line 4, that Ḥājī Khān assumed the sovereignty on the 1st day of the 2nd lunar fortnight of Ḥaṭṭaḥa, (बैशाखपदि) It appears also, that, according to Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 107) the coins of Ḥaidar bear the year 874 A.H., so we are as much in the dark as ever.

⁴ śrīvara in line 4 of the 2nd tarāhga of his Ṛḡaṭarāṅgini says यह वाल-प्रागत्व सातवृद्धिकारि राजवर्गीयद्वीप व बैशाखपदिने।

⁵ Neither Sikandarpūr nor Naushar appears to be mentioned in Ṛḡaṭarāṅgini; but "Nau Shah" is mentioned in the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, page 483, as being on the route by which Ḥaidar Dughlat entered Kashmīr.
famous as Naushahr he gave away to deserving men the gold which was scattered over him. His brother Bahram Khan and his son Hasan Khan placed the crown of the empire on his head; and continued to serve him.

Couplet:

When death casts away the crown from one head,
The sky (providence) places it on another's head.

He allotted the country of Kamrāj as the jāgīr of Hasan Khan; and made him the Amir-ul-umarā and his heir and successor. He allotted Nagam as the jāgīr of Bahram Khan. He permitted the Rājas of the different districts, who had come to offer condolence on the death of the late Sultān, and congratulations to the new Sultān on his accession, to return to their territories after bestowing on them horses and robes of honour. He also bestowed on most of the amirs jewelled swords and robes.

He had innate generosity, but was always drunk, and as he had a vindictive temperament, most of the amirs, being aggrieved with him, went away to their jāgīrs. As he was careless about the state of the kingdom, the razirs perpetrated various acts of oppression on the ra'iyats. He distinguished a barber of the name of Boli by proximating him to his person; and acted according to what he said to him. The barber took bribes from men, and turned the Sultān's disposition

---

1. See line 7 of the 2nd taraṅga of the Rājatarangini of Śrīvara where it is said that his younger brother and his son standing before the Sultān were like Śukra and Bhāspati shining in front of the moon.

2. The allotment of Kamrāj as the jāgīr of Hasan Khan does not appear to be mentioned by Śrīvara; but he says (l. 10 of the 2nd taraṅga) व्रज-वैभव नागादिगुम खडङ्ग मधुवराज्या।

3. Nāgām or Nāgrāma was a district of considerable extent in southern part of Maḍavaraṇya.

4. The name is Lūlū in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is rather difficult to decipher it in the other MS.; and it is Lūlū in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. He is mentioned repeatedly by Śrīvara in the 2nd taraṅga, see lines 35, 47, etc.), but I cannot find his name. He is called Lūlū by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 107) and Lūlū in the Cambridge History of India, p. 284.
against anyone with whom he happened to be on bad terms. 1 Ḥasan Kachhī, who before all others had endeavoured to secure the allegiance of the amīrs to the Sultān, was put to death on the accusation of the barber Bōlī.

Before this 2 Ādām Khān had collected a large army, and had arrived in the country of Jammū in order to fight the Sultān. When the news of the murder of the amīrs reached him, he turned back and went to Jammū. He then went to fight some Mughals, who had come to that neighbourhood to aid and reinforce the troops of Mānik Dēv Rāja of Jammū, was struck by an arrow in the mouth and died of that wound. 3 The Sultān was sorrowful on hearing of his death, and ordered that his dead body might be brought from the battlefield, and buried near that of his father.

At that time owing to his (excessive and) continual drinking several serious diseases attacked the Sultān. 4 The amīrs conspired secretly with Bahram Khān, and wanted to place him on the throne. When this news reached 5 Ḥasan Khān, who had conquered many

---

1 The name is ہرکتی Bar Kachhī in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and is rather indistinct in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has Ḥasan Khān Kachhī. He was called Ḥasan Kachhī before this in the Ṭabaqāt. And Ḥasan Kogān or Ḥasan the treasurer by Śrīvara. As to his murder see line 79 of the 2nd taraṅga of Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini.

2 See line 107 of the 2nd taraṅga of the Rājatarangini of Śrīvara where the Rājā of Jammu or Madrampaṇḍalū is called Mānikya Dēvā and the Mughals are called the Turukkas. Firishtah agrees, but he calls the Rājā ملک دیو Rājā Mulk or Malik Dēv. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives his name.

3 See line 110 of the 2nd taraṅga of Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, where however the dead body is said to have been buried near that of his mother (तराप्रकाश-सानीय अभीविधियो वधान)।

4 I cannot find the mention of any actual conspiracy of the amīrs or ministers to place Bahram Khān on the throne in Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini. It is only said in line 160 of the 2nd taraṅga ताबुगान रहस्य-पात्रो राजविदाहः।

5 Firishtah, who is followed by Col. Briggs and Rodgers, says that it was Fath Khān, son of Ādām Khān who was making these conquests, but the Cambridge History of India, page 284, agrees with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that it was Ḥasan Khān the Sultān’s son who was raiding the Punjab. According to Śrīvara, line 144 of the 2nd taraṅga, he (i.e., Ḥaidar Shāh) sent his son
fortresses in India, and had acquired much booty: he with his victorious army returned to Kashmir by forced marches. As his return was without (the Sultan's) permission, interested and malicious persons having said words, (as if) from his side, turned the disposition of Sultan Haidar (from him). 1 The latter being annoyed with him did not allow him to make his qārnish; and none of his services was accepted. 2 One day the Sultan climbed to the polished terrace roof of a palace and occupied himself in drinking. In his drunken condition his foot slipped, and he fell down and died. 3 The period of his sovereignty was one year and two months.

4 An account of Sultan Hasan, son of Hāji Khān Haidar Shāh.

He ascended the throne sixteen days after the death of his father,

with an army outside the kingdom for a (conquering expedition). Then in line 159 it is said karaṇaṭṭhaṃaṭṭaṃ: the 3rd, 4th, and 5th mānasābā of kṣaṭarājaṇaṇaḥ: i.e., having made many kings his tributaries, and having stayed for six months, he became anxious to return to Kashmir at the end of the month of Caitra, and then in line 162 he goes on to say that the wicked ministers shrivelled up on Ḥasan Khān's arrival, as lotuses are shrivelled up on the rising of the full-moon.

1 The Sultan's behaviour towards his son as described by Śrīvara Pāṇḍit cannot be clearly understood. He was apparently afraid of Bahram Khān, and so, as is said in line 186, he gave his son, who had returned from his conquering expedition merely a sight of himself vājeṣṭakāya puṣṇaḥ haṃ śṛṃmāṇaḥ and in the next line it is said that he was certainly afraid of Bahram Khān, otherwise how was it that he did not honour his son with giving him robes of honour gūmṛ cṣaṭruṣaṁ svaṃ pṛṣṭhaṃ rājyaḥ paryājanaḥ: paryājanaḥ gūmṛ gūmṛ gūmṛvaṁśa). At the same time he was secretly very angry with Bahram Khān like the Śāmi tree with the fire concealed in it, fearing that the latter might injure the son. (pārśvara rājaṁ gūmṛ mālayoṣṭhaḥ prabhuvṛ: śrīvaraḥ gūmṛ gūmṛ gūmṛ)

2 The scene and the nature of the accident and subsequent treatment are described by Śrīvara in lines 169-73 of the 2nd taraḥga.

3 Neither the Ţabaqāt nor Firishtah gives any indication of the date of Haidar Shāh's death, nor does Śrīvara; but seeing that the death of Sultan Zain-ul-ʿabidin occurred in the month of Jyaiṣṭha, and Haidar Shāh reigned for one year and two months, his death very probably took place in the month of Srīvaṇa in the year 878 A.H. or 1473 A.D.

4 The heading is incorrect in both MSS. One gives the name as Sultan Ḥusain, the other omits the name altogether. I have adopted the heading in the lith. ed.
by the exertion of 1 Ahmad Aswad. On the 10th day (after his accession) he imprisoned some people about whom he had suspicion. He 2 went away from Sikandarpur to Naushahr, and took up his residence there. He gave away the treasures of his grandfather and uncle to (deserving) people; conferred the title of Malik Ahmad on Ahmad Aswad; and 3 entrusted the administration of the affairs to him; and made his son named Nauruz Aswad his chamberlain.

Bahrám Khán came out of Kashmir with his son; and went away towards Hindústán. All his soldiers separated from him; and all his affairs will be narrated later. 4 The Sultán again revived all the rules and regulations of Sultán Zain-ul-Abidin which had been abolished in the time of Sultán Haidar; and directed that all affairs should be carried out in conformity with them. At this time, some people, who wanted to create disturbances, went to Bahrám Khán; and incited him to declare war against the Sultán. The amirs also wrote letters to him and summoned him. Bahrám Khán returning from

1 The name is written as Ahmad Abrus in the MSS., and Ahmad Abrus in the lith. ed. It is is Ahmad in the lith. ed. of Firsihtah, and Ahmad Aboo in Col. Briggs' History (vol. IV, p. 477). Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 107) and the Cambridge History of India, page 286, call him Ahmad Aswad; and Rodgers has (the black) in brackets after Aswad. Ahmad Aswad has been adopted in the text-edition. Śrīvara in the 2nd taraṅga of his Rāja-taraṅgini calls him अजुक्त in line 178, and अजुक्त in line 197. I cannot make out how Ajukta could be transformed into Aswad or vice versa Aswad besides 'black' means 'powerful', 'illustrious'. Śrīvara describes the contention between Hassan Khán and Bahrám Khán about the succession; and then after it had been decided in favour of the former, describes the burial of Haidar Sháh (lines 211 et seq. in the 2nd taraṅga). This chapter he calls वर्णकथा अजुक्त in 12.

2 Śrīvara in line 7 of the 3rd taraṅga says—the Sultán left चेहरा, and went to his विमंचित चित्तावन. Then he describes the coronation ceremonies, which were highly Hindu in their character, and in which चालावदन बूढ़ा विधान निष्कम स्वयं. शोभक्रमोऽति: पूजामण्डलयोऽबृहतते: (l. 9); then there was दीपोऽन्त इन the अवमष्टिक्ष्ण (line 12).

3 This is mentioned by Śrīvara in line 23; and the appointment of Ahmad Aswad's son नौरूज in the दांतपादिक्षेत्र in line 25.

4 See Śrīvara, line 33 in the 3rd taraṅga, where he says चित्तावनमण्डल दिवसमावर यावेत खलसे।
the district of Karmā, arrived, after traversing the hills in the district of Karmā. The Sultān had at this time gone to Wallpūr on a pleasure trip. On hearing the news, he went to Suyyāpūr in order to fight with him. Some people tried to persuade the Sultān to go away in the direction of India; but Malik Āljmad Aswad inciting him to fight, did not allow that he should retire towards India. The Sultān approved of the Malik’s opinion and sent Malik Tāj Bhat with a large army against Bahrām Khān. The latter had hoped that

1 The name is Karmā in one MS. and looks like Karhā in the other. It is Karmā, which cannot be clearly deciphered, in the lith. ed. Firisṭah lith. ed. has Karmar. The text-edition has Kamrāj. Šrivara in line 41 says कर्मच्यानां: कर्मच्यारुपाकटकोलक:। ज्ञानापमुः प्रांत: समरप्रति विनोक्षर:। which means that wishing to seize Kamarā, he arrived at Kamarājapura from Karnabhyantara after crossing the hills. This is clear and agrees with the Ṭabaqāt except that we cannot find what Karnabhyantara means. Ordinarily it would mean from the interior of Karna, but I cannot find any locality of the name of Karna. Now taking the European authorities I find Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 477) says Beiram Khān came by the route of Kurmar; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. IIV, p. 108) says he came “by way of the mountains to Kamarāj”; while the Cambridge History of India, page 285, says he “took refuge in the hills of Kama to the west of Kamrāj”, and he apparently came from there. I cannot find anything about the Kama hills; and the names do not agree with that in the Persian chronicles or in Šrivara’s work.

2 It appears from line 42 of the 3rd tarāṇya of Šrivara’s Rājatarangini that Ḥasan was at that time at Avantipura and he returned from there on hearing the news of the return of Bahrām. This probably indicates the identity of Avantipura now called Vantipur on the Vīsṇū, which was in old times probably the most important place in the district of Holūqā, with Wallpūr. Ḥasan’s return to Svayapūra is also mentioned in line 43.

3 See Šrivara, line 48, from which it appears that some of the leaders of the ministers said, नमुना भोगसामयिनि नमा प्रतिष्ठि, though the sentence appears to be somewhat incomplete.

4 The name is rather indistinct in one MS., but it is Malik Tāj Bhat. Filisṭah has only Malik Tāj Bhat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Mullik Tāj Bhat. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the commander of Ḥasan’s army. Šrivara in line 54 has दशसमासाराज्ञिष्ठत्तें दोष अस्त्रप्रद: from which it appears that Tāj Bhat or Tāj Bhat was the name of one of the commanders.
the Sultān's troops would come over to him; but in the end the contrary happened. There was a severe battle in a village of the name of 1 Dulāpūr; and Bahāram Kān was defeated and fled, and came to the village of 2 Zainagir. The Sultān's troops hastened in pursuit of him and seized him. An arrow struck him on the face, and all his equipage and other things having been plundered, he was brought before the Sultān in a wretched condition. The Sultān ordered that both he and his son might be put into prison. After a time a blinding needle was drawn across his eyes, and after remaining in prison for 3 three years, he passed away from the world.

4 Sultān Ḥasan (at this time) had Zain Badr, who had been the vazir of Sultān Zain-ul-ʿābidin and the rival of Malik Aḥmad Aswad,

---

1 The name is لولو Lūlū, in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is لولو in the other. Firishtah lith. ed. has لولو. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Looooloor. The reading in the first MS. is adopted in the text-edition. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the place. Śrīvara in line 55 तांकायाम्बासामसु गां रुसुरासारः । Dulapura is so near Tūlapūr the name in Firishtah, that I have no doubt it is the correct name of the place where the battle took place, though I cannot find out anything about it. It may be that لولو is a corrupt form of Lōlau, the Kashmiri name of the pargana Lōlāb (see Stein, Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 487).

2 The name of the place is زين كار Zainkar in both MSS. and Ratankara in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has زين كار Marhanahpūr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) has Zeenpoor. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India furnishes any further light on the matter. Śrīvara in line 59 says जाजिरिय गाववाइयार तलाएलकुः from which it would appear that he came to Jainagiri dismayed with the result of the battle. Jainagiri or the pargana of Zainagir appears to comprise "the fertile Karēwa tract between the Volur and the left bank of the Pohur River". (Stein, Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 487).

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have سل with three years. Firishtah lith. ed., however, has سر روز three days and Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India following him have three days also. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 108) says, "He remained in prison for three years after this and then died." The Ṭabaqāt, however, appears to be right, for Śrīvara in line 125 says तबबया वस्तु तुधदलसुतरभव । अयोध्यवन:। हेमातिज्ञेय: चर्च चिरो। i.e., there suffering great agonies for three years, and being reduced to a skeleton from his privations he died.

4 This is also mentioned by Firishtah, almost in the same word as the Ṭabaqāt, but is not mentioned by Col. Briggs. It is mentioned by Rodgers,
and who had exerted himself in the matter of the blinding of Bahram Khan, and whom Sultan Zain-ul-Abidin had on many occasions, owing to being annoyed with him, wanted to put to death, but had not been able to do so, seized. And it so happened that on the very day on which Bahram Khan was deprived of his eye-sight, the needle was drawn across Zain Badr's eyes; and he also died in prison after three years.

Couplet:

Who'er in some one's eyes put the thorn of tyranny,
It behoved that his own eyes were soon destroyed.

Malik Ahmad having now become the vazir with full authority, sent Malik Yar Bhat, who was his favourite with a large who says that he was blinded with the same needle with which Bahram Khan had just before been blinded. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matter. It is mentioned by Srivara in lines 133 et seq. at some length and the particulars appear to agree with those in the Tabaqat, but the name of the man does not agree with that given in the Tabaqat or by Firishtah. M. Hidayat Husain has adopted این بدر in the text-edition, but it was بدر earlier on p. 678.

1 The MSS. and the lith. ed. are rather obscure, and it is not quite clear whether Malik Yar reinforced the Raja of Jammū or vice versa; and which of them invaded the Punjab. Firishtah appears to say that Malik Yar reinforced the army of the Raja of Jammū who led the invasion of the Punjab; and he looted the country, and devastated the city of Stálkot. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 478) says that the invasion was undertaken at the instigation of the Raja of Jammoo, called Ajeet Dew, and that the latter took the command of the allied army, that he was defeated by Tatar Khan, who penetrated into Jammoo and sacked the town of Stálkote. He calls the commander of the Kashmir army Mullik Taj Bhut. Rodgers calls him Malik Bârî Bihut, and says he was sent to assist the Râjah of Jammû against Tâtâr Kân, who was harassing the borders of Kashmir; and that they plundered some part of the Punjab, and destroyed the town of Stálkot. The Cambridge History of India, page 285, says that Hasan Shâh "sent an expedition under Malik Yâr Bhat, to co-operate with the troops of the Raja of Jammû in ravaging the northern districts of the Punjab, where Tâtâr Khan Lodî represented the military oligarchy over which his cousin Buhlûl presided at Dehli. The town of Stálkot was sacked, and Malik Yâr Bhat returned with as much plunder as enabled him to form a faction of his own." It does not say whether the Râja of Jammû commanded or even accompanied the troops.

It will appear from the above, that there is great deal of discrepancy about the facts of this expedition. I am afraid Srivara's account does not clear it
army in the direction of the territory of Delhi by way of Rājaurī; and ‘Ajab Dēō the Rāja of Jammū came and met him, and reinforced him with an immense army. Malik Yārī advanced and fought with Tātār Khān, who was the governor, on behalf of the Bādshāh of Delhi, of the foot-hills of the Punjāb, and plundered the whole of his territory; and devastated the town of Stālkōt.

1 The Sultān had a son by Ḥayāt Khatūn, who was a descendant of the Saiyids. The Sultān gave him the name of Muḥammad and entrusted him for his education to Malik Yārī Bhat. His second son was named Ḥusain; and was entrusted to Malik Nūr, son of Malik Aḥmad, so that he might bring him up. Some enmity having occurred between Malik Aḥmad and Malik Yārī Bhat, they tried to destroy each other, and differences having also come about among the amirs, there were three great battles, till one night (the amirs?) collected their men, and getting into the palace of Sultān created

up. It appears that although Aḥmad Aswād oder Ahmad Aḥmadīkta had at first befriended Yārī Bhat (Ṭājī Bhaṭṭa), he and his sons were now jealous of him (l. 310 of the 3rd taraṅga). He insinuated that it was no good obtaining the kingdom, if the outskirts were being raided by the enemies (l. 314). Tājī Bhaṭṭa then prayed that he might be entrusted with an army to lead an expedition (line 315). He was accordingly provided with it. All the kings who were in the Madranḍaḷa (Jammu) headed by Aṭyābha Dēva (‘Ajab or Ajeet Dēō) abandoned Tātār Khān and joined him (lines 319, 320). He caused much damage (वर्षकस) in Tātār Khān’s country, burning down mosques built by the Khān in गार्वविपलानि i.e., in Sialkot, etc. (l. 321). Then he quickly returned (line 325). From this it would appear that the expedition owed its origin to a political intrigue arising out of the jealousy of the minister, and more specially of his sons against Ṭājī Bhaṭṭa. बर्ष in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for पार्वती बहुत.

1 Compare line 222 in the 3rd taraṅga of Śrīvarṇa’s Rājatārāṅgini, which is सचतानि शोकास ब्रह्मचर्याय नसर्वते। तवसति भगवान राजश्री प्रमाणानविद्वानस्।. Her son was named Muḥammad Khān (l. 226), and was made over to Tājī Bhaṭṭa for the purpose of being looked after (वर्षक).

2 This is mentioned in lines 328-329 of the 3rd taraṅga, where it is said, somewhat curiously, that he was for being suckled or supplied with milk entrusted to Malik Nauroz परमेश्वर संभवोवृद्धय समर्पित.

* The MS. omits grande great. Firštah agrees generally as to the troubles. Both Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India note that the two factions were constantly quarrelling with each other.
1 various disturbances, and set fire to the palace; and there was very great trouble in the work of the government. The Sultān imprisoned Malik Ahmad Aswad and a number of his relatives, and his property was given up to be plundered, and he died in prison.

The Sultān sent for Saiyid Nāṣir, who had been highly esteemed by Sultān Zain-ul-ābidīn, who had in his assembly accorded him precedents even before himself, but who had later been banished from Kashmir, and had gone to the territory of Dehli. Saiyid Nāṣir died when he arrived near the valley of the Pir Punjāl. Then (the Sultān sent for Saiyid Ḥasan, who was the son of Saiyid Nāṣir, and was the father of Ḥayāt Khātūn from Dehli, and made over the reins of authority to his hands. The Saiyid turned the mind of the Sultān from the Kashmirī amīrs; and a large number of the chief men of the state were put to death at his instance and by his endeavours. Malik Yārī was put into prison. The other nobles fled out of fear, and went to different places. 2 Jahāngīr Mākri, who was a great nobleman fled to the fortress of Lōharkōt. After some time, the Sultān was attacked by a 3 severe form of diarrhoea, and he became extremely weak. He made a will that as my sons are too young, Yūsuf Khān, son of Bahram Khān who is in prison, or Fath Khān, son of Ādam Khān, who is in the country of 4 Ḥaswās be

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have دمست اندازیم, while the other MS. has دمست درازیم; the latter is adopted in the text-edition.

2 The Cambridge History of India, page 285, describes him, by mistake, as chief of the Mākū clan. In the text-edition it is جهانگیر ہاکروی instead of جهانگیر مکروی.

3 Firishtah says از کئیں جام مسیار مرمن سنس سالیا شدین, where the word بسیار seems to be redundant. کئیں جام is translated by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 108) as "over uxoriousness", and by the Cambridge History of India, page 285, more correctly, I think, as debauchery.

4 The name of the place is حسواس Ḥaswās, in one MS.; and looks like فلوس Ḥasvās in the other and in the lith. ed. It is جسروتی in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and is transliterated as Josroth by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 109). Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 479) does not mention the place, but he says that Hussun directed that either Yoosof Khan or Futtah Khan should succeed him. The Cambridge History of India does not mention any testamentary direction by Ḥasan Shāh. The name of the place does not appear to be mentioned by Ṣirvā who describes the king's illness in somewhat poetic language without specifying any particular disease from which he suffered (line 541 et seq.).
placed on the throne; and Muḥammad Khān should be declared as the next heir. Saiyid Ḥasan outwardly accepted this. The Sūlṭān died of the illness from which he was suffering.

1 The period of his reign is not known.

2 An account of Sūlṭān Muḥammad Shāh, son of Sūlṭān Ḥasan Shāh.

Muḥammad Khān was aged seven years, when he attained to sovereignty by the exertions of Saiyid Ḥasan. 3 On that day all articles of gold and silver, and arms, and valuable stuffs, and viands, etc., were placed before him. He did not pay any attention to any of these things, but took up a bow. Those who were present inferred from this act of his that he would be a great and brave man, and said that he would endeavour to rule wisely and well.

The power of the Saiyids attained to such a height, that they 4 did not permit any of the amīrs and vazīrs to go near the Sūlṭān. The Kashmiris, being much annoyed at this, 5 one night, in concert with Parāsṛām, Rāja of Jammū, who for fear of Tāṭār Khān had taken shelter in Kashmir (i.e., Srinagar) treacherously slew Saiyid Ḥasan with thirty of the chief Saiyids in the garden at Nau Shahr. They

---

1 According to Śrīvāra he reigned for twelve years and five days (l. 560). According to the Cambridge History of India, page 698, his reign extended to eighteen years from 876 A.H., 1472 A.D. to 894 A.H., 1489 A.D. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 80) is inclined to believe that he must have reigned for about 19 years, but as Heidur, his father, did not die till 878 A.H., and he died in 891 A.H., the period of his reign could not be more than 13 years in any case.

2 There are slight differences in the heading. I have taken that in one of the MSS. The other MS. has Ḥusain instead of Ḥasan as the name of the preceding Sūlṭān, and omits the word Shāh after the name. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MS. but omits the word Shāh after Sūlṭān Ḥasan.

3 This is mentioned by Fīrishtah and by Col. Briggs and Rodgers. Śrīvāra (4th taraṅga, lines 4, 5) says something slightly different: तथा विद्वानानी जापितां श्रापुराणिः। नाका भोगशरणं भवं प्राप्तपत्तकर।। शतरंवरं श्रवयुवः अभिसा सख्यान्तरे। रहस्य महुलतिर्मविशालितिः।

4 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have हीरिकिं स व दशर नी कांकड़े। It appears to me that the word lā should be inserted after वज्र; and I have done this. Fīrishtah lith. ed. has lā after वज्र.

5 The attack on and the slaughter of the Saiyids is described by Śrīvara in lines 37–49 of the 4th taraṅga of his Rājatarangīṇī.
then crossed the river Bihut (Jhelum), and broke down the bridge; and collecting their men sat down on the other side of the river. Saiyid Muḥammad, son of Saiyid Ḥasan, who was the maternal uncle of the Sultān, collected his men and took up his quarters in the palace in order to guard him.

One of these nights, when a great disturbance was going on, and every one was in fear and distress, 1 'Abd Zinā' wanted that he would take away Yūsuf Khān, son of Bahrām Khān, who was in prison. But one of the Saiyid amīṛ of the name of 'Ali Khān, becoming acquainted with the plan, slew Yūsuf Khān, and he also slew Bāji Bhat, who was making lamentations at the murder of Yūsuf Khān. Yūsuf Khān's mother who was called Sān Dēvi, who from the time when she had become a widow, did not eat more than three mouthfuls of barley meal when breaking her fast, kept watch for three days in her house over the coffin of her son; and after it had been buried, had a chamber built for herself near his mausoleum, and lived there till the time when she passed away.

In short Saiyid 'Ali Khān and the other Saiyids collected their retainers and sat down on the bank of the river in order to fight their enemies. They spent much money and collected an immense army. The people of Kashmir came from all directions in a large

1 The name looks like عدی and in the MSS. and عدی in the lith. ed. . Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name. According to Śrīvara, Yūsuf Khān was killed by a man of the name of 'Ali Khān, when he was being taken away by some of his partisans who are described as (the exact meaning of which I cannot make out), who had released him from the prison (see lines 77-79 of the 4th tarangā).

2 The name is written as in the MSS. and بھیت in the lith. ed. . Śrīvara calls him پھٹ (4th tarangā, l. 83). It is Mājī Bheit in the text-edition.

3 The name is written as in the MSS. and دربو in the lith. ed. . Srīvara has (l. 88 of the 4th tarangā). The facts of her living on वधन and her living (without life) and in जुरिये (place of cremation) are also mentioned. M. Hislayat Ḥosain has adopted سن دربو in the text-edition.
body and joined the latter. Skirmishes took place with arrows and muskets; and every day large numbers were slain on both sides. Robbers came into the city openly and plundered and looted. The Saiyids dug a trench round the city so that they might be safe from the robbers. They also razed to the ground the houses of their enemies in the city and the villages wherever they might be; and having plundered their property and cattle, did not, because of great pride, guard their own property. At this time, 1 Jahāngīr Mākri, who was at Loharkōt, came to the capital at the summons of the Kashmiri party, i.e., those opposed to the Saiyids. Although the Saiyids made overtures of peace to him he did not agree. One day Dāūd the son of Jahāngīr Mākri and 2 Saifi and Ankri crossed the bridge and fought with the Saiyids. Dāūd and most of his companions (they are called Makhālifān i.e., enemies of the Saiyids) were killed. The Saiyids became 3 joyful, and beat drums and made minarets of the heads of their enemies. On another day the Saiyids went to cross the bridge. The enemies met them there and there was a great fight near the middle of the bridge. Then the bridge 4 broke down, and many people of the two parties were drowned in the river.

---

1 The invitation to Jahāngīr (जमांगिर) is described in lines 137-42 of the 4th taraṅga; and his arrival by पृष्ठ 45 में in line 145. The overtures of the Saiyids to him are mentioned in lines 147-154 and Jahāngīr's reply in 155-162. The Saiyids were angry on receiving the reply; and prepared for war (lines 163 165). Then भिलास राजा आगम्य करते crossed the bridge and came to the capital to fight with the Saiyids (line 166).

2 The names appear to be सीफ़ी and अक्रोdrawing in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah there is only one name سیفی شق ما كاری. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers have any of the names mentioned in the Tabaqāt or in Firishtah. In the text-edition the name is سیفی دانکاری. Dāūd is called दाँद, and his death is mentioned in line 178 of the 4th taraṅga.

3 I cannot find any mention of minarets being made of the heads of the slain but in line 190 it is said that the corpses were placed on the road राजमार्ग में. Dāūd's head was also cut off and placed राजमार्ग में (l. 157). The Saiyids also made बिजयोलव गये: (l. 193).

4 The breaking down of the bridge and the falling of विटास्तिया: विटस्ती that day in the Vitaslā is mentioned in line 196 of the 4th taraṅga.
After that the Saiyids wrote letters to Tātār Khān, the governor of the Punjāb, and asked him to come to their help. He sent a large army to help them. When his army arrived in the neighbourhood of Bhimbar, the Rājā of the place named Hans fought with them, and slew their best men. The enemies (of the Saiyids) on hearing this news made great rejoicings, and for a period of two months there were constant skirmishes between the Saiyids and the Kashmirīs. At last the latter divided themselves into three troops, crossed the river and seized the environs of the hills. The Saiyids came to meet them and fought with great bravery; but as the number of their enemies was double their number, most of their leaders were slain, and the rest fled into the city. The Kashmirīs pursued them, and entering the city, stretched their hands for slaughter and rapine. They set fire to the city, and in the conflagration the Khānqāh of Mir Saiyid 'Alī Hamadānī was burnt down, and from

1 Neither the Tabaqat por Fīrūzštāh mentions it; but it appears that after this Jahāngīr, Jyallāla, Saiphafofāmara and others thought of various plans of defeating the Saiyids, (l. 202). There were frequent skirmishes and his warfare degenerated into mutual abuse in indecent language (line 208), and they frequently degenerated into mutual abuse in indecent language (line 210).

2 The sending of a sīrākh Aṣīrāk Bach by Tātār Khān is mentioned in line 217 of the 4th tarānqā.

3 The name is written as Bahaz, and Bahth in the MS, and as Banīr Bahtar in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Fīrūzštāh it is Banīr Banīr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 183) has Bhimbar and Rodgers Bhimbar. In the text-edition it is Bahtar.

4 The name looks like Pūsh in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Hans in the other MS. Fīrūzštāh lith. ed. has Hansh and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 483) Hows. in the text-edition. Srivara does not mention the arrival of Tātār Khān’s army at Bhimbar; but says that on their arrival at Sustragula sthāna they were met by Habhābhāo sthāna Rājā and others (l. 218).

5 It appears from Srivara, line 223 of the 4th tarānqā, that two thousand were slain near the camp of Tātār Khān’s army; and then the Kashmirīs being delighted determined on a war (तत्तार अस्तित्र नन्दन नन्दन जयां जयां)

6 According to Fīrūzštāh the fire was extinguished on reaching the Khānqāh; and that edifice was not damaged in any way. Srivara in line 319 says that the fire reached the Khānqāh of Jāmācchāwādān but it is not quite clear
there the fire was extinguished. The number of the slain in the
course of the day was two thousand. This happened in the year
892 A.H. Saiyid Muhammad, son of Saiyid Hasan got into the
house of a man named Gadāf of the 1 Rāwat tribe, and fortified
himself.

The enemies (i.e., the party opposed to the Saiyids) then all
collected together in the palace or audience hall, and went to offer their
homage to Muḥammad Shāh. They got him to join them, and he banished Saiyid ‘Ali Khān and other Saiyids from Kashmir.
2 They now sent back Parasrām after presenting him with various
gifts. As everyone of the Kashmiris claimed to be the sardār (chief),
in a very short time enmity made its appearance among them; and
the administration of the government fell into confusion. 3 Fath Khān son of Adam Khān, who after the death of Tātār Khān, had
become the governor of the Punjāb arrived in Rajauri from Jālandar,
and took up his quarters there in an endeavour to regain his ancestral
dominions. As he was the grandson of Sultān Zain-ul-ʿAbidin,
4 people, who sought for adventures among the amīrs and the Saiyids
went to him in large numbers, and he giving rewards to each one of
them gave them hopes (of further favours). He hoped that Jahāngīr
Mākri would come before all others, and would see him; but Jahāngīr
imagining that his enemies had gone before to see Fath Khān, did not
join the latter; and dissuaded him from attempting to conquer Kashmir.

Sultān Muḥammad Shāh came out of Kashmir (i.e., Srinagar),
being persuaded by Jahāngīr Mākri to do so; and encamped in the

---

1 The word is written as Rāwat in both MSS. In the lith. ed. and the
text-edition it is Rāwan, while in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is راوان. In
line 339 of the 4th tarāṣṭa of Śrivara’s Rājatarāṣṭaṅgini it is said that Miyan (अम) Muḥammad got into बसिबिरास.
2 Śrivara in line 347 says बधु: नरवरमिरा: करिक ग्रामबिरुचि: i.e.,
Parasrāma (Parasrām) and others went to their own country after receiving
honours.
3 The account of his birth, etc., is given by Śrivara in lines 406–410 of the
4th tarāṣṭa.
4 This is mentioned by Śrivara in line 419 and the following lines. Then
the negotiations between Fath Khān and Jahāngīr Mākri are described at some
length.
plain of ¹ Karsawār. Fath Khān also arrived in the neighbourhood of Aidan by way of Hirpur; and placing a spring of water between the two armies, settled down in front of the Sultan’s army. Then the lines of the troops having been arranged, the flame of battle blazed up. At first Fath Khān made an onset, and it appeared probable that the Sultan’s army would fall into disorder. But Jahāngīr Mākri placing his feet firmly slew about fifty of the best men of Fath Khān’s army; and that army being discomfited Fath Khān was about to be seized, when one of the enemies raised a (false cry), that Sultan Muḥammad Shāh had been taken prisoner by his enemies. Jahāngīr becoming disturbed in his mind refrained from further pursuit of Fath Khān.

The Sultan came to Kashmir, (i.e., Srinagar) after the victory, and sent Malik Yārī Bhat to ravage the villages, which had given shelter to Fath Khān. ² 'Ādam Khān and Fath Khān having disappeared for sometime again raised their heads in the neighbourhood of Bahrāmgāla; and for a second time having collected a number of men advanced to conquer Kashmir. Jahāngīr Mākri advanced with an immense army to meet them, and encamped in the village of Gosawār in pargana Nāgām. Zirak, a servant of Fath Khān, availing himself of an opportunity, went into the city (Srinagar); and released the large number of amirs who were in prison there.

¹ The name of the place is written as Karsawār in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the other MS. it is Kishthwār, and in the lith. ed. it is Girswār. Col. Briggs and Rodgers do not mention the name of the place. Śrīvara mentions two names; but I cannot find any place mentioned as the camping ground of Muḥammad Shāh’s army, which at all resembles the names mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt or by Firishtah.

² Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have 'Ādam Khān and Fath Khān; but 'Ādam Khān had died earlier, and so the mention of his name is a mistake. Firishtah lith. ed. does not mention him.

³ The name is written as Bahrāmgāla in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah. There is a place mentioned in Śrīvara’s Rājatarangini, 4th tārānga, line 589, called Bhairavagala of which Bahrāmgāla is the modern name. (See Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 398.) I have, therefore taken Bahrāmgāla as the correct name. The text-edition following the second MS. has Bahrāmgāla.

⁴ The name is written as Karsawār and Kīswālahū in the MSS. and as Gosawār in the lith. ed.; and as Kahwākah in the
Among them were Saifi and Ankri. Jahāngir was sorrowful at Saifi and Ankri having obtained their release, and determined to make a treaty of peace with Fath Khān. He sent a message to the Rāja of Rājauri, by whose help Fath Khān had invaded the country that he might create disaffection in Fath Khān’s army. The Rāja of Rājauri and other amirs separated from Fath Khān, and joined Jahāngir. Fath Khān in great dismay turned back, and Jahāngir pursued him as far as Hirapūr. Fath Khān went to Jammū and conquered it; and bringing great army from that country again advanced to conquer Kashmir.

Jahāngir now gave assurances of safety to the Saiyids, whom he had before this banished from the country, and summoned them; and a great battle took place between the Sultan and Fath Khān. Saifi and Ankri on the side of the latter fought with great gallantry; and on the side of the Sultan the Saiyids made fine efforts, and behaved with great bravery and courage. A large number of them attained to martyrdom, and the rest who survived obtained the confidence of the Sultan and Jahāngir. On this occasion Fath Khān was defeated and retired. But he again collected an immense army and invaded Kashmir; and after fighting several battles, became victorious.

Couplet:
If the flower of joy thou seekest, from the thorn of sorrow draw not thy skirt;
If treasure thou seekest, thy foot into the mouth of the serpent place.

lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the text-edition it is Khaswār. Various names are mentioned by Śrīvara in lines describing this meeting, but I cannot find any which at all resembles any of the names mentioned in the MSS. of the Tabaqāt or the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah; but in line 398 the battle is called the battle of Gusikoddāra (गुसिकोड्दार). (See also Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 474 and also note 1 on p. 687).

The meaning is not clear. The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah all say अराद्ध चले तुम्हें खान नमूने औरा; but apparently it was only a stratagem, and there was no real intention of making a treaty with Fath Khān.

This is mentioned by Śrīvara in line 570 of the 4th tārāṅga of his Rājatarangini.

See line 596 of the 4th tārāṅga.
Things now came to such a pitch, ¹ that no one remained with the Sultân, and all his treasure was gone. ² Jahângîr, who was wounded, secluded himself in a corner and Mir Saiyid Muḥammad son of Saiyid Ḥasan joined Fatḥ Khân. ³ After some time, some zamindârs seized Sultân Muḥammad Shâh; and surrendered him to Fatḥ Khân. At this time Muḥammad Shâh had reigned for ten years and seven months. ⁴ Fatḥ Khân kept him in the palace with his own brothers; and gave orders that articles of food and drink and all other necessaries should be provided for him; and Saifi and Ankri always showed all honour and respect to him, and were always at his service.

**AN ACCOUNT OF FATḤ SHĀH, WHICH IS ANOTHER NAME FOR FATḤ KHĀN.**

He sat on the throne of power in the year 894 A.H., assuming the title of Fatḥ Shâh, and made Saifi and Ankri respectively the superintendent and administrator of all his affairs.

At this time ⁶ Mir Shams, one of the disciples of Shâh Qâsim, came from Ḫirmaq to Kashmir; and many people accepted him as their

---

¹ See line 614 of the 4th taraṅga.
² See line 632 of the 4th taraṅga.
³ See line 643 of the 4th taraṅga.
⁴ See line 644 of the 4th taraṅga.
⁵ In the text-edition it is only ڀ ذکر قلم نہ شاہ. According to the Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājataranginī भोसराजावंक-, सच्चिपरिचयेः प्रतीपालपिरिचयेः: were his three ministers (see lines 16–19). It is impossible to identify any of them with the plain Saifi and Ankri of the Ṭabaqat and Firishthah, or with Suffâ and Runga Ray of Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 489), or with Saifi Vâṅkari or Saidfâr as Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. 1, p. 110) joining the two names jumbles up two persons into one. I cannot find anything about Somrâj or Prâthara; but Advâpāti or Advâpâ seems to be the same as Mârgâsî, or a lord or keeper of the road. Stein thinks that a mârgâsî was equivalent to the Malik of the Muḥammadan period; but I do not think that there is any connection between the two names.
⁶ He is called खारणविषवंक– राजसे: चंबलविषवंक, but it is also added पत्राजः पूरवसिंह ीसा, the meaning of which is not clear to me (see l. 21). Some person of the name of Somacandra probably the same as Somarâjânaka is said to have made over to his servants the lands appertaining to temples (l. 22) and his followers called Suphas cut down very tall trees on the pretext of getting fire-wood (l. 23).

Firishthâh gives some account of the tenets of Mir Shams, from which it appears that they were the same as those of the Shî‘as in the guise of Sūfîs.
religious teacher; and all the endowments and property of the religious establishment of Dēvharah were allotted to his disciples; and his Sūfī followers endeavoured to ruin and destroy all the temples of the Kāfirs; and no one dared to forbid them. In a short time disputes arose among the amirs and they came to the palace and slew one another. 1 Malik Ajī and Zinā, who were among the chief amirs of Fath Khān, combined with a number of others, and taking Sultan Muḥammad Shāh out of prison, brought him to Bārāmūla; but as they did not find any marks of wisdom in him, they repented of what they had done, and wanted to seize him again, and surrender him to Fath Khān. Muḥammad Shāh having got information of this, made his escape one night to another place.

After that, 2 Sultan Fath Shāh divided the country of Kashmir into three equal parts, among himself and Malik Ajī and Sankar; and made Malik Ajī, the razīr with full powers, and Sankar the Diwān or revenue officer of the whole territory (Diwān-i-kul). Malik Ajī had wonderful skill in the decision of cases. Among the cases was this: two men had a dispute about an 3 invoice of fine silk.

and says that in a short time the people of Kashmir specially the Chaks became his disciples; and some, who were ignorant, and did not understand his esoteric doctrines, became muldhids or heretics, after his death. For other accounts of his doctrines see the Tarikh-i-Rashidi (Elias and Ross, pp. 435-436).

1 The names are written as ملک اجی و دنا ملک اجی و زینا and ملک اجی و ریتا ملک اجی و ریتا in the MSS. and the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and Frishtah respectively. In the text-editition the names are Malak ājī, and Malak ājī. 1 cannot find any name in Prajyabhatṭā's Rājatarāṇī from which at all resembles them but see the next note from which it appears that Malik Ajī was called سُلَمِی.

2 See lines 70 of Prajyabhatṭā's Rājatarāṇī from which it appears that one share was allotted to Fath Shāh (کبیر), another to Malik Ajī (کبیر), and the third to Shankar (کبیر). The reason of this division is not at all easy to discover. It also appears from line 73 that خاک had the خاصیت, and دانش$strong> and دانش had the خاصیت.

4 The words are بر سر بچک باریک پرستم, Col. Briggs does not mention the matter. Rodgers says that the dispute was about a bale of silk. چک in the dictionary is said to mean an invoice, a list. But this meaning does not quite fit in with the context, where the judge is said to have inquired whether the چک had been wound with the finger, or on his finger. In the text-editition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has بر سر بچک.
Each claimed the invoice to be his; and they both agreed as regards the weight and the colour. When the dispute came before Malik Ajhi, he asked whether the silk had been wound on the finger or on a spindle. The owner said on the finger; and the opposite party said on a spindle. When the silk was unwound it appeared that it had been wound on the finger.

1 After some time had passed after the accession of Fatḥ Shāh, Ibrāhīm son of Jahāngīr Mākri, on whom the position of his father had been conferred, went to Muḥammad Shāh, and having persuaded him to come from Hindūstān, brought him to invade Kashmir; and a great battle having taken place between him and Fatḥ Shāh in the neighbourhood of Khōlāhīyah, Sultān Fatḥ Shāh's army was defeated. He retired to Hindūstān by way of Hirānpūr. He had reigned for nine years, when this happened.

After that Sultān Muḥammad sat on the seat of government for the second time; and made Ibrāhīm Mākri his vazīr with absolute powers; and named Iskandar Khān, who was a descendant of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, his successor to the throne: The sons of Ibrāhīm went into the prison and put Malik Ajhi, who was their brother-in-law, to death. After some time Fatḥ Khān having collected an immense army again invaded Kashmir; and Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, not having the power to oppose him, fled without a fight. On this

---

1 From line 90 of Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarangini it appears that Fatḥ Shāh ruled the country for nine years, after which Muḥammad Shāh regained the kingdom, under the protection of the māryāda (Ibrāhīm).

2 The name is written as Kāhārāmāhuva and Kēhārāmāhuva in the MSS. It is Kūhārāmāhuva in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and in the text-edition, and Kēhārāmāhuva in the lith. ed. of Firishtā. Col. Briggs says that the battle took place near Baramoola, while Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 111) says it was at Kohāsāla. I cannot find any name in Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarangini, which at all resembles any of these.

3 This is mentioned in line 91 of Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarangini.

4 Firishtā lith. ed. has by mistake Nērūn, near for Nīrūn, brother-in-law. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 488) says that it was the sons of Mullīk Atchey and not himself that were put to death. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 111) says correctly that the sons of Ibrāhīm Mākri put Malik Ajhi to death in prison, but he does not mention the relationship between them. Lines 92–94 of the Prājyabhāṭṭa's Rājatarangini agree with the Ṭabaqāt.
occasion the period of Sultan Muhammad's reign was nine months and nine days.¹

Sultan Fatḥ Shāh again took possession of Kashmir, and made Jahāngīr, who was of the tribe of Badrah his vazīr and Sankar Zinā his revenue minister (Divān-i-kul). He ruled justly. Muhammad Shāh after his defeat went to Ḳisandar Kakhar, and the latter sent a large force to help him. Jahāngīr Badrah was also aggrieved with Sultan Fatḥ Shāh, and joined Muhammad Shāh: and brought the latter into Kashmir by way of Ṵājaurī. Sultan Ḳiṣandar made Jahāngīr Mākri the commander of the vanguard of his army; and sent him to oppose Muhammad Shāh. But his army was defeated, and Jahāngīr Mākri together with his son was killed in the battle; and some chief amirs of his such as 'Ali Shāh Bēg and others joined Muhammad Shāh. Sultan Fatḥ Shāh being utterly helpless fled to Hindūstān, and died there.² His rule this time lasted for one year and one month.

Sultan Muhammad Shāh sat on the seat of authority again for the third time, and had the kettledrums beaten.³ He imprisoned

¹ See line 99 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini. ⁲ See line 100 of Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini. This Jahāngīr is called in it بہت اقبال رحم و رض و Sankar Jīna is called رضایت اقبال بن و. I cannot find anything about Prājīhara or Ṭījhānānāghāra.

³ One MS. and the lith. ed. have اسکندرا Ṭījhānānāghtār Iskandar Kakhar; the other MS. اسکندرا Ṭījhānānāghtār Iskandar Ṭākti. Firishtah lith. ed., however, says that he went نزد شاه اسکندرا لودھی بادشاه دھلی; and he is followed by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 489) and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 111). The Cambridge History of India is silent on this point, and so is Prājībhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini.

⁴ One MS. and the lith. ed. have ازرا جری which is correct, and which I have adopted. Firishtah lith. ed., also has ازرا جری. The return of Muhammad Shāh is described in lines 120–125 of Prājībhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini.

⁵ Compare line 127, which says that Fath Shāh advanced from the capital to fight Muhammad Shāh, aided by only one of his ministers بہت اقبال رحم و رض و. ⁶ These facts are mentioned by Firishtah, who, however, calls 'Ali Shāh Ṭākti, 'Ali Shāh Bēg, but they do not appear to be mentioned in Prājībhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini.

⁷ Compare line 130 of Prājībhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini.

⁸ Compare lines 135, 136. Kājī Chak is called رضایت اقبال بن in line 136. He is also called رضایت اقبال بن elsewhere (see l. 194).
Sankar, who was among the great and trusted amirs of Fath Shâh, and selected Kâji Chak, who was noted for his wisdom and bravery, to be his vazir. This man had wonderful cleverness in the decision of disputes. Among the disputes one was this: A writer had a wife. It so happened that he remained at a distance from her for some time. The woman in her passions married a second husband. After a time the writer again appeared; and there was a dispute between him and the second husband (of his wife). They appeared before Kâji Chak. As neither of them had any witnesses in support of his claim, the decision of the matter appeared to be difficult. At last Malik Kâji Chak said to the woman, "You are telling the truth, and the writer is a liar. Come, pour a little water into this inkstand of mine, so that I may write a bond (judgement?) for you, so that he may have no further dealings with you. The woman got up, and put as much water in the inkstand as was required. The Malik said, "Pour more". Again she put a little water, so that it might not spill the ink; and in doing so she showed the greatest caution. The Malik said to those who were present, "From the great caution shown by the woman, it is evident that she is the wife of the writer." In the end she also acknowledged it, and the dispute was settled.

As the government of Sultan Muhammad acquired greater stability, he ordered the execution of most of the amirs of Fath Shâh, such as Saifi, Ankri, and others; and Sankar Zina died a natural death. The servants of Fath Shâh brought his dead body from India. Sultan Muhammad Shâh went forward to meet it and ordered it to be buried in the neighbourhood of the tomb of Sultan Zain-ul-Abidin. These events happened in the year 922 A.H. (1516 A.D.).

In the same year, Sultan Sikandar Ludi, the Baddshah of Dehil, died; and his son Ibrâhim sat on the throne. At this time Malik Kâji imprisoned Ibrâhim Mâkri. Abdâl Mâkri, the son of the

---

1 Compare lines 165, 166 where the execution of Kâji Chak is mentioned in the first and the death of Râjâlâkarî, or rather his following Fath Shâh to the grave owing to the great love he bore him are mentioned in the second.

2 Compare line 171 of Prâjayabhatta’s Râjâlakaranî, from which it appears that Ibrâhim Mâkri is there called Kâjâlalâkaranî. He is, however, called Râjâlakaranî.
latter, in concert with some people from Hindūstān, made Iskandar Khān a claimant for the throne, and brought him to Kashmir. Sultān Muḥammad and Malik Kāji advanced to meet them in battle at Lūlpūr in pargana Bāngil. Iskandar Khān not having the power to meet them retired into the fort of Nākām. Malik Kāji besieged the fort; and for some days there were skirmishes between the two parties. At this time, a number of the amīrs of the Sultān rebelled against him, and went to Iskandar Khān. Malik Kāji sent his son named Mas'ūd to attack them; and he fighting bravely against them was slain, but the victory remained on his side, Iskandar Khān left the fort of Nākām and escaped; and the Malik entered it. The Mākris in distress and disorder followed Iskandar Khān; and Sultān Muḥammad Shāh returned to the city joyful and happy. These events happened in the year 931 A.H. (1524 A.D.).

It was in that year, that His Majesty, Firdūs Makānī Bābar Rūḍshāh attacked Ibrāhīm Lūdī, and slew him in the battle of Panipat. At this time the disposition of Muḥammad Shāh at the insinuations of his enemies turned against Malik Kāji. He became suspicious, went to Rājaurī and made the Rājās of the various parts of the

1 The name is written as प्रजयवहत्ता in the MSS and as प्रजयवहत्ता in the MSS, and as प्रजयवहत्ता in the lith. ed. Firishtah lit. ed. has प्रजयवहत्ता, but the name is not very distinct. Prājiyabhātta’s Rājatarangini, line 176, has प्रजयवहत्ता. Col. Brigg-vol. IV, p. 490) calls the place Alurpoor in Fankul district; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 112), apparently following Firishtah, has Nolpūm in the pargana of Māhekal. The name of the pargana is परगना, or परगना in the MSS and परगना in the lith. ed. of the Tagāqat. The correct name is Bāngil (No. 31 in the list of Kashmir parganas on page 494 of Stein’s Rājatarangini, Vol II).

2 Compare line 176 of Prājiyabhātta’s Rājatarangini.

3 Compare line 178 of Prājiyabhātta’s Rājatarangini.

4 The account in Prājiyabhātta’s Rājatarangini is somewhat different. It is said there that फरसिन्द प्रजयवहत्ता entered the fort of Luhara; and the Cakraka, i.e. Kāji Chak, sending two armies on his two sides (बकार: प्रजयवहत्ता और फरसिन्द), sent his son फरसिन्द to attack Luhara (lines 179, 180). The fight of Mauṣum’s army with the Luhara garrison and Mauṣum’s death are described in lines 182-190.

5 This appears to be mentioned in line 218 of Prājiyabhātta’s Rājatarangini.
country obedient to himself. At this time Iskandar Khan, who had
gone away, after being defeated by the Sultan, came back with a
number of Mughals; and took possession of Loharkot. 2 Malik
Yari, brother of Malik Kaji, hearing of it went and attacked him;
and having fought with him, seized him, and sent him to the Sultan.
The Sultan, being pleased with Malik Kaji on account of his loyal
services, again entrusted the post of the vazirat to him. 3 He had
Iskandar's eyes blinded by drawing the needle across them.

At this time Ibrahim Khan, son of Sultan Muhammad Shih,
who had gone with his father to Sultan Ibrahim Ludi, when the
latter had furnished Sultan Muhammad Shih with a large army, and
had given him permission to return to Kashmir, but had kept Ibrahim
Khan in his service, came to Kashmir owing to the catastrophe which
had overtaken Sultan Ibrahim Ludi. Malik Kaji, who was annoyed
with the Sultan on account of his having blinded Iskandar Khan, put
him and his immediate attendants, by every pretext that he could
think of, into prison. After having imprisoned him, 4 he raised
Ibrahim Khan to the throne.

1 Firishtah says that these Mughals belonged to, or were sent by Firdous
Makani Zahir-ud-din Muhammad Bajur Badehshah.
2 He is called Tajacakra in line 230, in which it is said that he and his
other heroic brothers slew the Mughals in a battle in ..
3 This is mentioned in lines 236, 237 in Prayaubhat's Rajaaraangini.
4 The matter of the deposition of Muhammad Shih, as it is called in Prayaubhat's Rajaaraangini, begins in line 245, where the author
exclaims on the strange act of Providence (विविध) by which Muhammad Shih
lost his kingdom by the act of his own son. In line 248 it is said that on Ibrahim
Ludi's defeat, Ibrahim Khan came to Kashmir, cherished by his father's
affection (विग्रहित). In the following line, it appears that Kaji Chak's evil
intent towards the Sultan made its appearance on account of his wish to
seize the kingdom (दशकबोध); and he in his anger cast the  in prison; and from line 252 it appears that the  swallowed up the sun called Muhammad Shih. It
would appear, therefore, that, according to the chronicle, it is not true that
Kaji Chak cast Muhammad Shih into prison, because he was annoyed with him
for having caused Sikandar Khan to be blinded, but he did so to gratify his own
ambition. It is true that the chronicler after stating the fact moralizes, that

(1. 254).
The period of the reign of Muḥammad Shāh was, on this occasion, eleven years and eleven months and eleven days.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN IBRĀHĪM SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH

When he sat on the throne, he made Malik Kājī his permanent vazir according to previous custom. Abdāl Mākri son of Ibrāhīm Mākri, who had gone to India to escape the tyranny of Malik Kājī, having at this time entered the service of His Majesty Firdūs Makānī, submitted to him, that he had sought an asylum at that threshold, from the violence of his enemies. If His Majesty would help that slave with an army, he would conquer Kashmir for the servants of His Majesty in the easiest possible way. His Majesty, after obtaining the necessary information, about his appearance and character, said in kind language, that even in jungles such men could be met with. He honoured Abdāl Mākri with the gift of a horse and a robe of honour, and detached a large number of troops to accompany him. He made Shaikh ‘Alī Bēg and Muḥammad Khdr and Māmhūd Khdr the commanders of the detachment.

1 This agrees with Firishta and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 113); but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 491) says that Mahomed had reigned for nineteen years, when he was deposed, but it is not clear whether this was the period of his reign in the third term. Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarāṅgini (l. 253) makes it eleven years, ten months and ten days (एका दसस्वाद दश माह दस्य सप्त दिनः)

2 Compare lines 257 and 258 of Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarāṅgini.

3 Compare line 260 of Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarāṅgini where Bābar is called बिषौय सुमुखेश्वरः

4 This is stated by Prājyabhāṭṭa as बाबर रघुनाथरत्नम् बिषौय सुमुखेश्वरः (l. 261) from which it would appear, that Bābar was greatly impressed by what he saw of and heard from Abdāl Mākri.

5 It is rather difficult to understand the mention of jungles but Firishta also has the same word. The idea probably is that Bābar was probably surprised that a country like Kashmir, which he thought was covered by forests, could produce such a fine-looking and able man. As the Rājatarāṅgini, in the line I have quoted, says, he lowered his head in astonishment.

6 Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarāṅgini (l. 262) says बिषौय सेनाधीन भेंटाकै प्रतिविराहितः

7 All the three names appear in both MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firishta’s lith. ed. omits the second name, and he is, of course, followed by Col. Briggs and Rodgers. Prājyabhāṭṭa’s Rājatarāṅgini (l. 263) also has the first and third
As Abdāl Mākri perceived, that the Kashmiris would 1 hate the coming of the Mughals, he advanced towards Kashmir, having, for political reasons, given the name of Sulṭān to 2 Nāzuk Shāh, son of Fath Shāh. On the other side, Malik Kāji took Ibrāhīm Shāh with him; and made the village of 3 Sullāh in the pargana of Bāngil his camping ground. The two armies encamped in front of each other. Abdāl Mākri sent the following message to Malik Kāji. 4 “I waited on Bābar Bādshāh, and have brought reinforcements from him. The power and grandeur of that Bādshāh are so great, that he made Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, the Bādshāh of Dehli, who had five hundred thousand men, in the winking of an eye, like the dark dust. Your welfare lies in this that you should come into the band of his loyal adherents. But if this great fortune is not in your lot, come quickly and fight with this army. There is no time left for remedy or hesitation.” Malik Kāji made 5 Saiyid Ibrāhīm Khān and Sarang and Malik Yārī the names, which it transforms, almost beyond recognition into निवासबन्ध and मन्दिर धर.

1 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 113) I think, quite incorrectly translates the words नन्दन खराबन्द जस्ते by the words “would despise”.

2 Firishtāh lith. ed. incorrectly calls Nāzuk Shāh, the son of Ibrāhīm, and he is followed by Col. Briggs and by Rodgers. The Cambridge History of India, page 287, agrees with the Tabaqāt, and calls him the second son of Fath Shāh. Pṛujyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarāṅgini (l. 260) has नन्दन खराबन्द जस्ते वाजोपाययाबियम्.

3 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtāh have در نوبخ in the district of Fankul and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 113) has “Sulah in the pargana of Bāṅkul”. The Cambridge History of India, III, page 287 says the battle took place at Naushahra (Nowshera), but does not give any authority. According to Pṛujyabhaṭṭa (l. 267) the Cakrapa, i.e., Qāḍī Chak, placed his army at Nīlāsva. The place is mentioned in various places of Kalhana’s Rājatarāṅgini as a district of Kashmir. In the text-edition it is changed to ما تكل, while in the English translation, following Stein (vol. II, p. 481), Bāṅgil has been adopted.

4 A part of this adjuration of Abdāl Mākri appears in lines 269–271 of Pṛujyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarāṅgini.

5 The commanders are called सवालवान बहादुर and वंशवान मालव in line 273; and those of the other army are called सवालवान रिसवान मालव and
commanders of three detachments, and began the battle. A great fight took place between the two armies, and many were slain. And of the renowned nobles of İbrāhīm Shāh, Yārlı Chak, and Sarang and others, each of whom had large number of followers, were slain. Malik Kājī in great distress fled to the city, but he could not stay there also; and went away towards the hilly country. Nothing is known about İbrāhīm Shāh, as to what happened to him, and where he went.

The period of his rule was eight months and twenty-five days.

AN ACCOUNT OF 1 NĀZUK ShāH, SON OF Fath ShāH.

After the victory, 2 he ascended the throne in the city of Srinagar, and gave assurances of safety to the Kashmiris, who were afraid and suspicious of the Mughals. The Kashmiris then made rejoicings at his accession. And he then left the city, and took up his abode in Nau Shahr, which from ancient time was the capital of the Sultanāns. He selected Abdāl Mākri to be his vazīr and representative (vakil). Abdāl went as far as the 3 country of Jamālnagari in pursuit of Malik Kājī; but whom he found that it would be impossible to seize him, he commenced to make a division of the country. Leaving aside the Khālsu or the crown lands, the country was divided into

1 Which are probably identical with Malik Lōhar and Malik Rāgi Chak; and seems to be another form of the name of Shaikh ‘All Bēg. See the latter part of note 7, pages 696, 697. The battle is described with some spirit in line 275 and the following lines and the death of Yārlı Chak (called Sīrāj Tājāb) is mentioned in line 282, and that of Sarang in the next line. The flight of Qādī Chak to the city is mentioned in line 284. In the text-edition Sermek has been adopted in place of Sarang.

2 He is also sometimes called Nādir Shāh, as the name is Nādir on all his coins (Rodgers, J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) but all the histories call him Nāzuk Shāh.

3 The words are Tā sūrād Ħelī nūrī or Tā sūrād Ħelī nūrī in the MSS. and in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 492) has “The town of K’ḥulnagry”, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) has “the confines of Jahālnagari”. In line 288 of Prājyabhaṭṭa it is stated that Ġelī nūrī though it is not said there, that they went there in pursuit of Malik Qādī. In the text-edition it is Ġelī nūrī.
four shares. One share was allotted to Abdal Makhri, the second to Mir 'Ali, the third to Lohar Makhri and the remaining to one of the Chaks. Abdal Makhri then sent back the servants of Firdaus Makani to Hindustan, after giving them many presents and valuable gifts. They sent an angry message to Malik Kaji, and summoned Muhammad Shah to come to them; and going to Mir 'Ali, brought Muhammad Shah out of the fort of Loharkot; and they all came together to Kashmir (i.e., Srinagar). They did not permit Malik Kaji to come.

Sultan Muhammad Shah then sat for the fourth time on the throne, and he made Nauk Shah, who had governed the country for twenty years, his successor. At this time His Majesty Firdaus Makani departed from this transitory world; and His Majesty Jinnat Ashar Muhammad Humayun Badshah sat on the throne of the empire. This happened in

1 The division is mentioned by Firishtah and Rodgers, with some differences and also in Pragyabhatta's Rajaarangini, lines 288, 289; but no one gives any reason for the division. The division as given in Pragyabhatta's Rajaarangini agrees with that in the Tabaqat, the four shares being allotted in it respectively to Bariwala, Balimere, Lahrur and Kajichak. It is curious that, according to Mirza Haidar Duqhdar (page 441, Elias and Ross's translation of the Tarikh-i-Rashidi), he found the following four Malik in Kashmir: "Abdal Makri, Kajichak, Lahrur Makri and Yakechak." Three of these names appear to agree with those who got three of the shares. The fourth Balimere or Ali Mir had been in an engagement with the Mirza himself.

2 Firishtah's account is somewhat different. According to him Shaikh Mir 'Ali went to Loharkot and brought Muhammad Shahl with him. According to Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) Abdal Makhri recalled Muhammad Shahl "from his prison of Lanharkot" and the two, i.e., Abdal and Muhammad Shahl entered Kashmir as friends. This does not appear to me to be quite correct. Pragyabhatta in lines 290-290 mentions the message sent to the Cakreja, the sending back of the Mughals, and the going of 'Ali Mir to Muhammad Shah.

3 Firishtah says he had governed the country for twenty years and eight months. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) has "20 years and 20 months"; the number of months is of course incorrect. Pragyabhatta in line 298 has राजा सवाल वर्ष में राजा नाजिका बचपन में i.e., the King Najiaka (Nauk) having reigned for one year, obtained the position of heir apparent from King Muhammad. The period of Nauk's reign certainly was not twenty years; he ascended the throne in 933 A.H., 1537 A.D., and was deposed and made heir apparent, in 935 A.H., 1529 A.D., so he reigned for a little more than a year as stated by Pragyabhatta.
the year 937 A.H. When one year of the reign of Sultân Nâzuk Shâh had elapsed, Malik Kâji Chak, who had gone to the hilly country collected a vast number of men there, and came to the neighbourhood of Kahrâr. Malik Abdül came and confronted him, and fought with him. Malik Kâji fled and went to Hindûstân.

At this time, Mirzâ Kâmârân had absolute power on the Punjâb. Shaikh'Ali Bôg, Muḥammad Khân and Maḥmûd Khân, who had, after the conquest of Kashmir returned with the permission of Abdül Mâkri, represented to Mirzâ Kâmârân, "As we have acquired a knowledge of the whole country of Kashmir, if you pay a little attention, the whole country can be conquered with the greatest ease." Mirzâ Kâmârân appointed Maḥrâm Bôg to be the commander of his army, and sent him to conquer Kashmir in concert with the nobles who had joined them. When the Mughal army arrived in the neighbourhood of Kashmir, the inhabitants in great terror left all their property and things in their houses, and fled towards the hills. The Mughal army

---

1 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have Nâzuk Shah, but this is clearly a mistake. Firishtah has از شاھی محمد, i.e., of the reign of Muhammad Shâh, which is correct.

2 Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have کر绯 Kahrâr. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqât has پنجرے Punjhrâr. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) has Kahrâr. Prâjyabihatâ has پرنساپارچا: شاہی میرزا رضوان: وضاحت (l. 301) which does not, however, make one much wiser as to the locality.

3 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 114) says, "Shaikh Ali Bôg and Muḥammad Khân the leaders of the allies who had helped Abdül Mâkri, and who had left him without permission." This is totally incorrect. As a matter of fact they were sent back with many presents and valuable gifts. In the particular passage under translation both Niẓâm-ud-dîn and Firishtah say با رخصت and not رخصت. In the text-edition it is رخصت.

4 This is mentioned by Prâjyabihatâ (l. 303) Maḥrâm Bôg being transformed into سلسلة: and Mirzâ Kâmârân into میرزا رجلاً and the following facts are mentioned (lines 304–338) that विजयविजय, भूपकिरण and other Mughals accompanied the Mughal army; that Muḥammad Shâh and others quickly brought back the Cakresa, i.e., Qâdi Chak to help him, that the Mughals having invaded the city with thousands of horses and elephants, the Kashmiris took shelter in the fort, and the Mughals burnt down and looted the houses and cities, etc.
then looted the city, and set fire to it. Some of the Kashmiris who had returned from the hills to fight with the Mughals were slain. Abdāl Mākri had a conviction at first that Malik Kājl; was with the Mughals; but when he knew at last of a certainty, that he was not with them, he showed friendship and attachment towards him; and summoned him with his sons and brothers; and they made promises and bound one another by oaths. This became a source of strength for the Kashmiris; and they set their heart on a battle; and combined together and engaged the Mughals in a big fight. The latter, considering it advisable to do so, went back to their own country.

2 After some time, Malik Kājl, having seen the treachery and pride of Malik Abdāl, did not consider it desirable to remain in the country and went to Hindūstān. It was in this year, that is, in 939 A.H., that Sultān Saiyid Khān, the Bādshāh of Kāshghar, sent his son Sikandar Khān, in company with Mīrzā Hādār Kāshgharī, with twelve thousand men, by way of Tibet and Lār to invade Kashmir. The Kashmiris (frightened) at the rumour of their power and grandeur evacuated Kashmir; and without any battle fled in different directions, and sought shelter in the hilly country. The Kāshghar army, having entered the Kashmir territory, razed the grand edifices, which had been built by the old Sultān, to dust; and set fire to the city and the villages; and having searched for the treasures, which were buried under the ground, seized them; and all the soldiers loaded themselves with the booty; and went everywhere to find the Kashmiris who had

1 This appears to be described in a very metaphorical language in line 311 of Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangini.

2 Firishtah agrees, but says Malik Qājī Chakk went to Bihr. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) says, “Malik Qājī Chakk could not endure the prosperity of Abdāl (which is not at all correct) so he betook himself to Bihr.” Prājyabhaṭṭa gives (I. 312) the reason and the fact of the departure of Qājī Chak very succinctly, namely सर्वज्ञानार्थकः वापसज्ञो वर्तिको, i.e., being alarmed at the scanty regard shown to him by the Mārgdhā, i.e., Abdāl Mākri, Kāca Cakra left the country.

3 Firishtah agrees almost verbatim. The invasion of the Kāshghar army is mentioned Prājyabhaṭṭa in line 314, etc. It is said to have been commanded by Mīrzā Hādār (मिर्ज़ा हादर), and Sikandar Khān is not mentioned in the beginning, but is mentioned further on in line 331.
hidden themselves, and slew them and took them prisoners. This state of things went on for 1 three months.

And Malik Kājṭ Chak and Malik Abdāl Mākri and other renowned sardārs went to and took shelter in 2 Chakhdhar; but as they did not consider it advisable to remain there, 3 they descended from the mountains in the direction of Khāwaryāraḥ, and having resolved

1 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) contrary to both Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah has six months. Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 325) also says that the Kashmir chiefs fought with the Mlecchas for three months.

2 The name is written as چکدر in both MSS., and as چکدر in the lith. ed Firishtah lith. ed. has چکدر. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 494) has “the town of Chukdura,” and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) has Chakdara; but no attempt has been made by anybody to identify the place, and I also have not been at all successful. Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 324) has जालचिर-रुक्षततु मुहामिद मिलियन धाक्शिक्षबासुराव दालावान देन्धा, i.e., the commanders of the Kashmir army, fearing the Mlecchas, obtained asylum in the Bhūpabhūmis (whatever they might be) which were covered with water; but I have no idea as to what the Bhūpabhūmis were and where they were situated. The next line, however, mentions three places, Ciroḍāra, Hájyeṅgakotta and Cakradhara, but the line goes on to say हुलबाहियावस्था मामला हैः प्रश्न नेन. If हुलबाहियावस्था is a mistake for विलबाहियावस्था, then the line would mean that taking shelter in Ciroḍāra, Hájyeṅgakotta and Cakradhara, they carried on the war with the Mlecchas for three months; and then Chakdara or Chakhdhar would probably be Cakradhara; but unfortunately I cannot find anything about Cakradhara also; and I cannot alter सुदरद to सुदरद. In the text-edition it is چکدر.

3 The readings here are different. One MS. has सजनवं कृपाया व अंज्ञा, the other has सजनवं कृपाया व अंज्ञा. Firishtah ed. has सजनवं कृपाया व अंज्ञा. The lith. ed. has सजनवं कृपाया व अंज्ञा. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 494) has (they) “retreated to Baramoola living occasionally in the hills.” Rodgers says that from Chakdara “they went to Khāwara and Bāradār. From this place by the way of Bādah they descended from the mountains.” Prājyabhaṭṭa does not give much help. He says (l. 330), निजामुद्दीन भृतस्वरूपी भगीरथिकृतिविषयी बिनं भगीरथिकृतिविषयी बिनं. If Cakrādhara is identical with Cakradhara, then we find that the Kashmiri leaders coming from Cakrādhara or Cakradhara encamped near Bhimādevī after crossing the Ledari, for a battle; but there is no mention of any places like this in Niẓām-ud-dīn or Firishtah. In the text-edition it is apparently a misprint for मार बारा.
to engage the Mughals in battle, went forward from there by way of Mārbāwah. The Sultānzādā Iṣkandar Khān and Mīrzā Ḥaidar also came forward with an immense army to meet them. ¹ There was a great battle, and Malik ʿAli and Mīr Ḥusain and Shaikh Mīr ʿAli and Mīr Kāmāl among the Kashmiri commanders were slain. Of the Kāshgharīs also, some good men met their death. The Kashmirīs wanted to turn their backs on the battle-field; but Malik Kājī and Abdāl Mākī placed their feet of bravery firmly, and persuading and encouraging the others, did justice to their bravery and gallantry. So many men were slain on the two sides that they were beyond all calculation. Some headless bodies rose up and moved about. The reason of this has been mentioned on a former occasion. The battle between the parties went on from morning till evening. When night came on, the two armies taking note of their plunder, went back to their respective places. Both sides coming out of the battle agreed to a settlement. The Kāshghar men sent ² camelot, the warm woollen cloth (purpel), and other beautiful things to Sultān

¹ The account of the battle as given by Firishtah agrees with that in the text, except that Mīr Ḥusain is called Mīr Ḥusain. He is also called Mīr Ḥusain in one of the MSS. of the Tabaqāt, but he is called Mīr Ḥusain in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Col. Briggs and Rodgers generally agree, but the statement made by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) that, "the prisoners were numbered on both sides, and were liberated" does not appear to me to be correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 287, only mentions the battle briefly, but the statement made in it, that "the army of Kashmir fought so fiercely from morning until evening, that the invaders were fain to make peace", is also not correct. The advantage, if any, lay on the side of the invaders, as the Kashmirīs at one time, were about to retire; and in any case both sides were anxious for peace. The battle is described by Prājayabhaṭṭa, in lines 331 to 337; and here we have not only the headless bodies mentioned by Nizám-ud-dīn and Firishtah, but बजनमंदिशा बचनरा वेताफरचम। महानाथवाणशष्म। i.e., the dancing headless bodies, Yaksahānas, Vediṣas and Rākṣasas eager to feed on human flesh.

² The presents according to the MS. were صوف وسقلات وسابر نقاس; the lith. ed. has سملات instead of سقلات. سقلات according to the dictionary is a purpel. Firishtah agrees with the MSS. but changes سناب to سناب. Col. Briggs does not mention the presents; but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) has "wool, hawks and precious things". Neither the Cambridge History of India nor Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangini mentions the presents.
Muḥammad and agreed to a relationship. Sultān Muḥammad also in concert with Malik Kājī and Ābjāl wrote a treaty of peace; and sent it with the wonderful products of Kashmir to the Kāshghar people. It was also settled that Sultān Muḥammad's daughter should be given in marriage to the Sultānzāda Sikandar; and the Kashmiri prisoners still in the custody of the Mughals should be released. The Kāshgharīs agreed to this treaty, and turned towards Kāshghar; and the disturbances which had been caused in Kashmir became changed to peace and prosperity.

During this year two comets or stars with tails rose above the horizon. A terrible famine took place in these days, so that most of

---

1 For an explanation of this see the Tarikh-i-Bashidi, p. 441, where it appears that, "everyone, according to his rank, formed a connection (mulākā) with one of the Sultāns or Maliks of Kashmir." Mirzā Haidar became connected with Muḥammad Shāh, and according to "the Moghul practice we called each other 'friends'." Similar relations were formed between the other Moghul leaders and the Kashmir nobles.

2 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 115) gives what appears to me to be a quite incorrect account of these terms. He says, "the Kāshghar party taking with them presents of wool, hawks and precious things, went to Muḥammad Shāh, and asked his daughter in marriage to Sikandar Khān, and desired that the women whom the Mughals had in their hands, should there remain". Neither Nişām-ud-dīn nor Fīrisṭah says that the Kāshghar people went to their presence, and asked for Muḥammad Shāh's daughter. They both say that it was settled that the marriage would take place. Prājyabhaṭṭa in lino 342 makes a curious statement about the marriage of the princess, सर्द बुद्गुँ चन्द्रपुरः। चन्द्रपुर चन्द्रपुरः चन्द्रपुराय चन्द्रपुराय। This would mean that the princess was taken away by conciliatory methods.

3 The comets and famine are mentioned by Fīrisṭah and Col. Briggs. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, mentions the famine but not the comets. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 116) mentions two comets and the famine; and with reference to the latter, he makes the curious statement, "The massacre of Zuljīr was regarded no less severe than this famine in its effect," which is very different from what Nişām-ud-dīn and Fīrisṭah say about the matter, as would appear on a comparison of my translation. He had also apparently forgotten that he had called Zuljīr Zuljū on page 99 of his paper. According to Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 344) there were not two comets, but there was a rain of meteorites everywhere on the ripe paddy fields, and then a comet made its appearance. The line is प्रभाशिन्देशक्षीत्तिः पांचवें राष्ट्रः। स्मारकारः।
the people died of hunger; and the remainder who survived, abandoned their native land and went away to distant places; and the story of Diljū, who had perpetrated a general massacre, having sunk into oblivion in people’s minds, appeared as of no importance in comparison to this catastrophe. These hardships continued for ten months, and then ceased; and as the fruit season also drew near, some happiness made its appearance among the people.

During this period a disagreement occurred between Malik Kājī and Abdāl Mākrī; and the former coming out of the city took up his residence in Zainpūr. Malik Abdāl continued to be the Sultān’s vazir; and the governors and the officers perpetrated every kind of oppression that they wanted on the ra‘īyāts; and no one was there to attend to their complaints. 2 After some time, Sultān Muḥammad Shāh suffered from a burning fever; he gave away all the gold that he had to the poor and needy, and passed away from the world as a result of the same illness. The period of his reign was 3 fifty years.

---

1 The famine is described in lines 345-358. It is said (l. 350) that 

2 Compare line 360 of Prājyabhaṭṭa. The place where Qāḍī Chak took up his residence is called Jainapura in this line. Zainpūr is mentioned in the Index of Stein’s Rājatarangini, but the page reference, vol. II, page 472, against it is incorrect; on page 471, however, it is stated that “From the small town of Jainapuri founded by him, the new subdivision took the name of Zainpūr or Jainapura.”

3 The illness and death of Muḥammad Shāh and his adjurations to his ministers are described in Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangini, lines 365-373. He seems to have suffered from various complaints and not from the قبر مغرب 

4 Finishtah also says he reigned for fifty years; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 116) explains this by saying that, “The fifty years must reckon from 891 A.H. and include all the reigns of Fath Shāh and Nāzuk Shāh.” It is noteworthy, however, that Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 373) says that he reigned for five years نهائی پن سی ہوری راہیہ ہم. His last or fourth reign extended from 935 to 941 A.H., 1529-1534/35 A.D., which is about 5 years, so that the fifty of Niẓām-ud-din and Finishtah may be a mistake for five.
THE SULTANS OF KASHMIR

1. AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN SHAMS-UD-DIN, SON OF SULTAN MUHAMMAD SHAH.

2. Sultan Shams-ud-din sat on the throne of the empire after his father, and divided the whole country, in agreement with his vazir, among the amirs. The people of Kashmir made rejoicings on his accession. But in a very short time there were disputes between Malik Kajī and Abdal Mākri; and the former carried the Sultan away in the direction of Gōswā to fight with the latter. Abdal also came forward to meet him with a complete army. But in the end a peace having been determined upon, Abdal went away to Kamrāj, which was his jāgīr, and the Sultan and Malik Kajī returned to Srinagar. Again after some time Abdal Mākri turned his head from allegiance; and commencing to make disturbances created confusion in Kamrāj. This time also the disturbance was quelled with ease. Nothing more than this can be gleaned from the Tārikh-i-Kashmir about Sultan Shams-ud-din; and the period of his rule

---

1 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. omit the word son, after Shams-ud-din. Firishtah lith. ed. has it. I have inserted it.

2 Firishtah agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 496) following the Towarikh Kashmeery calls the successor of Muhammad Shāh, Ibrahim, and not Shams-ud-din. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India follow Niẓām-ud-din and Firishtah. Prājyabhatṭa devotes some lines (374–376) to the people’s lamentation on the death of Sultan Muhammad, and calls the new Sultan मकर (l. 380) a very abbreviated form of Shams-ud-din Shāh. It also mentions the rejoicings of the high and the low (वर्षचन्द पारव: सम्भव) and their blessings in line 382. Then we suddenly come to the disputes between the two factions, but it is difficult to discover any reason for them. The two armies were stationed at वर्षचन्द and आलोचनालिक, and then Rigacakra went as an intermediary; and concluded a settlement to the effect that Kācacakra (Qūlt Chak) should remain at the capital and the Mārgapās (Mākris) in Kamrāj (l. 389).

3 As to the account of the latter part of the reign of Shams-ud-din and the reign of Nāzuk Shāh, Firishtah agrees almost word for word, and so does Rodgers. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, says that Shams-ud-din II died in June or July 1540, when Nāzuk Shāh was restored. The account in Prājyabhatṭa’s Rājatarangini is very confused. It mentions the intrigues of the leaders and the incursions of the Mughals (l. 403) but I have not been able to discover anything about Shams-ud-din or Nāzuk Shāh.
cannot be ascertained. After him his son Nāzuk Šāh sat on the seat of government; but five or six months had not passed, when Ṣirā Ḥaidar having acquired power in the country took possession of it. During the period of his rule, public prayers were read and coins struck in the renowned name of His Majesty, Jinnat Ashfānl

1 Humāyūn Bādshāh.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF MIRZA ḤAIDAR.

In the year 948 a.h., at the time, when Jinnat Ashfānl having been defeated by Šehr Khān had come to Lāhore, Ābdul Mākri and Ṣādī Chak and some other of the chief men of the Kashmir sent a petition, through Mirza Ḥaidar, containing expressions of their loyalty, and incitements to him to seize the country. His Majesty (i.e., Humāyūn) gave Mirza Ḥaidar permission to go; and also decided to follow him himself. When Mirza Ḥaidar arrived at Ṣādī Chak, 2 and distinctly it is written in Persian, Ṣādī Chak is, therefore, the correct name and I have kept it. Ṣādī Chak, but cannot be changed to Zangī Chak. Ṣādī Chak is, therefore, the correct name and I have kept it. 4 Ṣādī Chak is, therefore, the correct name and I have kept it. 4

1 One MS. omits by mistake the passage from Bādshāh, including the heading about the rule of Mirza Ḥaidar.

2 He is called Zangī Chak in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, Zangī Chak by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498), and Zangī Chakh by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 117) and the Cambridge History of India; and the translators of the Tarikh-i-Rashidi also call him Zangī Chak; but the name is Ṣādī Chak in both MSS. of the Tabaqāt, and more distinctly it is written in Persian. Ṣādī Chak is, therefore, the correct name and I have kept it. Ṣādī Chak is, therefore, the correct name and I have kept it. 4

3 The name looks like 5 in the MS. The lith. ed. has 7, and Firishtah 5 has 7. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498) has Mīn, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 117) has Bhir. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the name of the place. I consulted the fountain head for the correct name, but Mirza Ḥaidar is delightfully vague in the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, page 483, where he says, “when I arrived at the foot of the pass (leading to) Kashmir, Kāči Chak ascended (?) by one road and we by another, and without further contention or discussion, we (all) arrived at (Kashmir).” I cannot find any place of the name of Bhir, but Bhimbar or “Bhimbar” lies at the foot of the outer hills, in the centre of the tract between the Vistāta and the Chab, note 180.

In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has 5 , in the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has 5.
Abdāl Mākri and Rēgī Chak came and joined him. There were not more than four hundred horsemen with Mirzā Ḥaidar. When he arrived at Rājauri, Kājī Chak, who was (then the de facto) ruler of Kashmir, came with three thousand horsemen and fifty thousand foot soldiers to the 1 Karmal pass, and strengthened it. Mirzā Ḥaidar abandoned that route, and started by way of Punj. Kājī Chak in his great pride did not guard that road; and Mirzā Ḥaidar, crossing the hill, arrived in the Kashmir plateau; and suddenly took possession of the city of Srinagar. Abdāl Mākri and Rēgī Chak having secured a footing, took charge of all affairs; and allotted some parganas as the Mirzā’s jāgīr. It so happened that about this time Abdāl Mākri’s days came to an end; and he died after recommending his sons to the Mirzā. After the arrival of Mirzā Ḥaidar in Kashmir, 2 Kajī Chak went to Shēr Kḥān Afgān in Hindūstān; and brought five thousand horsemen, who were commanded by Ḥusain Sharwānī and 3 Ādīl Kḥān

---

1 Firishta has كنل كرتل and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 498) has Kummul pass. In the text-edition كنل كرتل has been changed to كنل כורתל. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV) p. 117, has transformed Katal Kartal to “Khabal Kartal (it is called Karmal by Erskine)”; and he has transformed בָּנֹת, which is written as בְּנֹת in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and as בְּנֹת in Firishta lith. ed., out of all recognition to “Pahbaj (the Pamij of Erskine).” Col. Briggs comes very near the correct name and calls it Punnuj. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, does not give the name of the place, where Kājī Chakk was stationed; but gives the correct name (Pūnch) of the pass, by which Mirzā Ḥaidar crossed the hill. It makes the statement that Mirza Ḥaidar’s allies “engaged Kājī Chak’s attention by threatening a frontal attack”; but I cannot find any authority whatever for it. Both the Tabaqāt and Firishta simply say that he abandoned that route, and Mirza Ḥaidar (whose words I have quoted in the preceding note) whatever he says or means, does not mention any threat of a frontal attack by his allies on Kāchī Chak.

2 According to Mirza Ḥaidar (Tārikh-i-Rashidi, p. 485), there was an interval of some months between his arrival, and Kāchī Chak’s bringing the troops from Shir Kḥān. Mirza Ḥaidar crossed the pass into Kashmir on the 22nd of Rajab. Then the winter came on, and it was not till the beginning of spring that Shir Khan’s troops arrived. Just then Abdāl Makri was attacked by paralysis and died.

3 The name is ‘Alāwāl Kḥān in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; but it is ‘Ādīl Kḥān in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishta.
and two elephants, to reinforce his own troops. Mirzâ Haidar in concert with Rêgi Chak, advanced to meet him in battle. The two parties arrayed their forces between the villages of 1 Datarbâr and Kâwâh; and the breeze of victory having blown on the plumes of the standards of Mirzâ Haidar, the amirs of Shêr Khân and Kâjî Chak were routed. Kâjî Chak took up his residence in 2 Bahramgalah. Mûllâ Muḥammad Yûsuf the Khâtib (preacher) of the Jama' Mosque of Srinagar 3 obtained the date of the victory in the words "Fath-i-Mukarrar".

In the year 950 A.H., Mirzâ Haidar took up his residence in the fort of 4 Indarkôt. 5 Owing to Mirzâ Haidar having entertained suspicions about Rêgi Chak, the latter fled and went to Kâjî Chak; and the two united together, and in the year 951 A.H., advanced towards Srinagar with the object of destroying Mirzâ Haidar's power). Bahrâm Chak son of Rêgi Chak reached Srinagar. Mirzâ Haidar nominated Bandagân Kôkah and Khwâjah Hâjî Kashmiri to crush

1 The names are دن در بارو گا و دن دارو گار in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and گا و دن دار in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has دن در دن دار. The Tarikh-i-Rashidi gives various particulars which are not to be found in the Ţabaqât or in Firishtah, but does not give the names of these villages. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 499) has Dhunuj and Gava, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. I. IV, p. 117) has Danahdyâr and Kâwâh. The Cambridge History of India does not give any name. In the text-edition the names are صخیخ و خان دربار and صخیخ کار گار and پرم کلا in the text-edition.

2 Bahramgalah has wrongly been changed to Parmkalaha in the text-edition.

3 The meaning is not clear, some words having probably been omitted. I have, however, supplied the omission by a reference to page 485 of the Tarikh-i-Rashidi.

4 According to the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, page 485, Mirza Haidar is said to have placed his and his followers' families in the fort of Andarkul, when he was going to fight Kâchi Chak and Shir Khân's armies. The translators say in a note that this must be the Indrakot of Firishtah. Firishtah, however would not dream of writing Indrakot, he has Indarkot. It may be noted, however, that there is a parpâna called Andarkoth among those of the Kamraj tract (Stein, vol. II, p. 494). So Indarkôt may be correct.

him, and he was unable to meet them, and fled. When the Mirzâ’s troops pursued him, Kâji Chak and Rêgî Chak, considering flight the safest course, took up their quarters at Bahramgalah. Mirzâ Ḥaidar left Bandagān Kōkah and others at Srinagar and advanced to conquer Tibet; and seized the fort of 1 Kōsūr, among the great forts, and some other forts.

In the year 952 a. h., Kâji Chak and his son Muḥammad Chak died of a 2 shivering fever. Mirzâ Ḥaidar passed the year in peace. In the year 953 a. h., Rêgî Chak fought with the amirs of Mirzâ Ḥaidar, and was killed; and his head with that of his son Ghazi Kāhn was brought before Mirzâ Ḥaidar.

In the year 954 a. h., an ambassador arrived from Kâshghâr. Mirzâ Ḥaidar went to Lâr to welcome him. Újh Bahrām, son of Mas‘ūd Chak, who for seven years had fought bravely in Kamrāj and had defeated everyone there, made proposals of peace to Kāhn Mirak Mirzâ, and made conditions and engagements. Kāhn Mirak Mirzâ summoned him after making promises and taking oaths. But when Újh Bahrām came to his majlis, he drew a dagger out of his boot, and stabbed him in the stomach. The man, wounded as he was, fled and got into the jungle. Kāhn Mirak Mirzâ hastened in pursuit of him, and seizing him cut off his head, and brought it to Mirzâ Ḥaidar at Lâr, believing that Mirzâ Ḥaidar would be pleased. 3 Ídî Zinā, after the food had been brought in, rose up in great

---

1 The name of the fort is كورسوز كورسوز in the MS., and كورسوز كورسوز in the lith. ed. Firishta (vol. IV, p. 499) has Looshoo, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 117) has Lansūr. The Tarikh-i-Kushâr is of no help, as it ends with Mirza Haidar’s victory.

2 نب و لوزة instead of لوزة لوزة in the text-edition.

3 It is not clear who he was. He was apparently someone in authority, for Mirzâ Ḥaidar thought it necessary to excuse himself on the ground of his ignorance of Mirak Mirzâ’s acts (Jān Mirak Mirzā in the text-edition). He is, however, named, a few lines below, as one of the leaders of the vanguard of the army sent to conquer Kishtwâr. Both the MSS. say بعد ار حاضر ساحتي غلام. The lith. ed. omits the word غلام. Firishta says nothing about anything being brought. If the reading in the MSS. is correct, the production of the head was delayed till the food was brought in, apparently with the object of giving it a special relish. In the text-edition the name is Ídî Rainâ, but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) has Ídî Zinâ.
anger and wrath on seeing the head; and said "It is not right to kill a person after making conditions and engagements." Mirzā Haidar said, "I had no information of these happenings."

After this, Mirzā Haidar advanced from Lār to Kīshtwār. He made 1 Bandagān Kökah, Muḥammad Mākri, Makna Mughal, Mirzā Muhammad Yahīya and 'Īdī Zīnā the commanders of his vanguard; and himself remained in the village of 2 Jhālū near (the boundary of) Kīshtwār. The vanguard, after traversing marches of three days in one day, arrived in the village of 3 Dōhut which was on their side of the river Mārnā. The Kīshtwārā army was on the opposite side of the river. There was a skirmish of arrows and musket shots, but neither party could cross the river. The following day Mirzā Haidar's army, turning from the right road, wanted to get into Kīshtwār. When they arrived in the village of 4 Dār, a strong wind

---

1 The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS, and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, with slight variations. Firishtah lith. ed. omits the third and makes Mirzā Muḥammad Yahīya Zīnā one man. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 500) only gives the name of Bandagan Koka, and adds "with other officers." Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) follows Firishtah, but calls the last man there Yahī Zīnā. The Cambridge History of India does not give any name.

2 The name looks like دو دور جهان in the MS, and جهان in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Firishtah lith. ed. has جهانپیر. Col. Briggs does not mention the place, but Rodgers, following Firishtah, calls it Jhāpūr. The place is not mentioned on page 21 of the Introduction to Elias and Rose's Tarikh-i-Rashidi where the editors speak of the expedition against Kīshtawār. In the text-edition it is جمایلو .

3 The name of the village looks like زوهم و دور in the MSS. It is دوست and دانو in the Tabaqāt, and دانو in that of Firishtah. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) has Dāhlot. No name is given in the introduction of the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, but it is said that the advance guard came up with the enemy on the banks of the Kīshtawār river. The name of the river is مامارا, مامارا, or مامارا را in the MS, and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Firishtah lith. ed. has مامارا. Col. Briggs does not give the name; and Rodgers says, "where the river winds". In the text-edition it is adopted as the name of the village.

4 The name of the village is دار in one MS, and in the lith. ed., and دار in the other MS. It is Dār in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118).
rose, and it became dark. The Kashmiris came bravely in crowds and attacked them. Bandagán Kıkah, who was the leader of Mirzâ Ḥaidar’s army, was slain with many others. When they started from there, Muḥammad Mākri and his son with twenty-five principal men were slain on the road. The rest, who had escaped death from the sword, came and after suffering much privations, joined Mirzâ Ḥaidar. The Mirzâ coming back from there in the year 995 A.H., advanced towards Tibet and conquering Rājauri from the Kashmiris made it over to 1 Muḥammad Naẓr and Ṣabr ‘Alī. He gave Paklī to Mullā ‘Abd-ul-lah and little Tibet to Mullā Qāsim; and conquering great Tibet appointed a person of the name of 2 Muḥsin to be its governor.

In the year 956 A.H., Mirzâ Ḥaidar turned his attention to the fort of 3 Danīl. Ādam Kakhar came there; and prayed for the pardon of the offences of Daulat Chak, nephew (brother’s son) of Kājī Chak. Mirzâ Ḥaidar granted the prayer; and sitting with Ādam in his pavilion, summoned Daulat Chak to come there. The latter became angry, and rose up, and taking the elephant which he had brought with him as a tribute, went away. Some persons wanted to pursue him, but Mirzâ Ḥaidar forbade them.

---

1 The first name is Muḥammad Naẓr in both MSS. and the lith. ed. The second name is Ṣabr ‘Alī in one MS. and جبر على which may be a mistake for بر على in the other, and Mir ‘Alī in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Muḥammad Naẓr and Nāṣir ‘Alī. Col. Briggs does not mention the names, and Rodgers gives the names after Firishtah. No names are given in the introduction (p. 21) to the Tarikh-i-Rashidi, which contrary to Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah’s account, that he seized Rājauri, Paklī, Little Tibet and Tibet in the order mentioned, says that he conquered Little Tibet (or Baltistan), Tibet (or Ladak) and subsequently Rajaori and Pakhlī.

2 The name is محسن نامي in both MSS. and محسن نامي in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Mullī Qāsim.

3 The name is دملى and دملى in the MSS., and دملى in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has دملى. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 501) has Deebul, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) has Danel. In the text-version it is دملى. غلبانہ تھانہ میں محض اور بود اعجاز و اکرم بجا نیا بندگی as the probable reason for Daulat Chak’s anger.
After some time, Mirzâ (Hadîr) returned to Kashmir. 1 Daulat Chak and Qhâzî Khân and Hasan Chak and Bahârân Chak went to Haibat Khân Niyâzi, who having been defeated by Islâm Khân, had come to Râjauri. Islâm Khân had also come to 2 Madwâr, belonging to the Naushahrah area in pursuit of the Niyâzîs. 3 He sent Saiyid Khân 'Abd-ul-mulk one of his trusted servants to Haibat Khân; and Saiyid Khân, having introduced matters about an amicable settlement, brought the mother and sister of Haibat Khân to Islâm Khân. The latter then turned back, and coming to the village of 4 Ban, in the neighbourhood of Stâlkôt, took up his quarters there. The Kashmirs mentioned above took Haibat Khân to 5 Bârâmûla, and wanted to take him to Kashmir, in order to do away with Mirzâ Hadîr (with his help). He, however, could not make up his mind to do so; and sending a Brahman to Mirzâ Hadîr, made proposals for peace. Mirzâ Hadîr sent ample funds by the hand of that Brahman; and Haibat Khân, leaving the place where he was, went to the village of 6 Bir, which is a dependancy of the territory of Jammu. 7 The

1 Firishthah substitutes Jai Chak for Hasan Chak, and is followed by Rodgers. Firishthah, however, has the name of Haibat Khân correctly, but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) converts it to Haidar Khân, though a few lines further down, he has Haibat Khân Niyâzi.

2 The name is Madwâr in one MS. and Badwâr in the other and in the lith. ed. Firishthah lith. ed. has Madwâr. The article جî appears to have been omitted before واعیت in the MSS. and the lith. ed.

3 Firishthah (and following him, Col. Briggs) and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 118) say that it was Haibat Khân who sent Sayyid Khân Niyâzi to Islâm Shah.

4 The name is Ban in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It looks like Man in the other MS. Firishthah lith. ed. and Rodgers have Ban, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 502) has Bhimbur.

5 The MSS. have دابله, and the lith. ed. has رمله, but Firishthah lith. ed. has بارزة مرمیل which, I think, is correct. It is islem in the text edition.

6 The name is بسر, and同心 in the MSS. and ام in the lith. ed. Firishthah lith. ed. has هیر. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 502) has “the town of Subzech,” while Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 119) has Hir, and says that it is Nir in MS. No. 6571, in the British Museum. ملك has been adopted in the text edition.

7 Firishthah and Col. Briggs and Rodgers agree. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 119) says that he has seen two coins of Islâm Shah of this time,
Kashmiris separated from him, went to Islam Khan, but Ghazi Khan went to Mirza Haidar.

In the year 957 A.H., Mirza Haidar, becoming assured in his mind of the condition of the outskirts of the country, sent Khwaja Shams Mughal, with a large quantity of saffron, as an ambassador to Islam Khan; and in the year 958 A.H., Khwaja Shams returned with many presents, and much rich stuffs; and Yasin Afghan came from Islam Khan with Khwaja Shams; and Mirza Haidar gave (many) shawls, and much saffron to Islam Khan's ambassador, and gave him permission to return.

He then appointed Qarra Bahadur Mirza to the government of Baharmal; and sent Idi Zina and Nazeruk Shah and Husain Maki and Khwaja Haji from amongst the Kashmiris with him. 1 Qarra Bahadur and the Kashmiris left Indarkot, and took up their quarters at Barleena, and commenced to create disturbances on the ground that the Mughals looked down on them. The Mughals represented this to Mirza Haidar, but the latter did not believe it; and said that the Mughals were not in any way better than the Kashmiris in the matter of creating disaffection and disturbance. 2 Husain Maki sent his brother Ali Maki to Mirza Haidar, to make him acquainted

and adds that the Kashmiris were tired of Mirza Haidar, and wanted to have Islam Shah as their king, and the coins were struck in anticipation of his conquering the country, or they might have been struck by Mirza Haidar himself in compliment to Islam Shah.

1 Firishtah agrees, but Rodgers wrongly translates the words افزاندگان کوت بر امردة which are in the lith. ed. of Firishtah as well as in the Tabaqat, by the words “came back to Indarkot.” The sentence, as it stands, means that Qarra Bahadur and the Kashmiris all commenced to create disturbances, but apparently it was the Kashmiris who did so. Rodgers’s translation of the words كم مختار ایشان در نظر نی ارکند by the words that “the Mughals (the forces of Mirza Haidar) were not acceptable to them” also appears to be incorrect.

2 Apparently Husain and ‘Ali were not acting in concert with the other Kashmiris. There are slight differences in the wording of the sentences. I have adopted the reading quoted by one of the two MSS., which makes most sense, but I have had to change the last word طلیب which is in both MSS. to طلیب. Firishtah lith. ed. has طلیب. Rodgers’s translation (J. A. S. B., vol. LIV, p. 119) in which he reads the word عذر as غذر (excuse) appears to me to be incorrect.
with the treachery of the Kashmiris, so that he might decide to recall the army. Mirzā Ḥaidar took no notice and refused to listen to him; and said "What cause of jealousy should the Kashmiris have against you that they should act treacherously towards you," and did not summon the army back.

On the 27th of the Ramaḍān there was a great conflagration in the Indarkōt; and most of the houses were burnt down. Qarrā Bahādur and all the men sent the following message, "Our houses have been burnt down; if you will give an order we would come and repair our houses and turn our attention next year to Baharmal." Mirzā Ḥaidar did not at all agree to this; and the army had to proceed to Baharmal, whether they liked it or not.

‘Īdī Zīnā and all the Kashmiris then combined together; and when night came they separated themselves from the Mughals, and came to the pass of Baharmal. They also separated Ḥusain Mākri and ‘Ali Mākri from the Mughals, and took them with themselves, so that they might not be slain with the Mughals. In the morning, there was a battle between the Mughals and the men of Baharmal, and the former were entangled and confined in the hills. Saiyid Mirzā, however, fled to 1 Dabil. About fifty renowned Mughals were slain, and Muḥammad Nazr and Qarrā Bahādur were taken prisoners. The rest, who escaped the sword, came by way of Punch to Bahramgalah. Mirzā Ḥaidar was deeply grieved on hearing this news and ordered that the broken silver 2 dēga (saucers), which are now current in Kashmir, be coined. He also made Jahāngir Mākri his trusted agent, and bestowed the jāgir of Ḥusain Mākri on him. He also gave horses and money to many of the craftsmen, and made soldiers of them. Just after this news came that Mullā 'Abd-ul-lah on hearing of the rising of the Kashmiris.

---

1 The name looks like دیلم and دمل in the MSS. and رمل in the lith ed. and appears therefore to be identical with Danil, see page 712 and note 3. Firishta lith. ed. however has دمل. قلعة بیرمل in the text-edition is certainly incorrect.

2 There is a word which looks like سمبہ or سمبہ Sahl, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. which I cannot make out, but which may be "made of copper". Firishta lith. ed. has زرکما in the corresponding passage. سمبہ has been adopted in the text-edition.
was coming to meet Mirzā Ḥaidar; but when he arrived near Bārāmūlā the rebels who had collected in large numbers slew him; and Khwājah Qāsim was slain in little Tibet; and Muḥammad Naẓr was taken prisoner in Rājaurī; and the Kashmiris having collected in large numbers had come from Bahramgalah to 1 Hirahpūr. Mirzā Ḥaidar, having no other alternative, 2 came out of Indarkōt, with the intention of engaging them. The total number of men with him was only a thousand. Among the Mughals men like Ḥabīb-ul-ʿrūf and Shāhzāda Lang, and 3 Khān Mirak Mirzā and Mir Maktā and 4 ʿṢabr ʿAlī and others, who were altogether about seven hundred men, joined him; and they took up their quarters at Shīhāb-ud-dīn pūr.

Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān and other notable leaders in concert with ʿĪdī Zinā collected their men, and came to Hirāpūr, and leaving that place came to the village of Khānpūr. Mirzā Ḥaidar encamped in the plain of Khālidgarh, which is close to Srīnagar. Fāṭḥ Chak, whose father had been slain by the Mughals, raided Indarkōt with Rāja Bahārām and three thousand men, in order to avenge his father’s death, and burnt down the buildings erected by Mirzā Ḥaidar in the Bāgh-i-Ṣafā. When Mirzā Ḥaidar heard this news, he said, “I did not bring these edifices from Kāshghar. With Divine favour similar ones can be built.” ʿṢabr ʿAlī burnt down the edifices of Soltān Zain-ul-ʿabīdīn, which were in Suyyapūr, in retaliation of the burning down of Mirzā Ḥaidar’s buildings, but the Mirzā was not pleased at this. (They) also burnt down the houses of ʿĪdī Zinā and Naurūz.

1 The name is clearly Hirahpūr in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has what looks like Habzāpūr. Col. Briggs’s account (vol. IV, pp. 502, 503) is very sketchy, the whole of the incident from the appointment of Qarrā Bahādur (called Kiran Bahadur) to Baharmal (called Bheerbul) to the death of Mirza Heidur being narrated in the space of eight or nine lines; and the name of the place under consideration is not mentioned. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 120) calls the place Hambarapūr.

2 Rodgers translates اَنِّذ‌ر كوك بر امدة "came to Indarkot."

3 in the text-edition is a misprint for جان پرک میرزا.

4 The name is میر مکننا in one MS. and the lith. ed., and میر مکننا in the other MS. Firishtah lith. ed. has جر علی, but Rodgers has Jai Alī. In the text-edition میر مکننا is a misprint for میر مکننا.
Chak in Srinagar. After this Mirzâ Ḥaider came and took up his residence in Khânpûr. In this village there is a plane tree, in the shade of which two hundred horsemen can stand; and it has been found by trial, that whenever a single branch of it is moved the whole tree shakes. The writer of this history Niẓâm-ud-din Aḥmad was in attendance, when the sublime standards of His Majesty the Khalîfâ-i-Ilâhî went on a visit to Kashmir for the second time; and he saw the tree, and examined it. In short, the Kashmiris moved from Khânpûr and came to the village of Adânpûr; and the distance (between the two armies) was not more than two karôhs.

Mirzâ Ḥaider then decided that he should make a night attack on the enemy; and he gave direction that Mirzâ ‘Abd-ur-raḥman, his brother, who was adorned with the attributes of piety and purity, should become his heir; and took the allegiance of his men to him. Then they all mounted, and started for making the attack. As decreed by fate, there were heavy clouds that night. When they arrived near the tent of Khwâjah Ḥâji, who was the cause of the disturbance, and also the vakil (agent or representative) of the Mirzâ, nothing could be seen owing to the darkness. Shâh Naẓr a cuirassier says, “At this time I shot an arrow. The voice of Mirzâ Ḥaider came to my ears, which said ‘thou hast done an evil thing.’ I knew that my arrow had hit the Mirzâ.” It is also narrated that a

---

1 The name is in one Ms., and बद in the other. The lith. ed. has बनार बद and बनार बाजार. बाजार may be mistakes for चनार or the plane tree, while बद is a willow. Firishtah lith. ed. has बद and Rodgers has willow. Both plane trees and willows grow in Kashmir, but I should be inclined to think that the tree in question was a plane tree which is a tall spreading tree.

2 Both MSS. have आद पूर. The lith. ed. has आद पूर. Firishtah lith. ed. has आद पूर and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 120) has Adnîpur.

3 It should be noted, however, that just before this, apparently the two armies were both in Khânpûr.

4 The readings in the MSS. are تباحت تولدا and تباحت تولدا and in the lith. ed. صاحب تولدا. These are all incorrect, unless is same word in the dialect of Kashgar. Firishtah lith. ed. has تباحت كردي which I have adopted. The whole affair is mysterious. Although it was dark the cause of the death could have been ascertained. Then, why was the corpse, or in fact the man, who was on the point of death left lying where he had fallen.
butcher hit his thigh with an arrow. Another tradition is that Kamāl Kōkah slew him with the sword; but there was nothing (visible) on his body except a wound caused by an arrow. In short, when the morning came, it was bruited about, that a Mughal, who had been killed, was lying there. When Khwājah Hājī and his son arrived at the spot, they saw that it was Mirzā Ḥaidar. They raised his head from the ground. There was no more than breath left. The dying man opened his eyes, and surrendered his life to the creator. The Mughals fled to Indarkōt. The Kashmiris going in pursuit of them took up the corpse of Mirzā Ḥaidar to the Darbadū Mausoleum, and buried it.

The people were sorely grieved at the death of Mirzā Ḥaidar. The Mughals got into Indarkōt, and fortified themselves in it; and fight went on for three days. On the 4th day Muḥammad Rūmī shot Kashmirī coins from mortars, and every one, who was hit, was killed. At last, Khānam, the widow of Mirzā Ḥaidar, and his sister said to the Mughals, “As Mirzā Ḥaidar has gone away from us, it is better to have peace with the Kashmiris.” The Mughals accepted this, and sent Amīr Khān, the architect, to the Kashmiris to conclude a pact. The Kashmiris agreeing to a peaceful settlement gave a letter containing engagements and oaths to the effect that they would not cause any trouble to the Mughals.

The period of Mirzā Ḥaidar’s rule was ten years.

1 The name is Kamāl Dōnī in the MSS. and Kamāl Dōnī in the lith. ed. I cannot find any meaning of Dōnī or Dōnī. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kamāl Kakah and I have adopted it. The reading in the MSS. is followed in the text-edition.

2 One MS. has ṭāriq al-bāb wa ḥunādī darqūr, which is of course incorrect. The other has ṭāriq al-bāb ḥunādī darqūr, which appears to be correct. The lith. ed. is also incorrect; it has ṭāriq al-bāb ḥunādī darqūr. Firishtah lith. ed. has the same reading as the second MS., and this is followed in the text-edition.

3 It is curious that the Mughals did not even attempt to carry away the Mirzā’s dead body; and it was left to the Kashmiris to bury it. The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say that they buried the body in Darbū Madar. I cannot find out what this burial place was. Firishtah only says that the Kashmiris—seeing the body of the Mirzā buried it.

4 There are slight differences in the readings.

5 She is so called in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls her Khānī and it calls the Mirzā’s sister Khānī.
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AN ACCOUNT OF NAZUK SHAH.

When the gates of the fort (of Indarkot) were opened, the Kashmiris entered the 1 apartment containing valuable furniture, etc. belonging to Mirza Haidar and carried away fine and delicate goods. They brought the family and dependants of Mirza Haidar to Srinagar, and placed them 2 in the house of Hasan Matu. They divided the country of Kashmir among themselves; and pargana 3 Dëvsar was allotted to Daulat Chak, and that of 4 Wahl to Ghazi Khân and that of 5 Kamraj to Yusuf Chak and Bahrâm Chak. One lakh of 6 donkey-loads of paddy (or rice in husks) was allotted to Khwajah Häji, the vakil, of Mirza Haidar. Daulat Chak gave pargana Dëvsar, which was his jâqir to his son Habib Chak, and the daughter of 1 Idi Zinâ was married to the latter. The amirs of Kashmir, and more specially 'Idi Zinä, having gained complete power, raised Nazuk Shâh on the throne, and kept him as a puppet; but in fact 'Idi Zinä was the Bâdshâh.

1 The word is نوشک خانه, which according to the dictionary is a wardrobe, and which Rodgers calls the treasury. It is really what I have called it in the text. There is or at least was some years ago, what was called a Toshâkhânâ correctly Tâshakhânâ of the government of India, in which the articles offered to the Viceroy at the Durbars were kept.

2 I have not thought it necessary to point out all the mistakes in Rodgers's paper, but I cannot pass this over. The words both in the Tabaqat and in Firishtah are اهل و عمال ميزا را در سري نكروردند و در قولى حس مينجا دانند but of the Tabaqat is misread in Firishtah. My translation is based on this text. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 121) has, "the family of the Mirza was taken to Srinagar, and placed in the hands of Manujah."

3 Given as one of the S.E. parganas, see list on page 369 of the Ahn-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II).

4 It is written as زهی in both MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has زهی and I have taken this in preference to زهی, as it is probably identical with Vihî, one of the parganas east of Srinagar (Ahn-i-Akbari, Jarratt, vol. II, p. 368).

5 Kamraj is called a tract containing 16 Mahals, page 370 of the Ahn-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II) but there is a pargana also of the name of Kamraj included in the S.W. parganas of the Kamraj tract.

6 یک لک خرور شالی i.e., a lakh of donkey-loads of paddy is transformed into "a lakh of shawls" by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 121).
In the year 959 A.H. Sankar Chak, son of Kāji Chak, wanted to go away from Kashmir (i.e., I suppose Srinagar), as Ghāzī Khān who called himself the son of Kāji Chak and had much jagīr. The details of this statement are these; that Sankar Chak was the son of Kāji Chak without any difficulty or doubt, and Ghāzī Khān although he was commonly known to be the son of Kāji Chak was not in reality his son; for Kāji Chak, after the death of his brother Ḥasan Chak, took the latter's widow, who was then with child (who was afterwards named Ghāzī Khān); and after two or three months the child was born. Hence Sankar Chak on account of the envy (which he bore) to Ghāzī Khān wanted to leave Kashmir and go to 1 ʻIdī Zinā. When a rumour of this got about, Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān sent 2 Ismaʻil Hayāt and Harjū, with one hundred men to summon Sankar Chak. They told them that if he did not come with them they were to bring him by force. Sankar Chak did not come on their summons, and went to ʻIdī Zinā. In the end ʻIdī Zinā came to them, and made an amicable settlement; and the parganas of 3 Kothār and Khāwar and Māwar having been allotted to Sankar Chak the disturbance subsided.

At this time, there were four groups who had power in Kashmir (1) ʻIdī Zinā with his group; (2) Ḥasan Mākri, son of Abdāl Mākri

---

1 It is not at all clear where he was.

2 The name is written as اسیعال رایبت in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. the last half of the name is written as هابیت without any dots above or below the second or third letters. This second part is distinctly written as هابیت in Firishtah lith. ed., and Rodgers has Hanit. اسیعال رایبت has been adopted in the text-edition.

3 The names of the parganas are not very easily decipherable. They look like كوبهادره باره in one MS. In the other they are the same except that the first is كوبهادره باره. In the lith. ed. there is apparently only one name كوبهادره باره. Firishtah lith. ed has كوهادر و كوهادر و موار and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 122) has Kothār Khāwin and Madurū. In the list of parganae in the Āmin-i-Akbar (Jarrett, vol. II, p. 369) there are two parganae Khatṭār and Khāwarparāsh, and I think it very probable that Sankar Chak got these. In the tabulated list of Kaśmir Parganas in Stein's Rājatarangini (vol. II, pp. 493, 494) I find Kūtaḥār, but no trace of any of the other. In the text-edition the names are كوبهادر و كوهادر و موار.
with his group; (3) the Kishtwâris whose leaders were Bahrâm Chak and Yûsuf Chak and others; and (4) the Kâmis of whom Kâji Chak, Daulat Chak and Ghazi Khân were the leaders. Yehayyi Zinâ gave his daughter in marriage to Hasan Khân, son of Kâji Chak; the daughter of Daulat Chak was married to Muhsammad Mâkri, son of Abdâl Mâkri; and the sister of Yûsuf Chak, son of Râj Chak, Köpwâri by name, was married by a nikah ceremony to Ghazi Khân. These alliances became the cause of the strength and power of the Chaks; and they, in concert with one another, went away to different parts of the country. Ghazi Khân went to the country of Kamrâj, and Daulat Chak to Sûyyapûr. The Mâkris went to Bânkal; and Ídī Zinâ remained at Srinagar in a sorrowful mood, and devised plans for their destruction.

As the season for egg fruits or brinjal now came, Ídī Zinâ ordered that fowls and brinjal may be brought so that they be cooked together. This was a dish much liked by the Kashmîris. Then Bahrât Chak and Saiyid Ibrâhim and Saiyid Ya‘qûb came at his invitation, but Yûsuf Chak did not come. Ídī Zinâ had the three guests seized and imprisoned them. Yûsuf receiving information of this went away by way of Kamrâj with three hundred horsemen and seven hundred foot soldiers, and joined Daulat Chak. When Ídī Zinâ saw that the Kashmîris had united with the Chaks, he released the

---

1 The name is written very differently in the different MSS., etc. The MSS. have, while the lith. ed. has . Firishtah lith. ed. has . Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 503) has Kapoories, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 122) has Kapûris. I prefer Kishtwâris as it means the people of Kishtwâr, while the others have no meaning at all.

2 The name is written as and in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has . The name is not given either by Col. Briggs or by Rodgers.

3 Firishtah lith. ed. has and Rodgers has Pâkul, but the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât have Bânkal, which is the name of a pargana in S.W. part of Kamrâj. See page 371 of the Ain-i-Akhbar (Jarratt, vol. II) where it is Bânkal, one of the south-west parganahe.

4 The word is in both MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât. Firishtah lith. ed. has .
Mughals, such as Qarrā Bahādur Mirzā, ‘Abd-ur-rahman Mirzā, Khān Mirak Mirzā, Shāhzāda Lang, Muḥammad Naẓr, and Shabr ‘Alī from prison; and showed favour to them; and giving each one of them a horse and armour and some money remained at Chakpūr.

At this time, Saiyid Ibrāhīm and Saiyid Ya’qūb, in concert with Jārūd, who was employed to guard them, fled; and going to Kamrāj joined Daulat Chak. Bahrām Chak could not escape. On the following day, Ghāzī Khān came to Srīnagar with three thousand horsemen. ‘Idī Zinā sent the Mughals to fight with him; but he broke down the bridges, and so the Mughals could not do anything. At this time Daulat Chak also came, and joined Ghāzī Khān in Srīnagar, and they joined together and took up a position in the ‘Idgāh. There were constant skirmishes between the two parties, but Bābā Khalīl went to ‘Idī Zinā in order to bring about a peace. He said, “You put your trust in the Mughals, and paid no regard to the Kashmirs. This was not right.” Having said words like this he effected a peace.

1 The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., with slight differences. In the Firishtah lith. ed. some of the names are different.

2 The word used is صحرا in one MS. and in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and Firishtah, and صرويا in the other MS. I cannot find either Sirpā or Siropā in the dictionary. Rodgers has translated the word as armour, and I have adopted his translation. There is a Bengali or Hindi word Siropā (सिरपा) which means an article of dress, e.g., a scarf, which can be worn as a mark of distinction; for instance, in certain places of pilgrimage various kinds of Siropās are given to the pilgrims, according to the amounts offered by them to the presiding deity of the temple. Siropā may also mean something covering the head and feet.

3 The name is Chakpūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt it is چک پرتو Chakpartū.

4 This passage with which Firishtah agrees word for word has been translated by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 122) quite incorrectly as: “the Sayyida Ibrāhīm and Ya’qūb by the help of the troopers escaped from prison, and joined Ghāzī Chakk at Kamrāj.” The name of the officer-in-chARGE is incorrectly given as Jārūd instead of Jārūd in the text-Edition.

5 The numbers are very differently given. One MS. has 3,000. The lith. ed. has 3,000. In the other MS. and Firishtah lith. ed. it is 3,000; and this is followed in the text-Edition. I am inclined to think that three thousand was the correct number.
between him and the Kashmiris. They then sent away the Mughals with their families and dependants by way of Tibet. 1 Khānāmji, the sister of Mirzā Haidar went away to Kābul by way of 2 Pakht. The people of Tibet slew 3 Šabr 'Alī and the other Mughals; and Khānāmji reached Kāshghar.

Following these events news came that Haibat Khān and 4 Saiyid Khān and Shahbāz Khān Afghans, who were of the Niyāzī tribe, were coming to conquer Kashmir; and had arrived in the pargana of 5 Bānihāl, and have entered the hills of 6 Lūnkōt. 7 Idi Zinā, Hasan Mākri, Bahrām Chak, Daulat Chak and Yūsuf Chak combined together, and marched out to fight the Niyāzīs. The two parties confronted each other, and fought bravely. 8 Bibi Rābe'a, the wife of Haidar Khān, also fought manfully; and struck 'Ali Chak with her sword. In the end Haibat Khān and Saiyid Khān and Firūz Khān and Bibi Rābe'a were slain and the Kashmiris returned to Srinagar with triumph and victory. They sent the heads of the Niyāzīs by the hand of Ya'qūb Mir to Islām Khān, in the village of Ban, which is near the river Chināb.

---

1 The name is خانم جی in one MS. and خانم جی in the other MS. and in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and Firishtah. It will be seen from page 718 and note 5 that in the account of the events which happened immediately after Mirzā Haidar's death, his widow was called Khānām in the Tabaqāt, but the sister's name was not mentioned; but Firishtah lith. ed. called the widow Khānāmī and the sister Khānji. I have, therefore, called the sister Khānāmji following the MS. which gives her that name. It is Khānī جی in the text-edition.

2 The name in the text-edition is بیکلی Bakki. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) has Paqī.

3 The name looks like صبر على in one MS. and جر على in the other, and صبر على in the lith. ed. The name is Šabr 'Alī in earlier passages.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. has صبر خان but later on he calls him خان.

5 Firishtah also has Bānhāl, but Rodgers has Bānihāl. There is a parganah called Bānihāl to the S.E. of Srinagar (see Ain-i-Akbarī, Jarratt, vol. II, p. 369).

6 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have در لون کوت. Firishtah lith. ed. has در نوین. I cannot find anything about دن لون کوت. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) has "at the salt range"; but I do not know his authority for saying so. Of course it may be the Salt Range, which runs parallel to the Jhelum near Pind Dādān Khān.

After that, hostilities again commenced among the Kashmiris: and 'Idi Zinā, in concert with Fath Chak, 1 Lōhar Mākri, Yusuf Chak, Bahram Chak, and Ibrāhīm Chak came to 2 Khālidgarh, and took up residence there; and Daulat Chak, Ghāzī Khān, Ḥusain Mākri and Saiyid Ibrāhīm Khān and a band of 3 Dūms joining together, took up their quarters in the 'Idgāh. When a period of two months had passed in this way, Yusuf Chak, Fath Chak, 4 Lōhar Mākri son of Sahu, and Ibrāhīm Chak separated themselves from 'Idi Zinā, and joined Daulat Chak. Then Daulat Chak mounted with a large force advanced against 'Idi Zinā; and he being unable to meet them, fled without fighting; and went to the village of 5 Jharō. About this time he wanted to mount a horse, but by accident the horse kicked him on the chest, and he concealed himself in the village of 6 Sannāk; and he passed away from the world on account of the pain of the accident. They brought his body to Srinagar; and buried it in

---

1 The name is Kohrād Mākri in one MS.; but two lines further down it is Lōhar Dānkrī and is Kōhar Dānkrī and Lōhar Dānkrī in the other and in the lith. ed. In Firishtah it is Kōhar Mākri. I have accepted Lōhar Mākri.

2 The name is Khāldkar and Khāldkārah in the MS., and Jālakar in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Khālidgār, but Rodgers has Khāgār.

3 The MSS. have طائيه دو مان, and the lith. ed. of Firishtah has what also looks like طائيه دو مان. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has دون نمان. I do not know what طائيه دو مان would mean. Of course means base, vulgar, etc. and طائيه دو نمان may mean a group of the common people. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. Liv, p. 123) translates طائيه دو مان بچا شد as "joining themselves together."

4 See note 1 above. After وله خبر and لوهر دانکری words like وله خبر and لوهر دانکری occur in the MSS. The lith. ed. has خبر and Firishtah lith. ed. has no corresponding words. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed. The text-edition has وله خبر.

5 The name is خبر and جپر in the MSS., and جپر in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has خبر or it may be خبر; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. Liv, p. 123) has Merv. I cannot decide between these various readings, but I certainly do not consider that Merv is the correct reading. In the text-edition it is جپر.

6 The name is سیناك in the MSS., and the lith. ed. has سیناك; but Rodgers has Simālā.
the mausoleum of Mūsā Zinā. The amirs then rebelled and excusing Nāzuk Shāh, who had nothing of the government except a name, from that also, determined on ruling themselves.

(Nāzuk Shāh) ruled nominally for two months, for the second time, after (the death of) Mīrzā Haidar.

An account of Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh, who was the brother of Nāzuk Shāh.

As 'Idī Zinā had passed away, Daulat Chak became the Madār-ul-mulk, and took up the management of affairs into his own hand. But when he saw, that there was no escape from having someone who should bear the name of Sultān, he raised Ibrāhīm Shāh to the seat of government, and kept him as a puppet. At this time Khwājah Ḥājī, the vakil of Mīrzā Haidar, came out of the jungle; and went to Islām Khān. And seizing Shams Zinā and Bahārām Chak put them into the prison. When the day of the 'Id-i-iftār came, Daulat

1 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) translates as "in the village of Mūsā Zinā".

2 The MSS. are incorrect. One has heard Shams Zinā and the other Serai Karden. I have adopted the reading in the lith. ed. which is correct, and which is also the reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

3 The MSS. and the lith. ed. have for the second time. Firishtah lith. ed. has for the third time. Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs have two months, but Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India have ten months.

4 That is the heading in the MS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishtah however calls Ibrāhīm Shāh, the son of Nāzuk Shāh Col. Briggs calls him brother of Nazuk Shah on one page, and his son in the next page. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India, page 289, say that he was a son of Nāzuk Shāh.

5 It is the reading in the MSS. and also in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah; but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) has Khugal, and he translates as "took refuge with Islām Shāh."

6 This is the reading in the MSS. and also in the lith. ed. The sentence has no nominative, and the verb karden is in the plural. Firishtah lith. ed. has drīn wa ṣīr i-Zinā wa then as in the Ṭabaqāt, which makes matters, if anything, worse, for the two defects pointed out remain, there is the additional difficulty that 'Idī Zinā was dead. I think the nominative should be Daulat Chak and the verb should be in the singular. Rodgers tides over the difficulty, by saying that Shams Zinā and Bahārām Chakk were thrown into prison, but he does not say by whom.
Chak having put his troops in order, came to the foot of the Qābq (to practise archery). Yūsuf Chak also rode out to the foot of the Qābq. The runner or footman, who was collecting the arrows, came among the horse’s legs. The horse got entangled; and Yūsuf Chak fell from his horse, and his neck was broken.

In the year 960 A.H. hostility took place between Ghāzī Khān and Daulat Chak and there was very great dissension among the Kashmīris. Ḥusain Mākrī and Shams Zinā, who were in Hindūstān, came back; and in the year 961 A.H., joined Ghāzī Khān. The sons of Yūsuf Chak and Bahārum Chak went to Daulat Chak. These disputes and dissensions continued for two months; but at length a husbandman, in a spirit of impertinent interference, came to Daulat Chak, and said in his ears; “Ghāzī Khān has sent me to you to enquire why you have collected these unprincipled men round you, as they are all your enemies.” In the same way, he went to Ghāzī Khān.

---

1 The word is Qābq in one MS. It looks like Qābq in one place and like Qābq in another in the second; and it is Qābq in both places in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firistāh it is Qābq in both places. Whatever the correct word is it seems to be the name of a hillock near Srinagar. Rodgers’s translation (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 123) is “outside the city.”

2 The words are in one MS. and the lith. ed., and in the other MS. Firistāh lith. ed. has no corresponding words. In the text-edition the reading the aspāš has been adopted.

3 Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have Yūsuf Chak and Bahārum Chak; but Yūsuf Chak had broken his neck; and Firistāh lith. ed. has the sons of Yūsuf Chak; so I have inserted the word sons before Yūsuf Chak in the translation. The text-edition has followed the manuscripts.

4 The words are which Rodgers has translated “assuming the garb of an ambassador.” The meaning is somewhat doubtful, but I think my translation is correct. The second word is Qarvāli in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firistāh, but it is Qarvāli in the other MS. In the lith. ed. of the Tābaqāt the words from گفت و گفتن are omitted, and in their place the words are در گوش أو گفتن, according to which the meaning would be that it was the sons of Yūsuf Chak and Bahārum Chak who spoke the words in Daulat Chak’s ear.

5 There is an adjective to the noun گلم in both the Tābaqāt and in Firistāh. Rodgers has omitted translating it. I think my translation is correct.
and said, "Daulat Chak intends to be at peace with you. Why are you quarrelling with him." Having said things like this he effected a settlement between them. Shams Zinā then fled and went to Hindūstān.

At this time, some Tibetans came and drove away the flocks of sheep of parganas 1 Khāwah and Bārah, which were allotted as the jāgir of Ḥabīb Chak, brother of Naṣrāt Khān. Daulat Chak sent Ibrāhīm Chak, Ḥaidar Chak, son of Ghāzi Khān and other chief men with a large army by way of Lār to invade great Tibet. Ḥabīb Khān himself advanced with great rapidity in pursuit of the Tibetans, by the road by which the flocks had been driven away. He suddenly came up to a fort of the Tibetans, fought with the garrison, and slew their commander by the sword. The rest all fled. Ḥabīb Khān encamped there, and said to Darvīsh Chak his brother, "Do you mount with the troops, and get into Tibet." Darvīsh Chak was negligent, and did not comply with his words. Ḥabīb Chak, in spite of his 2 wounds, which were still bleeding, mounted and got into the edifices and great mansions of Tibet. The Tibetans, being unable to oppose him, fled without attempting to fight. Forty of the men, who were clinging to the roof of one of the palaces, were seized. They made much importunities, and begged that they might not be killed. They also promised to give five hundred horses, one thousand 3 pieces of pāṭū (woollen cloth), fifty yāks and two hundred tolas of gold. Ḥabīb Chak paid no attention to their words, and hanged them all. He mounted and rode to another fort, and destroyed it also. The Tibetans sent three thousand horsemen, five hundred pieces of pāṭū, one hundred sheep and thirty yāks for his acceptance. He also

1 The name of the parganas are as I have them in the text in one MS.; in the other they are گَابِه ِ و ِدِیْاَرَة, and in the lith. ed. گَابِه ِ و ِداِرَة. Firuštah lith. ed. has گَابِه ِ و ِدِیْاَرَة and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 124) has Khāwan and Bāra. I think, however, that the flocks were taken away only from one pargana that of Khāwarpārah which is one of the parganahs to the N.E. of Šrinagar (see Aḥ-i-Akbār, Jarrāt, vol. II, p. 369).

2 One MS. inserts between خویم مصرفت and زخمها the phrase تَو باً a segment, a piece. Rodgers has pieces.

3 The word is ِبِارچه a segment, a piece. Rodgers has pieces.
took from the Tibetans some ¹ good horses of Kāshgār, which had come into their hands.

Haidar Chak, son of Ghāzī Khān, sent ² Sūkhāi, his foster brother, to Ḥabīb Chak (with the message): "The Tibetans had kept these horses for Ghāzī Khān; and it would be better that you should send them, that I may send them to him." ³ Ḥabīb Chak had Sūkhāi struck about two hundred times with a stick, and said, "What power does Ghāzī Khān possess that he should take these horses, which I have seized by the force of my sword?" They wanted to fight about these horses; but men intervened to effect a settlement, and did not allow them to fight. After that they came to Srinagar; and passed the winter there.

In the year 962 A.H., there was a great earthquake in Kashmir, and many villages and towns were destroyed. The villages of ⁴ Jhalū and Dāmpūr, with buildings and ⁵ trees, were removed from one bank of the Biḥat (Jhelum) to the opposite bank; and in the village of Mārwarah which is situated at the foot of a hill, owing to a landslip (lit. falling of the hill) ⁶ about sixty thousand people perished.

¹ Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 124) translates "some five Kāshgār horses"; apparently here five is a misprint for fine.
² The name is in the MSS. and Sūkhāi in the lith. ed. Firistaḥ lith. ed. has Khān; Rodgers also has Khānī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 506) does not mention the name; and his translation of the passage is quite incorrect.
³ Firistaḥ lith. ed. has a totally different account of what happened, but it appears to me less natural than that in the text.
⁴ One MS. has Jhalū dāmāpur جلور دامپور, the other has جلوز dāmāpur جلوز دامپور. The lith. ed. has Jhalu wa dāmāpur جلوز و دامپور. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 506) does not mention the first, but calls the other Dampoor. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 124) has Nilū and 'Adampūr.
⁵ Firistaḥ agrees. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 506) says the town was removed from the east to the west bank of the Behut river, and in a footnote he adds that it is not easy to say whether the text should be taken literally. Rodgers says that the villages were "washed away". Dāmpor, with a spring, is mentioned by Stein. Dūmām بہت in the text-edition is apparently a mistake. The earthquake is mentioned by Prājyabaṭṭa (lines 513 to 521). There is no mention of the removal of Jhalū and Dāmpūr from one bank of the Biḥat, but it is said भेरुपरदरण्युपरदरण्युपरस्थितिः जोत्रीक्षयु प्राशिकाय प्रकाशाये (l. 517).
⁶ The words are distinctly مقدر حصار in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firistaḥ, however, has شش صد six hundred, and this is more probable.
1 An account of Isma'il Shāh, Brother of Ibrāhīm Shāh.

When five months had elapsed from (the beginning of) the rule of Ibrāhīm Shāh, which was in reality the rule of Daulat Chak, the times became propitious for Ghāzī Khān, and Daulat Chak was slain. Ghāzī Khān became fully independent, but for name's sake raised Isma'il Shāh to the throne in the year 963 a.h. In this year, Ḥabib Chak wanted to join Daulat Chak (it would appear that what was said about his being slain or defeated and blinded, as in Firishtah, was said in anticipation of a coming event) and with this determination he went towards Mardā Dūn. Ghāzī Khān said to Naṣrat Chak, "Your brother Ḥabib has joined Daulat Chak. It is right that before he arrives we should seize Daulat Chak, for after his arrival the matter

1 That is the heading in one MS., in which however the name is instead of Abūl. In the other MS. and the lith. ed. the words are added after Ibrāhīm Shāh, but it does not appear who 'Ali Shāh was. Ibrāhīm Shāh, according to the Ṭabaqāt, was a son of Muhammad Shāh, and according to Firishtah a son of Nāzuk Shāh (see p. 725 and note 4).

2 The MSS. and the lith. ed. all say Daulat Chāk Bānī, is not Daulat Chāk Bānī, i.e., was defeated and fettered. Prājyabhaṭṭa's Rājatarangini has a curious story (see lines 523-535). It says दोषुपूनसरसः (the change from Cakra to Cakka should be noted) attempted to stop the flow of water in the वेत्राकारकमेति. Thrown by the angry Vetālas (some kind of supernatural beings) stones fell into his house. He then went to a नवराजा यायां known as वशिष्या, who lived in a village called Tūlamūla; and inquired of him, how the dominions could be rich and free from all fears. The Śādhu said महानाथा वरिष्ठों युक्तार्थेन निविष्टे. When Daulat Chak inquired how he could do such a thing, the Śādhu became रूपवपुत्रमानस; and he cursed Daulat Chak. The curse also was curious लिङ्गमभवस्याय मन्दायेण न विनिष्टा; that is, the moon and sun will fall on your reaching the middle of the sea. After अभेदानिवधानान्त (i.e., I suppose Ibrāhīm Shāh) had reigned for one month, Ghāzī Khān himself in his avarice took his position (अभायं न तपस्यं ब्राह्मणाः अभिनवाध्यक्ष:).

I have included this long quotation as it appears to me to show a great increase of superstition and a great deterioration in the historical sense of the chronicler.

3 The name is written as Mūrad Dowl and Mūrad Dowl in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. also has Mūrad Dowl. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed., while the text-edition has Mūrad Dowl.
would be difficult." 1 It so happened that Daulat Chak had got into a boat, and had gone to the Dal reservoir (lake) to shoot ducks. When he got out of the boat, Ghāzī Khān coming up seized his horses; and he fled and got on the 2 Ñák hill. Ghāzī Khān pursued and seized him. Habīb Chak arriving at 3 Nir, knew that Daulat Chak had been seized, and became distressed in his mind. Ghāzī Khān caused Daulat Chak to be blinded.

After that Habīb Chak came, and saw Ghāzī Khān. The latter was not pleased with him. He sent for Nāzuk Chak, nephew (brother’s son) of Daulat Chak, and 4 wanted to give him the trouble of becoming his vākīl; but he did not agree owing to the anger he felt at his uncle having been blinded, and Ghāzī Khān wanted to seize and imprison him; but he being warned fled, and went to Habīb Chak.

AN ACCOUNT OF HABĪB SHĀH, SON OF ISMA’IL SHĀH.

When two years had elapsed from (the beginning of) the rule of Isma’il, he died; and Ghāzī Khān raised his son to the government. At the end of the year 964 a.h., Naṣrat Chak, Habīb Chak, Nāzuk Chak, Sankar Chak brother of Ghāzī Khān, and Yūsuf and Hāstī Khān all collected together, entered into an agreement, and determined to the following effect: "Today Ghāzī Khān has taken a 5 medicine; his brother Husain Chak is in prison. We will bring the

---


2 The name is Ñák in one MS. In the other it is not decipherable. In the lith. ed. it is خاک. Firishtah lith. ed. does not give the name. The text-edition following the lith. ed. has كرمه خاک.

3 The name is Ñehr, and Ñehr, in the MSS., and منذر in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not give the name of the place.

4 The words are تکفيف وکالات باز نمود in the MSS. as well as in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah; the meaning of which is not quite clear. Rodgers’s translation (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 125) is "gave Nāzuk Chakk the nephew of Daulat Chakk much inconvenience and trouble."

5 The word in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. are داروی کار خوردیده است. I cannot find any meaning of the word کار which would suit the context. Firishtah lith. ed. has got the same words, but the word کار is omitted. Rodgers
latter out of prison and kill Ghāzi Khān." This news reached Ghāzi Khān. He won over Yūsuf Chak and Sankar Chak, and summoned them to his presence. Ḥabīb Chak, Naṣrat Chak and Darvīsh Chak declared, that they would either go (to Ghāzi Khān?) or would make their escape, after engagements and promises have been made in the presence of Qadīs and learned men. Naṣrat Chak went to Ghāzi Khān without any engagements, and was thrown into prison. Ḥabīb Chak, in concert with Nāzuk Chak, broke down the bridges, and rose in rebellion. Hastī Khān came with a large force and joined them. Ghāzi Khān sent a large army to attack them; and a great battle took place. Ghāzi Khān's army was, however, defeated, and some of his men were taken prisoners. Ḥabīb Chak having gained the victory went to 1 Māmūn. After his men had been defeated, Ghāzi Khān himself rode out to attack Ḥabīb Chak. He went to 2 Dūmrah, and having got hold of three or four boats crossed the river.

He had three elephants and three thousand men with him. When he arrived at the plain of Khālidgarh, Ḥabīb Chak came forward with 3 two thousand men, and engaged him in battle. After much fighting, Ḥabīb Chak got into the 4 Jamjah river; and his horse could not cross it. Hastī Ṭariq, one of the servants of Ghāzi Khān, coming after

(J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 125) has translated the words, "was eaten up by physic," which cannot be understood.

1 The word is مامون in the MS., and باسون in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has مامون and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has Hamoon; and Rodgers has mountains of Māmūn. I cannot find anything about any of these places, and have adopted Māmūn. The text-edition following the lith. ed. has باسون.

2 There are different readings here. One MS. has در دوره رننه, the other has در دور مرتبه رننه, while the lith. ed. has دور زمره رننه. Firishtah lith. ed. has دور مرتبه رننه. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has "marched on to Domra"; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 125) has "went to Badūmara", which is certainly incorrect, as he has prefixed the preposition Ra to Dūmrah has made one word of them, I have adopted Dūmrah, though I have failed to find its location. In the text-edition it is دور دوره apparently a misprint for دوره.

3 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have بست کس twenty men, but this is apparently incorrect. Firishtah has بست مد twenty hundred, and I have inserted hundred after twenty; but the text-edition has followed the MSS.

4 The name is جاموش; and جاموش in the MSS., and جاموش in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has جاموش پل Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has "the
him, put his hand on his mouth, and brought him down. About that (time) Ghāzī Khān’s elephant came there and he was seized. Ghāzī Khān ordered his ǧilbān to cut off his head. When the ǧilbān put his hand on Ḥabīb Chak’s face (or into his mouth), the latter caught his fingers firmly and bit them. In the end his head was severed from his body, and was taken to Kalahmāt, where his house was; and hung there from the gallows. Ghāzī Khān also seized Darvish Chak and Nāzuk Chak, and had them hanged. After some time, Bahrām Chak came from Hindūstān to Ghāzī Khān; and the pangana of Kahunahāmū was allotted as his jāgīr. He received permission to leave Srinagar, and went to Madanjang, in pangana Zaingar, which was his Muchbul”'; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 125) has “at the bridge of Jamja.”

Rodgers’s translation (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 125) of Firishtah’s version “he was compelled to flee. At the bridge of Jamja his horse stuck fast”, is not correct. The correct translation would be “his horse stuck fast in the river of the Jamja bridge”. Prājyabhāṭa’s Rājatarangini is rather difficult to follow in the later portions; but I think the following words refer to this incident: (lines 551-52). It will be noticed that Ghāzī Khān is already described as Bhūpāla or king; and Ḥabīb Chak is transformed into Habhe Cakka and not Cakra. I hoped to be able to fix the locality by finding out something about the Sitā Nadi; but this has not been possible.

1 The words सरोराजर जदा करदें सरोराजर जदा करदें occur in only one MS., but not in the other or in the lith. ed., but as this was necessary before it could be sent to the place of his residence, and as Firishtah has मरो जदा करुङ्ग् I have inserted them.

2 The name is in one MS. and in the other, कल्ल बाब in the lith. ed. and कल्ल नामत in Firishtah lith. ed. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has Kulananmut, and Rodgers has only Kala thinking that the latter part of the name in Firishtah which is नामत means the name. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. IV, p. 126) translates the words ब्रोदर कम्बदन which follow immediately afterwards, “hung it there on the door.”

3 The name is कोहोने हेम in both MSS., and कोहोने हेम in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has कोहोने हेम. Col. Briggs has Kohtahoomoon, and Rodgers has Khuba or Khoba Hāmūn. The nearest I can get to these in the list of panganas in Ḥin-i-Akbār (Jarratt, vol. II, p. 370) is Khōhāma, in the N.W. part of the Kamrāj tract. The text-edition has followed the MSS.

4 The name is मुद्दत in the MS., and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah. मुद्दत has been adopted in the text-edition.
birth-place. Then Sankar Chak and Fath Chak and others went to Bahram; and they all came together to pargana Suyyapur; and began to create disturbances. Ghazi Khan sent his son and brothers to attack them. They were unable to meet them, and fled towards the hills. On the next day Ghazi Khan went in pursuit of them; and when he arrived in the village of Madanjah, he selected two thousand men, whom he sent in pursuit of them, so that they might capture them. The next day news came that Bahram, having been hit by an arrow, had gone away to some (unknown) place, and Sankar Chak and Fath Chak had separated from him. Ghazi Khan went with great rapidity to Kuhunaham, and for six days made great search to capture Bahram. Ahmad Jaurin, brother of Haidar Chak, son of Ghazi Khan, was entrusted with the duty of capturing Bahram. Ghazi Khan himself returned to the city. Ahmad Jaurin went to Sherkot, which was the abode of the Rishts, i.e., Sufis; and

---

1 There are different readings and the meaning is not quite clear. The MSS. have instead of بررام ثبر (نبر) خبره رفته. The lith. ed. has بررام از مر کرب رفته. Col. Briggs gives no translation of the passage. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 128) has “Bahram Chakk had escaped from Sarkob”, taking Sarkob to be the name of a place, which I do not think is correct. It will be seen that a few lines further down the place is called Sherkot in the Tabaqat, though it is called Sarkob there also in Firishtah. Sherkot is apparently the correct name of the place.

2 See page 732 and note 3.

3 The MSS. as well as the lith. eds. of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah all say برادر حیدر چک ولد غازی خان. I do not know why Ahmad Jaurin could not be called son of Ghazi Khan, instead of being called the brother of his son. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 509) has Ahmad Hoorein, a son of Heidur Chuk brother of Ghazy Khan. This is probably correct. The words brother and son have become transposed.

4 The name is written ریشانی in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat. Firishtah lith. ed. has ریشانی. I think the latter to be the more correct form. Col. Briggs calls (vol. IV, p. 509) them Russies; and he thinks they were the inhabitants of a “convent of Russian missionaries being in Thibet”; for he argues the philosophical and horticultural Russies can be no other, though their being there is a very extraordinary fact. Rodgers simply calls them Risht or Sufis. I have no doubt also that they were some kind of Sufis, of whom there were apparently many sects in Kashmir (see Tarikh-i-Rashidi, p. 436). Mirza Haidar paints them in very dark colours, but some of them might have been peaceful rustics, as those mentioned here are described to have been.
seized them, and in order to make them produce Bahrām had them bastinadoed. The Rishis said "We took Bahrām in a boat to the village of 1 Bādhal to the house of Amir Zinā." The Rishis are a community or a group of people, who always carry on agriculture and plant orchards, and they live in a society by themselves and do not marry. 2 Aḥmad Jaurin went to Amir Zinā, and after much search, got hold of Bahrām Chak; and took him to Srinagar. He was there hanged by the neck; and Aḥmad Jaurin received the title of Fath Khān.

4 At this time, Shāh Abu-ul-maʿālī, who was in the custody of the Khakars, came with fetters on his feet mounted on the back of Yūsuf Kashmirī. When he arrived at Rājauri, a band of Mughals collected round him. The blind Daulat Chak and Fath Chak and other Chaks and Lōhars and Ankris all came to him; and in the year 965 A.H., they advanced towards Kashmir. When they arrived at Bārāmūla, Muḥammad Ḥaidar and Fath Khān, who guarded the road,

---

1 The name of the village is in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Badālī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 510) has Nadily and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 126) Bādell.

2 I am not sure whether my translation is correct. The words in the Ṭabaqāt MS. and lith. ed. are اتفاق نمرانند و بنجرند گذارند. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has کنند instead of گذارند.

3 The text in the Ṭabaqāt (MSS. and lith. ed.) is imperfect here. I have inserted Aḥmad before Jaurin, and have put in جوزيف نمرانند instead of جوزيف نمرانند. In the text-edition it is جوزيف نمرانند.

4 Prājyabhaṭṭa’s Rājatarangini, which is very meagre and very incorrect in its later pages, has some account of Shāh Abu-ul-maʿālī’s invasion immediately after the mention of the death or slaying of Ḥabbū Chak in lines 551-52 (see note 4, pp. 731-32). It says मस्तक वर्गविशेष मधुरीविद्वान: | पाबेती युक्तमित्रो बोधयोरार्जनीया | ये त्योहारसाधीति यथा वस्तुमपवृति। (lines 552-53). It is curious that Shāh Abul Maʿālī should be called the Lord of the Mughals, when he was fleeing from them. I cannot identify Nosmi Cakka. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, describes the raid of Shah Abul Maʿālī, as “the serious rebellion of Yūsuf Chak who was supported by Shāh Ab-’l-Maʿālī.” This does not appear to me to be correct. No Yūsuf Chak is mentioned in connection with the reign, except one, who is said to have carried Shāh Abu-ul Maʿālī on his back. If Yūsuf Chak should be identified with the Nosmi Cakka referred to in the early part of the note, there will be some foundation for the statement.
fled and went to the village of Bādūkhi. Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī, having adopted the path of justice, none of his soldiers had any power to oppress the ra'iyats. When he arrived in the village of ¹ Bārbakla, which is near ² Pattana, he encamped on high ground. Ghāzi Khān also marched out from Srinagar, and encamped in Pattana, in front of Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī. He made his brother named Ḥusain, the commander of his vanguard, and stationed himself in ³ mauḍa Khōd. The Kashmiris, who were with Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī, attacked without his permission, the army of Ḥusain Khān, and compelled him to turn back. Ghāzi Khān, coming to his aid, fought with great gallantry, and having slain many of the Kashmiris defeated Shah Abu-ul-ma'ālī. The latter seeing the state of things, without fighting turned his face to flight. When his horse became exhausted on the way, a Mughal came to him, and gave him his own horse which was fresh and strong. He then took hold of the exhausted horse, and stood on the spot, and kept back all the Kashmiris who were going in pursuit of Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī. When his quiver became empty, the Kashmiris advanced on him in a crowd, and slew him. During this time, Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī managed to make his escape. Ghāzi Khān then turned back and went to Pattana. He ordered every Mughal, who was brought before him, to be beheaded except Ḥafiz (one who has memorised the Qurān) Ḥabsī, one of the readers of His

---

¹ The name of the village is ماركل in the Mṣṣ., and باركلا in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is باركلا. The text-edition following the first MS. has ماركل.

² Pattana or Patan is on the side of the ancient Šāmkarapura and lies on the direct road between Srinagar and Bārāmūla. According to Prājya-bhaṭṭa (l. 555) पार्थक्य ज पुष्पाय: परिष्ठपुराणिक where I think Ghāzi Khān is referred to in the words ज पुष्पाय: I cannot find out the distance between Parihāsapura and Pattana, but seeing that “Šāmkavarman is said to have carried off ‘whatever was of value in Parihāsapura’ in order to raise the fame of his own town” of Šāmkarapura, where Pattan now stands (side Stein’s Rājatarangini, vol. II, p. 481), it could not have been very great. In the text-edition the name of the village is given as بِين.

³ The name in both Mṣṣ. is کہر. The lith. ed. says incorrectly در بیکاپیع استاد. Firishtah lith. ed. has کہر. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 510) has Gahwar and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 126) has Khanūd. In the text-edition the reading in the Mṣṣ. has been followed.
Majesty Jinnat Ashānī, whom he did not slay on account of the beauty of his recitation.

After this victory (Ghāzī Khān) released Naṣrat Chak out of prison, and sent him to wait upon His Majesty, the asylum of the Khālīfat (Akbar). Naṣrat Chak went, and saw the Khān Khānān Bahārām Khān, and the latter showed him all honour and respect.

In the year 966 A.H., there was a change in the disposition of Ghāzī Khān; and he began to act with tyranny and oppression, and the people showed great detestation of him. At this time a report was conveyed to his ears, that his son, in concert with some people, wanted to seize the kingdom. Ghāzī Khān summoned 2 Muḥammad Ṣadūr, who was his vakil (representative or agent), and Bahādur Bhat, and said, “People say this.” They said, “What they say is true.” Ghāzī Khān told them, “Give him good advice, so that he may not again allow such a thought to enter his mind.” Muḥammad Ṣadūr called Ḥaidar Chak to his house, and reasoned with him, and abused him. Ḥaidar Chak got into a rage, and forcibly took the dagger from Muḥammad’s belt, and struck it in his stomach and killed him on the spot. Men came in a crowd, and seized Ḥaidar; and Ghāzī Khān gave the order for slaying him. In the end he was executed and his head was taken to Zaingarh, and there hung from

---

1 Instances of his barbarity and cruelty are given in lines 558, etc. of Prājahabatā’s Rājataragini. Among these is mentioned the slaying of his son named Ḥaidar, but the circumstances surrounding the incidents are somewhat difficult to understand. It is said in line 560, that while in sympathy with the son or at least grieved over his death, and were hostile to Ghāzī Khān; and it is also said that he was responsible for the slaying of the prince executed. I cannot understand the word prakāṣa in this line. It may be a printer’s mistake for prakāṣa. The description of Ghāzi Khān like a mad Rākṣasa had the eighteen councillors of the prince executed. The name is Muḥammad Ṣadūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. it is Muḥammad Ṣadū. The name is Muḥammad Junaid in Firishtah.
a gibbet. Ghāzī Khān also had the men, who had conspired with him (Haidar), put to death.

In the year 967 A.H., Qarrā Bahādur came from Hindūstān with a large army and nine elephants; and he had with him 1 Naṣrat Chak and Fath Chak and others from among the Kashmirīs and also a large body of Khakars. He waited for three months at 2 Lālīpūr. He had great hopes that the Kashmirīs would join him; but at this time Naṣrat Khān and Fath Chak and Lōhari and Ankri fled from him and went to Ghāzī Khān. Owing to this, great weakness crept into Qarrā Bahādur's army. Ghāzī Khān came out of Kashmir and arrived in Naurozkōt. (He) sent some foot-soldiers against him and defeated him. Qarrā Bahādur fled and got into the fort of Dāiyarah. The following day he fled from the foot-soldiers; and his elephants fell into the hands of the Kashmirīs; and five hundred Mughals were put to death.

When a period of five years of the rule of Ḥabīb Shāh had passed, Ghāzī Khān concealed him in a corner, raised the standard of his own rule, did not allow even the name of sovereignty to another, and had the public prayers read and the coins struck in his own name, and gave himself the title of Ghāzī Shāh.

3 An account of the rule of Ghāzī Khān.

Ghāzī Khān, having ascended the throne according to the custom of the rulers of Kashmir, commenced giving himself the titles of Bāḍshāh and Sultān. Owing to 4 leprosy, with which he had before this been afflicted, his voice at this time underwent a change; and his

1 The name is Naṣrat Khān Chak in one MS. It is omitted in the other. In the lith. ed. both of the Taḥaqāt and of Firishtah it is Naṣrat Chak.
2 The name is Lālīpūr in the MS. as well as the lith. ed. of the Taḥaqāt. It is Lālāpūr in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
3 The heading is as I have it in the text-edition, in both MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah has ذكر حكومت عاري شاة, which is better.
4 The attack of leprosy and the death of Ghāzī Khān or Shāh are described in Prājyaabhāṭṭā's Rājatarangini, lines 563-567. It, however, omits all the incidents which are mentioned in the Taḥaqāt and Firishtah, as having occurred after his assumption of the royal title.
fingers were about to drop off, and there were ulcers in his gums (dar dandān, i.e., in his teeth). In the year 968 A.H., Fath Khān and Lōhari and Ankri and other Kashmiris became suspicious of him, and fleeing got into the hilly country. Ghāzi Khān sent his brother Ḥusain Khān with two thousand men in pursuit of them. As it was the season of snow, Ḥusain Khān, on arrival at Baharārah, made a halt. The enemy getting warning, went to the village of Ahlān; and a large number of them, falling under the snow, perished. The rest, who survived, went to Kishtwār, and in the year 969 A.H., they were in great distress there, and sought an asylum with Ḥusain Khān. The latter prayed to Ghāzi Khān to pardon their offences, and he pardoned them, and gave them good jāgīrs.

In the year 970 A.H., Ghāzi Khān left Kashmir, and took up his residence at Lār; and sent his son Aḥmad Khān in concert with Fath Khān and Nāsir Kiyānī and other renowned amirs for the conquest of Tibet. When they arrived within five karōhs of Tibet, Fath Khān went into (invaded) Tibet with the permission of Aḥmad Khān; and getting among the Tibetans came out quickly. The Tibetans  

1 The name is Baharārah in the MSS., Firishta lith. ed. has left out a considerable number of words from مخالفین خبردار بر فر بود, and Col. Briggs and Rodgers have followed it.
2 The name is Ahlān in both MSS., and Ahlān in the lith. ed.
3 The name is Khor in both MSS., and Khor in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and Khor in the lith. ed. of Firishta.

4 The name is Nasir Kianī in both MSS., and Nasir Kianī in the lith. ed. Firishta lith. ed. has Nasir Kibāyi, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 513) transliterates as Nasir Kutaby, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 128) has Nasir Kibatu.  
5 The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt have برهعت, i.e., with the permission; but Firishta lith. ed. has برهعت, without the permission; and the subsequent incident shows that the latter reading is probably correct.
6 The reading in the Tabaqāt is درمیان تنبیه در امده چود بدر امهد. The penultimate word is بدر in one MS. which I have adopted. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. it is بدر. Firishta lith. ed. has a different reading; it is فنده بصر در امهد. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 514) translates this in the words, "proceeded to the capital"; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 129) has "went into the city" without specifying what city. It is very doubtful that Fath Khān reached as far as the Capital of Tibet.
were unwilling to fight, and sent much tribute. 1 At this time the idea came into Ahmad Khan's mind, "Fath Khan went into Tibet, and came out. If I do not do a similar deed, the people of Kashmir will all praise him." Then he determined that he should go jariqah (alone, or with a small retinue). Fath Khan said, "It is not advisable that you should go; and indeed if you must go, go with a large force." Ahmad Khan did not listen to his words, and went with only five hundred men. He left Fath Khan in the camp. When the Tibetans saw that he had such a small force, they attacked him. He was unable to withstand them, and fled; on coming to Fath Khan said, "Today thou be the rearguard. I am off." He did not delay anywhere. When the men saw, that Ahmad Khan was running away, they all turned their faces in flight. Fath Khan, however, halted. The Tibetans came up to him; he fought single handed with them; and was slain. On hearing this news Ghazi Khan got into a rage, and strongly 2 criticised his son's conduct.

3 The period of Ghazi Khan's rule was four years.

---

1 Firishtah agrees, except in the latter part, where he says: "هم نرخف نکرده پیش شد تیبان باو رسیده جون ننها دیدنده سجند برداختند و فتح خان از کمال غیرت ننها جگن کرده کشته شد." The versions both in Col. Briggs and Rodgers are altogether wrong, but it would be useless to point out all their mistakes. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, gives a short summary, as follows: "His advanced guard was defeated, and instead of pressing forward to its support he fled with the main body of the force." Every statement in this sentence appears to me to be incorrect. The advanced guard was not defeated, and in fact there was no advance guard; and Ahmad Khan could not have pressed forward to its support. He was, in fact, running away, the main body running away with him; and it was only Fath Khan, whom, when he was running away, Ahmad Khan implored or ordered to be the rearguard; and he fought bravely and was killed. It is unfortunate that a history which is believed to be a standard work should contain such a statement. The compiler, apparently, read neither the Tabaqat nor Firishtah; and apparently not even the incorrect translations of Col. Briggs or Rodgers.

2 The word "اعراض" (honours, reputations) in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for "عتراض" (criticism, animadversion).

3 The account of the reign of Ghazi Shah appears to end thus abruptly both in the Tabaqat and in Firishtah, but as a matter of fact it is continued in the earlier part of the account of the reign of Husain Khan or Shah.
1 An account of Ḥusain Khān, brother of Ghāzi Khān.

In the year 971 a.h., Ghāzi Khān left Kashmir with the intention of conquering Tibet; and took up his quarters in Maukhdah Khār; but owing to an acute attack of leprosy he lost the use of his eyes; and adopted bad manners and perpetrated tyranny on the people, and extorted sums of money as fines from innocent men. The people being aggrieved at his conduct, divided themselves into two parties. One of them united with his son Aḥmad Khān; and the other joined his brother Ḥusain Khān. On hearing this, he came back to Srinagar; and as he had more affection and kindness for Ḥusain Khān, he raised him in his place to the salṭanat. The vakils and vazīrs of Ghāzi Khān all went to Ḥusain Khān’s house, and began to serve him. After fifteen days Ghāzi Khān divided all his equipages and rich stuffs into two portions. One share he gave to his sons, and made over the other moiety to tradesmen, and ordered that they should pay him its price. The tradesmen came to Ḥusain Khān praying for justice. The latter forbade Ghāzi Khān (to effect the sale and demand the price). Ghāzi Khān being annoyed with him wanted to make his son his successor. Ḥusain Khān, on being informed of this, summoned Aḥmad Khān, son of Ghāzi Khān, Abdāl Khān and other chief men; and took pro-

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. and in the lithe. ed. Firistah has دار سلطنت حسين شاه, which is better. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, says that the new ruler ascended the throne as Nāṣir-ud-din Ḥusain Shāh.

The accession of Ḥusain Khān or Shāh is mentioned in line 575 of Prājyabhata’s Rājatarājīni, and the following lines describe his impartial justice, his prosperity, his fame and his pleasure, in respect of which, it says: „तद्यत तत्त्वस्य सम्भव े व राजार े वासर: । (l. 578), i.e., even Indra did not have such pleasure in Srarga. The happiness of the people is described in line 583, which says: „दु:भिषेपर जगमो भवे तें विवाहिते । भलम् सभास्यध लोकं भधोश्चरतरसं ।“ i.e., famine, robberies and fear from kings having been prevented by him, the people thought Kashmir to be like Srarga.

2 The name is مروجکہ مارکھادہ Khār in both MSS. It is Maukhdah in the lithe. ed. Firistah lith. ed. has Maulad Khār. Col. Briggs (vol. IV p. 514) has Mukudkar and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 129) has Muladghar which is, however, not a correct transliteration of the name as given in the lithe. ed. of Firistah, where the last syllable is ghār, or may be ghār but not ghar.
mises and engagements from them, that they would remain obedient to him. Ghāzi Kān summoned and collected his own men and the Mughals. Husain Kān also prepared to meet him. The people and the Ḍūrān intervened, and quelled the disturbance. Ghāzi Kān came out of the city, and took up his quarters in Zaipīr; but after three months he came back to Srinagar. Husain Kān divided the country of Kashmir among men.

In the year 972 a.h., Husain Kān granted Rāja and Nau Shahr jāgīr to Sankar Chak, his elder brother, and sent him there. Immediately after this news came, that Sankar Chak had risen in revolt. (Husain Kān) then allotted the jāgīrs to Muḥammad Mākri, and sent a large force against Sankar Chak. The commanders of the force were Ahmād Kān, Fath Kān and Khwājah Masʿūd Nāyak. They went, and fighting with Sankar defeated him. Husain Kān advanced to welcome them, and brought them to Srinagar. After some time Husain Kān learnt, that Ahmad Khan and Muhammad Khan Mākri and Nasrat Kān had made plans for murdering him and wanted to imprison them. They on learning this came to Husain Kān with a large number of followers; and he was unable to harm them in any way. When they left his presence, he became anxious (knowing) that they had become acquainted with the true state of things. He,

---

1 Similar divisions have been made by other Sultāns also, but the reasons of such divisions is not clear. Fīrūštābīr prefaced the statement by saying حسن ایستقلاج کلی بهم رسانیده, but I do not think it gives any sufficient reasons.

2 There are differences in the readings. One MS. has احمد خان و فنهم خان احمد خان و مصعود و عابد, the other has احمد خان و مصعود و نايسک خواجه مصعود نایک, while the lith. ed. has احمد خان و فنهم خواجه و مصعود باهک فنهم خان و خواجه مصعود و مانک چک. Fīrūštābīr ed. has احمد خان و فنهم خواجه و مصعود باهک فنهم خان و خواجه مصعود و مانک چک. I was inclined at first to adopt the reading in Fīrūštābīr, but I found that the construction of the sentence in the Ṭabaqāt is different, so I have adopted the reading in the first MS., though I am not quite sure about the last word. In the text-edition M. Ḥudayyīt Ḥusain has مصعود مانک in place of مصعود نایک in the translation above.

3 The readings are slightly different. One MS. has متغير شده که, while the other and the lith. ed. have متغير شده. I have adopted the first reading.
therefore, sent Malik Lüli Laund to them, with the message, that they should all meet together; and make promises and engagements that none of them would attempt any hostility to the others. Malik Lüli Laund went and made proposals of peace. They then all came together in the house of Āḥmad Khān, and agreed that they should take Āḥmad Khān to the house of Ḥusain Khān. Āḥmad Khān, after much pressing consented; and went with Naṣrat Khān and Malik Lüli to Husain Khān’s house.  Qādī Ḥabib, who was one of the chief men of Kashmir, and Muhammad Mākri were also sent for. They all met together in the Divānkhāna, which is celebrated as the Rang Maḥal. When night came Ḥusain Khān said, 2 “We are inclined to-night to have some natūkah-bāzī. As the Qādī is puritanical, you go together to the first floor (bālākhāna) (and amuse yourselves); and I am also coming.” When they went upstairs, “Ḥusain Khān sent some men and had them imprisoned.”

After that, he sent ‘Ālam Khān and Khān Zamān, whose original name was Fath Khwājāh, with a large army to attack Sankar Chak, who was near Rājaurī. They went there and defeated Sankar Chak;

---

1 The name is as I have it in the text, in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has  لندن. Col. Briggs does not mention the name. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 130) has Lodin Lond. Laund according to the dictionary means a soldier or an adventurer. It also, I think, means a Levantine, but I cannot understand how a Levantine should have made his way to Kashmir.

2 The text is imperfect and contradictory. One MS. has  جو شما باتفاغ قاضي بالخانه. The other has  جو شما باتفاغ قاضي بالخانه رفته صحبت دار نه که من هم مي ايم. The lith. ed. has  جو شما باتفاغ قاضي به بالخانه رفته صحبت بدارگي که من هم مي ايم. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has the same reading as the lith. ed. of the Ĥabaqît, but leaves out the word Qādī. I consider this reading the best and have adopted it for the reason mentioned below.

I cannot find the meaning of  باتی. Bāzī means a game or play. In a preceding note I have said that Natuah is probably a corruption of Sanskrit Naṣa, an actor or a mimic. As there is a reference to the Qādī’s being orthodox or puritanical, the natuah-bāzī in this case was probably some kind of indecent mimicry or acting; but according to the text in the lith. ed. of the Ĥabaqît, the Qādī was also invited to go to the Bālākhāna, where the game would be played. If the text of the lith. ed. of Firishtah is adopted and the word Qādī is omitted then there would be no difficulty.
and returned with victory and triumph. Khan Zamān having acquired much credit, an order was passed that all the amirs should go every day to his house.

In the year 973 A.H., (people) slandered Khan Zamān to Husain Khān. The latter ordered that men should not go to his house. Khan Zamān wished to go away from Kashmir, and was arranging to get together the things that would be required for the journey. Then Husain Khān went away on a hunting expedition. Shams Dūbar came and said to Khan Zamān, “Why are you going away; Husain Khān is gone out for hunting, and his house is unoccupied. We should go there, and take possession of all his equipages and treasure.” Khan Zamān liked these words of his, and went in concert with Fath Chak and Lōhar and Ankari and others like them, and attacked Husain Khān's house. They set fire to the door, and wanted to bring out Ahmad Khān, Muhammad Khān Mākri and Naṣrat Khān from prison. Bahādur Khān son of Khan Zamān and Fath Chak then came there. Mas'ūd Nāyak was in charge of the prison. He discharged water on the courtyard of the Diwānkhāna, so that it became muddy. Daulat Khān one of Husain Khān's men was

1 One MS. has by mistake kā ḥusain mukarī amdāh bāghān zamān gūf. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has kā ḥusain mukarī amdāh bāghān zamān gūf.

2 There are differences in the readings here. One MS. has rāntēh khānē or khalī ast bāghānē or nābd rēnt. The other MS., which has the incorrect reading mentioned in the preceding note, has bīs shem dūh bāghānē man gūf. Chera (red) movi ḥusain khān kār rēnt khānē or khalīvēh bāghānē or nābd rēnt. The reading in the lith. ed. is the same as the reading in the 2nd MS., but instead of which there is a deber dūh bāghādē shem dūh bāghādē which appears to be incorrect. I have adopted the readings in the 2nd MS., though I am doubtful as to who Shams Dūbar was. In the text-edition it is mukarī amdāh ḥusain. Besides, it was not likely, that because Husain Khan had gone away hunting, his house should remain unoccupied. Prājyabhātta refers to this in line 585. The line runs bānēyavānāmābānāmā bhaṇjanāyo tājā nārikāta: | 5 nānē qāriqāmi bānāhī bhag. Then there are some lines which appear to be an interpolation; after which line 586 runs as tārāvānāyāyanā yārāhām b tāhān. Āvibhāvanā: prāg-

These two lines (585, 586) mean that the king had a minister named Khan Zamān, who, when the king went out, seized the city in a moment. Then the king's troops came and destroyed (him) at once. The king was like the morning sun which destroys the darkness.
standing with his quiver on his back. Bahādur Khān ran to him, and struck him with his sword. The sword fell on his quiver; and he shot an arrow into the eye of Bahādur Khān’s horse, which reared up, and threw the rider. 1 Masʿūd Nāyak and Ankri attacked him, and cut off his head with a dagger. Khān Zamān received information of this from outside and fled. Masʿūd Nāyak pursued and seized him, and took him to Ḥusain Khān. The latter ordered that he should be carried to Zaingarh; and his ears and nose and hands and feet should be cut off, and he should be hung from a gibbet. He also gave the designation of son to Masʿūd Nāyak, and honoured him with the title of Mubāriz Khān, and allotted the 2 pargana of Bānkal as his jāgīr.

3 In the year 974 A.H., Ḥusain Khān ordered that the blinding needle to be drawn across the eyes of Aḥmad Khān, son of Ghāzi Khān, Naṣrat Khān and Muḥammad Khān. Ghāzi Khān, on hearing this news, suffered great anguish, and as he was already ill, he passed away.

Ḥusain Khān then founded a college, and lived in the society of pious and learned men in its precincts, and he allotted them the pargana of 4 Zainpūr as their jāgīr.

In the year 975 A.H., Lūli Laund informed Ḥusain Khān that Mubāriz Khān says that as Ḥusain Khān had called him his son, he

1 These names are variously written. One MS. has رخت ماریک وایربی. the other has مانک وایربی. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has نازک و انکوئی; while that of Firistah has مسعود نابک و انکوئی. The latter appears to me to be correct and I have adopted it.

2 One of the parganas in the S.W. part of Kamrāj. See page 371, Ṭin-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II, p. 370).

3 This is also mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 588) which runs नरेन्द्र विनरेन्द्र विवेकशिल गुरु | श्रीरामकालायोगिन्य श्रवण ग्रामन्त्र स: | i.e., he pulled out the eyes of Muḥammad Khān and others who were determined to fight with him, and whose hearts were filled with enmity towards him.

4 The name of the parganah looks like مالك مالك and بکور in the MSS., and as لیالیز in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firistah it is Zaipūr. In the list of parganahs in Ṭin-i-Akbari (Jarratt, vol. II, pp. 368–371) there is none that at all resembles any of the names in the MSS. or the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. There is, however, a pargana called Zainpur among those to the S.E. of Srinagar. I have, therefore, substituted the name of Zaipūr, and this is followed in the text-edition.
should give him a share of the treasure. Husain Khan was much
pained in his heart. One day he went to the house of Mubāriz Khan.
He saw many horses in his stables. The pain in his mind became
more acute; and he ordered Mubāriz Khan to be imprisoned. All
affairs were now entrusted to Malik Lūlī. But in a short time he also
was imprisoned on the ground that he had embezzled 1 forty thousand
donkey-loads of paddy belonging to the government; and ‘Ali Kōkah
was appointed in his place.

In the year 976 A.H., Qādi Ḥabīb, who was of the Ḥanafī faith,
coming out of the Jāma' Mosque on a Friday 2 had gone to the foot
of Mārān hill on a pilgrimage to the tomb; when a 3 Rāfī'i of the name
of 4 Yūsuf Andāz drew his sword, and struck the Qādi. The latter
was wounded on the head. Yūsuf again struck him with the sword.
The Qādi shielded his head with his hand, and his fingers were cut off.
Except the bigotry that was due to the difference of their religions
there was nothing else between them. Maulānā Kamāl-ud-dīn,
the son-in-law of the Qādi, 5 who occupied himself with teaching in
Ṣālākot, was with him at the time. Yūsuf fled after wounding the
Qādi. When Ḥusain Khan heard this news, he appointed some men
who found Yūsuf out, and brought him. Ḥusain Khan then assembled
lawyers like Mullā Yūsuf, Mullā Fīrūz, and others like them, and
ordered them that they should state whatever might be in accordance
with the law (Shara'). They replied, that the execution of such a
person by way of punishment was legal. The Qādi said, "It would

---

1 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 517) incorrectly translates چھاں مور خروار شاہی as "forty thousand bales of shawls", and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 131) also incorrectly has "40,000 ass-loads of shawls."

2 Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 131) translates در پائی کوریا ماران برنارد "came to the ziārat in the graveyard of Yālkoh Mārān."

3 A man belonging to a section of the Shi'a sect, who renounced their allegiance to Zaid, the son of 'Alī, the son of Ḥusain. Fīrīshātah calls Yūsuf a Shi'a.

4 That is the name in both the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is Yūsuf Tandōz. Fīrīshātah lith. ed. has only Yūsuf. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers has any name. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted بیوسف اندر.

5 It is invidious to go on pointing out Rodger's mistakes, but he translates ک ک در سیالکوہ بندرسی اشناد داست in the words, "was also with him engaged in reading."
not be right to execute this man, so long as I am alive." In the end, they stoned him to death. Members of the sect, who were united with Yūsuf in religion and faith, said to Ḥusain Khān, "There has been too much haste in executing him." Ḥusain Khān said, "I acted in accordance with the verdict of the Mullās."

About this time Mīrzā Muqīm, and Yaʿqūb, son of Bābā ʿAlī came to Kashmir as ambassadors from the threshold of the servants of the asylum of the Khilāfāt. When they arrived at Hīrahpūr, Ḥusain Khān sent men to welcome them, and he himself came to the plain of 1 Sālah; and erected a pavilion and awnings and all the furniture of an assembly. When he heard that the ambassadors had come near, he came out of the pavilion and greeted them. Then they all came into the pavilion, and sat down in one place. After that the ambassadors got into a boat, and Ibrāhīm Khān, the son of Ḥusain Khān, also went with them. Ḥusain Khān did not go in the boat, but went to Kashmir (Srinagar) on horseback. He allotted the house of Ḥusain Mākri to the ambassadors.

After some days Mīrzā Muqīm said, "Send the Qāḍī and the Muftīs, according to whose decision Yūsuf was executed, to me." Ḥusain Khān sent the Muftīs to him. Qāḍī Zain who was of the same religion as Yūsuf said, "The Muftīs made a mistake in their verdict." The Muftīs said, "We did not give a decisive verdict for his execution. We said that the execution of such a person by way of punishment was lawful." Mīrzā Muqīm insulted the Muftīs in the assembly; and made them over to Fath Khān Rāfīdī and tortured them. Ḥusain Khān embarked in a boat and went away to Kamrāj. Fath Khān had the Muftīs put to death, by order of Mīrzā Muḥammad Muqīm, and had their bodies dragged round the lanes and bazārs by ropes tied to their feet. Ḥusain Khān sent his daughter with fine gifts and presents with the ambassador for the service of the asylum of the Khilāfāt. The ambassadors taking his daughter and the tribute with them went back to Āgra.

1 That is the name in both MSS. The lith. ed. has in the plain of Shāhzāda. Firishtah does not mention the name of the place.

2 One MS. inserts بديع تاء و هدایا instead of رستند. I think رستند is better and I have retained it. It is in the text-edition.
AN ACCOUNT OF 'ALI SHĀH, BROTHER OF ḤUSAIN.

In the year 977 a.h., news came that His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī had ordered Mīrzā Muqīm to be executed, in retribution of the unjust executions which he had perpetrated in Kashmir; and he had also rejected Husain Khān's daughter. On hearing this news, Husain Khān had an attack of dysentery or bloody flux, and he continued to be ill for three or four months.

At this time, Muhammad Bhat incited Yūsuf, son of 'Ali Khān, to rebel against Husain Khān. When this news reached Husain Khān, he said to Yūsuf to go to his father, i.e., 'Ali Khān, who was at Sūyyapūr and to remain there. When Yūsuf went to 'Ali Khān, other men also fled one after another, and went to 'Ali Khān. When the going of the people, and also of his son to 'Ali Khān became a certainty, Husain Khān sent men to 'Ali Khān with this message: "What offence has been committed by me? I sent your son to you without any objection or censure." 'Ali Khān said: "I also am not guilty in any way. People come to me fleeing from you; and although I advise them, it has no effect."

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. and the lith. ed. The account of Husain's reign ends abruptly, but some account of it is continued in that of the next reign. Prājyabhaṭṭa does not mention the incident of Qāḍī Ḥabīb or of the arrival of Akbar's ambassadors. He describes some spring and Śrī Paṇḍacamī festivities of Ḥusain Khān (lines 589–594), and then, in lines 595–6, he says that he had Ḡāmī(�)रेद; and रोधिसराष शारिरिभो बलो शारिबा अजश् i.e., the Ḥusain Shāh Moon having been swallowed up by the Ṛāhu of epilepsy the people became frightened of the darkness of injustice. The next line describes, in somewhat curious language, that bestowing the kingdom on his brother the king Ḥusain went to paradise, which he had acquired by his bounty, as if incited by his curiosity. The next line says he was always happy in his reign, which extended to seven years.

2 Firishtah lith. ed. has incorrectly द्रिप्रेत् मुहम्मद खान व बोसर वल्ड उस नाम च चक रा ब्रिं दाशत. Col. Briggs makes no mention of Muhammad Bhat or Yūsuf; he calls (vol. IV, p. 520) the place where "Alī Khān" was, "Shewpur." Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 132) translates Firishtah correctly, but "Bihut Yūsuf" is curious. The place of 'Ali Khān's residence is called Sonpūr.

3 One MS. has Sūyyapūr, the other has Rasūlpūr. The lith. ed. is defective and omits a part of the sentence. Firishtah lith. ed. has Sonpūr.
THE SULTANS OF KASHMIR

In the end, 'Ali Khan advanced towards Srinagar, and encamped at a distance of seven karoks from there. Malik Lulu Laund now fled, and went to 'Ali Khan. Husain Khan came out of the city, and went to Jabal 'Ata, which was one karok from it. Ahmad and Muhammad and Anki, who were his door-keepers and amirs, fled that night and went to 'Ali Khan. 2 Daulat, who was one of his near relations said to Husain Khan, "As all men are running away from you, it would be better that you should send the emblems of royalty, about which there is always dispute, to 'Ali Khan. He is your brother, and is not a stranger." Husain Khan then sent the royal umbrella and the yak-tales, and all other insignias of royalty to 'Ali Khan by the hand of his own son Yusuf; and said, "My only offence was this that I became ill." After that 'Ali Khan came to Husain Khan's house, and enquired about his health; and they wept together.

3 Then Husain Khan made over the city to 'Ali Khan; and he came to Zainpur, and took up his residence there. 'Ali Khan assumed the title of 'Ali Shah, and the duties of royalty devolved upon him; and Dukha, who was the vakil of Husain Khan was put in charge of the public affairs. After three months Husain Khan departed from the world. 'Ali Khan went to meet his bier, and he was buried in the vicinity of Haiwan Bazar.

1 The name in one MS. is جعله حادج without any dots, in the other it is حد حادج which is probably Hajadjayam. The lith. ed. has جعله حاجم. Firishtah lith. ed. has جعله حاجم. Col. Briggs does not mention the place. Rodgers calls it Jalajam.

2 There is no affix to the name in the MSS. or in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Daulat Chak.

3 Prasababata is silent over all that happened prior to the transfer of the sovereignty; but line 600 reads चालेखालीते राजा होँ। हेवामा: प्राण। ! वेदात्साहिते मारे प्राण। दसहिनि प्रचा। i.e., the kingdom having devolved on 'Ali Khan, all the people were happy as in the morning the lotus (blooms) when the sun goes to the mountain of the dawn.

4 The name appears to be Dukha, though there are slight variations. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 522) calls it Dookna. Rodgers does not mention the name. Dukha meaning "sorry", "poor" is quite a humble name; and the man was apparently of humble origin.
At this time Shāh ‘Ārif Darvīsh, coming from Ḥusain 1 Qūlī Khan at Lāhōre arrived in Kashmir. ‘Alī Khan gave him his daughter in marriage; and believed him to be the Mahād of the end of the world. ‘Alī Chak, son of Naurōz Chak, and Ibrāhim Khān, son of Ghāzi Khān, placing great faith in him, bowed in worship before him; and considering him to be fit (for such honour) decided to place him on the throne. When this news reached ‘Alī Khān’s ears, he became annoyed with him, and wanted to injure him. Shāh ‘Ārif, coming to know of this, gave out, that he would not remain there, and that he would go to Lāhōre or some other country in the course of one day; and hid himself, so that people might believe that he had disappeared (by some occult power). After two or three days, it became known, that he had paid two ashrafis to some boatmen, and embarking in their boat, had arrived at Bārāmūlā, and from there had got into the mountains. Some men were sent, and he was brought from there, and was placed in the custody of guards. When he fled a second time, he was brought back from the mountain of Mehtar Sulaimān. This time ‘Alī Khān took from him a thousand ashrafis in exchange for the miḥr of his daughter, and obtained ṭulāq (divorce) for her from him; and he was permitted to go away to Tibet; and the two eunuchs, that he had with him, were separated from him and kept under surveillance.

In the year 979 A.H., ‘Alī Chak son of Naurōz Chak, came before ‘Alī Khān and said, “Dūkha has come into my jāgīr and has created disturbance there. If you will not forbid him, I shall cut open the stomachs of my horses.” ‘Alī Khān understood that these words were a hint that he would cut open ‘Alī Shāh’s stomach. He became angry, and had him seized and sent to Kamrajā. He fled from there and went to Ḥusain Qull Khan, the governor of Lāhōre; but as at the interview he did not perform the ceremonies, which were customary, his going there was of no avail, and he fled from Lāhōre and returned to Kashmir.

1 The name is Ḥusain Qull Khan in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the other MS. it is Ḥusain Khān by mistake while it is Ḥusain Qull Khān in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat. Firishtah says he described himself as a descendant of Shāh Ṭahmāsp Safvi, and was a Shi’ā.
He was seized and brought to Srinagar, and was kept in prison. After some time he escaped, and fled to Nau Shahr. 'Ali Khan sent some troops against him, and he was again seized and brought before 'Ali Khan.

In the year 980, 'Ali Khan sent an army to invade Kahtwarah (Kishtwar); and, taking the daughter of the ruler of the country, made peace with the latter, and returned.

During this time Mullâ 'Ishqî and Qâdi Sadr-ud-dîn came as ambassadors from the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilâhi. 'Ali Khan sent the daughter of his nephew for the service of the fortunate prince Sultan Salim, with Mullâ Ishqî and Qâdi Sadr-ud-dîn, with other fine presents and tribute; and the public prayers and the coins of Kashmir were adorned and embellished with the renowned name of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilâhi. These events happened in the year 980 A.H.

At this time Yusuf Shâh, son of 'Ali Khan, had Ibrâhîm Khan, son of Qâzî Khân, executed on the accusation of Muḥammad Bhat, without obtaining the consent of his father; and for fear of the latter he and Muḥammad Bhat fled, and went to Bârâmûla. 'Ali Khan, on hearing this, was much pained in his mind. But men prayed for the pardon of Yusuf's offence, and he was summoned; and Muḥammad Bhat, who was the cause of this disturbance, was imprisoned.

In the year 982 A.H., 'Ali Shâh sent an army to invade the country of Kahtwarah, which is also called Kishtwar; and taking the daughter of the ruler of that country (in marriage) for his grandson Ya'qûb made peace with him; and returned to the city.

In the year 983 A.H., 'Ali Khan went with his family and dependants to see Jamâlnagari. Ħâdâr Khan, son of Muḥammad Shâh, one of the descendants of Sultan Zain-ul-ʿabîdîn, who had been in Gujrat, and when the servants of His Majesty went there, had waited upon him and had come to Hindûstân at his stirrups. From Hindûstân he had come to Nau Shahr. There was a cousin of his, Salim Khân, there. A large body of men joined him (i.e., Ħâdâr Khan). ‘Ali Khan sent a large body of troops with Lôhar Chak to remain at Râjauri. Muḥammad Khân Chak, who was at Râjauri, was jealous of Lôhar Chak having been made the commander; he seized him and taking all the troops with him, went to Ħâdâr Khan at Nau Shahr, and said to
him "Send Islam Khan, who is a brave man, with me, so that I may go and conquer Kashmir for you." Haider Khan being deceived by his words, sent Islam Khan with him. When they arrived in the village of Jaukas, Muhammad Khan, in the morning, treacherously slew Islam Khan, and returning from there came to Kashmir and going to Ali Shah became the recipient of favours from him. 3 Ali and Ankrī and Dāūd Kadār and others, who had intended to help Haider Khan, were imprisoned.

In the year 984 A.H., there was a great famine in Kashmir, and many people died of the great hunger.

In the year 5 986 A.H. (the Sultan) climbed to the top (platform in front?) of the mosque, and joined in an assembly of learned and

1 Apparently the man who was described as the cousin of Saltm Khan a few lines before. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 134) wrongly describes him as "his" (i.e., Haider Khan's) cousin Saltm Khan.

2 The name is so written in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is Jaukaash. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is. Col. Briggs does not mention it. Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 135) calls it "the town of Jakūn." Rodgers translates: "Leaving Islam Khan with an excuse."

In the text-edition the name of the village is: موضع جنشک.

3 The names are as I have them, in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah they are: ملی مارکی و دادر کنار ملی دانکی و دادر کنار.

4 Prajñābhaṭṭa mentions the accession of 'Ali Khan in line 600 (see note 3, p. 748) and then describes in the next five lines his impartial justice, and the happiness of the people; and then says in line 606 धन्यात्यान्यात्संवादशाहारानामप्रदत्तं, i.e., suddenly the face of the quarters became red, like the fire of the terrible times indicating the destruction to be caused by the coming famine. The horrors of the famine are described in lines 607 to 614. All family ties were broken asunder, the people clamoured for the flesh of an elephant which had died at the king's gate, and even a boy was killed, and his flesh was sold for human consumption. Then there was a great storm and a great conflagration (lines 615-621). Then in line 622 it is said दुर्दर्शान्तलोकान्त: भूमाणुः प्रवविद्त: दुर्दशान्तिः शास्त्रानुपलबो वनक्षेत्र, i.e., the Lord of the world, having enjoyed all pleasures for nine years, went to heaven, as if to give information of the hardships caused by the famine.

5 The year is 985 in Firishtah lith. ed.
pious men. Then bringing a book called the 1 Mishkuṭ to that
assembly, he, in accordance with a tradition which had come down in
respect of the excellences of repentance, repented of his sins, and
after making ablutions occupied himself with offering his prayers and
reading the Qurān. After he had finished these, he mounted with the
intention of playing Chauqān (polo); and going to the field of ‘Īdgāh
engaged in the game. Accidentally he was hit on the stomach by a
wooden bow of his saddle; and died of that injury.

AN ACCOUNT OF Yūsuf Khān, SON OF ‘ALI SHĀH.

When ‘Ali Shāh passed away, his brother 2 Abdāl Khān did not,
for fear of his nephew Yūsuf Khān accompany the funeral procession.
Yūsuf sent 3 Sāiyid Mubārak Khān, and Bābā Kharāl to him with
the message, “Come and bury your brother. If you accept me as the
Sultān then it is all right, otherwise you be the ruler and I shall be
4 your subject.” When they took Yūsuf Khān’s message to Abdāl

1 The word is مشکوت in the MSS., and مشکوتة in the lith. ed. both of the
Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. The correct name is مشکوتة. It is a very popular
collection of the Traditions by Al-Khāṣib-Al-Tubrizi, who was an eminent
Traditionist, and who flourished in the first half of the 8th century Hijra.
The work is an enlarged recension of an older book by Al-Baghavi, who died A.H.
516, A.D. 1142, entitled Masāḥih-As Sunna. The full title is مشکوتة المصاح,
Mishkūt- al-Maqabih (Niches for the lamps).

2 According to Prājyabhaṭṭa, Abdāl Khān was enraged at Yūsuf’s
succeeding his father ‘Ali Shāh. He claimed that the succession should pass
to the brother. Lines 623-24 say, ‘तिक्किः लोटांतु जिषरिं रोगें रा्यं रयातें श
लोपपुरें। सन्तालसोपिः सबार कोप विधयु रस्स रस्ससोपिः। यदापि लिये
भासा भासा रक्षारं तन्वद।’ अति कुलकोपिं वचथा रायं च रचणि। Then line
625 says there was a fight between Abdāl and Yūsuf, who is called योहोभ्रुण,
at Sekandarpura, about which place I cannot find anything; and the former
सतारिशिलिं। योहोभ्रुण दिं योह प्रकाशिश्या।’ (I. 626), i.e., after slaying the
troops went to heaven as if with curiosity to see his brother.

Yūsuf Khān is said to have given away much treasure to blot out the
memory of Kaṟṇa, Mānhātā (line 627).

3 Firishtah also has Sāiyid Mubārak Khān and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 525).
Syud Moobarik Khan, but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 135) has Sayyid
Mubārīz Khān.

4 One MS. omits the word शमा. The other has नदिं instead of नामु.

Firishtah lith. ed. is more explicit, and has मन ताक शमा खराहम बोधে।
Khān, the latter said, "I am coming relying on your words, and I am girding up my loins in your service. If I receive any injury that will be on your shoulders" (i.e., you will be responsible for it). Saiyid Mubārak, who was on bad terms with Abdāl, said, "We have also to go to Yūsuf, and take promises and engagements from him." With this agreement, the meeting broke up. When (Saiyid Mubārak) went to Yūsuf, he said to him, "Abdāl Khān did not come in compliance with your words." Abdāl Bhat said, "We should go very quickly, and attack him; and then we could bury 'Alī Shāh." Yūsuf Khān mounted at once and marched and attacked him (Abdāl Khān). The latter came, and met him, and was slain. Hasan Khān, son of Saiyid Mubārak Khān was also slain in the skirmish. The next day he buried 'Alī Shāh, and Yūsuf became the ruler in the place of his father.

After two months, 1 Saiyid Mubārak Khān and 'Alī Khān and others crossed the river with the intention of creating a revolt. Yūsuf Khān advanced against them in concert with 2 Muḥammad Khān, the murderer of Salīm Khān, and Muḥammad Khān, who was the commander of the vanguard, taking time by the forelock, came and confronted the enemy with sixty men, but was slain. 3 Yūsuf asked

---

1 See line 628 of Prājyabhaṭṭa which says भोगारणानार्याः पुष्पबिंबाएः, i.e., Mubārak Khān went away to a distance, wishing to fight (with Yūsuf); and line 629 says Muḥammad Khān, Yūsuf’s servant fought with Mubārak Khān in the neighbourhood of Diddā Maṭha, which according to Stein’s Rājatarāgniṇī, vol. II, page 448, is now the large quarter of Dūdāmar, which forms the western end of the city of Šrīnagar on the right river bank. The Maṭha was built by queen Diddā for the accommodation of travellers from various parts of India. The fact of Muḥammad Khān being slain is mentioned in line 631.

2 See page 750 where he was described as Muḥammad Khān Chak. Firīshtah lith. ed. has a different reading. It says برس ف ناتناث محمد ماکرو که هر اول او برد. The correctness of the Ṭabaqāt is proved by Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 629). See the preceding note.

3 Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 633) says, Yūsuf after enjoying the pleasures of rule for two and half months, अगस्त एकोमात्र मासि एको मासि । i.e., he went to the inaccessible mountains, the country of the Khaḍās. Those, it may be said parenthetically, belonged to a tribe, which is mentioned in the Bṛhat-Samhitā of Varāhamihira (ca. 500 A.D.), and they have been identified with the
for quarter, and came to Hirahpūr; and Saiyid Mubārak Khān sat on the seat of authority.

After some time Muḥammad Yūsuf Khān, acting on letters sent to him by (some) Kashmiris, made an attempt on Kashmir. Saiyid Mubārak Khān on hearing this news arrayed his troops and started to fight with him. Yūsuf Khān was again unable to withstand him, and went to the village of Barsāl, which is situated in the jungle. Saiyid Mubārak Khān hastened in pursuit of him, and a battle took place. Yūsuf Khān fled to the mountains round about; and Saiyid Mubārak Khān came to Kashmir with victory and triumph. He deceitfully summoned ‘Ali Khān, son of Naurōz, and imprisoned him. The other Chaks, such as Lōhar Chak, Haidar Chak and Hastī Chak did not come to him through fear. (Saiyid Mubārak Khān) sent Bābā Khalil and Saiyid Bārkhārdār to them, and summoned them after making conditions and engagements. They all came to him, and having obtained his permission, went away to their respective places.

On the way they settled among themselves, that Yūsuf should be sent for, and placed on the throne. They sent a messenger to Yūsuf Khān from the place where they were. Saiyid Mubārak Khān on hearing this was dismayed, and sent Muḥammad Khān Māksi to Yūsuf, so that he might tell the latter, that he (Saiyid Mubārak

present Khaka tribe, to which most of the petty chiefs in the Vīrastā valley below Kashmir and in the neighbouring hills belong.

1 The usurpation of Saiyid Mubārak Khān does not appear to be mentioned in so many words by Fīrāštah; but it is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa, line 634, and by the Cambridge History of India, page 292.

2 The name is Barsāl in the MS., and Barmāl in the lith. ed. of the Tābaqāt, and Parthāl in that of Fīrāštah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 525) has Hurunpal Nūrṣak, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 136) has Parthāl. Prājyabhaṭṭa does not mention the place, but proceeds at once to mention Yūsuf's going to Akbar, who is called एकबार विदारणाग्रेवा राजे महाराजाः दे भूपति I (l. 635).

3 Prājyabhaṭṭa in lines 636, 637 says that gradually the people became hostile to Mubārak Khān, and he died (जन्म रेषताकाले) after having enjoyed happiness for one and a quarter months (पापस्तिर्यम् नाम घृतिः).  

4 The name is as I have it in the text in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. it looks like Muḥammad Khān Kasi, and this has been followed in the text-edition. The name is not mentioned in Fīrāštah or elsewhere.
Khān) would accept him as the Sultan, and was repentant of what he had done. Muḥammad Khān on leaving him joined his enemies. Saiyid Mubārak Khān became still more distressed, and determined that he would go with his sons and slaves to Yūsuf Khān, and with this determination left the city and went to the ‘Īdgāh. He took ‘All Khān, the son of Naurōz Bhat, whom he had imprisoned, with him. Daulat Khān, who was one of his amirs fled from him. He in greater confusion released ‘All Khān from confinement, and went alone to the Khānqāh of Bābā Khalil. 1 Haider Chak said to ‘All Khān, “All our exertions and endeavours were for your release.” Yūsuf, son of ‘Alī Khān, said to his father, “Haider Chak wants to act treacherously towards you”; but ‘Alī Khān refused to believe him and started in company with Haider Chak. Lōhar Chak and others like him had assembled together. When ‘Alī Khān came, they seized and imprisoned him; and 2 decided among themselves that they would place Lōhar Chak on the throne.

At this time Yūsuf Khān arrived at 3 Kākpūr; and he then learned, that the Kashmiris had decided to place Lōhar on the throne. He came from there to the village of 4 Dhail, and taking all his men

---

1 Prājyabhaṭṭa (I. 638) says that Haider Chak and his companions defeated Mubārak Khān, and installed Lōhar Khān as the ruler of the country मोहार्याला मिशिमा चढ़ैल सबै हरैङ रयङः | राज्य निवेद्यमाणं ताम्रसिंहिनां | It goes on to say that during Lōhar Chak’s reign, there was great loss of life caused by lions. I mention this as a curious fact, for what it is worth, but I cannot find any mention of lions in Kashmir anywhere else; तालिकाश्रमाणि शृंगि विभागि सबैः | शस्त्रोपयद्र निद्रा निजेस्व दारावाणिङ। | राज्य दो यो न प्रतिष्ठानं वस्त्राराहितिसिङः | निहात: न निके प्रश्चिन विश्राणेव भवति। | (lines 639, 640).

2 One MS. omits by mistake the words from लोहरा तो तो दादने। In the text-edition it is only instead of लोहरा as in the translation.

3 The name is काकपूर in one MS. In the other the clause in which the name occurs is omitted in the preceding note. The lith. ed. has का का पूर, while the lith. ed. of Firishtah has काकपूर, and this name is used by Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LV, p. 136). I cannot find anything about Kākpūr or Kālpūr but there is a village of the name of Kākapūr, which forms as it were a riverside station or port of Śūpiyan on the Vīasta (see Stein’s Rājaṅarāṅg, vol. I, p. 183, footnote 695 and vol. II, p. 474).

4 The name is जिल and जिल in the MS., and रिल in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and ज़ाल in that of Firishtah. Col. Briggs does not give the name
with him, went to Saiyid Yusuf Khān Lāhōrī by way of Jammu. He then went to Fathpūr with Saiyid Yusuf Khān, and Rāja Mān Singh; and was honoured by being allowed to wait upon His Majesty the Khilīfā-i-European. From there he sent his Yaʿqūb to Kashmir. The government of Kashmir was confirmed on Lōhar.

In the year 987 A.H., Muḥammad Yusuf Khān started with Saiyid Yusuf Khān and Rāja Mān Singh from Fathpūr to conquer Kashmir. When they arrived at Siālkōt, he, without taking their help went to Rājaurī, and took possession of it; and he then arrived at the station of Thatha. At this time Lōhar sent Yusuf Kashmīrī to fight with Yusuf Khān; and Yusuf Kashmīrī, after leaving Lōhār's presence went to Yusuf Khān and joined him. Yusuf Khān then went by way of Jhavāil, which was the most difficult route, and


1 Both MSS. have buddgān khulāfat nīpāti but the lith. ed. has khilīfah alī. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has mālamet Jalāl al-dīn Muḥammad Aḥkār Bāshā.

2 Firishtah explains that Yaʿqūb was sent ahead, so that he might gain the people over to his father's side, and create disturbances in Lōhār Chak's government.

3 One MS. and the lith. eds. of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah have baddād muqadda, but the other MS. has by mistake baddād muqadda.

4 One MS. has bāmūl nīpāh, the other has bāmūl nīpāh. The lith. ed. has bāmūl nīpāh, and that of Firishtah has bāmūl nīpāh. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 326) has Lāssā, and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) has Thatha; but neither of them explains why or how he went to these distant places. Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 642) says viśva-yupadān vimāna-gahadūn. This is definite: he took shelter in Svayyapura, which was inaccessible on account of being surrounded by the waters of the Vītapūr. If Svayyapura be identical with Suyappūr, the modern Sōpurī, it was situated a short distance below the point where the Vītapūr leaves the Volūr. It is, however, very difficult to identify Svayyapura with Thatha or any other name like it.

5 The name is in both MSS. and Jhēriūn in the lith. ed. In Firishtah lith. ed. it looks like Jhēriūn or Jhēriūn. I cannot find anything about this place, but the correct name appears to be Jhavāil. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 326) has Jeehbul; and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) has Jhūpul.
marched rapidly and entered the fort of 1 Sūyyapūr. Lōhar came in concert with Ḥaidar Chak, 2 Shams Chak and Hasti Chak and confronted Yūsuf Khān. The armies encamped on the bank of the river Bihāt (i.e., the Jhelum). After some days 3 there was a great battle. From the auspiciousness of the attention of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, the victory fell to Yūsuf Khān.

After the victory, (Yūsuf Khān) marched to Srinagar, and entered it. Lōhar came, through the intervention of Qūli Mūsā and Muḥammad Bhat, and saw 4 Yūsuf Khān. In the first meeting, the interview was satisfactory; but in the end Lōhar was put into prison. A large number of the rebels were also cast into prison. When Yūsuf Khān’s mind was set at rest in respect of his enemies, he divided the country of Kashmir. He separated good jāgirs for 5 Shams Chak, son of Daulat Chak, and Ya‘qūb Chak, and Yūsuf Kashmīrī, and made all the rest his own Khālsa. On the accusation of some Kashmīrs he had the blinding needle drawn across Lōhar’s eyes.

In the year 988 A.H., Yūsuf imprisoned 6 Shams Chak and ‘Ali Shēr and Muḥammad Khān, on the suspicion that they were about to

---

1 The name is सूयपूर in one MS. In the other it is सूयपूर, and in the lith. ed. it is सूयपूर. Firishtah lith. ed. has सूयपूर Sōnpūr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 526) has Showpoor and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) Sonpūr. I think Sūyyapūr is the correct name. See note 4, page 766.

2 The name is Shams Chak in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; it is Shamsā Chak in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tarbāqāt.

3 The battle is mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (lines 645, 646), who says जाना गोपीभुपालशरणनिषिद्धिः विषयायासुरविजयाकुपे अस्त्रं भक्षयं । विवाह तनुं युं मन्ना विवाहस्वयमविवाहवर्ण । सातौँ स्वर्णाभद्रा सवाराष्ट्राङ्कितः ।

4 This is also mentioned by Prājyabhaṭṭa (l. 648) शवर्णालो योगोभाषाव- पाठितिकासू | स्वाभावर्म गोपिव विंगूनमवरितः स्वातः ।

5 There are some differences in the names. In one MS. Ya‘qūb Chak is written as Ya‘qūb Bōg. In the other Shams Chak, son of Daulat Chak, is converted to Shams Chak and Daulat Chak. Ya‘qūb Chak appears, according to Firishtah, to be Yūsuf’s son.

6 The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS, as well as in the lith. ed. of the Tarbāqāt. Firishtah lith. ed., however, has the suffix of Chak to the name of ‘Ali Shēr, and calls the third man Muḥammad Sa‘ādat Bhat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 527) calls the second man Ally Chuk and the third Maḥoimed Khan; while Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) transforms the third name to Muḥammad Sa‘ādat Bihut.
rebel against him. Ḥabib Khān fled for fear and went to the village of 1 Kasr. Yūsuf, son of ʿAll Khān, who had been imprisoned by Yūsuf Khān, effected his release, and with his four brothers joined Ḥabib Khān in the above-named village. From there they all went to 2 Ran Mal the Rāja of Tibet, and came back after obtaining reinforcements from him. When they arrived near the frontier of Kashmir, they, owing to the differences which developed among them, were unable to do anything, and parted from one another without doing anything. Yūsuf and Muḥammad Khān were seized, and brought before Yūsuf Khān; and their ears and noses were cut off. Ḥabib Khān concealed himself in the city.

In the year 989 a.h., His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāh, returning from the conquest of Kābul, made his grand encampment in Jalālābād. He sent 3 Mirzā Ṭāhir, a relation of Mirzā Yūsuf Khān, and Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ ʿĀqīl as ambassadors to Kāshmir. When they arrived at Bārāmūla, Yūsuf Khān hastened to welcome them, and taking the (imperial) farmān in his hand showed reverence for it. He came into Srinagar with the ambassadors and sent his son Ḥaidar Khān, with many rich presents to wait on His Majesty. Ḥaidar Khān remained in attendance for a period of one year, and then he, and Shaikh Yaʿqūb Kāshmirī obtained leave to return to Kāshmir.

In the year 989 a.h., Yūsuf Khān went on a visit to Lār and Shams Chak fled from the prison and went to 4 Kahwār; and joined 5

---

1 The name looks like Kasr in both MSS. It is Kashūr in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt; while Firishtah lith. ed. has Kāshūr. The text-edition following Firishtah has Kāshūr. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 527) has Gaheer and Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 137) has to the town of Khū. I cannot find any place in Kashmir which resembles any of these names.

2 The name is written as Zo Nāml in both MSS., and Zom in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The name is not quite distinct in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and both Col. Briggs and Rodgers omit it. I think Ran Mal (Sanskrit Ranamalla) is better and I have adopted it. In the text-edition it is Rām Nāml.

3 According to Firishtah Mirza Ṭāhir was a relation of Mirzā Saiyid Khān Shahdī.

4 The name is written as Kāshūr and Kāshūr, but it is the same as Kishtwār or Khatwārah. See note 3, page 758.

5 This is apparently referred to by Prājyabhaṭṭa (lines 649, 650) where: however, it is said that Ḥaidar Chak took shelter in लार and there was a battle between him and Yūsuf.
Haidar Chak who was there. Yüsuf receiving information of this event sent an army to attack them. They separated and fled; and Yüsuf Khan returned victorious and triumphant towards Srinagar.

In the year 990 A.H., Haidar Chak and Shams Chak advanced towards Kashmir from Kahlwar in order to fight with Yüsuf Khan. The latter advanced to meet them; and made his son Yaqub the commander of the vanguard. He was victorious in the battle, and returned to Srinagar. He, at the intervention of the Rāy of Kahlwar, pardoned Shams Chak’s offence, and granted him a jāgir. 1 Haidar Chak came out of the place where he was, and went to Rāja Mān Singh.

2 In the year 992 A.H., Yaqīb, son of Yüsuf Chak, was exalted by having the honour of kissing the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī. When the latter arrived in Lāhore with grandeur and good fortune, Yaqīb wrote to Yüsuf, that His Majesty intended to go to Kashmir. Yüsuf Khan determined that he should advance to welcome him. At this time information reached him, that Ḥakīm ‘Alī and 3 Bahā’-ud-dīn having come as ambassadors from the servants of His Majesty had arrived at 4 Thatha. Yüsuf Khan advanced to welcome them, and putting on the robes conferred on him by the emperor made repeated obeisances; and with a firm determination wished to present himself at the threshold. 5 Bābā Khallī...

---

1 This is referred to in line 651, which says, अहालादीगुप्त वयो देवर-प्रवरः: द्वादशे पुनःप्रवर्षे मनासर्वं सम्पन्न:।

2 Compare Pṛājyabhaṭṭa (l. 659) अहालादीगुप्तप्रवाहवेवनां हायोदसः। वाक्वामार्कुशप्रपीत प्रविशते गृहवत्।।

3 One MS. has Bahā’-ud-dīn Kambū, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have Kambū after Bahā’-ud-dīn. Firishtā lith. ed. omits the name of Bahā’-ud-dīn altogether, and mentions Ḥakīm ‘Alī Gīlānī as the only ambassador.

4 See note 4, page 756. तिह तिह is the name of the place in the text-edition.

5 Pṛājyabhaṭṭa (line 658 and the following lines) gives a different reason for the final breach of the friendly relations between Akbar and Yüsuf. It says that the prince Yaqīb was sent by Yüsuf to render service to Akbar, अहालादीगुप्तद्विजवेवनां। Akbar on seeing the rich presents placed before him by Yaqīb became anxious to conquer Kashmir, वल्लीरिकालोभुक्त वल्लीरिकु वनां बधवछ। नवप्रवाहः। He accordingly gave orders to Bhagwān Dās and other commanders, (वल्लीरिकालोभुक्तबधवछ)। Coming to know of this, Yaqīb left Akbar’s
and Bābā Mahdī and 1 Shams Dübi 2 being perplexed about him kept him back from carrying out his determination; and resolved that if Yūsuf Khān went towards the threshold, they would put him to death; and would raise his son Ya‘qūb in his place. For fear of this, (Yūsuf) postponed the carrying out of his intention; and gave leave to the imperial ambassadors to return.

The servants of His Majesty then appointed Mirzā Shāh Rukh and Shāh Quli Khān and Rāja Bhagwān Dās to invade Kashmir. Yūsuf Khān came out of Kashmir (Srinagar), and encamped with his army at Bārāmūla. When news came that the victorious army had arrived at 3 Bhimbar, 4 Yūsuf Khān (separating himself) from the service, and came secretly to Kashmir, त्यक्ता भूपालवेदन। प्रतापवर्गीय सम्मान हासिल।. He came and informed his father, and pointed out that the greatness of the great who are weak is of no avail (भयोचितमसंबंधे संपत्तं नानव निचुतं। पक्षपातविनाकारं क्षितिर निपितकरे।). Then they all set out for war; but after this there was a long controversy between Yūsuf Khān, who argued that it was not within their capacity to withstand Akbar’s power, and his ministers who advised war. They even said, भवनः दृष्टा दुर्भाग्य कुमायजयान्वीते। आकस्मिन हेमातिन दोष्टयायः प्रत्येक वयं (l. 677), i.e., you remain at a distance; we will decide your work; we will take shelter in the forest, and carry on daily skirmishes; but their arguments were of no avail; and he went to Rāja Bhagwān Dās, दृष्टि निर्देश भूपति तबाहकीमहानुष्ठाने। चरणं सरघेंन्द्राणं भद्रवालामात्रं (l. 691). Then Ya‘qūb ascended the throne, and he pleased the people by distributing the treasures collected by his father; but as usual, in the later history of Kashmir, there were mutual jealousy and quarrels. After that Akbar sent Qāsim Khān to conquer Kashmir. आशिशकाजायां वद्धेदर्ज्ञेतिन। वर्णाणां भूपाल: वक्रोत्तिवेदनः। (l. 705).

1 The name is Shams Dübi in the lith. eds. of the Taḥaqat and of Firishta; but the suffix is doubtful in the MSS., it is Dūnī in one and Dūlī in the other. Col. Briggs omits the name, but Rodgers (J.A.S.B., vol. LIV, p. 138) calls the man Shams Dadī.

2 The word is موس in both MSS. and the lith., ed. and موس in the text-edition.

3 There are differences in the readings. The MSS. have انة پر and انة پر; and the lith. ed. has انة پر. Firishta lith. ed. has انة پر لباس کم مرحود. The text-edition following the MSS. has adopted پر.

4 The sentence appears to me to be confused and incomplete. I have thought it necessary to insert the words جدا شدة to complete the sentence.
army took up his station in the village of Nagar, with the intention of loyally serving His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Illahi in concert with Mirzâ Qâsim, son of Khwâjah Hâji, and Mahdi Kôkah and Ustâd Latîf. Mîdîh Singh came to the above-mentioned village in order to receive Yusuf Khân; and took him with himself to Râja Bhagwân Dâs. The latter sent him a horse and a Siropâ after the meeting; and marching from there advanced towards Kashmir (Srinagar). The Kashmirîs received him peacefully, and agreed that they would send every year a fixed sum for the imperial treasury. Râja Bhagwân Dâs returned from there after concluding the peace; and obtained the honour of kissing the dust of the threshold at Atak. Yusuf Khân also came with him, and obtained the distinction of kissing the threshold, which is the semblance of paradise.

SECTION X. THE SECTION ABOUT THE RULERS OF SIND.

It is narrated in the history of Minhâj-ul-Masâlik, which is known as the Chach-nâma, that when the turn of the Khilâfat came to Walid, the son of 'Abd-ul-malik, the son of Marwân, 4 Hajjâj, the son of Yusuf, sent Muhammad Hârûn towards India, and he advanced into the country of Mekrân, in the early part of the year 86 A.H.; and commenced collecting revenue there. At this time news became

1 See note 2, page 722.
2 The history of Kashmir, after the treaty concluded by Râja Bhagwân Dâs and which Akbar refused to ratify, will be found in the history of Akbar's reign in this volume. The Cambridge History of India, page 293, gives a summary.
3 The heading in both MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has ذكر طبقة سلالة سندة.
4 He is described in Muir's Annals of the Early Caliphate (1883, p. 445) as, "At this period (A.H. 71) the right arm of the Umayyad Caliphs" and who afterwards for twenty years was Wald's Viceroy in the eastern provinces of the Caliphate.
5 "The ancient Gedrosia, that torrid region, extending in land from the northern shore of the sea of 'Oman" (Cambridge History of India, p. 1). I think it would have been much simpler, and more intelligible to call it by its modern name of Balûchistân.
current, in the capital city of Baghdād that Malik 1 Sarandip (who I suppose was the governor of Ceylon, but who is also called the king of Ceylon) had sent by sea a ship filled with rich and beautiful articles and male and female Ḥabēḥi slaves for the servants of the capital. When the Shaikh arrived in the neighbourhood of 2 Dēbul,

1 Sarandip is usually identified with Ceylon, but Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 325) calls it Saran-Dip and identifies it with Kachchh Bhuj.

2 Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 403) says that Deebul is identical with “Modern Tutta on the Indus.” The Cambridge History of India (p. 2) has Debul “Dāhir’s principal seaport,” and says further on that it was “about twenty-four miles to the south-west of the modern town of Tatta.”

The exact position of Dēbul (though the correct transliteration of دیبل which appears to be the form of the name in Persian would be Dabil) is as doubtful as the correct pronunciation of the name. There is a very long note, No. 316, in Major Raverty’s paper in “The Mihrān of Sind and its Tributaries” (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, 1893) which extends from page 317 to page 331, in which he says all that could be said about Debäl, and perhaps a good deal more, if I may say so, and in the course of which he says (p. 324), “Having clearly shown that Debäl or Dewal was not Ṭuṭṭah, nor ‘Bambura’, nor Lāhri Bandar, nor Karāχī, and stated that the latter was not founded for centuries after the Ḍārāb conquest, I will now show, as near as possible, where it was.” The note goes on for pages, and although Debal is occasionally mentioned, as on page 26, where Sulṭān Mu‘izz-al-Dīn Muḥammad-i-Sām is said to have marched against it in 578 A.H. (1182-83 A.D.), and again on the same page where Sisān-al-Dīn Chaḥbars of Debäl is mentioned as one of the seven petty Rānās in Sind, when Malik Nāṣir-al-Dīn Kābā-jah declared his independence and assumed the title of Sulṭān, I cannot find any indication of the exact situation of the place.

Earlier in the note (pp. 319-321), however, Raverty gives some information about Debäl from the accounts of the early English travellers. One of the earliest of these, Walter Paynton, who accompanied Captain Christopher Newport in 1612 (p. 320) that, “Boats were sent from Diu (Dewal) for conveying the Ambassadors goods and people……………..Tota a great City one dayes journey from Diul, both cities standing in the Great Mogolis Dominions.” Subsequent to this W. Paynton, then Captain Paynton (p. 321) mentions “Diu near the mouth of the river Indus.” He then mentions the account of Diu in the narrative of Sir Thomas Roe’s embassy in 1615 and of Thevenot in 1665-66, and comes to the conclusion that “Debal or Dewal is said to have been in 1666, southernmost town of Sind; and its position is plainly stated in the account of Captain Newport’s landing …….. The distance given as fifteen miles from
the turbulent people of that place looted that ship and seven other ships, and took possession of all the property in them. They also seized, with the object of making them slaves, a number of Musalmān women, who had embarked in the ship, with the object of circumambulating the Ka‘ba. When these things were happening, a number of men fled and going to Ḥajjāj complained to him. Ḥajjāj, the son of Yūsuf, wrote a letter to Rāy Dāhir, who was the ruler of Hind and Sind, and sent it to Muhammad Hārūn, so that he might send it by the hand of some of his trusted servants to Rāy Dāhir. When Muhammad Hārūn sent the letter to him, he wrote in reply that the act had been committed by robbers (pirates); and their power and pomp were so great that they could not be destroyed by his exertions and endeavours.

When this reply reached Ḥajjāj, he solicited permission for the invasion of Sind and Hind from Walīd, the son of ‘Abd-ul-malik, Thaṭṭah by the river, would bring us very near to the Shrine of Pir Patho, at the foot of the Makkah hill, and near the Bhāgar branch of the Indus” (p. 322). Debal, he, therefore, concludes, lay “in the vicinity of that Shrine, but a little further the south-westward perhaps.”

There are three maps in this paper, one without a date has Debal a little to the north of what is marked as Pir Patho and about twenty-four miles to the west and a little to the south of Tatta, a second which is said to be from Purchas about 1615 A.D., which places Diulf some distance almost due south, but a little to the west on the same bank of what appears to be the main estuary of the Indus, and a third, which is described as an old map published about the year 1700, which places Dobil or Dīoul on the coast some distance to the south-west of Thatta.

1 Rāy Dāhir, according to the old Arab historians, was the son of Chach, the Brahman minister of the Rāy dynasty founded by the white Huns who settled in Sind, whose throne he then usurped, and became the ruler of the country. He had his capital at Alor. The Chāch-nāma, extracts from the translation of which are given in H. M. Elliot’s History of India (vol. I, pp. 140–152), contains a long account of Chach the father of Dāhir. It is said in the preface to the translation of the extracts from the Chāch-nāma (p. 137) that Nizam-ud-dīn Ahmad, Nūr-ul-Hakk, Firishtha and Mir Masʿūm and others have drawn their account of the conquest of Sind from it.

2 One MS. has omitting the words ں والی من ں and the other has ں والی من ں. I have adopted the reading of the second MS. In the text-edition it is only ں والی من ں as in the first MS.
the 1 son of Marwân; and sent 2 Badîl with three hundred warriors to Muhammad Hârûn, and wrote to him, that he should send three thousand great warriors (mard jangût khûnrêz) with him for the capture of Dêbul. When Badîl arrived in the neighbourhood of Dêbul, he after making great exertions, attained the good fortune of martyrdom. The heart of Ḥâjjâj was distressed on hearing of this defeat and became very sad and sorrowful. Although ʿÂmir, son of ʿAbd-ul-lah, had intended to take the command of the army for the invasion of Sind, Ḥâjjâj in consultation with astrologers, who knew the niceties of their science, prevented 3 ʿImâd-ud-dîn Muhammad Qâsim, son of ʿAqîl Thaqîfî, who was the son of his uncle and also his son-in-law, and was in his seventeenth year; and sent him with 4 six thousand men chosen from the chief men of Syria for the conquest of Sind by way of Shiráz.

---

1 One MS. omits ʿAbd-ul-lah, while the other has ʿAbd-ul-lah but omits ʿAbd-ul-lah. In the text-edition, however, as in the translation, the words ʿAbd-ul-lah or the son of Marwân have been included.

2 He is called Badîl in the MSS. of the Ţabaqât and the lith. eds. of the Ţabaqât and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 403) calls him Budmeen. Al Bilâdûrî (vide Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) says there were two expeditions, one under ʿUbaidu-l-lah and the second under Budail son of Tahfa, both of which were unsuccessful and both the commanders were slain.

3 The Cambridge History of India, page 2, insists on calling him Muhammad, and says that he should not be called Qâsim or Muhammad Qâsim, as he is sometimes called by European historians and directe that “this vulgar error, arising from a Persian idiom in which the word ‘son’ is understood, but not expressed, should be avoided.” It appears, however, that this error is shared by Musalmân historians. Both Nizâm-ud-dîn and Firishtah call him Muhammad’ Qâsim, and as to the word ‘son’ being understood, it would appear that he was the son not of Qâsim but of ʿAqîl Thaqîfî. It must be noted, however, that Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 324) also calls him “Muhammad, son of Kâsim.” According to Al Bilâdûrî (Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) his full name was Muhammad, son of Kâsim, son of Muhammad, son of Hakim, son of Abû ‘Ukail.

4 Al Bilâdûrî (Elliot, vol. I, p. 119) says, “Ḥâjjâj ordered six thousand Syrian warriors to attend Muhammad, and others besides. He was provided with all he could require, without omitting even thread and needle.” According to the Cambridge History of India (p. 2), there were besides the six thousand Syrian horses, a camel corps of equal strength, and a baggage train of three thousand camels.
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After traversing the stages and reaching the end of their journey they laid siege to the fort of Dêbul, and after a few days captured it, and an immense quantity of plunder fell into their hands. Among those there were four hundred slave girls of matchless beauty. Muḥammad Qāsim divided the booty among his soldiers, and sent the daughter of the Rāy of Dēbul, with a fifth part of the booty to Ḥajjāj. The daughter of the Rāja of Dēbul fled and went to Jay Sinha, son of Rāy Dāhir, who was the governor of the fort of Nīrūn. Muḥammad Qāsim advanced with a stout heart against him. 3 Rāyzāda 4 Jay Sinha having placed the bridle of bravery and manliness in the hand of shamelessness, and making over the defence of the fort of Nīrūn to some trusted men crossed the Mehrān river and went to the ancient fort of Brahman-ābād. When Muḥammad

1 Firishtah does not agree with the Ṭabaqāt in saying that the princess was sent to Ḥajjāj. He says that seventy-five slave girls with the fifth part of the booty were sent to Ḥajjāj.

2 According to Ibn Ḥaukal quoted by Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, 1893, p. 215) "Nīrūn is a city situated between Debal and Mansūrīyah on the road thither, and is situated on the west side of the Mihrān." According to Al Bilādurl (Elliot, vol. i, p. 121) the inhabitants of Nīrūn had, already before the arrival of Muḥammad, sent two Samanīs or priests to Ḥajjāj to treat for peace; and on Muḥammad's arrival they furnished him with supplies and admitted him into the town, and they were allowed to capitulate. The Cambridge History of India (p. 3) says that Nīrūn was about seventy-five miles to the north-east of Debul and near the modern Haidarābād (Hydrābād). The name looks like حسبان in one MS. and حبسان in the other and حسبان in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls him son of Dāhir Faujī. The Cambridge History of India (p. 3) calls him Jai Singh. Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 232) has Jai Sinha.

3 "The Sindhu, Nahr-i-Sind, Āb-i-Sind or Indus, from the time that we possess any authentic records respecting it, was a tributary along with the other rivers now forming the Panch Nād or the Panj Āb, of the Hākrā or Wahindah, which having all united into one great river at the Dehā-i-Āb (literally meeting of water or waters-meet) as related by the old 'Arab and Sindī writers, formed the Mihrān of Sind or Sind-Sāgar" (Raverty, J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 316).

4 The name is written حصار برمان باد in the MSS. and حصار برمان باد in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has بقلط برمان باد The correct name of the place, however, was Bahman-ābad or Bahman-nih, the Bahman-no of the Sindis. It was "founded centuries before, by Bahman son of Isfandiyār,
Qāsim arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Nirūn, the residents of the city, being in the first instance frightened by the onsets of the arrival of the army shut themselves up in the fort; and later having arranged and provided for the necessaries of the army (i.e., I suppose Muḥammad Qāsim's army) joined its shout by shouting the word Al-amān (quarter or safety). Muḥammad Qāsim granted them quarter, took the heads of the different groups of people with him; and leaving his own superintendent or commander in the fort of Nirūn, advanced to conquer Siwistān, which is now known as Sihwān.

1 A number of the inhabitants of Siwistān went to Bachhrā, who was the ruler of the place, and was the son of the uncle of Rāy Dāhir, and said, "Our religion is safety, and to pardon is our faith, and according to our tenets, slaying and being slain are not allowed. It is advisable that we should petition for protection from the commanders of the army." Rāyzāda Bachhrā relying on his strength and power uttered harsh and unfitting words (towards them); but in the end after enduring the siege for a week took the path of flight and

in the reign of Guftāsib sovereign of I-rān-Zamin, who made conquests in valley of the Indus and western Hind, which were retained up to within a few years of the fall of the I-rāni empire" (vide note 102, p. 196 of Raverty's paper, J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i). In another note, No. 105, page 196, Raverty says "This place Bahmanābād or Bahman-nih, notwithstanding that more than one old author distinctly states by whom it was founded, European writers (and Nizam-ud-din and Firishtah also) insist in calling 'Brahmanābād', because it is incorrect, seemingly."

1 There are differences in the readings here. One MS. has مرمز انوازات ندر وجهی از سکنن سیستان معبد که حاکم انها و ابن عرب داهر بود برق از پردازد که حاکم انها و ابن عرب داهر بود از سکنن سیستان ندر بچه که حاکم انها و ابن عرب داهر بود Firishtah lith. ed. has مرمز سیرستن که همه برهیمی برایند ندر حاکم خود کچره که ابن داهر بود It appears from comparing these that the inhabitants, who, according to Firishtah, were all Brahmins went to the ruler of the place, who according to one MS. of the Tabaqat was called, apparently incorrectly, Muḥammad but according to the other and the lith. ed. Bachehra and according to Firishtah Kachrāl, and said that they did not want to fight the invaders. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 405) calls the governor of Sehwan Kucha Ray; the Cambridge History of India (p. 3) calls him "Bajhra, son of Chandra and cousin of Dāhir"; and Raverty also (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 233) has Bajhra.
prayed for shelter to the Rāy of the fort of Sisams. Early next morning Muḥammad Qāsim, in concert with the leaders of the different sections of his army, entered the fortress the Siwistān; and granted quarter to those who had not accepted the advice of or shown goodwill to Rāyzāda Baḡhrā. He divided the booty and the fruits of the conquest of Siwistān among the troops, after setting apart a fifth part (to be sent to Ḥajjāj); and then turned his face towards the fort of Sisam. After the conquest of that fort he advanced to engage Rāy Dāhr, who was the head of the disturbance, and the chief of the disturbers.

While this was going on, there was a dearth of commodities in the army of Muḥammad Qāsim; and most of the beasts of burden became lame (and unfit for work); and owing to this anxiety and distress regarding the condition of the troops became apparent. Ḥajjāj, son of Yūsuf, becoming acquainted with the true state of things, after making necessary preparations, sent to Muḥammad Qāsim two thousand horses from his own stables, and the soldiers having gained fresh strength advanced to attack Rāy Dāhr. After the parties met, a series of battles took place one after another. They say that while these things were going on, Rāy Dāhr sent for the astrologers to attend on him in his private chamber; and asked that the circumstances and the aim of the ‘Arab army to be explained to him. The astrologers, who knew the stars, said, "We have read in ancient books that in the lunar year 86, the 'Arab army would take possession of the country

---

1 The name is written as 㗯 in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Firishtah lith. ed. has 㗯, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 406) has Sulim. The Cambridge History of India (p. 4) has Sisam. Raverty calls it Sisam, Sahbān and Sīlam of others (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 233). In the text-edition it is 㗯.

2 This dearth is also mentioned by Arab historians (vide Raverty, J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 237). Muḥammad had to build a bridge of boats to take his army over to the Bahmanābād side of the Mihrān. The bridge was constructed, and the army crossed without much opposition on the part of Dāhir. Major Raverty also says that the writers do not mention the difficulties he had to encounter, such as the delay in obtaining boats, the want of food and forage, and the consequent loss of men and horses from disease, and months that elapsed in the meantime. It is not clear where he got the information about the delay and the difficulties.
round Dēbul; and that in the year 93 they would gain possession of the whole country of Sind.” As he had repeatedly examined the astrologers, he knew that in forecasting the influence of the stars, they were sure and protected against all errors and mistakes, he grappled (with the difficulties of his position); and as the cup of his life had begun to overflow, he, on Thursday the 10th of the auspicious month of Ramadān in the year 993 A.H., turned the face of his spirit with the greatest vigour to the 1 battle-field; and with the help of the greatest endeavour and exertion, shot every arrow, which he had in the quiver of his devices, at the enemy, and struck by the arrow of fate died. A summary of the circumstances attending the death of Dāhir Rāy is as follows: that on the day of battle he, riding on a white elephant, took his place in the centre of the line of warriors and exerted himself with great gallantry and showed himself to be an expert archer. While the brave men of the two sides and the warriors of the two armies were mingled with each other, a thrower of naphtha (or an archer) shooting arrows tipped with naphtha struck a flame of fire at the howdah of the white elephant on which Rāy Dāhir was seated. The elephant was frightened and began to run away; and although the driver struck it with the hooked goad it had not even the power of a whip with which one strikes an ‘Arab horse. The elephant fled and got into the river. The warriors of Muḥammad Qāsim’s army pursued it from behind, and sent the message of death by the tongues of their arrows from different directions. After he had received many

1 The account of the battle in the Tabaqāt, which appears to be copied from the Chach-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, p. 170), is enumbered in the earlier part with Dāhir’s consultation with the astrologers and much figurative language. The actual circumstances attending the death of Dāhir, due to the elephant on which he was riding being frightened are, however, described here clearly. Firisṭah’s account is somewhat different and more matter of fact. The account given in Raverty (J.A.S.B., vol. 8 LXI, pt. i, p. 239) is rather brief, and gives no details. The Cambridge History of India (p. 5) gives a circumstantial account, which agrees mainly with that given by Firisṭah and may have been taken from it.

2 The words are in one MS. حکم ثاراناه نعاشت که بر اسپ عربی بزنند. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. are the same, with the difference that the word is in one MS. and Nāshāt in the other and in the lith. ed. In the text-edition Nāshāt has been adopted.
wounds, he returned to the bank of the river. The elephant came out in its own way and made the horsemen run away in all directions. At this time acting with great gallantry Rāy Dāhir, wounded as he was, descended from the elephant by such device as he could think of, and confronted one of the brave 'Arab warriors. The latter with one blow carried to its end that half-finished life. The Rāys and Rājpūts, on seeing this, threw the dust of misery on their heads and took the way of flight; and the brave 'Arab warriors mingling with the Rājpūts pursued the latter as far as the gate of the fortress. They cast down many of the infidel warriors after aspersing them of cowardice by the thrusts of their spears. So much plunder and booty fell into the hands of the soldiers that these were beyond one's ideas and estimates.

3 Rayzāda Jay Sinha, after making the fortress strong by putting into it a garrison of brave warriors, wanted to come out and again engage in a drawn battle; but the representatives and ministers of his father did not permit that he should again fight a battle, and they carried him away to the old fort of Brahman-ābād (Bahmanābād). Rāy Dāhir's widow, however, disagreeing with her son, strengthened

---

1 The readings here are also different. The MSS. have و بر كنار درباري شر و شغب شد while the lith. ed. has كنار دربار شر و شغب شد. Firishtah has no passage, which is exactly similar to this. I cannot find any meaning of شغب or شعب which will at all fit in with the context. The Cambridge History of India (p. 5) has “the driver arrested his flight in midstream, and induced him once more to face the enemy.” This seems to be the meaning but I cannot get the word to fit in. The account of the battle in the Chach-nama (vide Elliot, vol. I, p. 170) is “Dāhir and the driver were carried into the rolling waves.”

2 On the other hand, Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 5) say that he was struck by an arrow and fell from the elephant. For accounts of the events just before the battle see note No. 187 in Raverty’s paper (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 239), but it does not give any detailed account of the final battle. It only says, “the Arabs made a general attack on Dāhir and his forces; and he was finally killed near the fort of Itāwar, between the Mhrān river and the canals of Dadahah Wāh, in endeavouring to reach the fortress, and his troops were overthrown with great slaughter, and pursued to the gates of that place.” These details do not agree with the accounts of the battle as given by Nizam-ud-din or Firishtah or the Cambridge History of India.

3 The following account agrees with that in Raverty’s paper (J.A.S.B., vol. LXI, pt. i, p. 239). The widow was named Rānī Bā‘l, and she is stated to have been a sister of Dāhir.
the gates of the fortress; and making fifteen thousand Rājpūts join her prepared to defend it. 'Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāsim, 1 considering the conquest of the fortress of Rāwar to be easy, and thinking that this should be done before the destruction of Jay Sinha, turned his bridle from the battle-field for the capture of the fortress of Rāwar, and surrounded it. After some days, when the people of the fortress were reduced to straits, they lighted a great fire and threw their women and children into it; and opening the gates of the city prepared for battle and slaughter. The Syrian warriors, drawing their blood-drinking swords from the scabbards, entered the fortress and slew six thousand Rājpūts; and thirty thousand were seized as slaves. The daughters of Rāy Dāhir, who fell into the hands of the conquerors among the prisoners, were sent as a present for the service of the Khāliifa. When they came before the latter's eyes, he made them over to the servants of the harem, so that they might attend to their wants for some days, and then had them brought to his presence. He wanted that he would have 4 one of them to share his bed. She

---

1 The readings are different and none of them appears to be quite correct.

One MS. has تسخير حصار را در راه اسیان دانسته شغل انرا بر دفع جسم مقدم داشته و از جنگ گاه علی صوب تسخير وا گردانیده حصار مذکور را درمیان گرفتند. The lith. ed. has تسخير حصار در راه اسیان دانسته شغل انرا بر دفع جسم مقدم داشته و از راه جنگ گاه علی صوب تسخير در گردانیده حصار مذکور را درمیان گرفتند. It would be seen that the 2nd MS. and the lith. ed. agree very much. If the حصار در is a mistake for حصار راوز, the reading in the lith. ed. may be accepted, after substituting راوز for دوز, and I have made my translation accordingly.

2 The name of the fortress is not mentioned in the text-edition.

3 The Jauhar could not have been very complete.

4 The words are یکی را بکل الیمین نصرف نمایید. The circumstances of the accusation made by Dāhir's daughter, which she afterwards declared to be false, and which she said she had made to avenge the killing of her father are mentioned by Firishthah, but not by Al Bīlādūrī, who says (vide Elliot, vol. I, p. 124) that after Walīd's death his brother Sulaimān became the Caliph. He appointed Sālīh to collect a tribute of Irāk. Yazīd was made governor of Sind, and Muḥammad was sent back a prisoner, and was kept in prison at Wāsit, where he was put to torture with other members of the family of Abū 'Ukail, until they
submitted, "I do not possess the status of being honoured with the association of the Khalifa's bed, for 'Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāṣim had kept me for three nights in his own harem." The Khalifa, being overpowered by an access of rage, wrote an order with his own hand that Muḥammad Qāsim, wherever he might have arrived at the time (the order should reach him), should put himself (sew himself up) in raw hide, and should start for the capital. The helpless man had himself sewn up in a raw hide, and ordered that he should be placed in a box, and should be sent to the capital. He died in the course of two or three days. They carried him in the way described.¹

In short, when the country of Sind came, without dispute and hostility into the possession of the agents of the government of 'Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāsim, he appointed his own officers and agents in each town and city.

Historical works are wanting and destitute of accounts of the events which happened in Sind (after this date), and in no history are the circumstances connected with the events and the people of the country narrated either as a whole or in detail. But the writer of the history called the Ṭabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhī has given the name of some of those who were engaged in the government of the country in certain years, and has written only this much in reference to each of them, that he was occupied with the work of government for some years. I, Niẓām-ud-dīn Aḥmad, the compiler of this history, relying on the history of the Ṭabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhī, ² follow in his service by

---

¹ The lith. ed. inserts here: "بنا نا غلیم را بیرین قیاس باند کرد i.e., and the remaining booty might be estimated in accordance with this; but as these words do not appear in either of the MSS., I have not inserted them in the text.

² The meanings of the words اقتدا بخدمت نش مینااابد are not very clear. It is not possible to be definite as to who is intended to by the pronominal ش unless it is ʿAmbar.
narrating the names of some of them, and some of the circumstances which were included in the things known to the slave of the threshold of his Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilahi Akbar Shah. And all help and all defence is from God!

The compiler of the history called the Tabaqat-i-Bahadur Shahi says, that in the earlier times the government and the rule of the country of Sind were vested in the children of Tamim Ansari. Afterwards as among the zamindars (land-holders or chiefs) of that country, the Sumras were distinguished by great power and numbers of followers, they, in the course of time, having gained great power, became invested with the work of government. For five hundred years the government of the country remained with the house of Sumras. But as it is incidental with the revolution of the skies, or rather as it is incidental with all governments, that they are transferred from one tribe to another, after five hundred years the chiefship of the country of Sind was transferred from the Sumras to the

---

1 The word بندي in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. is meaningless in reference to the context. I have ventured to change it to چندی, while in the text-edition بندي.

2 Tamim, the son of Dhaud-ul-Utbah, succeeded Junair in Sind, when the latter was promoted to the Vicereignty of the eastern provinces of the Caliphate.

3 For an account of the Sumras see the translation of the extract from the Tarih-i-Sind or Tarih-i-Ma'sum (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 215-223). It is described as an account of the Samma dynasty but is really an account of the Sumras. The account of the Summas does not begin till page 223. It is said on that page that “some men of the tribe of Summa had previously come from Kachh and had settled in Sind.” M. Hidayat Hosain has زمیداران گنه تاج کی سومر کان in the text-edition.

4 Firishtah lith. ed. has one hundred years, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 411) agrees with the Tabaqat and makes the period of domination of the Soomura five hundred years. The Cambridge History of India only mentions theSomura, on page 54, where it mentions Malik Sina'i-ud-din Chatisar, eleventh of the Sumer line, a Rajput dynasty the latter members of which accepted Islam, submitted and was permitted to retain his territory as a vassal of Ilutmish (commonly called Altamsh). Wunar, another chief of the Sumras, is mentioned on page 147 in connection with the account of Moorish traveller in his Tuhfat-un-Nassar fi Guharib-il-Amsar, who visited India in the reign of Muhammed Tughluq.
dynasty of 1 Sēmmas. Of this dynasty fifteen persons were engaged in the 2 government (of Sind).

AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF 3 JĀM ĀNAR.

He was the man in the tribe of Sēmmas who was vested with the office of government and rule. The tribe of the Sēmmas considered themselves to be descended from Jamshid, and traced their genealogy to him. This word Jām, which they gave to their leaders and chiefs, preserves the memory of that connection. The period of the rule of this Jām was three years and six months.

4 JĀM JŪNĀN.

When Jām Ānar drank a draught from the full cup of death, his brother, Jām Jūnān, in 5 virtue of a mandate or testament, became

1 They appear to be mentioned for the first time in the Ghach-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, p. 191) as coming to receive Muhammad Kāsım “ringing bells and beating drums and dancing.” Kharim, the son of ‘Umar, pointed out to Muhammad Kiśām they were submissive and obedient to the ‘Arab. Muhammad Kāsım laughed at the words and told Kharim, “You shall be made their chief,” and made them dance and play before him. They are called Sāmmās in the Cambridge History of India (p. 500), and are described there as a Rājpūt tribe of Cutch and lower Sind and who ousted the Sūmras. On page 518, it is said that the “Sāmmā Rājpūts of Sind fleeing from that country before the Sūmras, who had superseded them as its rulers, found an asylum with the Chāvada Rājpūts who ruled Cutch.” M. Hidayat Husain has بطلبہ سیمکان in the text-edition.

2 Firishtah inserts an account of Nūsar-ud-din Qubācha before giving an account of the Sēmmas. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 413-421) also devotes some nine pages to the reign of Naseer-ud-Deen Kubbacha.

3 He is called Unar in the Tārikhu-s-Sind (Elliot, vol. 1, p. 224) and in the Imperial Gazetteer (vol. XXII, p. 396) and is described “as a Muhammadan with a Hindu name, a fact which seems argue recent conversion.” The Tārikhu-s-Sind gives an account of the conquest of Siwistān or Siwān by him. He is called جام افراء in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 423) calls him Jam Afra. جام آفراء Jām Ānar in the text-edition.

4 The Tārikhu-s-Sind and the Imperial Gazetteer and Firishtah call him Jām Junā. In his reign Bhakkar was rested from the Turks or Arabs. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 423) calls him Jam Choban. In the text-edition the heading دکر حکومت جان جونان is.

5 There are differences in the readings here. One MS. has بحکومت و مامت بحاکم و مامت بیا والدہ, the other has بحکومت و مامت بیا والدہ while the lith. ed. has
vested with the rule and chieftainship of the country of Sind. In the time of his greatness the buds of the desire and hopes of the people blossomed. The period of his rule was fourteen years.

AN ACCOUNT OF Jâm Malitha, son of Jâm Ānār.

When Jâm Jūnān passed away Jâm Malitha rose to demand the inheritance of his father’s dominions and made the people combine with him. And Sultān Firūz Shāh came repeatedly to the country of Sind with his army, and the above-named Jâm arranging his troops in the field of battle attempted to withstand him. But at last, on the third occasion, the country passed into the possession of his servants. Sultān Firūz Shāh took the Jâm with him to Dehli; and as the latter performed praiseworthy services, the Sultān conferred many favours on him, gave him the (royal) umbrella, and again entrusted the government of the country of Sind to him, and granted him permission to return there. The particulars of these transactions have been written in the section about (the Sultāns of) Dehli.

The total period of his rule was fifteen years.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF Jâm Tamāchī.

After the death of his brother he sat on the bed (Chahār bālish, i.e., a raised bed with four bolsters round it) of rule and carried out

\*\* \*\* \*\* 

I think the last is the best reading, and this is followed in the text.

1 The name is Jâm Malitha in one MS. and Malitha in the other, and Malīmīn in the lith. ed. Finishta calls him Jâm Jūnān. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 423) has Jam Bany. Neither Tārikhu-s-Sind nor the Imperial Gazetteer includes him in the list of the Jāms. Both make Jâm Tamāchī succeed Jâm Jūnān. In the text it is mentioned that Jâm Bany Bin Jâm Ānār.

2 One MS. substitutes گربه bātanajrād ḥawadist hāmān in place of گربه گربه hāmarād ḥawadist hāmān which is in the other and in the lith. ed.

See page 247 of vol. I of the English translation.

3 The name is Jâm Tamāchī in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is Jâm Tamājī in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Finishta. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 424) has Jam Timmajy. The Tārikhu-s-Sind and the Imperial Gazetteer make him the successor of Jâm Jūnān. The former (Elliot, vol. I, p. 225) says that the troops of 'Alāū-d-din took him prisoner and carried him with his family to Dehli.
the work of government for some time. He passed away after ruling for thirteen years and some months.

1 Jām Šalāḥ-ud-dīn.

He was vested with the duties of government after the death of Jām Tamāchī, and passed away after eleven years and some months.

2 Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, son of Šalāḥ-ud-dīn.

After the death of his father, he became the successor of the latter; and the great men and nobles of the country of Sind were pleased with his rule and chieftainship. He enjoyed the pleasures and delights of this great position for two years and some months.

3 Jām ‘Alī Shēr.

After the death of Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, ‘Alī Shēr, claiming the dominion of his father, Jām Tamāchī, rose up and made the great men of the kingdom, and the chiefs of his tribe join and unite with him.

After his death his son Malik Khairu-ud-dīn who had been taken to Dehlī returned to Sind and assumed the government. The Imperial Gazetteer (p. 396) says it was Firoz Tughlaq who retook Bhakkar and carried Tamāchī and his son Khair-ud-dīn as prisoners to Dehlī. After Tamāchī’s death, Khair-ud-dīn was released and was allowed to assume the government of Sind.

According to the Tārikhu-s-Sīnd, Jām Khairu-d-dīn was succeeded by Jām Bābāniya. He was defeated by Sultān Firoz (Shāh Tughlaq), and was taken captive to Dehlī, but was afterwards reinstated to the government of Sind. The Imperial Gazetteer does not give a list of the Jāms after Khair-ud-dīn, but only mentions Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, better known as Jām Nanda who was the most powerful ruler of the dynasty. Jām Tamājī in the text-edition.

1 The MSS. have only Jām Šalāḥ-ud-dīn. But the lith. ed. has: An account of the government of Šalāḥ-ud-dīn.

2 The MSS. have only “Jām Nizām-ud-dīn” but the lith. ed. has: An account of the government of Nizām-ud-dīn, son of Šalāḥ-ud-dīn, and this has been followed in the text-edition.

3 Both MSS. have the heading I have in the text. The lith. ed., however, has: An account of the rule of Jām ‘Alī Shēr. According to Tārikhu-s-Sīnd (Elliot, vol. I, p. 228) he was murdered by men headed by Sikandar Karan and Fatah Khān, sons of Tamāchī. In the text-edition the title is ذكر حكومتJām ‘Alī Shēr.

4 One MS. inserts بطلب ملك پدر خود, before امرا را بعفویدوار و موانعی ساخته.
Owing to this union the different sections of the people enjoyed the peace in (seats of) safety, during the time of his rule. He passed away after ruling for six years and some months.

1 Jām Karn, son of Jām Tamāchī.

When Jām ‘Alī Shēr drank what was left at the bottom of the brimming goblet of death, Jām Karn, imagining that when a man’s father was the king and ruler of a country he should, also, even without the help and favour of providence, attain to that greatness, sat with audacity on the seat of the great. But as time does not tolerate such acts, after a day and a half it poured a draught of failure and death into his throat.

2 Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān.

As the country remained vacant and unoccupied by the person of a ruler, the great men of the tribe and the nobles of the kingdom made Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, who possessed the necessary skill for that high office, the ruler of the country. He died of natural death after having occupied this noble position for fifteen years and some months.

---

1 The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. But one MS. has Karān instead of Karn. The lith. ed. prefixes گرام کون ذکر حکومت before جام کون ذکر حکومت. According to the Tārikhu-s-Sind (Elliott, vol. I, pp. 228, 229) he was displeased with the nobles and the great men of the city, ........................ to slay some, and confine the rest. On the day that he ascended the throne, or the day after, he held a public court, and summoned all men great and small to attend. He addressed them in conciliatory terms. Dinner was served, and after its conclusion he arose to retire to his chamber, when a party of men who had been employed for the purpose, met him at the door of his room and cut him to pieces. In the text-edition ذکر حکومت is added before the heading as given above.

2 The heading in the MSS. is what I have it in the text, but one MS. omits the word Khān after Sikandar. The lith. ed. prefixes یکر before Jām and also omits خان after Sikhān. The Tārikhu-s-Sind (Elliott, vol. I, p. 229) says that it was in Jām Fath Kān’s time that Mīrzā Pir Muhammad, grandson of Timūr, seized the towns of Mūlān and Uch. It also relates that one Saiyīd Abī-1 Lāʿās interceded with Mīrzā Pir Muhammad for the people. Here again ذکر حکومت is added before the heading in the text-edition.
1 Jām Tughlaq, son of Sikandar Khān.

When Jām Fath Khān passed away, Jām Tughlaq his brother was invested with the duties of government; and after twenty-eight years accepted (the summons of) death.

2 Jām Mubārak.

When Jām Tughlaq was overtaken by that which is unavoidable, Jām Mubārak who was one of his relations, and to whom the office of his usher or chamberlain appertained, considering himself to be fit and deserving of that noble office, sat on the seat of the great; but he was not allowed to hold it for more than three years.

3 Jām Iskandar, son of Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān.

When the field of the minds (of men) was purified of the dust of the rule of Jām Mubārak, the great men of the country of Sind raised

1 According to the Tārikhu-ṣ-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 230) Jām Sikandar succeeded Jām Tughlik, but he was young in years, and his uncles whom his father had appointed to be the rulers of Siwistān and Bhakkar refused to obey him and quarrelled. Sikandar left Thatta and proceeded towards Bhakkar, when Mubārak, who had been chamberlain in the time of Tughlik, suddenly came into Thatta, and seized the throne; but his rule lasted only for three days, and Sikandar was sent for and reinstated on the throne. As in the case of the last reign ہکومت is again added in the heading in the text-edition.

2 The heading in the text-edition is ہکومت جام مبارک and not only ہکومت.

3 One MS. has بِردن ضاری while the other has نردن ضاری and the lith. ed. has نرجه داری. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has نرده داری. I have adopted نردن ضاری.

4 According to the Tārikhu-ṣ-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 230) Iskandar or Sikandar was succeeded by a man of the name of "Rāf Dan" who had lived in Kachh, and "had a considerable body of tried men to whom he paid great attention." After Sikandar's death he came with his followers to Thatta; and although he disclaimed all desire for the throne, he was selected. In the course of a year and a half he conquered much territory. After he had reigned for eight years and a half Sanjar, one of his attendants, gave him poison in his drink; and on his death after three days Sanjar became Jām (p. 231). The latter was a handsome youngman, and he was on friendly terms with an excellent dārūṣeh, through whose prayers he became Jām. The country was very
Jām Iskandar, who in addition to the rights of inheritance possessed the qualifications for the government of the empire, to be the ruler (of the country). He passed away after performing the duties of the government for one year and six months.

13 JĀM SANJAR.

When Jām Iskandar after partaking of worldly pleasures passed away to his appointed place (i.e., died), the chief men of Sind selected Jām Sanjar, who at that time was occupied in the performance of the duties of the government, to be their chief. He accepted the summons of death, after having been engaged with the performance of the work of government for eight years and some months.

"JĀM NĪZĀM-UD-DĪN, WHO IS KNOWN AS JĀM NANDĀ.

After Jām Sanjar, Jām Nīzām-ud-dīn who is known as Jām Nandā, occupied himself with the performance of the duties of the government. In his reign the country of Sind acquired new grandeur. He was contemporaneous with Sulṭān Husain Lankāh ruler of Multān.

1 In his time also in the year 899 A.H., Shāh Bēg came from Qandahār, and having conquered the fort of Sēwī, which was in the charge of Bahādur Khān the Jām’s agent, returned to Qandahār, leaving his younger brother Sulṭān Muḥammad there. Jām Nandā sent Mubārak Khān to attack Sulṭān Muḥammad, and the latter being killed in the battle which ensued, Sēwī again came into the Jām’s possession. On hearing this news, Shāh Bēg sent Mīrzā ‘Īsā Tarkhān to avenge the death of his brother. Mīrzā ‘Īsā fought with the Jām’s army, and defeated it. After that Shāh Bēg also arrived there and took possession of the fort of 2 Bhakkar, by the capitulation of 3 Qādī Qādan, the agent prosperous in his time. He improved the judicial administration by increasing the pay of the Kāzīs, who had before been badly paid; and used to take money from both plaintiffs and defendants of suits they tried (p. 232). In the text-edition there is 4 زذكر حكومت before the heading of this Jām also.

1 The account of Shāh Bēg’s invasion given in the Tārikhu-s-Sind (Elliot, vol. I, p. 234) differs materially from that in the Tabaqāt, according to the former it was altogether unsuccessful, but Firishtah agrees with the Tabaqāt.

2 The name of the Bhakkar fort in the text-edition is given as بکر.

3 The name is Qādī Qādan in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah, but it is Qādī Dādan in both MSS. of the Tabaqāt. A Kāzī Kāzim is mentioned.
of the Jâm, and left it in charge of Fâdil Bêg Kökaltâsh. At that
time the fort of Bhakkar was not so strong as it is now. He also
seized the fort of Siwhân, and making it over to Khwâjâh Bâqî
Bêg returned to Qandahâr. Jâm Nandâ repeatedly sent armies to
recover possession of Sêwî; but it was of no avail.

Jâm Nandâ, who had ruled for sixty-two years, now passed away.

1 AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF Jâm Fîrûz.

Jâm Fîrûz the son of Nîzâm-ud-dîn succeeded his father, and
the duties of the vazârat became vested in Daryâ Khân, who was one
of his near relations, and he acquired all power. Jâm Salâh-ud-dîn,
who was a relation of Jâm Fîrûz, and considered himself to be the

on page 310 of Elliot, vol. 1, as a most distinguished scholar by whose strenuous
exertions the outrages which were being committed by order of Shâh Bêg’s
soldiers on their entry into Thatta were put an end to. If this be the correct
name it would be written according to the rules of transliteration now followed
as Qâdi Qâzim.

1 Neither of the MSS. has the heading giving the name of Jâm Fîrûz;
but after گرضش and goes on as یسیار او جام نیرووز. The lith. ed. has usual
heading of ذکر حکومت جام نیرووز. I have followed the heading in the lith.
ed. according to the Târikhu-s-Sind (Elliot, vol. 1, pp. 234, 235). Jâm Firoz was
of tender years, and Salâhu-d-dîn, who was the son of Jâm Sanjar’s daughter,
had pretensions to the throne; but Daryâ Khân and Sârang Khân, who were
powerful slaves of Jâm Nizâmu-d-dîn, placed Jâm Firoz on the throne, with the
consent of the nobles and the head men of Thatta. After Salâhu-d-dîn had gone
to Guzrât, Jâm Firoz gave himself up to low pleasures; and Daryâ Khân retired
in disgust to his jagîr. The nobles being on the verge of ruin, owing to Jâm
Firoz’s dissipation, sent a messenger to summon Salâhu-d-dîn. He came and
Jâm Firoz’s followers led the latter out of the city on one side, while Jâm
Salâhu-d-dîn entered it on the other. Then Jâm Firoz’s mother took the latter
to Daryâ Khân and he was induced to collect troops, and to advance to attack
Salâhu-d-dîn. The latter wanted to go out, and meet the enemy; but his vazîr
Hâjî told him not to do so, and himself went up. He defeated Daryâ Khân’s
troops; and sent a messenger to inform Salâhu-d-dîn of the victory. The
messenger was intercepted by Daryâ Khân, who substituted a letter, which
purported to come from the vazîr, and in which Salâhu-d-dîn was informed that
his army had been defeated, and he must leave Thatta at once with his family.
He did so, and Daryâ Khân took Jâm Firoz to Thatta where he reigned securely
for some years, until the end of 916 A.H. (1511 A.D.) when Shâh Bêg Arghân
invaded Sind. A foot-note says that 916 A.H., is a mistake, and 926 A.H.
(1520 A.D.) is the correct year.
heir to the kingdom, commenced hostilities and warfare; but as he could not effect anything, he fled to Gujrat, and prayed Sulṭān Mużaffar Gujratī for help. As the wife of Sulṭān Mużaffar was the daughter of the uncle of Jām Šalāḥ-ud-dīn, he extended the hand of his support, and spread the wing of his affection over his head; and sending a considerable army with him, gave him leave to go to Thatha. As Daryā Kḥān, who was all-powerful and on whom everything depended, had now combined with Jām Šalāḥ-ud-dīn, the country of Sind came into the latter's possession without any dispute or fighting. Jām Firūz betook himself to a corner, hoping for the blowing of the breeze of prosperity, and waiting for the rising of the star of good fortune. In the end Daryā Kḥān, who had the reins of power of the kingdom in his hands, summoned Jām Firūz, and raised him to the chieftainship.

Jām Šalāḥ-ud-dīn, scratching the back of his head, went again to Gujrat. Sulṭān Mużaffar again made preparations to help him, and 1 in the year 920 A.H., sent him to Sind; and he turned Jām Firūz 2 Khwajahdār out of Sind and himself took possession of the country. Jām Firūz had necessarily then to seek for help from 3 Shāhī Bēg Arghūn. The latter sent his slave, who had the name of Sanbal Kḥān, to help him. He brought Shāhī Bēg’s army with him and had a drawn battle with Jām Šalāḥ-ud-dīn in the neighbourhood of Sihwān; and Jām Šalāḥ-ud-dīn and his son Haibat Kḥān were slain in this battle; and the country of Sind again, as at an earlier time, came to the possession of Jām Firūz.

At this time, which was the time of interregnum, Shāh Bēg into whose mind a desire for the conquest of Sind had found its way, and who was watching for an opportunity, marched out from Qandahār, and in the year 927 A.H., took possession of Thatha. The date of the capture of Thatha has been found in the words Kharābī-i-Sind (the ruin of Sind). Daryā Kḥān, who was in charge of Jām Firūz's

---

1 Both MSS. have 928 A.H., but the lith. ed. has 920 A.H. As Shāh Bēg Arghūn invaded Sind in 926 A.H. (see the last part of the preceding note) I think 920 A.H., is the correct year.

2 This word has occurred twice previously, but it has not been possible to find its exact meaning.

3 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Shāhī Bēg, but the other MS. has Shāh Bēg.
government, was put to death. Jáma Firúz being completely helpless abandoned Sind, and sought the protection of Sultán Mużaffar Gujrátí. As at this time Sultán Mużaffar died a natural death, Jáma Firúz again came to Sind; but, as he saw, that he was unable to effect anything, he returned to Gujrát. He gave his daughter in marriage to Sultán Bahádur Gujrátí; and became enlisted among the latter's amírs. The power of the dynasty of the Sèmnas having been cut off, the duties of government now devolved on Sháh Bég.

1 An Account of Sháh Bég Arqún.

2 This Sháh Bég was the son of Mir Dhuálnún Bég, who was the Amir-ul-umará (chief nobleman) and sipásálar (commander-in-chief) of Sultán Mirzá, and atáliq (guardian) of the son, Badi'-uz-zamán Mirzá. From before (the time of) Sultán Husain Mirzá he held the government of Qandaháí. 3 Amir Dhuálnún Bég was slain in the battle with 4 Sháhí Bég Üzbak, who was at war with the sons of Sultán Husain Mirzá. 5 The government of Qandaháí descended to his son

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other the word Arqún is omitted. In the lith. ed. it is ذكر حكومت شا بیگ.

2 For a detailed history of Sháh Bég, and his father Amir Zú-n Nún, see the Turkhán-náma (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 303-312). The Cambridge History of India, (p. 501) only gives the years of Sháh Bég's invasion of Sind, and of his death.

3 The name is ذوالنون بیگ in this passage in both MSS., but the prefix Mir is omitted in the lith. ed. As he is generally called Amir Zú-n Nun Beg in the Turkhán-náma and other histories, I have changed the Mir to Amir. In the text-edition, however, میر is retained.

4 The name is incorrectly written as Sháhí Bég Üzbak in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has, somewhat more correctly, سبیل خان اوزیک. The name in the Turkhán-náma (Elliot, vol. I, p. 304) is Muhammad Khán Shaibání Uzbek.

5 As a matter of fact, according to the Turkhán-náma (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 306-309) Sháh Beg who succeeded his father in 913 A.H. found his position in Kandaháí precarious in 915 A.H., owing to his being threatened on one side by Sháh Isma'il the second, who had conquered Khurásán, and on the other by Bábáar, who had seized Kábul, and had determined to seize the Siwi territory as a future asylum. Accordingly in 917 A.H., he defeated Sultán Purdíl Birlás, who ruled there, and took possession of Siwi, and left a garrison there under
Shāh Bēg, who became his successor, and having conquered the greater part of the country of Sind, gained great power.

1 He had great literary accomplishment also; and he wrote a commentary on the ‘Aqīd-ī-Nasafi, and a commentary on the Kāfīā and a Hāshīa (super-commentary) on the Maṭāli‘-i-Mantiq, and was also a man of pure morals. In the lines (of battle), he always advanced in front of every one, and although people forbade him from doing so and said, “This kind of reckless bravery is not right for a leader,” it had no effect. He always said, “At such a time I lose all control over myself, and it comes into my mind that no one should stand in front of me.” 3 He died in the year 930 A.H., and his son Shāh Ḥusain took his place.

Mizār Tārīkh. In 919 A.H., Bābar again invaded Kandahār, but went back to Kābul without conquering it. Shāh Beg did not, however, consider his position to be safe there, and resolved to conquer Sind. Bābar invaded Kandahār again in 921 and 922 A.H.: and Shāh Beg, wearied by these repeated invasions, made over Kandahār to Bābar by an amicable settlement. After that he passed two years in Shāh and Siwi in great penury and distress; but in 924 A.H., he invaded Sind; and after defeating Dāryā Khān in a great battle occupied Thatta.

1 There is nothing about Shāh Beg Arghūn’s literary works in the extract from the Tarkhān-nāma as given in Elliot.


The Hāshīa bar Maṭali‘ Mantiq is a super-commentary on the commentary of Maṭāli‘-al-Anwār. The first part of the work deals with logic. The author of the Maṭāli‘ was Maḥmūd bin Abī Bakr-Al-‘Urnavi, who died in 682 A.H., 1283 A.D. (vide Brockleman, vol. I, p. 467).

The Sharḥ bar Kāfīa is a commentary on Ibn Ḥajib’s well-known work on syntax called Kāfīa. The full name of Ibn Ḥajib was ‘Uṯmān bin ‘Umar, who died in 646 A.H., 1248 A.D. (vide Brockleman, vol. I, p. 303).

3 The year is 930 in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India (p. 501) agrees with this date and gives 1524 A.D., as the year of Shāh Beg’s death. The Tarkhān-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, p. 312) however, says that he died in Shab‘ān 928 A.H. (June, 1522) Shahr Shābān is given in it as the chronogram of his death. The Imperial Gazetter (vol. XXII, p. 397) has 1522 as the year of Shāh Beg’s death, and agrees with the Tarkhān-nāma.
THE RULERS OF SIND

1 AN ACCOUNT OF SHĀH ḤUSAIN.

2 When Shāh Ḥusain succeeded his father, (he) acquired many followers and much power; he went and attacked Sultān Māhmūd the ruler of Multān, and took possession of that territory from him, and having now gained complete and undoubted possession of the

---

1 There are slight differences in the heading. One MS. has the heading as I have it in the text. The other prefixes Mirzā before Shāh Husain. The lith. ed. as usual inserts the word Ḥakīmat before Shāh Ḥusain.

2 The Tarkhān-nāma (Elliot, vol. 1, pp. 313–323) gives a much longer account of the rule of Shāh Husain Arghūn. In the first place he marched against Thatta where Shāh Beg had appointed Jām Firoz to be the governor. The latter on hearing of Shāh Beg’s death assumed a hostile attitude, but on Shāh Husain marching against him, he fled to Kach, whence he returned with a large following. The force, however, was destroyed with great slaughter. In 931 A.H., he advanced against Uch, and on arriving near it he defeated the Multān army which met him there, and seized Uch. Sultān Muhammad Langā (he is however called Sultān Māhmūd further on) collected a large army. Shāh Husain remained on the bank of the Ghāra awaiting an attack. At this time the Sultān was poisoned by his son-in-law Shaikh Shuja’ Bukhārī, who was detected in an intrigue in the royal harem. The Langāhs placed Sultān Māhmūd’s son on the vacant throne, and sent a holy man to negotiate for a peace, and a peace was effected. But one Langar Khān came and asked Shāh Husain to capture the city; and the latter then laid close siege to the fort. At length a great scarcity took place in the city; and after some time it was captured. Mirzā Shāh Husain then passed fifteen years in peace and tranquillity. Then Humāyūn came to Sind in 949 A.H., fleeing before Shīr Khān Afghān. He wrote to Shāh Husain reminding him of the ties of amity and friendship between him and the emperor Bābār. Shāh Husain wrote to him that if he wanted to conquer Gujarāt, he would accompany him with his whole army in the expedition. Shāh Husain wanted to present himself before Humāyūn, but the Arghūns nobles dissuaded him; and Humāyūn unsuccessfully besieged Siwistān or Shhwān for seven months, after which he went away towards Jodpur on the invitation of Rājā Māldeo. After the birth of Akbar, he had again to return to Sind and took up his residence in the neighbourhood of the town of Jūn. Then after some fighting with Shāh Husain’s army he determined to march to Kandahār.

Towards the end of his life, Shāh Husain appears to have been attacked by a fatal sickness. The Arghūns and Tarkhāns then combined against him; and chose Mirzā ‘Isā Tarkhān governor of Fath Bāgh as their leader. A sort of civil war followed, in the midst of which Mirzā Shāh Husain became very ill. After further negotiations Shāh Husain made Mirzā Sālīh, the second
whole of Sind, he became very powerful. He also rebuilt the fort of Bhakkar, and also built a fort of Sihwân; and having occupied himself with the work of government for thirty-two years passed away in the 1 year 962 A.H.

2 An account of Mirza 'Isâ Tarkhân.

3 Sultan Mahmûd and Mirza 'Isâ Tarkhân ruled at Bhakkar and Thatha respectively, independently of each other. There was sometimes peace and sometimes war between them. Mirza 'Isâ ruled for a period of thirteen years, and passed away in the year 975 A.H.

son of Mirza 'Isâ, the governor of Thatta; and returned towards Bhakkar and died on the way on the 12th Rabi‘u-l-Awwal A.H. 961.

1 The year is 962 A.H., in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqât, Firishtah lith. ed. also has 962 A.H.; but as will be seen from the preceding note, the Tarkhân-nâma has 961 A.H., 1554 A.D. The Cambridge History of India (p. 502) gives 1556 as the year of Shâh Husein's death.

2 The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. The lith. ed. has Hukûmat before 'Isâ, and omits Tarkhân after it.

3 Firishtah's account agrees with that in the text; and he very candidly admits that he does not know how the government was transferred from the Arghûns to the Tarkhân.

The Tarkhân-nâma (Eliot, vol. I, pp. 323-336) says, that Mirza 'Isâ Tarkhân appointed Mirza Sâlih his second son to be his successor, and made the government over to him, and only retained the name of king. Mirza Sâlih soon after marched against Siwistân; and wrested it from Mahmûd Khân Bhakkar. After that Mirza 'Isâ Tarkhân led a large force to conquer Bhakkar, but peace was affected, Bhakkar being led to Mahmûd Khân, while he surrendered Siwistân to Mirza 'Isâ. After that Mirza Muhammad Bâki, 'Isâ Tarkhân's eldest son, rebelled against him. He was defeated, but afterwards a reconciliation was effected and Mirza Muhammad Bâki was sent to Bhakkar. In 970 Mirza Sâlih was assassinated by a Bulûch named Murid. Mirza 'Isâ then nominated Mirza Jân Bâbâ, his third son, as the heir apparent. People interested themselves in favour of Mirza Muhammad Bâki, who was then granted Siwistân as a jagir. Some of the Arghûns then rebelled against Mirza 'Isâ, but they were defeated, and fled to Bhakkar for succour. They were helped by Mahmûd Khân, and besieged Siwistân. Mirza 'Isâ advanced from Thatta, and defeated the rebels, and their allies, Mahmûd Khân's men; and at last a peace was affected. Mirza 'Isâ died in 974, after reigning for fourteen years; and Mirza Bâki succeeded him, through the help of Mâh Begam, although Mirza 'Isâ had nominated Mirza Jân Bâbâ as his heir.
1 An account of Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqī, son of Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān.

His (Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān's) eldest son Muḥammad Bāqī Khān, by virtue of his rectitude, and of the number of his followers, defeated his younger brother Jān Bābā, and took the place of his father. In the manner of the latter, he sometimes had peace and

---

1 The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other the word Mirzā is left out before the name of Muḥammad Bāqī. In the lith. ed. the word Ḥakāmat is inserted after Dhikr and the word Khān after Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqī; and the words بِنِي مِرْضَى مَهْسُو تَرَ خَان are omitted. The extracts from the Tarkhān-nāma (Elliot, vol. I, p. 326) ends with the account of Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān; and there is no account of the succeeding Tarkhāns in that volume. The Tārikh-i-Tābīrī (Elliot, vol. I, pp. 282-284) contains an account of Mirzā Muhammad Bākti Tarkhān sending his daughter Sindī Begam to Akbar, and the latter's returning her.

2 Firishtah's account is somewhat similar but he omits the word رشید. For the circumstances under which Mirzā Bāqī succeeded Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān as told in the Tarkhān-nāma, see the latter part of note 1 above. The name of Jān Bābā is written as Khān Bābā in one MS. and in the lith. ed. and as Hān Bābā in the other MS. The Cambridge History of India (p. 502) says that Mirzā Muhammad Bāqī crushed the revolt of his younger brother.

---

3 One MS. inserts here:

خُرَابِيْن جَعَن سَاَحَنَهُ بِمِنْ فَوْت كَشْيِد سِيَالَان اَكْتُرُ سَرُدَارَان أَرْوَيْنَ كَ كَوْذُم أُسْتَقَالَ مَبَرَدِدَن عَاَلَ سَاَحَنَهُ بِنْبَرَ بَكْرَيْنَ - وَقَلِيِبْيْكَ إِزَان تَنْكَلَّ لِثَارٍ نَمْوَة بَوْدَدٌ مَفْتَرَق شَدَة سَرِدِ بَيْنَ كَذَاتَهُ بِعَضْي نَزَدِ مُحَمَّدَ خَان بِهِ بَكْرَ زَنَدَدٌ - وَجَمِيْعَ جَعَنَهُ بَعْجَرَات نَزَدَ رَاحِيْمَ كَجَمْهُ نَوْكَر شَنَدَدَ - وَإِبْنَاتَ خُرَابِيْن نَحَرُدُ إِخْرَجَ مَحْيَاء بِبِهِ مَسْمَعَ بِسَرَكَر خَوَرْد را بِبَرَدَم إِراَزَل وَكَمْ أَصَلْ سِرِدْنَ - وَهُجَا بِبَرَدَ وَأَكْبَرْ بُوْدَ مَهَّر را بِبَغَذَ وَمَكْرِ بَقْطَل بِبِهِ مَسْمَعَدْ - كَفَّانِجَهُ مَبَرَدِدُ الرَّهْمَانْ را بَقْطَل رَسَمَيْن وَشُيِّبَ فَرَعَ وَرَلَّدْ را بِبَهَدَد كَشْتَ - صَلَبَتَ وَبِدْخَرْيَن بَدْرَجِه دَاَشَت كَدَ مُهْيِكْس حَرَف رَأَسَ بَارَ نَيْنَ كَفَتَ - جَان بَبَا بَرَادَر خَوَرْد را قَسَم كَلَم مُجَجَّد عَلِيْهِ مَرْ ضَرَد عَلَى رَا كَ كَ اَجْلَيْلَتَ أَكْبَرْ اَنْدَر بَوْد، درْيِدَانَ أَوْرَهُدَ نُرذَوَر أَوْرَدَ نُسَسْتَؤَهُ سَاَحَنَ - أَخَرَ حُيْبَ أَوْلَدَنَ خَوَرْد را نَيْنَ دَرَشَيْن بَكْشَتَ i.e., having much treasure, he made most of the Arghun mirdârs, who affected to be his rivals and equals, careless at a banquet, slew them with a merciless sword; and the few who escaped from the fatal meeting, dispersed and betook themselves to the jungles. Some of them went to Mahmûd Khân at Bhakkar, and a number of them fled and entered the service of the Râja of Kachh in Gujarât.
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was sometimes at war with Sultan Mahmud. He ruled for a period of eighteen years, and then passed away from the world in the 1 year 993 A.H., and the duties of the government devolved on Mirza Jani Beg.

**An Account of Mirza Jani Beg.**

2 After Muhammad Baqi, the government became vested in Mirza Jani Beg; and in the year 1001 A.H. he became enlisted among the servants of the threshold; and the country of Sind was added to the countries occupied (by Akbar).

3 **An Account of Sultan Mahmud.**

Sultan Mahmud, the ruler of Bhakkar, sat on the masnad of rule for twenty years. He was insane and a shedder of blood. Whenever

Owing to the bad luck, which follows the shedding of unrighteous blood, he in the latter part of his life, suffered from melancholia, and (often) talked nonsense and entrusted great appointments in his government to base men and men of low origin. Wherever there were noble and great men, he had them all put to death by deceit and treachery. For instance, he had Mirza ‘Abd-ur-Rahman executed, and slew Shaikh ‘Abd-ul-wahab with the unrighteous sword. He had such rigour and evil nature that no one spoke (or dared to speak) the truth to him. He summoned his brother Jani Baba, under an oath on the sacred word (the Quran), and bringing Mir Sayyid ‘Ali, who was one of the nobles and great men of the country, between them, kept him in fear of death for nights and days. At last his insanity becoming very severe, he one might killed himself.

There are some slight verbal mistakes in the above passage, but it appears to contain some facts about Mirza Baqi, which are correct and which do not appear in the other MS. or in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat or in Firishtah. I have, accordingly, thought it fit to transcribe it in a note, though I have not inserted it in the text.

1 Firishtah also gives 993 A.H., and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 440) 993 A.H., 1584 A.D. as the year of his death. The Cambridge History of India (p. 502) says, he committed suicide in 1585 A.D., in a fit of insanity. His son Mirza Piyanda Muhammad Tarkhan was also insane, and so the succession passed to his son Mirza Jani Beg Tarkhan.

2 He was the grandson of Mirza Muhammad Baqi Tarkhan. The final conquest of Sind by Khan Khansan ‘Abd-ur-Rahim Khan, and its inclusion in Akbar’s dominion have been described in the history of Akbar’s reign.

3 One MS. has no heading. The other MS. has only the word Sultan Mahmud. I have adopted the heading in the lith. ed. but have omitted the word Ruksamat. In the text-edition the account of Sultan Mahmud forms a part of the description of the reign of Mirza Jani Beg.
he had the least suspicion of anybody, he at once put him to death. He kept the roads of Sind 1 closed from all sides.

SECTION XI. 2 AN ACCOUNT OF THE DYNASTY OF THE SULTANS OF MULTAN.

Let it not remain concealed that the affairs of the country of Multàn have not been written in any history from the date of the introduction of Islam, which resulted from the exertions of Muhammad Qasim in the time of Hājjaj, son of Yūsuf. When Sultan Mahmūd Ghaznavi took it out of the possession of the Mulūḥids (heretics), it remained for a long time in the possession of his descendants. When the power of the Ghaznavids became enfeebled, the country of Multàn again fell into the possession of the Qārāmījah sect. Then from 3 the time, when it came into the possession of Sultan Mu'izz-ud-dīn Muhammad Sām, till the year 847 A.H., it remained in the custody and possession of the Sultans of Delhi. From that year, when there were rulers of different tribes in various parts of India, the rulers of Multàn also began to act as independent rulers and Multàn went out of the possession of the Sultans of Delhi; and a number of these rulers ruled in succession.

Shaikh Yūsuf about two years.

Sultan 4 Qutb-ud-dīn, sixteen years.

1 Firdūstah relates, as in fact is mentioned in the history of the reign of Akbar, that Muḥibb 'Ali Kḥān conquered the whole territory except the fort of Bhakkar. After that Sultan Mahmūd sent a petition to Akbar that he would surrender the fort to anyone, except Muḥibb 'Ali Kḥān, whom he might send. Akbar accordingly sent Gisū Kḥān, but before he arrived, Sultan Mahmūd died; and Gisū Kḥān took possession of the fort without any opposition in the year 982 A.H.

2 The heading in the MSS. is طبقہ حکام ملتان and طبقہ سلطان ملتان. The lith. ed. has ذکر سلطان طبقہ ملتان. I have kept the heading in the lith. ed. as the rulers are called Sultans in the MSS. also. In the text-edition the heading is ذکر طبقہ سلطان ملتان.

3 I have adopted the reading of the MSS.; but the lith. ed. has از سنہ اہدی و سبعین و خمسائیم i.e., from the year 571 A.H., instead of از زمان.

4 One MS. has Lankān after the name of Qutb-ud-dīn, but neither the other MS. nor the lith. ed. has it.
Sultān Ḥusain, according to one statement thirty-four years, and according to another statement thirty-six years.

2 Sultān Firūz, the period of his rule is not known.

3 Sultān Maḥmūd bin Sultān Firūz bin Sultān Ḥusain, twenty-seven years.

4 Sultān Ḥusain, the period of his rule is not known. According to one statement it was one year and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SHAIKH YŪSUF.

When in the year 847 A.H., the turn of the rule of the empire of Dehli came to Sultān 'Alā-ud-din, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Farid Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, son of Khādir Kān, the work of government and the affairs of the empire fell into disorder; and in the country of India the chiefs of (different) tribes or bands came into existence. The country of Multān remained without a ruler owing to a succession of onsets of the wrath of the Mughals. As the greatness of the noble family of the Shaikh-ut-Ṭariqa (the Shaikh of the path of truth) Shaikh Bahā'-ud-din Zakariyā Multāni, may the Great God sanctify his soul! had made such an impression on the hearts of the residents of Multān and of the zamīndārs (petty chiefs), that nothing greater than it can be imagined, all the people high and low, and all

1 One MS. has 34 years; but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have what I have in the text.

2 This name occurs in one MS. only but not in the other or in the lith. ed.

3 The heading I have in the text is in one MS. In the other MS. it is Sultān Maḥmūd 27 years; while the lith. ed. has Sultān Maḥmūd 27 years and some months. Probably there was only one Sultān Maḥmūd. There is considerable divergence in the lists of the Sultāns of Multān given in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. has Shaikh Yūsuf, Sultān Qutb-ud-din, Sultān Husain, Sultān Maḥmūd and Sultān Firūz. The other MS. has the first four names, but has Sultān Ḥusain II, instead of Sultān Firūz. The list in the lith. ed. only consists of the first four names. Firuştah has after the first four Firūz Shah, and then Maḥmūd Shāh, then Shāh Ḥusain II. The correct names and the sequence of the rulers will appear in the course of their history.

4 This name occurs in one MS. only.

5 The MSS. have Farid Shāh, and the lith. ed. has Firūz Shāh. Both these are incorrect. Muḥammad Shāh was really the son of Shāhzāda Farid, son of Khādir Kān, and he was adopted by Mubārak Shāh as his son. See page 322, vol. I, of the English translation of this work.
the residents and the inhabitants of that neighbourhood elected Shaikh Yūsuf Zakariyā Quraishi, to whom the superintendence of the Khāqān and the supervision of the surroundings of the sacred tomb of Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariyā appertained, as the ruler of the country; and had public prayers read in his name from the pulpits of Multān and Ḫūcha and some other towns. He then engaged himself in the administration of the government and made a beginning by increasing the number of his retainers and by enlarging his army. He made the hearts of the zamīndārs or petty chieftains attached to him; and gave increased currency and splendour to the government of the country.

It so happened, however, that one day Rāy Sahrah, who was the chief of the tribe of Lanḳiḥs, and to whom the town of Sēwī and that part of the country appertained, sent a message to Shaikh Yūsuf that "As from the time of my ancestors, the relationship of discipleship and belief to your family has remained on a sound basis; and the empire of Dehli is not free from disturbances and disorder; and they say that Malik Bahālūd Lādi has taken possession of Dehli, and has had public prayers read in his name, if His Holiness, the Shaikh would with the utmost promptitude turn his attention to the tribe of the Lanḳiḥs, and consider me among his soldiers, I shall not in every service and expedition, which may take place, consider myself excused from rendering loyal and devoted service, even to the extent of sacrificing my life. Also, at present, in order to strengthen the relationship of being disciple and of devotion and loyalty, I shall give my daughter to you (in marriage), and will accept you as my son-in-law." The Shaikh on hearing these words was delighted in his heart, and took the daughter of Rāy Sahrah in marriage. He (i.e., Rāy Sahrah) sometimes came from Sēwī to Multān to see his daughter and brought fitting presents for the service of the Shaikh. The latter, as a matter of caution, did not allow that Rāy Sahrah should have a mansion in the town of Multān, and therefore, he took up his residence outside the town, and he went alone to see his daughter.

On one occasion, he collected all his men and started for Multān and wanted that with deceit, and the power of trickery and fraud,

---

1 One MS. has instead of مَعْمُود.
2 One MS. has instead of بَرَاءَيْ شِيْمْ مَيْ گُذِرَانِہ.
3 One MS. omits the word دِسْتِنَارِی.
he would seize Shaikh Yusuf and himself become the ruler of Multān. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city he sent the following message to Shaikh Yusuf, "I have this time brought all the Lankāhs with me, so that after inspecting them, you might allot various services to them, according to their qualifications. The simple-minded Shaikh Yusuf had become careless of the fraud of the age and the deceit of the time, and met him with affection and kindness. Rāy Sahrah, after displaying his grandeur and retinue, came one night to see his daughter attended by only a single servant. He had directed that servant to cut the throat of a kid with his knife in some corner of the house and to bring the blood after heating it, and pouring it into a cup. When the servant carried out the order, Rāy Sahrah drank off the cup of blood. After a time he, acting with deceit and trickery, cried out that he had a severe pain in his stomach; and from time to time his groans and lamentations became louder. At about midnight he summoned the vakils (representatives) of Shaikh Yusuf to attend, so that he might give his last directions to them; and in their presence he vomitted blood. In the meantime, in the course of giving his directions, which were mixed with groans and lamentations, he sent for his retainers and adherents, in order to bid them farewell. As the representative of the Shaikh found the condition of Rāy Sahrah so bad (lit. of another kind), they did not at all object to the coming of the Rāy's relatives and adherents. When most of his men had entered the fort, he raised his head from the bed of illness with the intention of seizing the kingdom. He sent his trusted servants, and others who had his confidence to watch and guard all the four gates, so that they would not permit the servants of the Shaikh to come from the outer fort into the city. Then he went to the private apartments of the Shaikh and seized him.

The rule of Shaikh Yusuf lasted for about two years.

**AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QUṬB-UD-DIN LANKĀH.**

When Rāy Sahrah seized the Shaikh, he had the public prayers (read), and the coins (struck) in his own name; and assumed the title of Sultān Quṭb-ud-din. As the people of Multān were satisfied with his government, and rendered allegiance to him; he sent the Shaikh by the gate which was in the north, and near the tomb, which was the
recipient of rays of refulgence of the Shaikh-ul-Islam Shaikh Bahā'ud-dīn Zakariyā, and gave him leave to go to Dehlī; and gave orders that the gate should be blocked up with burnt bricks. They also say, that to this day, which is the year 1002 Hijrī that gate has been kept blocked up. He then raised the standard of sovereignty; and occupied himself with the work of government. When Shaikh Yūsuf arrived at Dehlī, Sultān Bahīlī received him with great courtesy and honour; and united his daughter in the bond of marriage with the son of the Shaikh, who bore the name of Shaikh 'Abd-ullāh and was better known under the name of Shāh 'Abd-ullāh. With his promises he always kept the Shaikh strongly in his heart, and pleased and hopeful. Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn ruled independently in the country of Multān, till, after a long time in the year 865 A.H. he accepted (the summons of) the just God.

The period of the rule of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn was prolonged to sixteen years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ḤUSAIN, SON OF SULTĀN QUTB-UD-DĪN.

When Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn surrendered his borrowed life to the true owner of it (i.e., God), the amirs and the pillars of the state of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, after the ceremonies of mourning, gave the title of Sultān Ḥusain to his eldest son, and had the public prayers read in his name in Multān and the territories surrounding it. And he was

1 The word is in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firıshṭah, مسند فرشتہ in the other MS., and منظور in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. I have adopted the first.

2 In other words, with promises of helping him to regain the possession of Multān. The Cambridge History of India (p. 504) says, that Buhīlī twice set out for Multān, with the object of restoring Shaikh Yūsuf’s power, once in 1452 A.D., and again after 1458 A.D.; but he was compelled to return on the first occasion, by the advance of Mahmūd Shāh of Jaunpur, and on the second by the menacing attitude of Husain Shāh also of Jaunpur.

3 The year is مصطَفٌ in one MS. In the other the space for the year is left blank. In the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt it is 860 A.H., and in the lith. ed. of Firıshṭah it is 874 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 384) has 874 A.H., '1469 A.D. The Cambridge History of India (p. 503) has 861 A.H., 1456 A.D.

4 قطب الدين للكاتب in the text-edition.
extremely able, and always ready (for all emergencies) and worthy of the descent of divine favours. In the days of his rule the status of learning and wisdom became exalted, and learned and wise men found support from him.

In the beginning of his reign he advanced to the fort of Shör. They say, that at that time the fort of Shör was in the possession of Ghazı Saiyid Khân. When the latter heard that Sultân Husain was coming to attack that country, he made his men ready, sallied out of the fort, and advancing ten karōhs engaged Sultân Husain in battle, and after doing justice to his courage and bravery, left the field of battle and turned his face in flight; and without reaching Shör went towards the town of Behrah. The family and the retainers of Ghazı who were in Shör occupied themselves in guarding and strengthening it, and were helping for the arrival of reinforcement from the direction of Behrah and Khânawāl and Khūshāb, which were in the possession of the Saiyid Khânī amīrs. When the siege had lasted for some days, and they became hopeless about the coming of the reinforcements,

---

1 The text appears to me to be incorrect and imperfect here. One MS. has رود الطاف خداوندی برد, the other has رود الطاف خداوندی برد. The lith. ed. has رود الطاف خداوندی برد. Firishtah lith. ed. has in the corresponding passage و سراوار و رود الطاف خداوندی برد. I think the insertion of the words و سراوار is necessary to complete the meaning; and this has been adopted in the text-edition.

2 The name is سحور in the MS., but in one place it looks like شهوغر Shēvur, though later even in that MS. it is Shör, and in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 385) calls it Sheevur. The Cambridge History of India (p. 504) calls it Shorkot. The Imperial Gazetteer also calls the tehsil and the modern town (which are situated in the Jhang district of the Punjāb) Shörkôt; but I doubt whether at the time of Husain Lankāh it was called Shörköt. The name was evidently شهر Shör or Shūr.

3 The name is written as بحر in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and بحر in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 385) has Bheemra. It is بحر in the text-edition.

4 The name is written as جنر in both MSS., and جنر in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has جنر. Col. Briggs does not mention the place. I have adopted Khānāwāl which is the name of a place which on the maps is situated ten or eleven miles to the N.E. of Multān. In the text-edition جنر is adopted throughout.
they prayed for quarter, and surrendered the fort, and went away to Behrah.

Sultān Ḥusain remained for some days in Shōr, in order to attend to matters connected with the country; and then advanced towards Khānāwāl, and Malik Mājhī Khōkhar who, from before Saiyid Khān, was the Superintendent (dārōgha) of that place as a matter of honour endured the hardships of a siege for some days; and then asked for quarter, and surrendering the fort of Khānāwāl, retired to Behrah. Sultān Ḥusain, after regulating the affairs of the country, returned to Multān; and after resting there for some days marched towards the fort of 1 Kōt Karōr; and brought the country near it, as far as the boundary of the fort of Dhanḵōt, into his possession.

As Shaikh Yūsuf had on many occasions complained to Sultān Bahūl of the injuries he had suffered (from Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn), and had prayed for justice, at this time, when Sultān Ḥusain had gone away to the fort of Dhanḵōt, Sultān Bahūl, taking advantage of such an opportunity, sent his son Bārbak Shāh, the circumstances connected with whom have been narrated in the section about Dehlī and Jaunpūr, to conquer Multān; and he also directed Tātār Khān Lūdī to reinforce Bārbak Shāh with the army of the Punjāb. Bārbak Shāh and Tātār Khān marched by successive stages in the direction of Multān. It so happened, that at this time, the brother of Sultān Ḥusain, who was the governor of the fort Kōt Karōr rebelled against him, and assumed the title of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn. Sultān Ḥusain considered the suppression of the disturbance in the fort of Kōt Karōr as of primary importance, and betook himself there on wings of speed. He seized Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn alive, and placing iron shackles on his feet returned towards Multān. At this time his scouts brought him the news, that Bārbak Shāh and Tātār Khān had encamped in the neighbourhood of Multān near the mosque or prayer ground of the 'Īd, which was situated to the north of the city, and were occupied with preparations of materials for seizing the fort and capturing the citadel. Sultān Ḥusain crossed the river Sind in the course of a night, and towards morning entered the fort of Multān.

1 The name is Kōt Karōr and Kōt Karor in the MSS., and Kōt Karor in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has Kōt Karur. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 386) has Kōtur and the Cambridge History of India (p. 504) has Karor.
He collected all his soldiers that very night, and told them, "I cannot hope that you will all be able to strike with your sword (i.e., fight boldly); there are some of you the large number of the members of whose family and their other dependants would interfere with fighting. These men, although they might not be of any use in the matter of actual fighting, yet in other matters such as the guarding of the fort, and increasing the number of the troops, etc. they would be of use." After emphasizing on this matter he said, "Everyone of you, who would strike with his sword should, without any hesitation, go in the morning out of the city, and the remainder of the troops should occupy themselves with guarding the fort." Accordingly ten 1 thousand cavalry and infantry decided to go out (of the fort) to fight.

When the standard of the dawn rose in the east of the horizon, they beat the drum of battle, and, going out of the city, 2 stationed themselves so that they might have the Dehlī army in front of them. Sūltān Ḥusain then ordered all the horsemen to dismount. In the first instance he himself dismounted. Then he ordered that each one of the soldiers should in common concert shoot their arrows at the enemy. When in the first instance twelve thousand arrows leaped at once from the bow strings, great confusion and distress appeared in the enemy’s ranks. On the second shot, they separated themselves from one another; and on the third they turned their faces to the desert of flight; 3 and (the fear of the enemy) had in such a way taken possession of their hearts, that when in the course of their flight, they arrived near the fort of Shōr, they did not at all turn towards it; and they did not draw the bridles of their horses, till

---

1 That is the number in both MSS., but the lith. ed. and Firishtah lith. ed. have twelve thousand; and this number is correct, as will appear a few lines further down.

2 The MSS. are incorrect here. One has Ṣīāla ʿAbbās roōi ḥord dāde and the other has Ṣīāla ʿAbbās ra dī pīsh roōi ḥord dāde. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has Ṣīāla ʿAbbās ra dī pīsh roōi ḥord karte. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted Ṣīāla ʿAbbās ra dī pīsh ḥord karte.

3 Here also the MSS. appear to be defective. They have Ṣīāla ʿAbbās ḥorl dī dī ʾishān dī shamsī jābi gīrneh būd and not Ṣīāla ʿAbbās ḥorl dī dī ʾishān dī shamsī jābi gīrneh būd. Firishtah lith. ed. has Ṣīāla ʿAbbās ḥorl dī dī ʾishān dī shamsī jābi gīrneh būd. Firishtah’s reading conveys the correct meaning.
they arrived near the town of Khānāwāl. From this 1 defeat (or rather victory), the army of Multān acquired much ammunitions of war and power and prestige.

When Bārbak Shāh and Tātār Khān arrived at the fort of Khānāwāl, they induced the thānādārs of Sultan Ḥusain with three hundred other men to come out of the fort by making promises and engagements, but they afterwards treacherously made them food for their swords. Sultan Ḥusain considering this defeat (of his enemies) a great boon, did not allow the intention of recovering Khānāwāl to enter his mind.

At this time Malik Suhrāb Dūdāl, who was the father of Isma'īl Khān and Fath Khān, came from 2 Kach and Mekrān, with their tribesmen and dependants, and joined the service of Sultan Ḥusain. The latter, considering the arrival of Malik Suhrāb a matter of good omen for him, conferred the whole of the country from the fort of Kōt Karör to the fort of Dhankōt on him and his tribesmen as their jāgīrs. After hearing this news many Balūchis (from Balūchistān) came to the service of Sultan Ḥusain; and the numbers of the latter's adherents increased from day to day. Sultan Ḥusain then made over the remainder of the country situated on the bank of the river Sind, which was well cultivated and populous, to other Balūchis in lieu of their service. Gradually the whole country from Sitpūr to Dhankōt was allotted to the Balūchis.

It was also at this time that Jām Bāyazīd and Jām Ibrāhīm, who were the chiefs of the tribe of the 3 Thathwās (?), being angry with Jām Nandā, who was the ruler of the country of Sind, entered the service of the Sultan. The particulars of this comprehensive statement are: that the greater part of the country which is situated between Bhakkar and Thatha appertain to the tribe of Thathwa, who consider themselves to be the descendants of Jamshīd; and this tribe was distinguished above all the other tribes for bravery and

---

1 The word is شکست in the Tabaqāt; and if this word is retained, the word أهدا should be inserted after it. The lith. ed. has شکست انگائیزی after شکست و فتح victory.
2 The name is کمی instead of کمی in the text-edition.
3 The name looks like سیلہ and لبیہ in the MSS., and سیلہ in the lith. de. of Firishtah. In the text-edition سیلہ has been adopted.
management. Jām Nandā, who was of the tribe of 1 Șemmās, also considered himself to be a descendant of Jamshid, and was always hostile to the Thathwa tribe. It so happened that among the chieftains of the Thathwa tribe some differences and enmity took place. Jām Nandā, considering this to be a great blessing, took the side of those who were hostile to Jām Bāyazīd and Jām Ibrāhīm who two were brothers. The latter becoming aggrieved in their hearts with Jām Nandā turned towards Sultān Ḥusain. As the mother of the latter was a sister of Jām Bāyazīd, he welcomed his arrival with respect and honour; and allotted the country of Shōr to Jām Bāyazīd, and that of Ūch to Jām Ibrāhīm, and gave them permission to go to their jāgīrs.

As Jām Bāyazīd was not wanting in the accomplishments of erudition, he always associated with men of learning and wisdom. Whenever he heard of any learned man in that neighbourhood, he offered so much kindness to him that the latter was obliged almost without any power over himself to come to the majlis of Jām Bāyazīd 2 and was never again separated from him. They say that the affection of Jām Bāyazīd for wise and learned men was such that with great earnestness he conferred the appointment of his vezir to Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishi, who was one of the sons of Shaikh Hākim Quraishī, and who had acquired various kinds of learning in Khurāsān although his eyesight had become destroyed; and making over his political affairs to him, passed his own valuable time in the society of learned and wise men. He carried out the divine commandments in such a way that on one occasion when he began to build a house in Shōr, it so happened that a treasure was found there. He withdrew his hands from the possession of it, and sent it whole and intact to Sultān Ḥusain. The latter on account of this act of his had very great faith in him.

When Sultān Bahālūl was united with the Divine mercy, and the term of sovereignty came to Sultān Sikandar, Sultān Ḥusain sent a letter of condolences and congratulations with elegant articles and presents by the hand of ambassadors, and began a policy of peace and

---

1 طینما instead of Șemma in the text-edition.

2 The reading in one MS. is یکست. The other MS. and the lith. ed. of Firshahī have یکست, i.e., he profited by him, which is somewhat sordid, and does not appear to me to be so good.
friendship. As the desire to follow the law of the Prophet and the fear of God were strong in Sultān Sikandar, he agreed to a specific settlement; and it was agreed that the two parties should follow the path of friendliness and attachment, and should be the well-wishers of each other; that the armies of neither should transgress their own frontiers, and whichever of them should be in need of help and assistance, the other should not consider himself excused from granting it. After the treaty had been written, and had been adorned with the signatures of the nobles and the great men of the kingdom, Sultān Sikandar granted robes of honour to the ambassadors, and gave them permission to return.

They also say that Sultān Husain kept up a correspondence with Sultān Mu'azzafar Shāh; and the doors of letters and epistles were opened from both sides. On one occasion Sultān Husain sent a man of the name of Qādī Muḥammad, who was adorned with wisdom and accomplishment, as an ambassador to the court of Sultān Mu'azzafar Gujratī; and he told him, “At the time of obtaining the Sultān’s leave to return you should ask him to send a servant with you so that you might go and see the various palaces of the Sultān.” The object of Sultān Husain in saying this was that he might build a palace in Multān like one of the palaces of the Sultāns of Gujrat. When Qādī Muḥammad arrived in Ahmadābād, and presented the beautiful presents, he, at the time of his taking leave, made the prayer which he had been ordered to make. Sultān Mu'azzafar sent a servant with him, so that he might show all the palaces to him in detail. When Qādī Muḥammad came back to Multān, he, after delivering the letter (he had brought from the Sultān of Gujrat), wanted to describe some of the beauties of the palaces of the Sultāns of Gujrat. He said that the tongue of description is dumb and the foot of its horse is lame; and in a spirit of arrogance said that if the entire revenues of the kingdom of Multān be expended in building one palace, it was not certain whether even that would be completed. Sultān Husain became sorry and sad on hearing this. 1 ‘Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak, who was charged with the duties of the vazīrat, put forward the foot of daring, and said, “May the kingdom last till the day of resurrection!

---

1 It is معاذ الملك بونک in the text edition.
I do not know the reason of your grief." The Sultan said, "The reason of it is this, that people have attributed the name of Bâdshâh to me; and I am destitute of the meaning of Bâdshâhi. And in spite of the fact that I shall rise up with the other Bâdshâhs on the day of resurrection I shall not be their equal." 'Imâd-ul-mulk said, "Let not the heart of the Bâdshâh be pained and grieved on this account; for the great and holy God has distinguished each kingdom by some special excellence which is held in great respect and honour in other kingdoms. Although the kingdoms of Gujrat, Deccan, Mâlwa and Bengâl are very fertile, and the materials of enjoyments are found there in the best possible way, yet the kingdom of Multân produces men; for wherever the great men of Multân went, they were highly respected and honoured. May there be praise and thanks to God! that there are present in Multân some persons belonging to the noble family of the Shaikh-ul-Islâm Shaikh Bahâ-ud-din Zakariyâ, may the mercy of God be on him! who are superior in all noble qualities to Shaikh Yusuf Quraishi, to whose son Sultan Bahlûl has given his daughter in marriage, and whom he holds in great honour. In the same way there are some persons in Ùch and Multân, belonging to the Bukhârî family, who in bodily and mental perfections are superior to His Holiness Häjî 'Abd-ul-wahâb; and among learned men Maulânâ Fath-ul-lah and his pupil Maulânâ 'Azîz-ul-lah have been produced out of the holy earth of Multân. (And these great men are such) that if the entire country of Hindustân were to pride itself on their account, it would not at all be doing what would be called absurd." When 'Imâd-ul-mulk said words like this, the constriction of the heart of the Sultan was changed to expansion.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTÂN FIRÜZ.

When Sultan Husain was overtaken by old age, he in his presence raised his eldest son, who had the name of Firûz Khân on the throne, and gave him the title of Firûz Shâh, and had the public prayers read in his name. He then occupied himself with devotion and the worship of God. The duties of the vâzârat remained confirmed as before on 'Imâd-ul-mulk Tawalak. As Sultan Firûz Khân was inexperienced and the emotion of anger was strong in him and dominated over all his other emotions, and as liberality was also wanting in his nature, he
was always envious of 1 Balāl, son of ʿImād-ul-mulk, who was adorned with wisdom and liberality and other accomplishments. On one occasion he said to one of his slaves, who was in his confidence "Balāl has been embezzling the Bādshāhī property and wants to create a disturbance, and having got men to combine with him wants to usurp the throne. It befits my state that before the disturbance begin, I should take measures to crush it." The misguided slaves intending to murder Balāl waited for an opportunity. It so happened that one day Balāl went out on a boating excursion, and after the evening prayer was about to return to the city. That slave jumped out of a hiding place, and shot an arrow in his breast; it did not only lodge in the body but passed through it. The innocent and helpless Balāl surrendered his life to the 2 Creator. ʿImād-ul-mulk within a short time caused poison to be administered to Sultān Fīrūz and avenge the murder of his son in the best way. When this calamity happened to the Sultān in his old age, he surrendered his bridle of patience into the hands of groans and lamentations, and wept with many sighs and exclamations of sorrow. In order to guard his kingdom, and avenge the murder of his son, he had the public prayers again read in his own name; and made Māhmūd Khān the son of Sultān Fīrūz his heir; and, as before, kept the affairs of the government in charge of ʿImād-ul-mulk; and did not at all display any annoyance or pain. After a few days he sent for Jām Bāyazīd into his private chamber; and said, "You are my maternal uncle and you know the pain in my heart. You should make such a plan, that I should have my revenge of this faithless and ungrateful wretch." Jām Bāyazīd accepted this work with much eagerness and obtained permission to leave. At night he said to his eunuch or herald, that he should proclaim in his army, that his troops should appear in the morning fully armed and accoutred at the gate of the palace. Early next morning

---

1 The Cambridge History of India, p. 504, has Bilāl.
2 Both MSS. have جان بیغائاتن تسلم نورود, but the lith. ed. and Firdorah lith. ed. have جان بیغائاتن افروز تسلم نورود.
3 The readings in the MS. and the lith. ed. of Firdorrah differ a little from each other and the meaning is somewhat doubtful; but I think my translation conveys it fairly well. In the text-edition the clause is inserted between ندا بکند and واجب طلبیده.
Jâm Bayazîd came to the gate of the palace with his men fully armed and ready (for any emergency). When the news reached the Sulṭân, he ordered ‘Imâd-ul-mulk to go and find out the exact facts of the preparations of Jâm Bayazîd’s and his retainers. When ‘Imâd-ul-mulk came before Jâm Bayazîd’s troops they immediately seized him, and put him in chains. Sulṭân Ḥusain made over the duties of the vazârat that very hour to Jâm Bayazîd, and added the duties of the guardianship of Maḥmûd Khân, son of Firûz Shâh, to those of the vazârat. After some days Sulṭân Ḥusain passed away on account of bodily ailments. His death took place on 1 Sunday, the 6th of the month of Šafar in the year 980 A.H., and according to another statement in 940 A.H., and the period of his reign was thirty-four years, and according to another statement 30 years. The writer of this history Niẓâm-ud-dîn Âhmad (may there be pardon for him!) submits, that in the accounts by the author of the Ṭabaqât-i-Bahâdur Shâhî, two or three errors have occurred in this matter. One is that he has called Sulṭân Maḥmûd the son of Sulṭân Ḥusain; and the other is that he has placed the accession of Sulṭân Firûz after that of Sulṭân Maḥmûd. (As a matter of fact, Sulṭân Maḥmûd was the son of Sulṭân Firûz, and his accession took place after that of the latter.) Another is that he has described Sulṭân Firûz as the brother of Sulṭân Maḥmûd, but in fact Sulṭân Maḥmûd was the son of Sulṭân Firûz, and his accession was after those of Sulṭân Firûz and Sulṭân Ḥusain.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULṬÂN MAḤMÛD, SON OF SULṬÂN FIRÛZ.

When Sulṭân Ḥusain passed away on account of illness (i.e., died a natural death), on the following day, which was 2 Monday the 27th Šafar, Jâm Bayazîd, in concert with the nobles and the great men and men of high birth, raised Maḥmûd Khân, in accordance with the directions of Sulṭân Ḥusain, to the seat of authority, and arranged for his accession. But as he was of immature years he associated

---

1 One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sunday the 26th Šafar, 908 A.H., the other has Saturday the 6th Šafar 980 and, according to some, 904. This is incorrect. Firishtah lith. ed. has Saturday the 26th Šafar 908. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 391) follows Firishtah, but makes it Sunday instead of Saturday; and he gives 29th August, 1502, as the date according to the Christian era. The Cambridge History of India (p. 504) gives August 31st, 1502, as the date.

2 This is the date according to both MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah.
himself with low people and collected common and vulgar people round him; and his time was spent in jesting and buffoonery. Owing to this great men and men of good lineage kept at a distance from him. When people acquired an ascendancy over him they devoted all their energy to turn his mind against Jām Bāyazīd. In order to gain their object, they made wonderful plans. Jām Bāyazīd on hearing of this, did not come to Multān from the camp which he had established on the bank of the river Chanāb, at a distance of one *farsūkh* from Multān; and attended to the affairs of the State at that place; and passed his time in pleasant amusements.

While these things were happening, one day he sent for the headmen of some town, in order to collect revenue from them, and for other matters. As some of the headmen showed some turbulence, Jām Bāyazīd said, "Let the hair on the heads of these men be shaved off, and let them be paraded round the city." The slanderers went to Sultān Maḥmūd and told him that Jām Bāyazīd had commenced to punish and to insult even some of the servants of the Sultān, that he does not present himself in the Diwān (or the royal court) and sends his son ‘Ālam Khān. It is advisable on the score of the Sultān’s greatness that ‘Ālam Khān should be insulted in the Sultān’s majlis, so that there might be a stain on the condition and dignity of the Jām, and he be disgraced and degraded in the eyes of men.

‘Ālam Khān was a young man of ability, and was distinguished above the men of his rank for the elegance of his person and of his nature. It so happened that he came one day to offer his respects to Sultān Maḥmūd. He was totally unaware that the men who were envious of him had made a plan for humiliating him. When he arrived in the presence of the Sultān, one of the courtiers asked him, "What fault had been committed by such and such headmen, that Jām Bāyazīd should have had the hair of their heads shaved off and should otherwise have disgraced them. It would be just that in return for that, the hair of your head should be shaved off." As such words had never before been used to ‘Ālam Khān, he protested and

---

1 The words look like تفقتل عجب in one MS.; in the other the adjective is omitted but the other word looks like لفقتها. Firishtah lith. ed. has the very simple word تدبرها. In the text-edition it is قصها.
said, "What has come to you, man, that you use such language to me in the majlis of the Sultân." He had not yet finished his words when twelve men fell upon him from all sides; and the first thing they did to him was to take off the turban from his head, and then cuffed and kicked him with great violence. At this time 'Alam Khân with great difficulty drew his dagger from the scabbard and lifted up his hand. By accident the point of the dagger struck the forehead of Sultân Maḥmûd, who, standing at the head of the men who were wrestling together, was amusing himself; and he fell down on the ground groaning and lamenting and bleeding profusely from the wound. The men who had fallen upon 'Alam Khân now kept their hands off him and turned to the Sultân. 'Alam Khân, who had received many blows, fled bare-headed for fear of his life. When he reached the gate he found that it was locked; but exerting all his strength he broke the boards of the door and went out and taking a sash from one of his servants, bound it round his head, and proceeded on his way.

When he arrived in the presence of the Jām Bâyazîd and explained what had happened, the Jām said, "Oh my son, what you have done has become the cause of (our) shame in both the worlds; but as it is not possible to remedy it now, go to Shôr with all quickness, and send the whole of the army with all despatch; so that before Sultân Maḥmûd should have collected all his troops, I may send all my men to Shôr."

He sent 'Alam Khân immediately to Shôr, and when his army arrived from there, he struck the drum for the march, and started for Shôr.

Sultân Maḥmûd on hearing this news nominated some of the amirs to pursue him. When the two armies approached each other, Jām Bâyazîd turned round, and took up a position and the war-like men belonging to the two armies went forward and fought bravely with each other. In the end, Jām Bâyazîd defeated the Sultân's army, and proceeded towards Shôr. When he arrived there, he had the public prayers read, and the coins struck, in the name of Sultân Sikandar, son of Bahlûl; and explaining all that had happened in a petition, sent it to him. The latter sent a farmân of encouragement, and a robe of honour to Jām Bâyazîd; and wrote another farmân to Daulat Khân Lûdi, who was the governor of the Punjâb to the effect, that "As Jâm Bâyazîd has appealed to me for protection, and has read the public prayers in my name, it behoves you that you
should make yourself acquainted with all the circumstances, and should not hold yourself excused from helping and assisting him; and whenever he should be in need of any reinforcement, you should go yourself to give it to him."

After some days, Sultan Mahmud collected all his army, and advanced towards Shör. Jām Bāyazid and Alam Khān, in concert with their men, came out of Shör, and met them at a distance of ten karohs from that place, and encamped with the river Rāvi in front of him. Jām Bāyazid also sent a letter to Daulat Khān Lūdī, and notified him with what had happened. No battle had yet taken place between the armies of Sultan Mahmud and Jām Bāyazid, when Daulat Khān came with the army of the Punjāb to reinforce Jām Bāyazid; and sending men, in whom he had confidence, to wait on Sultan Mahmud began negotiations for an amicable settlement; and in the end through his exertions a settlement was effected on the basis of the river Rāvi being recognized as the boundary between the territories of the two parties; and neither party transgressing it. Daulat Khān Lūdī then sent Sultan Mahmud to Multān, and escorted Jām Bāyazid to Shör and from there he went back to Lāhōre. But in spite of the fact, that a man like Daulat Khān Lūdī had intervened to effect the peace, it did not have any stability.

About this time 1 Mir Jākar Zand came to Multān from the direction of 2 Sēwī with his two sons Mir 3 Allahdād and Mir Shahhdād. Mir 4 Shahhdād was the first man who promulgated the Shi'a religion in Multān. As Malik Suhrāb Dādāī was held in great honour by the

---

1 The name looks like مرخا كورندان Mir? Jākar Dand or Zand in one MS.; and برجا كوروند Bar Jākar Dūzd in the other. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah the name looks like میر عماد کورونزی Mir 'Imād Karwī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396) has Meer Jakur Zund, and he says in a footnote that the name Jakur occurs among the early Saljock Turks. It is میرجارکارند in the text-edition.

2 The name is سهی in both MSS. It is سوئی in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Solyoor in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396).

3 The names are مبر شهداد or مبر الله داد in the two MSS. Firishtah lith. ed. has what looks like مرزلا شهید and مرزلا سیدا. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 396) calls them Meer Sheheed and Meer Shahida.

4 Firishtah takes exception to this statement of Nizām-ud-dīn, and says that the latter does not say who Mir 'Imād was, and whence he came, etc.
Lankâhs, Mr Jakar Zand could not remain there; and sought an asylum with Jâm Bâyazîd. As he was the head of a clan, Jâm Bâyazîd received him with much honour, and bestowed on him and his sons a part of the territory which was in the Khâla or crown land.

Jâm Bâyazîd was a man of high moral character and of a generous disposition; and showed much kindness to learned men and was generous to the men of piety. They say that at the time of the hostility (between Sultân Maḥmûd and himself), he sent gifts and arms to learned and pious men by boats from Shôr to Multân, and one after another many favours were shown by him to the great men of Multân. Many wise men leaving their birthplace took up their residence in Shôr, and he summoned a number of them with much eagerness. Among them he prayed His Holiness Maulâna 'Azîz-ul-lah, who was a disciple of Maulâna Faţh-ul-lah, with great solicitude to come to Shôr. When the latter arrived near Shôr, he met him with great respect, and bringing him with great honour into the city, took him with great courtesy to his own harem; and ordered his own servants that they should pour water over his hands, and he also directed that they should pour that water at the four corners of the house, for the sake of the good fortune which it would bring to it.

A wonderful story has been told of Shaikh Jalâl-ud-dîn Quraishi who was the vakîl (minister) of Jâm Bâyazîd, which, though it has no bearing on the subject matter (of this history), but, on account of its miraculous nature and to guard it from the evil of neglect, is being written down here with the pen of musk-like fragrant writing. They narrate that when His Holiness Maulâna 'Azîz-ul-lah came to Shôr and was received with great respect and honour, greater than what the men of the age had expected, from Jâm Bâyazîd and the latter took him into his own harem, and ordered the maid-servants to wait on him. Shaikh Jalâl-ud-dîn Quraishi sent a man to wait on the Maulânâ with the message that the Jâm Bâyazîd sends his prayers (for the Maulânâ's well-being), and his object in ordering the maids to attend before him was this that as he had come unattended by any one, if he would notify whichever of them finds favour in his eyes, she would be sent to serve him. The Maulânâ sent a verbal reply to the effect that "God forbid! that any man should cast an evil eye on the maids in the service of his friend; and besides the age and years of this fâjîr do not agree with such an insinuation." When the servant
of Maulānā 'Azīz-ul-lah went and gave the message to Jām Bāyazīd, the latter said, "I have no knowledge whatever of such a message." The Maulānā was ashamed, and said, "May the neck of the man who has done this thing be broken"; and without going to see the Jām he took his way to his own house; and before the news could reach the Jām, he had passed beyond the boundary of the latter's territory. In the end, it came to pass as had been said by the Maulānā, for when Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn returned from the service of Sultān Sikandar, and came to Shōr, one night his foot slipped, when he was on the terrace (of his house), he fell on his head, and his neck was broken.

When His Majesty Firdūs Makānī Zahir-ud-dīn Bābar Bādshāh Ghażī took possession of the Punjāb in the year 930 A.H., and marched towards Dehlī, he sent a farmān to Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain Arghūn, the ruler of Thatha, that he had bestowed Multān and the neighbouring territory on him. Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain Arghūn crossed the river near the fort of Bhakkār; and the blast of the wrath of the God began to blow and inundation of arrogance began to flow. Sultān Māḥmūd on hearing this news trembled for fear, and collected his troops, and coming two stages out of the city of Multān, sent Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Quraishī, who was the successor of the Shaikh-ul-Islām Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariya, may his soul be sanctified! as his ambassador to Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain; and he made Maulānā Bahlūl, who in the beauty of his diction and in the expression of his meaning was far in advance of the age, to be the assistant of Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn. When the latter arrived in the camp of Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain, the latter treated them with courtesy and respect; and after the former had performed his duties as ambassador, Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain said in reply, "My object in coming was to look after the training of Sultān Māḥmūd and for making a pilgrimage to the tomb of Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn." Maulānā Bahlūl said, "What would happen, if the training of Sultān Māḥmūd should be left to His Holiness the asylum of the Prophetship, may the benediction of God be on him and on his descendants! for he has given him the necessary spiritual training; and as to the second matter Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn has himself come to attend on you, and what necessity is there for your taking further trouble in the matter."

When Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn came back to Sultān Māḥmūd, the latter died the next night of an attack of colic. The surmise of some men was, that Langar Kān, who was a slave of the dynasty, had
administered poison to him. His death took place in 931 A.H.; and the period of his rule was twenty-seven years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ḤUSAIN, SON OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD.

When Sultān Maḥmūd had passed away, Qawām Khān Lankāh and Langar Khān, who were the commanders of Sultān Maḥmūd’s army, took the path of flight and joined Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain. They received such favours as their hearts wished for, and brought the towns (appertaining) to Multān under the rule of the Mīrzā. The rest of the amīrs of the Lankāh tribe, being discomfited, returned to Multān. There they gave Sultān Ḥusain, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, who had not yet passed the age of infancy, the title of Sultān Ḥusain; and read the public prayers in his name. Although they gave the name of Sultān to him, yet Shāikh Shujā’-ul-mulk Bukhārī, who was the son-in-law of Sultān Maḥmūd, assumed the name of vazīr, and took upon himself the administration of all matters of State. He was, however, without any experience, and although they did not have provisions sufficient for even one month in the fort of Multān he decided on defending it. Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain considering the death of Sultān Maḥmūd the means of his conquering Multān gave the people of the city no time for preparation for defence; and galloped in, and laid siege to the fort. When the siege had lasted for some days, the soldiers distressed by hunger, came to Shāikh Shujā’-ul-mulk, who was the minister responsible for the ruin of the country of Multān, and said to him, “Our horses are yet fresh, and we find the strength of fighting in ourselves. It is better, that having divided the troops, we should advance to the field of battle. It may be that the breeze of victory and triumph would blow on us. The other alternative is to guard the fort in the hope of reinforcement and help; but there is

1 The readings are different. One MS. has کہ عمده خرابے ولایت اور برد while the other has کہ عمده ولایت مملکت از پیش اور بردہ. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has کہ عمده خرابے مملکت از پیش اور بردہ. None of the readings is quite clear. The word عمده, one of the meanings of which is a minister, is the stumbling block. The reading of the first MS. and of Firishtah may mean: who was the minister who was responsible for the ruin of the country; and I have adopted this reading. In the text-edition the passage reads کہ عمداً خرابے ولایت مملکت از پیش اور بردہ.
no such hope from any side." Shaikh Shuja'-ul-mulk gave them no reply at the interview; but he summoned some of the trusted leaders to a private conference, and said, "The rule of Sultān Husain has not yet acquired any strength or stability. If we go out of the city with the determination to fight, there is a very strong likelihood that most of the men would, in the hope of obtaining favour from Mirzā Shāh Husain, go to him and render him homage; and the few who are bound by a sense of honour, would stand firmly in that field of battle, and would be slain."

1 It is related that Maulānā Sa'd-ul-lah Lāhōrī, who was one of the wise men of the age, said, "I was at that time in the citadel of Multān. When the siege had gone on for some months, the troops of Mirzā Husain shut up all the entrances and exits in such a way that no one could send any help to the garrison from outside and nobody going out of the fort could betake himself to a nook or corner of safety. Gradually the subsistence and the life of the men in the garrison were reduced to such straits, that if by accident, a cat or a dog fell into their hands, they devoured its flesh like that of a kid or lamb. Shaikh Shujā'-ul-mulk appointed a 2 pāji of the name of Jādā to be a commander of three thousand infantry men of the town and nominated him to be the defender of the fort. That misguided man went to the house of any poor man, who he imagined had any grain in his possession, and without any enquiry plundered it. Owing to these improper acts of his, men raised their hands in prayer and according

1 The MSS. say here and then go on to say, what he said had happened during the siege. This cannot be correct, as the siege was yet going on, and the incidents mentioned by the Maulānā had not yet happened. I have accordingly substituted what is written in the lith. ed. of FIRISHTAH, in which what the Maulānā had said has been recorded as a matter of tradition. The name of the Maulānā is Sa'd-ul-din in the lith. ed. of FIRISHTAH. I have, however, retained the name of Sa'd-ul-lah, as that is also the name given by Col. BRIGGS. The text-edition has followed the MSS.

2 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. calls the man جادا نام پاچی while the other has جادا نام پاچی and FIRISHTAH lith. ed. has بسرداری سرگار پیاده قصباتی جادا نام پاچی. Then one MS. has by mistake سرداری سید راز پیاده قصباتی instead of بسرداری سید راز پیاده قصباتی as in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of both the Tabaqat and the FIRISHTAH.

In the text-edition it is جادا نام پاچی instead of جادا نام پاچی.
to the purport of the saying that: any change is for the better though it may involve our loss, prayed for the ruin of Shujā'-ul-mulk. In the end 1 men having considered their being slain easier, threw themselves from the ramparts into the ditch below; and Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain having become aware of the terrible distress of the men in the fort, stopped his men from slaying them. After this when the siege had been prolonged for a year and some months, one night towards morning the servants of the Mīrzā entered the fort, and stretching out the hand of rapine from the sleeve of oppression began to slay and devastate. The residents of the city from the age of seven to that of seventy years, who escaped the sword, were taken into slavery; and every one against whom there was a suspicion of his having any gold, suffered much insult and torture. This calamity occurred about the end of the year 932 A.H."

Maulānā Sa’d-ul-lah has narrated the following about himself, "When the citadel was taken by the Arghūns, a number of men entered our house; and at first a man seized my father, who bore the name of Maulānā Ibrāhīm Jāma’, and who seated on the masnad or carpet of teaching had for five and sixty years given lessons in various branches of learning; and had towards the end of his life become blind, and began to treat him with insult and contumely. Others came in, and suspecting from the cleanliness of the house, and the elegance of the buildings that the inmates were wealthy people, one of them seized me as a captive. It so happened that that man took me as a present to the vazīr of the Mīrzā; and it also so happened, that the vazīr was seated at that time in the courtyard of a house on a wooden seat. He gave orders, in compliance with which the man put a chain on my feet and tied the end of it strongly to a leg of the vazīr’s seat. The tears were flowing freely from my eyes, and I was weeping chiefly on account of the condition of my father. After a little while the vazīr sent for a 2 receptacle for pens, etc., and after mending his pen

---

1 Firishtah explains that as everyone who attempted to go out by the gate was killed by the besiegers, the men in the garrison threw themselves from the ramparts.

2 The word looks like معينة in one MS. and in the lith. eds. of the Tabaqāt and Firishtah, but it is مذبذب in the other MS. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥossain has used the right word مذبذب, which is a synonym for قلمدان.
wanted to write something. 1 At that time it entered his mind that he should again perform his ablutions, and then begin to write. He got up and went to a place for easing nature. As there was no one in the house I drew myself close to the seat, and wrote down this couplet from the Qasida' 2 Burda 'What has happened to your eyes, that when I ask them to stop weeping they start weeping more vehemently than before? What is wrong with your heart that when I order it to be calm, it gets more excited?' on a piece of paper, which the vazîr had brought out for writing on. Then I dragged myself back to my own place and tears went on flowing from my eyes. After a little time when the vazîr again sat down in his place and wanted to write something on the paper, he saw that a couplet was written on it. He looked round on all sides of the place. As he saw no one there, he turned to me and said, 'Did you write this?' I said, 'Yes.' Then he asked me about my circumstances. When I told him my father's name, he got up, and removed the chain from my feet, and put his own dress on me; and immediately mounting his horse, went to the audience hall of the Mîrzâ, and placed me before the latter's eyes; and spoke to him about my father. The Mîrzâ gave orders, and his men made a search for my father and brought him. It so happened that at the time when my father was brought into the Mîrzâ's majlis in a wretched condition, they were talking there about the Hiddâya'-i-Fîqh (a treatise on law). The Mîrzâ ordered that a robe of honour should be bestowed on my father, and another on me. My father, in spite of the distress of his mind, began an address, and he stated the different heads of it in such a way that the people who were present became charmed and fascinated. The Mîrzâ in that very majlis asked my father to undergo

---

1 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. has جدّى بنبوسرد دران حال بخاطروش رسید که تجديد وضموم نبوده بنوشت بردارد. The other MS. and the lith. ed. have بخاطروش رسید که تجديد وضموم نبوده جدّى بنبوسرد while the lith. ed. of Virishtah is slightly different from either of these. I have adopted the reading in the first MS.  

2 The couplet is from the Qasida called Al-Burda by Bûsîrî.  

3 One MS. has بگرهش مقام خرد while the other and the lith. ed. have مقام خرد.
the trouble of accompanying him; and he ordered his officers that whatever the Maulānā should have lost should be restored to him; and if the whole of it could not be found the price of that portion should be paid to him. My father said to him in reply, ‘The days of life have come to an end. It is now time for my undertaking the journey to the other world and not of accompanying you’; and in the end what my father had said, came to pass; for after two months he was united with the proximity of the mercy of God.’"

In short, when the citadel of Multān was captured, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain made over Sultān Ḥusain to the guards; and treated Shaiḵ Shujā‘-ul-mulk Būkhārī with much contumacy; and extorted large sums of money from him, 2 till he came to an end in this matter. When the ruin and desolation of Multān reached a point; that no one could even think that it would again become populous and flourishing, the Mīrzā, considering the further administration of the affairs of Multān an easy matter, left a man of the name of Khwājah Shams-ud-dīn to guard it, and making Langar Khān his assistant returned towards Thatha. Langar Khān having encouraged men from all places again restored Multān. He combined with the people of the place and removed Khwājah Shams-ud-dīn 3 bodily and took independent possession of the place.

When His Majesty Firdūs Makānī departed from the world, and the position of the Sultān of the great country of Hindūstān devolved on his Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī, the latter made over the country of the Punjāb to Mīrzā Kamrān as his jāgīr. The latter sent some of his men and summoned Langar Khān to wait upon him. When the latter arrived at Lāhōre, and was honoured by being allowed to wait on Mīrzā Kamrān, the latter bestowed the territory of Bābal. 4

---

1 There are some differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have اَخِرٌ أَنْهيَانِي شَهِدَ كَرْبَلْ نَجَفَهُ بِرَدْ مَيْكَفْتَ كِمْ أَنْهيَانِي شَةَد. I consider the latter the better reading and have adopted it; and this has been followed in the text-edition.

2 The words are تاُ بِرْ سَر اِيِن كَان رَفْت, the meaning of which is not very clear.

3 Here again as in several previous passages the word is خِراَجَة دَار, the meaning of which I cannot find out.

4 خطَّةٌ بَالٍ in the text-edition.
on him, in exchange for Multān. He also appointed a place at the extreme end of the inhabited part of Lāhōre for the residence of Langar Khān. This place is now known as the Dā'īrah of Langar Khān, and has become one of the residential areas of the city of Lāhōre. From this time Multān again came into the possession of the Sulṭāns at Dehlī. After the death of Mirzā Kāmrān it descended to Shēr Khān and from him to Salīm Khān, and from them to the agents and servants of His Majesty the Khilīfa-i-Ilāhī, as each of these has been mentioned in its proper place.

A final statement.—In a description of the countries ruled over by the servants of His Majesty, let it not remain concealed, that the length of the country, which is to-day in the possession of this powerful State, from Hindū Kōh on the borders of Badakhshān to the country of Orīssa, which on the further side of Bengāl, from the west to the east is 1 one thousand and two hundred Akbar Shāhī karōhs by the Ilāhi yard measure, which is equal to one thousand six hundred and eighty karōhs Sharā'ī; and its breadth from Kashmīr to the hills of Bardah, which are at the extreme limit of the country of Sūrath and Gujrat is eight hundred karōhs Ilāhī; another breadth from the Kumāyūn hills to the boundary of the country of Deccan is one thousand karōhs Ilāhī. The whole of this land is fit for cultivation. In each karōh there is a certain number of inhabited and cultivated villages. At present there are three thousand and two hundred towns; and one or two or three hundred or a thousand villages appertain to each of these towns. The produce of this country is to-day 4 six hundred and forty krōrs of μuρādī tankas. Out of these there are one hundred and twenty great cities, which are now well populated and flourishing. As the particulars of the towns cannot be

1 One MS. omits the length by the Akbar Shāhī karōh and gives it only by the Sharā'ī karōh.
2 One MS. has कोरा बुधा, the other has कोरा बुधा, while the lith. ed. has कोरा बुधा. The text-edition has adopted the reading कोरा बुधा.
3 The lith. ed. ends abruptly at पांच हजार, five hundred, only.
4 One MS. gives the produce at शहीद महर, जहाज एक, while the other has शहीद महर जहाज एक और. I cannot make out what जहाज एक means.
contained in this brief account the particulars of the city will be given
and 1 will be written in alphabetical order, if the Great God so wills.

1 The sentence as given in the text is what it is in one MS. In the other
MS. instead of it has شد; and then خلیفه شد and after that بعین ملک الوهاب عری اسیه, which may be translated: Finish.
Here is finished the history book Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbar Shāhi, by the help of the
Lord of all gifts, may His name be honoured!

(END)
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I. PERSONS

A

Abdāl Bhat, his advice to Yūsuf Khān, p. 753.
Abdāl Khān, his promise to Ḥusain Khān, p. 740; a message from Yūsuf Khan, p. 752; was attacked by Yūsuf Khān and slain, p. 753.
Abdāl Mākwī, son of Ibrāhīm Mākwī, p. 693; his support of Iskandar Khān, p. 694; was honoured and reinforced by Bābar, p. 696; his advance towards Kashmir and message to Malik Kājī, p. 697; became vāzīr of Nāzuk Shāh, p. 698; his share in the division of Kashmir, p. 699; defeated Malik Kājī, p. 700; showed friendship towards Malik Kājī, p. 701; his defeat by the Kāshgharīs and flight, p. 702; his flight with the Kāshgharīs, p. 703; disagreement with Malik Kājī, p. 705; created disturbance in Kamrāj, p. 706; sent a petition to Humāyūn, p. 707; joined Mīrzā Ḥaidar and his death, p. 708.

'Abd-ul-ḥafīd, Shāikh, p. 621.
'Abd-ul-lah, Malik, reported about the treachery of the conspirators to Mahmūd Shāh and was asked to bring elephants to the darbār, pp. 239-40.
'Abd-ul-lah, Mullā, Pakī was given to him by Mīrzā Ḥaidar, p. 712; he was slain by the rebels, p. 715.
'Abd-ul-lah, Shāh, p. 791.
'Abd-ul-lah Jangī, Shāikh, his tomb visited by Ṭūrṭā Shāh; he was called Pandey Bīrī in the time of Rāja Bhōj, p. 299.
'Abd-ul-mulk, Malik, attained martyrdom, p. 296.
'Abd-ul-mulk, Saiyid Khān, brought the family of Haibat Khān to Islām Khān, p. 713.
'Abd-ul-qādir, Shāhzāda see Nāṣir-ud-dīn, Sūltān, Sūltān of Mālwa.
'Abd-ul-wahāb, Ḥāji, p. 798.
Adham Khan, was sent to conquer Malwa by Akbar, p. 631.

'Adil Khan, commanded an army to reinforce Kajj Chak, p. 708.

'Adil Khan, Governor of Asir, nephew of Sultan Bahadur, sent a letter to Sultan Bahadur, p. 344.

'Adil Khan, ruler of Asir and Burhanpur, his name was Malik Nasir Raja; his rebellion and return to his country on hearing the advance of Zafar Khan, p. 178; on the arrival of Ahmad Shakh he fled to Asir, p. 197.

'Adil Khan, son of 'Adil Khan Sawai, helped Malik Barid in acquiring the Sultanat from Sultan 'Ala-ud-din, p. 133.

'Adil Khan, son of Hasan Khan, his request to Mahmud Shakh which was accepted, p. 282; was given the title of Azam Humayun and entrusted the government of Asir and Burhanpur, p. 284; summoned Hisam-ud-din, received Hisam-ud-din, honoured Hisam-ud-din with favour and permitted him to go to his camp, arranged for the murder of Hisam-ud-din, summoned Hisam-ud-din to fulfil his plan, p. 286; possessed the country of his enemy; sent a petition to Mahmud Shakh with a description of the hostility of Shahr Khan and Saif Khan and the measures which were adopted to defeat the enemy, p. 287; determined to invade Kalna; permitted the amirs of Gujrat to go back and returned to Burhanpur, p. 289.

'Adil Khan, son of Malik Nizam-ul-mulk Turk; slew the governor of the fort of Kehorda; went with the dead body of his father to render homage to Muhammad Shah, p. 96; the sief of his father was confirmed on him by Muhammad Shakh, p. 97;
besieged the fort of Birākar; forgave Jay Singh Rāy; the territory of Jay Singh Rāy was conferred on him by Muḥammad Shāh, p. 100; killed Farbād-ul-mulk and Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk; shut up the Turkī amīrs in their houses and murdered them one by one, p. 112; informed Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn how he had dispersed the rebels, p. 115; defeated the rebels and requested Maḥmūd Shāh to pardon the offenses of Dastūr-ul-mulk, p. 116; attacked Sām Rāj of Bījānagar, p. 141.

'Ādil Khān, son of Mubārak Khān, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, p. 283.

'Ādil Khān Fārūqī, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, hearing of the advance of Maḥmūd Shāh paid him tribute and prayed to be excused, p. 281; joined Muṣaffar Shāh, was sent by Muṣaffar Shāh to attack Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 304.

'Ādil Khāniya, list of Sultāns, p. 7.

'Ādil Muhammad, was sent by Akbar to conquer Mālwa, p. 631.

Adwan, Rājā, his representative, p. 634; his order to the sons of Shāh Mir, p. 635.

Afjāl Khān, refused the offer of Burhān and was killed by him, p. 390.

Afjāl Khān Majlis-i-Karīm, took a message to Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 577; was given a title and sent to put down Muḥtaṣ Shāh and Iqbāl Shāh, p. 580; joined Sāḥib Shāh, p. 583; joined Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 584; was slain by the order of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 587.

Ahmad, son of Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī, his ambition, his hostilities, p. 136; his accession; declared independence; period of reign, p. 137.

Ahmad, Malik, son of Shār Malik, revolted against Ahmad Shāh, p. 194.

Ahmad, Saiyid, was summoned by Maḥmūd Khaḷīf, p. 502.

Ahmad, Sultān of Bangāla, p. 433; succeeded his father; died; period of reign, p. 434 (and n. 1, p. 433).

Ahmad, Sultān of Gujrat, p. 394; his name was Raḍī-ul-mulk; amīrs gave him the title of Ahmad Shāh; he was placed on the throne by Iṭmād Khān, who acted as Sultān and kept the (boy) Sultān under confinement; went to Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī; fought with Iṭmād Khān and was defeated, p. 305; wandered in the jungle; saw Iṭmād in his confinement; attack of Iṭmād-ul-mulk on Iṭmād Khān which ended in peace; was murdered, period of his reign, p. 398.

Ahmad Aswād, placed Sultān Ḥasan on the throne, bestowed title of Sultān Ḥasan on him, p. 676; opposed his retirement towards India, p. 677; in the post of vazīr, p. 679; enmity of Malik Yārī Bhat, p. 680; was imprisoned and died there, p. 681.

Ahmed Ayāz, Malik Muqarrab, was summoned by Ahmad Shāh and given the task of commanding the Tārāpur battery, p. 206; asked permission of Ahmad Shāh to attack the enemy, p. 207; asked Har Rāj to pay tribute, p. 212; was sent with Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān by Ahmad Shāh for an enquiry, p. 213; fought with Qadr Khān and defeated him, p. 214.

Ahmad 'Aẓīz, Malik, went to Badr 'Alā by the order of Ahmad Shāh, p. 193.

Ahmad Jauhar, was entrusted with the duty of capturing Bahārīn, p. 733; took Bahārīn to Srinagar, received a title, p. 734.
Aḥmad Kanbū, Shaiḵ, Aḥmad Shāh took advice of him, p. 191.
Aḥmad Khān, was sent by Maḥmūd Khaljī to crush Rāyzāda of Kehrla, p. 540.
Aḥmad Khān, son of Ghazi Khān, was sent to conquer Tibet, p. 738; his fight with the Tibetans, p. 739; his promise to Ḥusain Khān, p. 740; defeated Sankar Chak; his plans against Ḥusain Khān, p. 741; his imprisonment, p. 742; was blinded, p. 744.
Aḥmad Khān, Shāhzāda, son of Ḥūshang Shāh, was pardoned by Maḥmūd Khaljī; was confined in the fort of Islāmābād by Maḥmūd Khaljī; his rebellion; confronted Tāj Khān, p. 499; refused to act according to the precepts of Aʿẓam Ḥumāyūn; was poisoned and died, p. 500.
Aḥmad Khattū, Shaiḵ, pp. 242, 290, 292.
Aḥmad Sarkūjī, Malik, revolted against Aḥmad Shāh, p. 194.
Aḥmad Shāh, son of Maḥmūd Shāh, was placed on the throne by Malik Barīd; the name of bāḏshāh was nominally added to his name; the amīrs lived independently in his reign, p. 132; period of his reign and death, p. 133.
Aḥmad Shāh, son of Tāṭār Khān, i.e. Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, Sulṭān of Gujrat, sent the army which was summoned by Firūz Shāh, p. 43; sent a farāman to Shāhzāda Zafar Khān to help the Musalmaṇ Rāys of Mahāmūn, p. 50; sent a message to Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmanī to leave the fort of Tanbūl, p. 54; was sent to recover Mālwa by Muẓaffar Shāh, made the country of Dhār over to Sulṭān Ḥūshang, p. 187; was placed on the throne by Muẓaffar Shāh, and given the title of Nāṣir-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh, p. 188; accession to the throne; favours for the people; Firūz Khān became envious of his greatness; conferred the post of vażīr on Jīvan Dās Khattry; rebellion of Firūz Khān, p. 189; advanced towards Bahrūj; satisfied the rebels by sending a message to them; hearing the advance of Sulṭān Ḥūshang marched to the village of Wantaj; Bhikam Ādam Khān Afghan, p. 190; met Aḥmad Shāh; sent 'Imād-ul-mulk in advance to engage Sulṭān Ḥūshang; Ḥūshang went back in shame, taking the advice of Shaiḵ Aḥmad Kanbū founded the city of Ahmadābād; various material foundations in Ahmadābād, p. 191; second rebellion of Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān; arrived in the town of Wantaj to destroy the rebels; sent Fath Khān in advance; Fath Khān joined Saiyid Ibrāhīm Nizām the Jagāirlār of the town of Mahrāsā; advanced towards Mahrāsā; on arrival in the vicinity of Mahrāsā sent a message to Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān which was not responded to; sent another message to Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān, p. 192; Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān replied to the message stating that they would withdraw the idea of enmity when Nizām-ul-mulk, Malik Aḥmad 'Aziz, Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk, and Saif Khwājah would come and give them assurance of safety; ordered the above-mentioned amīrs to proceed to the fort of Mahrāsā; Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān had Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Saʿīd-ul-mulk seized and imprisoned in the fort, hearing the
treachery of the enemies attacked the fort; defeated the rebels; Firūz Khān and the Rāja, p. 193, of Idar fled; Ranmal seized the treasure of Firūz Khān and sent it to the Sultān; returned victorious to Aḥmadābād, p. 194; sent Laṭīf Khān with Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk to punish Malik Shāh Malik; advanced to crush Sultān Hūshang; sent Malik ʿImād-ul-mulk Samarqandi to fight with Sultān Hūshang from Bāndhū; on the retirement of Sultān Hūshang Shāh Malik attacked Laṭīf Khān; Shāh Malik could not defeat the Shāhzāda and fled to the Zaminār of Karnāl; thanked God and granted gifts to the people of Aḥmadābād, p. 195; attacked and subjugated the Rāja of Karnāl; appointed Shāh Abūl Khair and Sayid Qāsim as tribute collectors of Karnāl; returned to his capital; marched towards Nadarbār to stop ʿĀdil Khān; sent an army to capture the fort of Tambol, p. 196; flight of ʿĀdil Khān; victory of the fort of Tambol; arrived in the vicinity of Mahrāsā; after reproaching the Zaminār Sultān Hūshang returned to his own country, p. 197; nominated Maḥmūd Khān, p. 198, to recover tribute from the Zaminār of Sōrath; sent Malik Maḥmūd Barki and Mukhīsl-ul-mulk to punish Naẓīr; Naẓīr prayed for pardon of his offences; forgave Naẓīr with favour; advanced to conquer Mālwa; left Niẓām-ul-mulk as the regent of the kingdom during his absence and to punish the Rāja of Mandal, p. 199; war between the troops of Sultān Hūshang and Aḥmad Shāh, pp. 199–201; besieged the hill of Chāmpānīr; a petition of the Rāja of Chāmpānīr, p. 201, to the Sultān and its acceptance; conquered Son-kara; started towards Mandū, punished the inhabitants of the hill of Kāntū; Maulānā Mūsa and ʿAll Ḥāmid coming from Sultān Hūshang, p. 202; prayed the Sultān not to oppress the Musalmāns of Mālwa; sent an affectionate letter to Sultān Hūshang; went back to Aḥmadābād; laid the foundation of a fort at Jīmūr; built a line of fortifications round the town of Dhamūd, p. 203; exerted a tribute from Chāmpānīr; advanced towards Sonkhera and laid there the foundations of Jāmaʿ masjīd, p. 204; hearing of the disappearance of Sultān Hūshang marched towards Mandū; besieged Mālīsā; encamped at the foot of the fort of Mandū; marched towards Ujjain; the division of the country among his amirs; Sultān Hūshang entered the fort of Mandū, p. 205; went from Ujjain to Mandū and sat down in front of the Delhi gate; sent a ʿarmān to Aḥmadābād to summon Malik Aḥmad Ayāz; advanced to Sārangpur; Sultān Hūshang submitted to him and agreed to pay tribute; the sudden attack of Sultān Hūshang on the Sultān's camp, p. 206; destructions caused by the attack of Sultān Hūshang; victory of the Sultān; flight of Sultān Hūshang with his army to Sārangpur, pp. 207-208; started for Gujrāt; defeated Sultān Hūshang outside the fort of Sārangpur; advanced in the direction of Aḥmadābād, p. 208; lived for three years in Aḥmadābād for regulating the administration of his kingdom; sent an army to attack Pūnjā; advanced into Idar; on the bank of Hātmatī laid the foundation of a fort, p. 209; Pūnjā, till
his death, fought with the troops of Sultan, pp. 210-211; advanced to Idar; Har Rây, the son of Pûnî, begged for the pardon of his offences; forgave Har Rây, p. 211; conferred the title of Šaflar-ul-mulk on Malik Hasan; plundered Kîlâwâra; went to Ahmedâbâd, p. 212; Râja Kânâ brought a force from Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî and ravaged parts of Nadarbâr; Shâhzâda Muhammad Khân fought a battle with the Dakini troops and gained the victory, p. 213; Shâhzâda Muhammad Khân fought with Sultan 'Alâ-ud-dîn of Deccan and became victorious, pp. 213-214; on the petition of Qurîb, the officer-in-charge of the island of Mahaim, sent Shâhzâda Zafar Khân to destroy Malik-ut-tujjâr, one of the amîrs of Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî; Zafar Khân defeated Malik-ut-tujjâr, pp. 215-216; Zafar Khân took possession of Mahaim and divided it among the amîrs; Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî marched against the country of Baglâna; postponed the siege of Châmânîr; advanced towards Nadût; after plundering Nadût encamped in the vicinity of Nadarbâr; Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî, on the arrival of the Sultan, had left a detachment on the boundary of his kingdom and had gone back to Gulbarga; turned back towards Ahmedâbâd; crossed the Tâptî after successive marches, p. 217; Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî besieged the fort of Tambôl; advanced towards Tambôl; encouragement and assurance of reward by Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî to his soldiers, advanced towards him, Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî started to meet him; a conflict between Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî, p. 218; Sultan Ahmad Bahmanî took the path of flight; entered the fort of Tambôl; started towards Tâñîr; gave directions to Malik Tâj-ud-dîn and conferred a title on him; returned to Ahmedâbâd; marriage of Shâhzâda Fâth Khân; the story of the siege of the fort of Tambôl, p. 219; invasion of the Deccan; advanced to conquer the countries of Mewâr and Nâgôr; encamped in the town of Dûngarpûr and Ganâs; Râja of Dûngarpûr and Ganâs paid tribute to the Sultan; ravaged the country of Kîlâwâra; invaded Dîlîwâra; raised to the ground the palaces of Rûnâ Mûkul, p. 220; left Malik Mîr Sultanî for collecting Khîrâj; turned to Râthôra; Râthôr chiefs behaved with loyalty; Firûz Khân offered tribute; gave back the tribute; returned to Ahmedâbâd, p. 221; advanced and took possession of the greater part of Mâlwa; intention to place Shâhzâda Masa'ûd Khân on the throne of his ancestors; plague attacked the army and made him return to Gujràt; gave hopes of help to Masa'ûd Khân; date of his death, p. 222; period of his reign; place of his tomb; title after his death, p. 223; was sent by Sultan Mu'azzafar to help Sultan Hûshang, p. 470.

Ahmad Shâh Bahmanî, Sultan; with Firûz Shâh succeeded in regaining the hereditary dominion from Sultan Shams-ud-dîn, p. 27; he performed feats of valour when Sultan Firûz Shâh was fighting with Deo Rây, p. 34; prophecy of Saiyid Muhammad Ghûdarûs about his sovereignty, p. 38; attempt by the adherents of Firûz Shâh to seize him; Firûz Shâh attempted but could
not crush him, p. 40; he was declared by Firuz Shâh to be the heir of his throne, p. 41 (and also note 3, p. 40); succeeded his brother; assumed the title of Sultan Ahmad Shâh Bahmani; entrusted the reins of the government to the hands of Shih Malik, p. 42; being aware of the insult of Nâsir-ud-din awarded mortal punishment to Shih Malik; returned the army of Sultan Ahmad Gujrat, p. 43; advanced towards Bijârnagar, p. 44; commenced to ravage Bijârnagar; Deo Rây sent gifts and asked pardon for his offences; forgave Deo Rây; sent a friendly farmân to Deo Rây; came back to the capital; granted promotions to the amirs; allowed the amirs to retire to their thânas; sent a proposal to Nasir Khân of Asir for the marriage of his son ‘Alâ-ud-din; welcomed the guests of Asir, p. 45; summoned the Qâzîs and the great men of the city; arranged the marriage assembly; sent back the sons and the adherents of Nasir Khân; advanced towards Tilang, p. 46; certain forts were re-occupied; took tribute from the Kalântars and returned to Gulbarga; advanced to punish the Rây of Mâhrûr; defeated the Rây and took possession of every thing belonging to him, p. 47; appointed Shâhzâda ‘Alâ-ud-din to be the heir apparent and made Muhammed Khân over to him; conferred the country of Mâhrûr with its dependencies on Shâhzâda Mahmûd Khân; gave the fort of Râipûr its surroundings to Dâûd Khân, p. 48; appointed Khâlîf Hasan ‘Arab entitled Malik-ut-tujjâr to conquer the island of Mahâm, p. 49; the Musalmân Râys of Mahâm went to ask help from the Sultan of Gujrat; sent Shâhzâda ‘Alâ-ud-din to reinforce Malik-ut-tujjâr, p. 50; marched towards the territory of Narasingh Rây which was invaded by Sultan Hûshang; besieged the fort of Khorla; after defeating Sultan Hûshang arrived in the city of Bidar, p. 52; selected the city of Bidar for his capital, laid the foundation brick of the fort; planned a grand mansion for the palace, p. 53; marched to capture the fort of Tanbûl; Sultan of Gujrat sent a message to leave the fort of Tanbûl in the possession of its owner; withdrew his forces from the fort, p. 54; went to Gulbarga; became ill; gave counsel and directions to Shâhzâda ‘Alâ-ud-din, p. 55; his death; period of reign, p. 56 (and see note 1, page 56); sent Sultan ‘Alâ-ud-din and Khân Jahân to fight with Shâhzâda Muhammed, p. 213; despatched forces to strengthen Malik-ut-tujjâr, p. 216; marched again against the country of Bagîana; hearing the arrival of Sultan Ahmad Gujrat went back to Gulbarga, p. 217; besieged the fort of Tanbûl; encouraged his soldiers to fight the army of Gujrat; fought the army of Gujrat, p. 218; was defeated and fled from Tanbûl, p. 219; rejected the request of Sultan Ahmad Gujrat; was defeated and destroyed by Sultan Ahmad Gujrat, p. 220.

Ahmad Shâh, Malik, was sent to reconnoitre the roads, p. 506.

Aima, p. 140.

‘Ain-ud-din, Malik, one of the adherents of Mahtmûd Shâh, p. 239; was given a title of Niẓâm-ul-mulk by Mahtmûd Shâh, p. 242.
'Ain-ul-mulk, Maḥmūd Shāh sent him to take charge of the fort of Panāla and its neighbourhood, p. 123; from Panāla he was sent to the island of Goa for its possession; came back, and presented Malik Sa'id to the Sultan; properties and territories of Bahādur Gīlānī were conferred on him, p. 126.

'Ain-ul-mulk, joined Naṣir Shāh, p. 567.

'Ain-ul-mulk, Ḥakīm, came to 'Ali 'Ādil Khān from Khalīfa'-i-Ilāhī, p. 163.

'Ain-ul-mulk, Malik, waited on Muẓaffar Shāh; attacked the town of Mahrāsā; fight against the Rāja of Idar; took the path of flight, p. 296; was given money by Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 297.


Ajīl, Malik, released Muḥammad Shāh; his rank in the court of Fath Shāh; his ability, p. 690; was put to death by the sons of Ḫārīm, p. 691.

'Ālam, Shāh, p. 327.

'Ālam, Sultan, ruler of Kālpī, complained to Sultan Bahādur against the cruelty of the army of Jinnat Aḥshānī, p. 367; reinforced the army of Gujrat, p. 373; was hamstrung by the order of Humayūn Bādshāh, p. 375.

'Ālam Kālpīwāl, Sultan, was appointed to govern Rāfsīn by Sultan Bahādur, p. 610.

'Ālam Khān, defeated Sankar Chak, p. 742.

'Ālam Khān, son of Jām Bāyāzīd, an account of his insult in the court of Sultan Maḥmūd, p. 801; wounded Sultan Maḥmūd; his flight to his father; went to Shōr, p. 802.

'Ālam Khān, son of Sultan Sikandar Lūdī Bādshāh of Dehlī, his represen-
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from Ekdâla to Pandûlah; his reign; death; period of reign, p. 443.

'Alâ-ud-dîn, Sultân, son of Ahmad Shâh Bahman; Ahmad Shâh appointed him as the heir apparent and made Muhammad Khân over to him, p. 48; went to reinforce Malik-ut-tujjâr; came back unsuccessful, p. 50; heard the counsels and directions of his father, p. 55; succeeded his father and gave himself the title of 'Alâ-ud-dîn Shâh; entrusted the reins of the government to Dillâwar Khân, p. 56; sent Half Hasan Malik-ut-tujjâr to oppose Nasîr Khân; sent Shâhzâda Muhammad Khân, p. 58, to conquer Bijînagar; advanced to punish Muhammad Khân on receiving the information of the death of Malik 'Imâd-ud-dîn; defeated Muhammad Khân, p. 59; sent a farmân and conferred Mouzah Râjîr on Shâhzâda Muhammad Khân, p. 60; returned to the capital, p. 61; nominated Dillâwar Khân to conquer Kocan; sent farmân to the amîrs on the frontier to join Dillâwar Khân, p. 66; distinguished Dillâwar Khân for conquering Kocan and the fort of Râhal; turned against Dillâwar Khân, p. 67; received the information of plundering by the Rây of Bijînagar, p. 67; advanced towards Bijînagar; besieged the fort of Mudkal; excused the Rây of Bijînagar, made an agreement and returned to the capital; arranged a great entertainment and conferred distinctions on the amîrs, p. 69; came to save Mâhûr from the hands of Mahmûd Khâljî and Sikandar Khân; became victorious; granted honour to the thânaddâr of Mâhûr; gave him the title of Fâshr-ul-mulk; and confirmed him in the
government of Mâhûr; after making arrangements for the government of Mâhûr returned to capital; forgave the offences of Sikandar Khân and exalted him, p. 71; his character and nature, p. 71; direction and precepts to his son, p. 73; his death, p. 75; period of reign, p. 76; was sent by his father to fight with Shâhzâda Muhammad of Gujrât, p. 213; arrived at Daulatbâd; received reinforcements; fled after the battle, p. 214.

'Alâ-ud-dîn, Sultân, son of Mahmûd Shâh, was made the bâsîlîdîh after the death of Ahmad Shâh by Malik Barîd; planned to follow his great ancestors; in opposition of his plan Malik Barîd in concert with Nîgân-ul-mulk, 'Imâd-ul-mulk, and 'Âdîl Khân dethroned him; the period of reign which was passed in confinement was one year and eleven months, p. 133.

'Alâ-ud-dîn, Sultân, son of Sultân Shams-ud-dîn, Sultân of Kashâfîr; accession; imprisoned the Râstûris; laid the foundation of a city, p. 639; made a rule for unchaste women, period of reign, p. 640.

'Alâ-ud-dîn Hasan Shâh, p. 2; his rise in Daulatbâd, p. 3; his declaration as a descendant of Bahman, p. 4; came to Delhi, p. 7; went to the presence of Shaikh Nîgân-ud-dîn Dehlavî who predicted his future; turned towards the Dâkin; killed the superintendent of Gulbarga and possessed its neighbouring tract, went to Daulatbâd; gave safe conduct to 'Âlam-ul-mulk; possessed all the property belonging to Muhammad Shâh in Dârâgâr; placed Ismâ'll Fath on the throne of Dârâgâr and gave him the title of Nâsîr-ud-dîn, p. 8; on the arrival
of Muhammad Shah marched away towards Gulbarga; slew 'Imad-ul-mulk, p. 9; went to Daulatabad; placed himself on the throne; assumed the title of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din; made Gulbarga his capital and changed its name to Hasanabad; his illness; his advice to his son Muhammad Khan, p. 10; his death; period of reign, p. 11 (and see note 4 on page 9, and note 1 on page 10).

'Ala-ud-din Suhrab, Malik, fled from Sultan Mahmud and waited on Sultan Quab-ud-din; was given the title of 'Ala-ul-mulk by Sultan Quab-ud-din, p. 228; joined Mahmud Khalji and was given a high rank and title by him, p. 322; went to Sultan Quab-ud-din, p. 523.

'Ala-ul-mulk bin Suhrab, Malik, was sent by the amirs of Sultan Daud Shah to Makbuluma-i-Jahan to bring Shahzada Fath Khan; brought Shahzada Fath Khan, p. 237.

Ali Khan, son of Ulugh Khan, fled from Mahrusa, p. 279; gave the elephants in charge of Sharf-i-Jahan and went to Mandu; was not favoured by Sultan Ghiyath-ud-din; came towards Sultanpur; fought with the men despatched by Sultan Mahmud; prayed for the pardon of his offences; waited on Sultan Mahmud; did homage and was favoured by the latter; murdered nabi-i-yard for which he was imprisoned and died there, p. 280; sent a message to Latif Khan to leave Chempur, p. 336.

Ali, Haktim, came to 'Ali 'Adil Khan from Khalifa-i-Ilaahi, p. 163.

Ali, Malik, was slain in the battlefield, p. 703.

Ali 'Adil Khan, succeeded his father, p. 162; he blinded Tahmasp and Isma'il; his character and habits; he brought Amir Fath-ul-rah Shahrzai and made him his vakil; his possessions; his war with Husain Nizam-ul-mulk; his relation to Khalifa-i-Ilaahi, p. 163; he included the name of Khalifa-i-Ilaahi in the public prayers and the coins of his realm; his religious inclinations; demanded the eunuch of Malik Barid; Murtada Nizam-ul-mulk attacked Barid; he reinforced the army of Barid; Malik Barid sent his eunuch to 'Ali 'Adil Shah; his welcome of the eunuch; was killed by the eunuch; the period of his reign, p. 164.

Ali, Shaykh Mir, his share in Kashmir, p. 699; was slain in the battlefield, p. 703.

Ali Beg, Shaykh, as the commander of the army of Abdal Makhri, p. 696; his representation to Mirza Kamran, p. 700.

Ali Chak, was slain by Bibi Rabe'a, p. 723.

Ali Chak, son of Nauroz Chak, his faith in Shah 'Arif; his protest to 'Ali Shahr, went to Husain Quli Khan and returned to Kashmir, p. 749.

Ali Hamadani, Mir Saiyid, his Khanqah was burnt by the Kashmirs, p. 685.

Ali Haidar, p. 202; his request to Ahmad Shah not to fight with Sultan Hushang, p. 203.

Ali Khan, was sent with a letter and presents to Sultan Mahmud Sharqi by Sultan Mahmud Khalji, p. 455.

Ali Khan, father of Yusuf, his release from Mubarak Khan; his imprisonment by the Kashmirs, p. 755.

Ali Khan, uncle of Nasir, was sent with a tribute to Mahmud Khalji by Nasir Shah, p. 512; went as a messenger of
Mahmud Khalji to Mahmud Sharq, p. 516; fought against the troops of Konbha, p. 529; his dismissal, p. 562.

Ali Khan, Raja, was ordered to help Burhan; advanced to support Burhan; fought a battle; sent Burhan to Ahmadnagar, p. 158.

Ali Khan, Saiyid, joined the army of Humayun, p. 372; slew Yusuf Khan and Baij Bhat; collected soldiers to fight his enemies, p. 683; was banished from Kashmir, p. 686.

Ali Koka, was appointed in the place of Malik Luli, p. 745.

Ali Makhri, took a message to Mirza Haidar, p. 714.

Ali Mubarak, Malik see 'Ala-ud-din, Sultan of Hangal.

Ali Shah, brother of Husain, Sultan of Kashmir, his reply to Husain Khan, p. 747; advanced towards Srinagar; came to Husain Khan's house; assumed the title of 'Ali Shah and the duties of royalty devolved upon him, p. 748; his faith in Shah 'Arif Darvish; obtained divorce for his daughter; representation of 'Ali Chak; seized 'Ali Chak, p. 749; sent troops against 'Ali Chak; ambassadors for Akbar; sent the daughter of his nephew for the service of Sultan Salim; public prayers and the coins of Kashmir were adorned with the name of Akbar; forgave Yusuf Shah; sent an army to invade Kishwar; went with his family to see Jamshidgar, p. 750; famine in Kashmir, p. 751; repented of his sins; occupied himself in performing religious duties; his death, p. 752.

Ali Shah, Sultan, son of Sultan Sikandar Sultan of Kashmir, after the death of Siyah Bhat selected Shahi Khan for the post of vazir; went to

the Raja of Jammu, p. 650; a belief of the Indians; his defeat; period of reign, p. 652.


Ali Sher, his struggle with Sultan Jamshid, p. 638; his imprisonment, p. 757.

Ali Sher, Jum, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 775.

Ali Sher, Malik, sent to the fort of Raisin with Silihaj, p. 366.


Allahadad, Mir, arrival in Multan, p. 803.

Alp Khan Sanjar, Deputy of Sultan 'Ala-ud-din Khaji, p. 204 (and also n. 2 on p. 203).

Amin Khan Ghori, seized the fort of Junagar and Soorath, p. 398.

Amin Nasir, brought Silihaj by deceit, p. 356; was sent to bring Silihaj by Sultan Bahadur, p. 615.

Amin-ul-mulk, father-in-law of Mir Tahir, p. 153; his decision; his proclamation; was put to death, p. 154.

Amir, son of 'Abd-ul-lah, his plan for the invasion of Sind, p. 764.

Amir Khan, went with a message of peace to the Kashmiris, p. 718.

Amir Mahmud Barkat, joined Piruz Khan, p. 189; was directed by Ahmad Shah to command the force, p. 200.

Amir Zina, Ahmad Jaurin came to his house in search of Bahram, p. 734.

Amnan, complained to Rani Khurshid, p. 554; was sentenced to death, p. 564.

Anar, Jum, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 773.

Anchali, Malik, his plan to place Shahzada 'Uthman Khan on the throne of Hushang, p. 489; was
pardon of Mahmud Khalji; was given a sief by Mahmud Khalji; his rebellion, p. 499; was attacked and killed with all his men by the Gonds, p. 500.

Ankas Khan, foster brother of Husain Nizam-ul-mulk, p. 152; was imprisoned by Mirza Khan, p. 153.

Ankri, fought with the Saiyids, p. 684; obtained release and fought against Muhammad Shah, p. 688; treatment by Muhammad Shah; his rank, p. 689; his execution, p. 693.

Aras Khan, was sent with a message to Muding Ray by Mahmud Shah, p. 597.

'Arif Darwish, Shah, married the daughter of 'Ali Shah; faith of others in him; his flight; his imprisonment; divorced his wife, p. 749.

Arjun, p. 633.

'Arz-ul-mulk, his son was slain in the house of Qadr Khan, p. 336.

Asad Khan, devastated the country of the Rays of Kokan, p. 67.

Asad Khan, advanced from Junir; joined Malik-ut-tujjar, p. 97; made Malul Khan the Sultan; his repentance; went to Malkapur, p. 162.

Asad Khan Ludi, on the advance of Sultan Ibrahim he fled from Sanbas, p. 451.

Asad Khan Rumi, a vakil of Murtaza Nizam Shah; had an interview with Pishrau Khan, p. 148.

Asaf Khan, was sent by Mahmud Shah to punish 'Aliam Khan and Hisam-ud-din; took Malik Ladan Khalji with him and waited upon Sultan Mahmud, p. 284; was killed by Burhan, p. 390; was appointed by Sultan Bahadur to guard Mahmud Shah; made a martyr of Mahmud Shah, p. 614.

Asaf Khan Gujratii, was left with a large force by Muzafrar Shah to reinforce Sultan Mahmud Khalji, pp. 306, 605; his son was slain in a battle with Bhim Karan Purabia, p. 307; attained martyrdom, p. 607.


Ashti Khan, was the title of Nizam Mufarrab, p. 173.

'Askari, Mirza, was sent by Humayun and defeated 'Imad-ul-mulk, p. 376; was appointed to the government of Ahmadabad by Humayun Badshah, p. 377; relinquished the country of Gujar, p. 378; was left in Gujar by Humayun Badshah, p. 616.

'Athar, Malik, defeated Yakhan Khan, p. 580.

Aujahd Khan, was sent with tribute to Mahmud Khalji by his father, p. 520.

Auliya, Shaikh, was sent by Bihdat Khan to Mahmud Shah to ask for pardon of his offences, p. 595.

Ayaz, slave of Sultan Mahmud Gujratii, fought with the Firangi and defeated them, p. 282.

Ayaz Sultani, Malik; fought with the Rajaputs and defeated them, p. 275; stopped Muzafrar Shah and himself wanted to proceed to crush Ranaj Sangha, p. 312; was sent by Muzafrar Shah to chastise Ranaj Sangha; a representation to Muzafrar Shah, p. 313; besieged Mandisor, p. 314; a message from Ranaj Sangha; his reply to the messenger of Ranaj Sangha; asked Sultan Mahmud to come to his aid, p. 315; nir of Gujrat plotted against him, agreed to make peace with Ranaj Sangha; a representation to Sultan Mahmud Khalji, p. 316; encamped at Mallpur and honoured the emissaries of Ranaj Sangha; was permitted to go
to the port of Dèp; sent a message to Rānā Sānkā, p. 317; his death, p. 318.

Kīzm Humāyūn, younger son of Sultan Nāṣir-ud-din see Māhmūd Shāh, Sultan, son of Nāṣir Shah, Sultan of Mālwā.

Kīzm Humāyūn Zafar Khān (Gujrāt) owing to the excessive cruelty of Nīzām Mufarrah, Sultan Muḥammad Shāh conferred the jāgīr of Gujrāt on him; he started for Gujrāt, encamped at the royal reservoir, and heard the advice of Sultan Muḥammad Shāh, p. 173; titles which were written to him by Sultan Muḥammad Shāh, pp. 174-175; his delight on the birth of his grandson Aḥmad Khān; in the neighbourhood of Nāgōr men of Kābhāyat requested him to suppress the cruelty of Nīzām Mufarrah, he sent a letter to Nīzām Mufarrah, p. 175; the reply of Malik Nīzām Mufarrah to him; rebellion of Nīzām Mufarrah; a battle between Zafar Khān and Nīzām Mufarrah; death of Nīzām Mufarrah; victory of Zafar Khān, p. 176; he sent agents to all the pargānas; he advanced towards Asāwal; came back to the neighbourhood of Pattan; the death of Sultan Muḥammad Shāh; the disobedience of the Rāja of Idar; he advanced to punish the Rāja of Idar; crushed the Rāja of Idar, p. 177; took tributes from the Rāja of Idar; advanced towards Sōmnāth; advanced towards Nadarbār to punish Malik Naṣir Rāja ʿAdī Khān; returned to Pattan; invaded Jar and Tar; advanced for the destruction of Sōmnāth; his behaviour towards the Rājpūts and their temples; arrival at Sōmnāth and his activities; came back to Pattan; heard the tyranny of the Rājpūts of Mandaḷgarh, p. 178; he marched towards Mandaḷgarh to take revenge for the tyranny of the Rājpūts; he crushed the power of the Rājpūts, made them humble, and excused their offences, he performed a pilgrimage to the tomb of Shāikh Khwājah Muʿīn-ud-din Ḥasan Sanjari and plundered the towns of that country; his march towards Dandwāna, plundered Dilwāra and Jalwāra; returned to Pattan, p. 179; issued an order for the rest of his troops, pp. 179-180; Tātār Khān came from Delhi to Gujrāt owing to the violence of Mallū Khān; Tātār Khān prayed his father to help him in taking revenge from Mallū Khān; Mirzā Pir Muḥammad Khān possessed Multān and seized Sārang Khān; arrival of Taimūr in the neighbourhood of Delhi; he comforted Tātār Khān and postponed the march to Delhi; he and Tātār Khān advanced towards Idar; plundered the country of Idar and disgraced the Rāja, p. 180; returned to Pattan; after the attack of Amir Taimūr people fled from Delhi to Pattan; flight of Sultan Māhmūd from Delhi to Gujrāt; he disgraced Sultan Māhmūd; his victorious advance to Idar; his successful march to suppress the Hindūs of Sōmnāth, p. 181; he demolished their temples, laid the foundation of Jāmiʿ mosque, and appointed the religious servants; returned to Pattan; Tātār Khān asked favour of his father to take back the dominion of Sultan Māhmūd from Mallū Khān; he instead of agreeing with the idea of Tātār Khān, made him his successor to the throne, p. 182; grieved at the
death of Tātār Khān; transferred Shams Khān Dandānī to replace Malik Jalāl Kōkhar; again ascended the throne after the death of Tātār Khān, p. 184.

Āqām Khān, was sent by Khalifa-i-
Ilāhī to conquer the Deccan; returned without accomplishing anything, p. 157.

Azdar Khān, son of Alī Khān, it was reported to Maḥmūd Shāh that he was the murderer of Qāiṣar Khān; order of his arrest issued by Maḥmūd Shāh; later order of his release, p. 271.

'Azīz Khāmmār, caused rebellion in Gujrat, p. 2.

'Azīz Khān Nāmī, brought a letter from Aḥmad Shāh to Naṣīr Khān of Asīr containing the proposal of marriage of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, p. 45.

'Azīz Khān Turk, offered to sacrifice his life for Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 114.

'Azīz-ul-lah, Maulānā, p. 798; was invited by Jām Bāyāzīd, p. 804.

'Azīz-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent by Maḥmūd Shāh to punish Malik Ḥīsām-ud-dīn and 'Alam Khān, p. 284.
Āzuri, Shaiḵh, p. 53.

B

Bābā Khallī, effected a peace between 'Idī Zīnā and the Kashmiris, p. 722; took a message to Abdūl Khān, p. 752; was sent by Saiyid Mubārak Khān to the latter's enemies, p. 764; his determination about Yūsuf Khān, p. 780.

Bābā Mahdī, his determination about Yūsuf Khān, p. 780.

Bābar Bādshāh, Firdūs Makānī Zahir-
ud-dīn Muhammad, encamped in the neighbourhood of Delhi, p. 321; having slain Sultān Ibrāhīm Lūdī possessed Delhi, p. 444; Raḍī-ul-
Mulk came to him, p. 610.

Baghūra, Rāyāzā, his flight, p. 766.
Badeh, Malik, son of Niẓām-ul-mulk, p. 289; after the death of his father he was given the title of Iḵtiyār-
ul-mulk by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 271.
Bādī Alangdār, Saiyid, he was ap-
pointed by Maḥmūd Shāh for guarding the road and for the bringing in of provisions, p. 273.

Bādī, went to conquer Dābul but attained martyrdom, p. 764.

Bādī-'uz-zamān, Mīrāz, p. 781.

Bādī 'Alā', Malik, instigated Firūz Ḵān and Haibat Ḵān to revolt against Aḥmad Shāh; made arrange-
ments to defend the fort of Māhrās; message of Sultān Aḥmad to him; his reply to Aḥmad Shāh, p. 192; his treachery with the amīrs of Aḥmad Shāh; he was executed by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 193.

Bādī Khān, came into the city and offered congratulations to the murderers of Changāz Khān, p. 409.

Bahādūr, Sultān, Gujratī, Sultān of Mālwa, details of his reign in Mālwa, p. 615.

Bahādūr Bhat, was asked by Ghazī Ḵān to bring his son on the right path, p. 736.

Bahādūr Gīlānī, account of his rebel-
lion; took forcible possession; oppression in the ports of Gujrat; plundered ships of Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī and imprisoned his men; after a great battle arrested Kāmāl Khān and Šafdar Khān and sent them to Dābul, p. 117; wrote an improper reply to Maḥmūd Shāh Bahmanī, p. 119; fight with the army of Sultān Maḥmūd near the fort of Mirīch and its result, p. 120; sent Ḵhwājāh Na'amāt-ul-lah Tābrizī in order to ask pardon of his offences,
Shamshîr-ul-mulk to seize ‘Aḏḏ-ul-mulk and Niẓâm-ul-mulk to attack Muḥāfiz Khān, p. 335; sentenced Bahā'-ul-mulk to death; all the murderers of Sultān Sikandar were put to death, p. 336; pleased all people by his generosity, p. 337; coronation in the capital of Gujrat; bestowed wealth and honours on the people; Ghāzi Khān was appointed to the government of Nadarār and Sultānpūr; sent orders for Lāṭf Khān’s destruction, p. 338; arranged a festive assembly; a famine took place; endeavoured to ameliorate the condition of the ra‘yat; movements of disturbers; sent Ulugh Khān, p. 339, against Lāṭf Khān; Tāj Khān reported to the Sultān the hostile attitude of Ulugh Khān and Qaisār Khān; arrest of the conspirators; ordered release of the conspirators, p. 340; ordered the payment of Sīlāḥdār’s allowances; news from Ghāzi Khān about the battle and arrest of Lāṭf Khān; sent Muḥib-ul-mulk to bring Lāṭf Khān; appointment of beadmen at his brothers’ tombs, p. 341; wanted to advance against the Rājā of Māl; Tāj Khān opposed it and soothed the Sultān; sent an army with Tāj Khān for the punishment of Rāy Singh, p. 342; Tāj Khān ravaged the country of Rāy Singh; sent Tāj Khān to arrange the affairs of Kanbāyēt; dismissed the dārogha of Kanbāyēt; conquered the countries of Idar and Bākār; returned to Chāmpānīr; went to rebuild the fort of Bahrōj, p. 343; after finishing the work went to Kanbāyēt; travelled to Dīp by road; invited the firangīs to accept Islām; a letter from the governor of Āst; p. 344; an order was issued in
reply to the governor of Asir; advanced to conquer the Deccan; encamped for the collection of troops in the town of Baroda; Jam Firuz joined the Sultan, p. 345; fixed a stipend for Jam Firuz; promised to restore his dominion to Jam Firuz after recovering it from the Mughuls; powers from the various directions came and joined; representation from Imad-ul-mulk; decided to invade the Deccan; allowed Ja’far Khan to visit Ahmadabad, p. 346; returned to Mughammadabad and passed the rainy season there; marched towards Bakar and Idar; sent Khudawand Khan and Imad-ul-mulk from Khangpur to Bakar; proceeded towards Kanbayet; embarked in a ship for the Dfrp; showed kindness to Rumi (Turks), p. 347; arranged residences for Rumi and returned after recommending them to the favour of Malik Ayaz; on his arrival at Champaund ‘Umran, Qutb Khan, and amirs of Sultan Ibrahim fled to Gujrat and were exalted to high ranks; penetrated into Bakar by successive marches; arranged for the better government of Bakar, p. 348; acceded to the prayer of Ratan Sbn; laid the foundation of a mosque; gave Karchi to Prithi Raj; divided the territory of Bakar between Prithi Raj and Jagia, p. 349; bestowed favours on Sikandar Khan and Bhupat; a message from Sultan Mahmud, p. 350; reply to the message of Sultan Mahmud; marched towards Banswala; arrived at Sambla; waited for ten days for Sultan Mahmud, p. 351; on arrival at Dibulpur came to know that Sultan Mahmud wanted to confer the title of Sultan Chiyas-ud-din on his eldest son and had no desire to meet Sultan Bahadur; started and encamped at Sudpur; arrived at Na’lsha and made arrangements for the siege, p. 352; sent the Purabta contingent to Pahalwania; took up quarters in the palaces at Muhammadpur; captured the fort of Mandu, p. 353; ascended to the top of La’l Mahal and sent a man to wait on Sultan Mahmud; received Sultan Mahmud with respect and tried to please him; took up his residence, p. 354; at Mandu; gave permission to amirs to go back to Gujrat; went to see Burhanpur and Asir; conferred on Nizam-ul-mulk Dakini the title of Muhammad Shah and returned to Mandu; ordered the release of Mulsamn women from the disgrace of Kfr and condign punishment for Silhadi; sent Muqbal Khan to Champaund to guard the fort; sent Ightiyar Khan with troops and treasure; made proclamation of his departure to Gujrat, p. 355; went to Mandu to make preparations for the march towards Gujrat; left Ightiyar Khan in charge of the government of Mandu; gave permission to Bhupat to bring Silhadi; advanced towards Ujjain; went away to Dibulpur, Banharla and Sa’dulpur for hunting, p. 356; started from Sa’dulpur for Dhur; talked with the amirs about seizing Silhadi; took up his residence in the fort of Dhur; sent ‘Imad-ul-mulk to attack Bhupat; started towards Ujjain; conferred the government of Ujjain, p. 357, on Darya Khan; bestowed Sarrangpur on Mallu Khan; gave permission to Habib Khan to go back to Ashta; marched towards Bithia and Ratan;
on arrival at Bhisā came to know about the currency of heathenism there, p. 358; waited at Bhisā for three days for the erection of mosques and houses for pious purposes; advanced to conquer Rāśīn; attacked Pūrabī Rājpūts, p. 359; forbade continuance of the fight and postponed it to next day; marched from Rāśīn and commenced the construction of covered passages; representation from Silhādi for submission and acceptance of Islām, p. 360; acceding to the request of his brother, Silhādi asked leave of the Sultan for evacuating the fort; granted leave to Silhādi and waited; Silhādi was permitted to go to the fort; Silhādi advised the Rājpūts of the fort, p. 361; fight between the son of Silhādi and the army of Gujrāt; ordered imprisonment of Silhādi in the fort of Mandū; became violent on hearing the news of the Itānā’s approach; sent Muḥammad Khān and ‘Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī for their chastisement, p. 362; Muḥammad Khān and ‘Imād-ul-mulk submitted a report to the Sultan describing the advance of Rānā with a large force; on the report of ‘Imād-ul-mulk hastened towards Kahrār; report of the spies of Rānā about the arrival of the Sultan, p. 363; flight of Rānā and Bhūpat; pursued the enemy, p. 364; leaving the punishment and castigation of the Rānā to the next year returned to Rāśīn and after arrival there made the siege closer than before; terms and conditions of Lakhman for evacuating his fort for the Sultan; granted Lakhman’s prayer and summoned Silhādi from the fort of Mandū; detailed a body of soldiers to guard the fort, p. 365; sent Malik ‘Alī Shār with Silhādi to the fort; enthusiastic speech of Rānī Durgāwati made Silhādi ready for revolt, p. 366; fatal end of the rebels; granted the fort of Rāśīn and Chandārī and the territories of Bhisā as a jāgir to Sultan ‘Ālam; appointed Muḥammad Khān to capture the fort of the Kārkūn; started on an expedition to hunt elephants; made Kānūr over to Ulūgh Khān; took possession of Islāmābād and Hūshangābād and the whole of the country of Mālwa; granted these possessions as jāgir to the amirs of Gujrāt, p. 367; arrived towards Kārkūn; occupied himself in Kārkūn in a festive assembly; sent ‘Imād-ul-mulk and Iqtīyār Khān to capture the fort of Mandisār; forts of Mandisār and Kārkūn came into the Sultan’s possession; advanced from Mandū to Champānīr, p. 388; advanced towards Dip on being informed of the power of firangī; advanced towards Chitār; siege of the fort of Chitār, sporadic fights of the Gujrātīs and their victories; submission of the Rānā to the Sultan; cause of hostility with Humāyūn Bādshāh; conferred favours on Tātār Khān, p. 369; spent money for collection of troops, p. 370; letters from Humāyūn Bādshāh which were not satisfactorily responded to; Humāyūn Bādshāh advanced to crush the Sultan; advanced to seize the fort of Chitār, p. 371; took the fort of Chitār; met Humāyūn Bādshāh in the vicinity of Mandisār; opinion of the amirs of the Sultan, p. 372; preparations for war with the Mughals; reinforcement by ‘Ālam.
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Kālpīwāl, p. 373; exhaustion of the Gujrātīs; fled towards Mandū; Humāyūn Bādshāh pursued him to the fort of Mandū, shut himself up in Mandū, p. 374; flight from Mandū to Chāmpānīr; sent the treasure and jewels which he had at Chāmpānīr to the port of Dīp and himself went to Kanbāyet; taking strong horses went on to the port of Dīp, p. 375; distribution of the treasures of the Sultan; deputed 'Imād-ul-mulk for collecting the revenue, p. 376; rebellion over the whole of Gujrāt, p. 377; advanced into Gujrāt; relinquishment of Gujrāt by the amirs of Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 378; advanced towards Chāmpānīr to crush Tādī Bāg Kān; halted at Chāmpānīr for arranging the affairs in that neighbourhood; advanced towards Sūrath and Junāgarh to enable the firangīs, who had been called for help, to return, p. 379; arrival of the firangīs at the port of Dīp; successful conspiracy of the firangīs caused the death of the Sultan, p. 380; port of Dīp in the possession of the firangīs; period of reign, p. 381.

Bahār Kān, the command of the fort of Ranthambhōr was transferred from him by Maḥmūd Kbaljī, p. 520.

Bahā'-ud-dīn, was welcomed by Yūsuf Kān, p. 759.

Bahā'-ud-dīn, Malik, one of the adherents of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 239; he was made Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 242.

Bahā'-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk, Malik, he was sent to the khana of Sonkhīr by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 263; by taking an oath on Qurān he gave assurance to Rāy Rāyān not to disclose the secrets of his treachery to Maḥmūd Shāh and promised to assist him in carrying out his intention; had a talk with Malik Miyān; wrote a letter to Malik Farḥat-ul-mulk to meet him; sent a letter to Malik Qiyām-ul-Mulk forbidding him to march from Rakhīl; sent for Muḥāfīz Kān and gave him special directions, p. 265; advised Maḥmūd Shāh to go to Aḥmadābād; addressed the amirs in regard to the reply to the question of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 268; inquired the cause of silence of Maḥmūd Shāh; reported the whole story of conspiracy to Maḥmūd Shāh who sent him to conquer Jālūr and Sājūr; encamped near the tomb of Shaikh Hājī Rajab, p. 270; informed Maḥmūd Shāh what was done by Muḥāfīz Kān; his death, p. 271.

Bahā'-ud-dīn Quraishī, Shaikh, went as an ambassador to Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain, p. 805.

Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariyā Mīltānī, Shaikhī, p. 788.

Bahā'-ul-mulk, helped 'Imād-ul-mulk in placing Naṣīr Kān on the throne, p. 328; joined Sultān Bahādur, p. 332; was hanged by the order of Sultān Bahādur, p. 336.

Bahā'-ul-mulk (son of Alī Kān), killed ʿĀdam Silāhḍār and fled to Idar, p. 247.

Bahūlā, Māulānā, went as an ambassador to Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain, p. 805.

Bahūlū Lūḍī, Malik, was sent by Sultān Muḥammad to fight against Maḥmūd Kbaljī, p. 510.

Bahūlū Lūḍī, Sultān, Bādshāh of Dehli, asked help of Sultān Maḥmūd Kbaljī, p. 460; asked favour of Sultān Ḥusain, defeated Sultān Ḥusain, sent Makkah-i-Jahān to Sultān Ḥusain, p. 461; requested Sultān Ḥusain to be pardoned;
defeated Sultan Husain on every occasion, took possession of Jaunpûr and established his son there; his death, p. 462.

Bahrâm Khájâ, raided Indarkôt, p. 716.

Bahrâm Chak, son of Rêgi Chak, reached Srinagar, p. 709; went to Haibat Kháân Niyâz, p. 713; his share in the division of Kashmir, p. 719; was seized by 'Idî Zinâ, p. 721; defeated the Niyâzis, p. 723; his imprisonment, p. 725; was granted favours by Ghâzi Kháân, p. 732; joined the rebels, p. 733.

Bahrâm Kháân, p. 16; Bahrâm Kháân and Govind Rây rose in revolt; the Sultan started towards Deogarh; arrived in its neighbourhood; they became afraid and went to Daulatábâd to Shaikh Rukn-ud-dîn, the great Sâif of the time, p. 17; the Sultan on hearing of this arrived at Daulatábâd and went to visit the Shaikh, and agreed to pardon them; they went away to Gujrát, p. 18; was sent by Mahmûd Shâh to meet Rây Batâî, p. 272.

Bahrâm Kháân, son of Sultan Zain-ul-abbîdin, welcomed Háji Kháân, p. 668; his treachery, p. 670; in the service of Háidar Shâh; his jâgir, p. 673; went towards Hindûstân, p. 676; arrived in the district of Karmâ, p. 677; his defeat; his death, p. 678.

Bahrâm Kháân, Kháân Kháânân, respected Naqrat Chak, p. 736.

Bahádur, entered the service of Sultan Bahádur, p. 346.

Báji Bhat, was slain, p. 683.

Balâl, son of 'Imâd-ul-mulk Tawalak, his murder, p. 799.

Bandâgân Kôkâh, was nominated to crush the rebel, p. 709; was left by Mirzâ Háidar at Srinagar, p. 710; fought with the Kištîwârâ army as the commander of Mirzâ Háidar's troop, p. 711; was slain, p. 712.

Bâqî Bâg, Kháwjâh, the fort of Sihwân was made over to him, p. 779.

Bârbak Shâh, Sultan of Bangâla, the amîra seated him on the throne; passed his time in pleasure, died, p. 435 (and see notes 2-3, p. 435); period of reign, p. 436.

Bârbak Shâh, Sultan of Bangâla, after murdering his master took the title of bâdshâh, p. 438 (and see n. 1, p. 348); his pomp and strength; was slain; period of reign, p. 439.

Bârbak Shâh, son of Bahûl Lûdî, the government of Jaunpûr was given to him by his father; after the death of his father he advanced to conquer Delhi; being defeated by Sultan Sikandar he fled to Jaunpûr, p. 462; went to conquer Multân, p. 793; possessed the fort of Khánwâl, p. 795.

Barîd, Malik, imprisoned Sultan Kâllân- ul-lâh in the city of Bîdar, p. 4; was appointed as the kotwâl of Sultan Shihab-ud-dîn, p. 112; was informed about the intention of Dilâwar Kháân; kept the Sultan in imprisonment, p. 113; became all powerful in administration; kept Mahmûd Shâh as a puppet; met with the army of 'Imâd-ul-mulk Kâwîl, p. 131; placed Âhmad Shâh on the throne of Mahmûd Shâh and kept him in confinement, p. 132; placed 'Alâ-ud-dîn in place of Âhmad Shâh; deposed 'Alâ-ud-dîn, p. 133; placed Sultan Wâliullah in place of Sultan 'Alâ-ud-dîn; poisoned Waliullah on account of the latter's wife; after Waliullah gave the name of Sultan to Kâllân-ul-lâh, p. 134; had a fight with 'Imâd-ul-mulk.
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Kāwill; made submission to Sultān Bahādur of Gujrat, p. 135; his eunuch was demanded by 'Alt 'Adil Khān; was attacked by Murtada Niẓām-ul-mulk; asked 'Alt 'Adil Shāh for help; presented the eunuch to 'Alt 'Adil Shāh, p. 164.

Barkhūrdār, Malik, was sent by Ghaznīn Khān to seize Zafar Minjumla, p. 487; was given the title of Tāj Khān by Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 497; sent a petition asking for aid to suppress the rebels; joined Aʾtzam Humāyūn, p. 499; fought with Malik Hājī 'Alt; reassured Malik Iṣḥāq of his good luck, p. 504; was sent by Maḥmūd Khaljī with a message of peace to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 525; fought against the army of Kōnbhā, p. 529; captured the fort of Būndī, p. 532; defeated Rāyżāda of Kehrla, p. 540.

Barkhūrdār, Saiyīd, was sent by Saiyīd Mubārak Khān with a message to the latter's enemies, p. 754.

Basant Rāy, was entrusted with the administration by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 576; was slain by the amīr, p. 577.

Batāl, Rāy, fought with Malik Sadhā and killed him with his followers; plundered the army of Malik Sadhā; on the arrival of Maḥmūd Shāh he repented of his shamef ul deed and asked for pardon of his offences; his ambassadors were turned back by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 272; sent tribute to Maḥmūd Shāh which was refused; asked Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Khaljī to help him, p. 273; fought with Qawām-ul-mulk and his troops and made martyrs of them; p. 275; was captured and brought to Maḥmūd Shāh; was made over to Muḥāfīẓ Khān to recover his health; was urged by Maḥmūd Shāh to accept Islām; refused and was executed, p. 276.

Bāyazid, Jām, joined Sultān Ḥussain, p. 795; his love of learned men, p. 796; his engagement with Sultān Ḥussain, p. 799; seized 'Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak; his appointment as vāzir; raised Maḥmūd to the throne of Multān, p. 800; disposition of Sultān Maḥmūd towards him; his order for the punishment of the turbulent men of Multān, p. 801; sent his son to Shōr; defeated the army of Sultān Maḥmūd; his petition to Sultān Sikandar, p. 802; peace with Sultān Maḥmūd, p. 803; granted favours to Mīr Jākār Zand; his invitation to Maulānā 'Azīz-ul-lah, p. 804.

Bāyazid Saiṭhā, Malik, was sent with a message to Maḥmūd Khān, p. 494; his suggestion to the amīr to deal with Maḥmūd Khān, p. 495.

Bāz Bahādur, son of Shujā' Khān, Sultān of Mālwa, took possession of his father's property, p. 628; sent his mother to Daulat Khān; distribution among the heirs of Shujā' Khān, treacherously slew Daulat Khān; took possession of Mālwa; declared himself as the Sultān with the title of Bāz Bahādur Shāh; advanced towards Rāisīn; defeated Malik Muṣṭafā; advanced towards Kadrūlā, p. 629; took possession of Kadrūlā; invaded Katinkhā but was defeated; occupied himself in pleasure and enjoyment, p. 4630; was defeated by the servants of Akbar; his character; period of reign; went to Gujrat, p. 631; went to the Rānā of the fort of Kōnbhal-mīr; was enrolled in the band of Akbar's servants; his death, p. 632. Bhāgmātī, she was loved by Muḥammad Quli Qutb-ul-mulk, p. 171.
Bhagwan Das, Raja, was sent to invade Kashmir, p. 760; made peaceful settlement with the Kashmiris, p. 761.

Bhati Khan, p. 153; his resolve; his proclamation; was put to death, p. 154.

Bhareu, p. 136 (and see also n. 2, p. 136).

Bhawandas, son of Shevdas, brought his daughter as a tribute to Nasir-ud-din, p. 570.

Bheroda, took a letter to Bihujat Khan, p. 589; reported all the talk of Bihujat Khan to Mahmud Shah, p. 590.

Bihur Khan Afgan, p. 190; attended on Ahmad Shah and was received with favour, p. 191; revolted against Ahmad Shah, p. 194.

Bhim, p. 481.

Bhim, Ray, fought with Latif Khan, p. 341.

Bhim, Ray, Raja of Beyt, when the citadel of Beyt was captured by Mahmud Shah he took the path of flight, p. 261; was seized and sent to Muhafiz Khan for hanging and the announcement of his death, p. 262.


Bhopat, waited on Sultan Bahadur and was favoured, p. 350; asked Sultan Bahadur to go to Ujjain to bring Silhadi, p. 356; his flight with Rana of Chitor, p. 364.

Bhopat, son of Silhadi, went to Burhunpur with Sultan Bahadur, p. 615; went to Chitor, p. 616; possessed the fort of Raisan and its neighbourhood, p. 617.

Bihur Mal, joined Nizam-ul-mulk; was sent with Nizam-ul-mulk by Muazzam Shah to recover Idar, p. 300.

Bihishti, Mir, a Saiyid; had Fattu in his house, p. 149.

Bihujat Khan, was entrusted with the government of Chandar, p. 568; his reply to Mahmud Shah, p. 583; sent his son to attend on Mahmud Shah, p. 584; was summoned by Mahmud Shah, p. 588; his reply to Mahmud Shah; submitted a petition to Sultan Sikandar Lodi, p. 589; proclaimed Sahib Khan as the Sultan, p. 592; sent an army to capture Sarangpur, p. 593; prayed for the pardon of their offences to Mahmud Shah and was promised favours; his dishonesty with Sahib Khan, p. 595; welcomed Mahmud Shah and was favourised by the latter, p. 596.

Bir Ray, Raja of Idar, was rewarded by Mahmud Khalji, p. 522.

Bir Bal, Raja, p. 628.

Birkana Ray, could not withstand Muhammad Shah Lashkari and paid tribute to him, p. 102.

Bohi, a barbor, was distinguished by Haidar Shah, p. 673; caused the death of Hasan Kachi, p. 674.

Burhan, the pesh-mamaz of Sultan Mahmud of Gujrat, description of the murder of Sultan Mahmud committed by him, p. 389; murdered Asaf Khan and Khudawand Khan, p. 390; murdered Asfal Khan; his proclamation for the throne; was slain by Shorwan Khan, p. 391.

Burhan-ud-din, Quth Alam Shaikh, p. 324.

Burhan Nizam-ul-mulk, son of Ahmad, succeeded his father; Shah Tahir came from Iraq to the Deccan, p. 137; adopted Imami religion, p. 138; Sultan Bahadur Gujrati advanced to conquer the Deccan and encamped at Kailachahitra; Burhan did homage to him; Sultan Bahadur
respected Shāh Tāhir; Burbān had the public prayer read, and coins struck in his own name; ruled for forty-eight years, p. 139; married Amla, a prostitute, and Husain Nizām-ul-mulk was born of her, p. 140.

Burban Nizām-ul-mulk, son of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, escaped from prison; was defeated by the amirs of Murtada; went to Khalīfa-i-Ilahi and was favourably received, p. 148; his entrance in the service of Akbar and start towards Bera, p. 156; possessed the country of Bera; the duration of his imprisonment and escape; came to Gujrāt; was favoured by Khalīfa-i-Ilahi and sent to Mīlwa; Āzam Khān was sent to free the Deccan and make it over to Burbān; came back to the court of Khalīfa-i-Ilahi; was appointed to attack the Afghāns, p. 157; was summoned from Bangash and sent to the Deccan; a farmān of Khalīfa-i-Ilahi to all concerned in support of Burbān; Nazr Bē and Rāja ‘Ali Khān joined Burbān; Jamāl Khān marched from Bījāpūr to defend Burbān; date of his accession, p. 158.

Burbān-ul-mulk, Sīhādū was made over to him by the order of Sultān Bahādur, p. 362.

C

Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī, had an interview with Bahādur Shāh, p. 330; got out of the fort of Mandū and fled, p. 353; after the death of his father went to Mahmūd Shāh, p. 610; fled from Mahmūd Shāh, p. 612.

Chandar, son of Rāja Ramājan, p. 634.

Chengiz Khān, his father attacked Burbān, p. 391; ports of Sūrath,

Nāgōt and Chāmpānīr were in his possession, p. 398; arrived at Ahmādābād and congratulated Sultān Muẓaffar, p. 399; sent a message to I’tmād Khān, p. 400; sent a petition to the court of Sultān Muẓaffar for the extension of his dominion, p. 401; possessed Nadarābār; marched towards the fort of Tāhnīr; posted his army to defend Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, p. 402; being unable to withstand Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh fled to Bahroj; advanced towards Ahmadābād to punish I’tmād Khān, occupied Baroda; sent a message to I’tmād Khān that he should retire to his own ādābī, p. 403; advanced towards the battlefield of Ahmadābād; without giving battle I’tmād Khān took the path of flight and became victorious, p. 404; made an amicable settlement with Shēr Khān; defeated Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, p. 405; allotted some parganas in the Sarkār of Bahroj to the Mirzās as ādābīs; without his permission the Mirzās began to occupy other estates; sent an army to attack the Mirzās; his army was defeated by the Mirzās, p. 406; asked Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān to come to him; received Tāhtiār-ul-mulk, Ulugh Khān, Jhuhjār Khān and other Habshis with respect, p. 407; ordered Ulugh Khān to go to the chaugān field, p. 408; was killed by Jhuhjār Khān, p. 409.

D

Dāhir, Rāy, his reply to Hajjāj, p. 763; his fight with Muḥammad Qāsim, p. 767; summary of the circumstances attending his death,
p. 768; fight of his widow, p. 769; his daughters were sent to Khalifa, p. 770.
Darvish Chak, disobeyed his brother, p. 727; his execution, p. 732.
Daryā, Mullā, was favoured by Zain-ul-ābidin, p. 661.
Daryā Khan, amīr of Mālwa, was sent by Sultan Mahmūd as an ambassador to Sultan Bahādur, p. 350; informed Sultan Bahādur at Sambla that Sultan Mahmūd was unable to see him on account of illness, p. 361; told Sultan Bahādur the real cause of his master's inability to come; was sent back by Sultan Bahādur, p. 352; Sultan Bahādur conferred the government of Ujjain on him, p. 358; united with 'Imād-ul-mulk and put Iktiṭiyār Khān to death, p. 385; taking Sultan Mahmūd with him advanced towards Sūrath and defeated 'Imād-ul-mulk; made Sultan Mahmūd into a mere puppet, p. 386; gave the title of Sultan Muẓaffar Shāh to a boy of unknown descent; fight with 'Alīm Khān, p. 387; sought protection of Shīr Khān Afghān, p. 388.
Daryā Khan of Sind, was made vazir of Jam Firūz, p. 778, joined Jam Salāḥ-ud-dīn; summoned Jam Firūz and raised him to the throne; his death, p. 780.
Daryā Khān Turk, slew the governor of the fort of Kehria; taking the dead body of his father went to render homage to Muhammad Shāh, p. 96; the feuds of his father were confirmed on him and 'Ādil Khān by Muhammad Shāh, p. 97; was nominated by Muhammad Shāh Lashkari to pursue the Rāy of Orissa, p. 104; seized Farḥād-ul-mulk Turk; killed Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk; murdered the Turki amirs, p. 112.
Dastūr-ul-mulk, was defeated by 'Ādil Khān; at the request of 'Ādil Khān his offences were pardoned by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 116.
Dāūd, the kingdom of Sulaimān Karanān came under his power; was defeated by Khān Khānān; was slain by Khān Jahān, p. 446.
Dāūd, son of Jahāngīr Mākri, fought with the Saiyids and was killed, p. 684.
Dāūd, Malik-ul-umarā Malik, was appointed by Mahmūd Khalji to chastise the Gānds, p. 540.
Dāūd Kadhār, his imprisonment, p. 751.
Dāūd Khān, an amīr of the Deccan, challenged the Gujratī amirs and was taken prisoner, p. 219.
Dāūd Khān, governor of Bīyāna, made his submission to Mahmūd Khalji, p. 526.
Dāūd Khān, ruler of Asir, sought protection of Nāsir Shāh, p. 570.
Dāūd Khān, youngest son of Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, Sultan Ahmad Shāh gave him the fort of Rājāpur (Rāchāpur) with its surrounding country, p. 48; was sent to his sūba, p. 49.
Dāūd Shāh, cousin of Mughal Shāh, hostility with Mughal Shāh; slew Mughal Shāh; ascended the throne of Mughal Shāh, p. 21; hostility of the sister of Mughal Shāh against Dāūd Khān; he was wounded by his amirs who were incited by the sister of Mughal Shāh; was carried to the palace; his enemy was defeated; his death; period of reign, p. 22 (also see n. 1, p. 22).
Dāūd Shāh, Sultan, Gujratī, p. 235; amirs placed Shāhzāda Dāūd Khān, uncle of Qutb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh on the throne; began to commit unworthy deeds; made the promise of conferring the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk on a farādā; annoyance of
the amirs; direction to be separated from the work of government, p. 236; Malik 'Alä-ül-mulk took Shâhzâda Fatâh Khan to the royal palace; amirs placed Fatâh Khan on the throne and gave him the title of Sultan Mahmûd; period of reign, p. 237.

Daulat, his advice to Hûsain Khan, p. 748.

Daulat, nephew of Sultan Mahmûd, helped Burhân in the murder of Sultan Mahmûd, p. 390.

Daulat Chak, nephew of Kâjî Chak, ignored the summons of Mirzâ Haidar, p. 712; went to Haibat Khan Neyâzî, p. 713; his share in the division of Kashmir; gave his fief to his son, p. 719; summoned Sankar Chak, p. 720; marriage of his daughter; went to Sûyapûr, p. 721; joined Ghazi Khan, p. 722; defeated the Neyâzîs, p. 723; defeated 'Ind Zinâ, p. 724; rise of his power, p. 725; hostility of Ghazi Khan, p. 726; sent Ibrâhîm Chak and Haidar Chak to invade great Tibet, p. 727; was blinded by Ghazi Khan, p. 730.

Daulat Khan, p. 743; conflict with Bahâdur Khan, p. 744; fled from Mubârak Khan, p. 755.

Daulat Khan Ajîyâlâ, adopted son of Shuja' Khan, p. 623; requested Islâm Khan to pardon the offences of Shuja' Khan, p. 627; was slain by Miyân Bâyazid, p. 629.

Daulat Khan Lüdî, received the farman of Sultan Sikandar, p. 802; effected peace between Sultan Mahmûd and Jâm Bâyazid, p. 803.

Dâwar-ul-mulk, joined Sultan Bahâdur, p. 332; was arrested, p. 340. Döbâ, sent troops to fight against Mahmûd Khâljî, p. 512.

Deo Rây, sent an army in the neighbourhood of Badhûl, p. 32; his fight with Firûz Shâh, p. 34; his submission to Firûz Shâh, p. 35; his revolt against Firûz Shâh, p. 38; sent gifts and presents to Sultan Ahammad Shâh and asked pardon of his offences, p. 45.

Dhûlalnûn Beg, Mir, his death, p. 781. Dîâ-ul-mulk, saw Sultan Bahâdur in the city of Châmpânir, p. 334; was asked to convey an order to his father, p. 335; was imprisoned but was released by the order of Sultan Bahâdur, p. 340.

Dilâwar Khan, was sent by Mahmûd Shâh to reinforce A'zam Humâyûn, p. 288; arrived at the town of Nadarbâr, p. 289.

Dilâwar Khan, Khan A'zam Khan, the reins of the government of Sultan 'Alâ-ud-din came under his grasp; p. 56; was nominated by Sultan 'Alâ-ud-din to conquer the country of the Râys of Kokan; sent Asal Khan, Fîlûd Khan and Safdar Khan to devastate the country of the Râys, p. 66; forgave the Rây of Sangesar; advanced to capture the fort of Râhal; after much bloodshed the Rây of Râhal requested for pardon of his offences; at the instigation of envious people Sultan 'Ala-ud-din turned against him; retired into a corner of safety, p. 67.

Dilâwar Khan Ghûrî Sultan of Mâlwa, brought Mâlwa under his possession, p. 467; after the downfall of Sultan Mahmûd of Dehli declared himself as the independent ruler of Mâlwa; died after enjoying success and pleasures of life; views of other historians in connection with his death, p. 468.

Dilâwar Khan Habshî, wounded Nizâm-ul-mulk, p. 112; vakilât of 'Ibrâhîm
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Fādil Bēg Kokaltaš, was left in the fort of Bhakkar, p. 779.
Fadl-ul-lah Bādh, Malik, went in company of Tātār Khān to Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 557; joined Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 582.
Fadl-ul-lah Ḥakīm, Maulāna, was appointed by Mahmūd Khājī, 519.
Fākr-ud-dīn, Sultan of Bangālā, after murdering Qadr Khān became the master of the throne; sent Mukhliṣ to the frontier district of Bangālā, p. 419 (see notes 2–4, p. 419); had no faith in his followers; 'All Mubārak attacked him and sentenced him to death; period of reign, p. 420.

Fakhr-ul-mulk, was sent to crush Muhāfiz Khān, p. 594.
Fakhr-ul-mulk, Malik, dispersed the rebels, p. 115; was entrusted with the management of the army by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 116; was sent to take charge of the fort of Panāla, p. 123; destroyed Bahādur, p. 125; was given the title of Khān Jahān by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 126.
Farhād-ul-mulk Turk, was seized by the traitorous amirs in the time of Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī, p. 112.
Farḥat-ul-mulk, reported Mahmūd Shāh about the messenger of Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 290.
Farīd 'Imād-ul-mulk, Malik, was directed to command the force in war by Aḥmad Shāh; was summoned by Ahmad Shāh, p. 200; fought with Sultān Ḥūshang and defeated him, p. 201; was given Kāntha by Aḥmad Shāh in his sīf, p. 205; enquired of Malik Jūnā about the welfare of Ahmad Shāh; came for the destruction of Sultān Ḥūshang, p. 207.
Fath Chak, raided Indarkōt, p. 716; created disturbance, p. 733; joined Khān Zamān, p. 743.
Fath Jang Khān Shōrwānī, went to his jāyīr, p. 587.
Fath Khān, his flight from Ghāzi Khān, p. 738; his fight with the Tibetans and death, p. 739.
Fath Khān, commander of Ḥusain Khān, defeated Sankar, p. 741.
Fath Khān, son of ʿĀdām Khān, see Fath Shāh, Sultān of Kašmir.
Fath Khān, son of Sultān Muḥaffar, was sent by Aḥmad Shāh but joined his brothers, p. 192; helped to place Sikandar Khān on the throne, p. 323; was made over to custodians by the order of Sultān Ḥūshang.
p. 482; was sent by Muṣaffar Gujrāṭī to chastise Māḍīnī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā, p. 602.

Fath Khān, uncle-in-law of Bāz Bahādur, his consultation with Miyaīn Bāyāzīd, p. 626; was killed, p. 630.

Fath Khān, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 776.

Fath Khān, Shāhzādā, was married to the daughter of the Rāy of Mahām by Ahmad Shāh, p. 219.

Fath Khān Balūch, p. 398; was attacked by the Fūlādis and defeated, p. 399.

Fath Khān Rāfī, put Mullā Yūsuf and Mullā Frūz to death, p. 746.

Fath Shāh, Sulṭān of Bangāla, the amirs placed him on the throne, p. 437 (and see n. 4, p. 437); he was slain by the pāiks who were instigated by an eunuch who himself sat on the throne; period of reign; custom of Bangāla, p. 438.

Fath Shāh, Sulṭān of Kashmir, his efforts to regain his ancestral dominions, p. 686; his defeat in fight advanced to conquer Kashmir, p. 687; his fight with Muḥammad Shāh; defeat; victory; p. 688; his order for Muḥammad Shāh; accession; arrival of Mir Shams, p. 689; disputes among the amirs; release of Muḥammad Shāh; division of Kashmir; his vazir and Diwān; an example of the judgement of Malik Aḥī, p. 690; struggle between Muḥammad Shāh and the latter’s victory; retired to Hindūstān; period of reign; accession of Muḥammad Shāh for the second time; his vazir; his successor; death of Malik Aḥī; victorious attack of Fath Khān, p. 691; period of Sulṭān Muḥammad’s reign; Kashmir under Fath Shāh for the second time; successful attack of Muḥammad Shāh; his death and period of reign; Sulṭān Muḥammad’s accession for the third time, p. 692; his vazir; an example of the wisdom of Kājī Chak; execution of the amirs of Fath Shāh, p. 693; skirmishes between Muḥammad Shāh and Iskandar Khān; Muḥammad Shāh turned against Malik Kājī, p. 694; Malik Yāfī defeated and seized Iskandar Khān; Iskandar’s eyes were blinded; Malik Kājī imprisoned Muḥammad Shāh and raised Ibrāhīm Khān to the throne, p. 695; period of the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, p. 696.

Fath-ul-lāh, Maulānā, p. 798.

Fath-ul-lāh Shahrāzī, Amir, was brought by ‘Alī ‘Ādil Khān, p. 163.

Fattū, a prostitute, her account, p. 149; her power, p. 150.

Frūz, Jām, ruler of Sind, succeeded his father; made Daryā Khān his vazir; hostility with Jām Ẓalāḥ-ud-dīn, p. 779; account of his reign, p. 780.

Frūz, Mullā, gave the order for the execution of Yūsuf, p. 745; his execution, p. 746.

Frūz, Sulṭān, son of Sulṭān Ḥusain, Sulṭān of Multān, his accession; his vazir; his nature, p. 798; his envy towards Balāl; caused the murder of Balāl; his death by poison, p. 799.

Frūz Khān, was asked to come to the private chamber of Maḥmūd Shāh and was explained the purpose of the announcement of Ḥaj; p. 287; was ordered by Maḥmūd Shāh to arrest Azdār Khān, p. 271.

Frūz Khān of Kashmir, was slain in the battle, p. 723.

Frūz Khān, ruler of Nāgōr, son of Shams Khān Dandānī, fought with Rānā Mūkul, p. 194; brought some
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lakhs of tankas as tribute which was returned by Ahmad Shâh, p. 221; news of his death, p. 229.

Firûz Khân, son of Sultan Muṣaffar, rose in revolt, amîrs united with him in rebellion; went to Kanbâyat; used the opportunity of the unity of his brothers and advanced towards Bahârî; asked Sultan Hûshang Ghûrî to help him, p. 189; was favoured by Ahmad Shâh, p. 190; revolted in 814 A.H.; took shelter in the hills of Idar; asked Râja of Idar to help him, p. 192; fled from Ankhûr to the hills of Idar, fled to Nâgîr; attained martyrdom, p. 194; his revolt in the country of Bahârî and request to Sultan Hûshang; joined Ahmad Shâh, p. 472.

Firûz Shâh, Sultan, success in the attempt at regaining his hereditary dominions, p. 25; accession to the throne, p. 27; account of justice in his reign; conquered Bijâṅagar, p. 28; advanced towards Shakar, p. 29; opposed by the Rây of Bijâṅagar; defeated the Rây of Bijâṅagar, p. 30; marched to conquer the country of the Marhatta, p. 35; conquered Kehrâ and devastated its surrounding countries; sanctioned the plan of a new city with the name of Firûzâbâd, p. 36; welcomed Amir Saiyid Muhammad Ghâz darâz, p. 37; marched towards Arûnakâl, p. 38; was wounded by the army of Deo Rây and was taken to Gulbarga, p. 39; asked help of Sultan Ahmad of Gujrat, p. 40; tried to crush Khân Khânân; declared Ahmad Khân to be his heir; his death, p. 40; period of regio, p. 42.

Firûz Shâh, Sultan of Bangâla, the amîrs placed him on the throne, p. 439 (and see n. 4, p. 439); his death; period of reign, p. 440.

Firûz Shâh Tughluq, Sultan, son of Rajab, advanced from Delhi towards Lakhnauti, p. 422; engaged in a battle with Sultan Shams-ud-din near Ekdâla; returned to Delhi, received tribute from Sultan Shams-ud-din, p. 423; treated the ambassador of Sultan Shams-ud-din with kindness and sent 'Arab and Turkî horses to Sultan Shams-ud-din with Malik Sâif-ud-din, p. 424; advanced to conquer Bangâla in the time of Sultan Sikandar, p. 426.

Fûlâd Khân, was appointed as the governor of Bijâṅagar by Firûz Shâh, p. 32; killed many soldiers of Deo Rây, p. 34; devastated the country of the Râys of Koka; plundered the country of Râhal, p. 67.

G

Gadâî of Râwat tribe, Saiyid Muḥammad got into his house, p. 686.

Gadâî, Malik, was sent to help the men of Nâgîr by Sultan Quţb-ud-din, p. 230.

Gajâdhar, fought against Mahmûd Khâlij and was slain, p. 529.

Gandhâ, paid a tribute to Ahmad Shâh, p. 220; did homage to Sultan Muḥammad Shâh through the intervention of Malik Mîr Sultanî, p. 224.

Gangsâs, sent his request to Mahmûd Khâlij, p. 521; paid tribute to Mahmûd Khâlij, p. 522.

Gandâs Râja of Châmûnîr, p. 257.

Ghaḍansîr, fled to Sultan Bahâdur and incited him to advance on Ahmadâbâd, p. 377.

Ghâlib Khân, was ordered to destroy the palace of Nâsîr-ud-din, p. 557.

Ghâzi Khân, was appointed to the government of Nadarbâr and Sultan-
pûr; was sent with an army to crush Latîf Khân, p. 338; informed Sultân Bahâdur about the hostility of Latîf Khân, p. 341.

Ghâzi Khân, son of Mubârak Khân of Asr, his titles; his oppressions; asked pardon of his, p. 533, offences and was excused by Maḥmûd Khalîjî, p. 534; being defeated fled towards Elichpûr, p. 538; informed Maḥmûd Khalîjî about the rebellion of the Zamînâdars of Kachwârah, p. 541.

Ghâzi Khân, son of Râgî Chak, Sultân of Kashmir, was brought before Mîrzâ Hâidar, p. 710; went to Haibat Khân Neyâzî, p. 713; went to Mîrzâ Hâidar, p. 714; his share in the division of Kashmir, p. 719; his relation with Kâjî Chak; summoned Sankar Chak, p. 720; his marriage; p. 721; his fight with the army of 'Idl Zînâ, p. 722; hostilities with Daoulat Chak, p. 726; rose to power; his advice to Naṣrat Chak, p. 729; seized and blinded Daoulat Chak; raised Ḥabib Shâh to the throne, p. 730; fight with Ḥabib Chak, p. 731; attack on his enemies, p. 733; defeated Shâh Abu-ul-ma'âlî; his order for the execution of the Mughals, p. 735; his tyranny; his order for his son, p. 736; after defeating his enemies raised the standard of his rule; accession, p. 737; pardoned his enemies; took up his residence at Lâr; sent his son for the conquest of Tibet, p. 738; fight with the Tibetans; period of rule, p. 739, raised his brother to the throne, p. 740; collected army to fight with Ḥusain Khân, p. 741; his death, p. 744.

Ghâzi Saiyîd Khân, his fight with Sultân Ḥusain, p. 792.

Ghazîn Khân, with the title of Sultân 'Alâ-ud-dîn, was sent by Sultân Maḥmûd Khalîjî against Sultân Muḥammad, p. 510; for further details see Qadam Khân, son of Sultân Maḥmûd Khalîjî.

Ghazîn Khân, Shâhzâda, son of Sultân Hûshang see Muḥammad Shâh, son of Hûshang Shâh Ghûrî, Sultân of Mâlwa.

Ghiyâs-ud-dîn, Sultân, succeeded his father, p. 24; he was imprisoned and blinded by Taghaljî; period of his reign, p. 25.

Ghiyâs-ud-dîn, Sultân of Bangâlâ, succeeded his father with the title of Sultân Ghiyâs-ud-dîn, p. 427; his life; period of reign, p. 428 (and see note 4, p. 427).

Ghiyâth-ud-dîn, Sultân, Sultân of Mâlwa, p. 257; advanced to help Rây Batâî, p. 273; withdrew his steps and retired to Mândû, p. 274; was sent by Maḥmûd Khalîjî against Sultân Muḥammad, p. 510; entrusted with the command of the army of Sârangpûr, p. 523; ravaged the surrounding places of Sûrat, p. 520; ravaged the countries of Kîlîwârah and Dîlîwârah, p. 532; his accession; bestowal of Ranthambhûr upon Qadam Khân; his generosity, p. 543; granted rank and title to 'Abd-ul-qâdîr; his statement to the amîres about his activities for the sake of his kingdom, p. 544; sent an order to Shâr Khân, p. 548, to chastise Sultân Bahlûl; description of his faith and simplicity; his strictness in religious rites and duties; an example of his love and respect for Qurân, p. 548; an incident in connection with his obedience to the laws of the Prophet, p. 549; his reply to the petition of the Rây of Châmpânîr according to the law.
of religion, p. 551; period of reign, p. 553; representation of Shujā'at Khan and his order, p. 554; killed Malik Mahmūd and Sēv Dās; sent men to seize the murderers of Mūnjā Baqāl, p. 555; sent a message to Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 556; ordered the destruction of the Nāṣir Shāh palace; message of Nāṣir Shāh, p. 557; sent a message to Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 559; his effort to arrange peace among his sons, p. 561; destruction of his palace; shifted to the palace of Sarsatī, p. 563; recognised Nāṣir-ud-din as a Sultān, p. 564; news of his death, 566.

Gītā Dēōrah, did homage to Sultān Qutb-ud-din and represented the forcible possession of Rānā Kūmbhā, p. 231; the fortress of Ābū was made over to him by Sultān Qutb-ud-din, p. 233.

Gōp Sing, Rāja, his relations with Sultān Zain-ul-‘ābidīn, p. 660.

Govind Rāy see Bahārām Khan.

H

Hābīb, gun maker, Sultān Zain-ul-‘ābidīn wrote a book in concert with him, p. 657.

Hābīb, Qādī, went to the house of Ḥusain Khan, p. 742; was injured by a Rāfīq, p. 745.

Hābīb Chak, son of Daūlat Chak, his jāgīr; his marriage, p. 719; his victory over the Tibetans, p. 727; refused to fulfil the demands of Ḥaidar Chak, p. 729; his rebellion; fight with Ghāzī Khan, p. 731; his execution, p. 732.

Hābīb Khān, governor of Ashta, p. 301; fled from Māndū and complained about the power and violence of Pūrasū Rājpūts to Muḥaffar Shāh, p. 302; was permitted to go to Ashta by Sultān Bahādur, p. 358; was sent to crush Muḥaffīr Khān, p. 594.

Hābīb Khān, his effort to defeat Yūsuf Khan, p. 758.

Hābīb Shāh, son of Ismā‘īl Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, accession; agreement among the enemies of Ghāzī Khan, p. 730; definition of the Riseis; advance of Shāh Abu-ul-ma‘ālī towards Kashmir, p. 734; defeat of Shāh Abu-ul-ma‘ālī; execution of the Mughals, p. 735; was concealed in a corner, p. 737.

Hābīb-ulu-lah, Shāikb, was allotted the management of Khālēs parganas, p. 554; killed Mūnjā Baqāl and fled to the harem of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 555; fled from the palace of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 556; waited on Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 557; despatched his ring to Nāṣir Shāh after the victory, p. 563; favoured by Nāṣir ud-din; Nāṣir Shāh conferred on him the title of ‘Alam Khān, p. 564; went to Shēr Khān, p. 565; was made over to the men of Shēr Khan, p. 566; was imprisoned by Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 569.

Hābsh, Hāfīz, his escape from execution, p. 735.

Hāfīz, Malik, was given the title of Muḥāfīz Khān by Māhmūd Shāh and was sent in attendance on A‘ẓam Humayūn, p. 285.

Haibat Khān, had an interview with Firūz Khān; united with Firūz Khān, p. 189; was sent by the amirs to the presence of Aḥmad Shāh, was favoured by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 190; summoned the Rāja of Idrā for help, p. 192; joined Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 558; was nominated to crush Yaḵān Khān by Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 560.

Haibat Khān, son of Sultān Muḥaffar, his revolt in the country of Bahārīj
and request to Sultan Hushang; joined the troops of Ahmad Shâh, p. 472; was made over to custodians by Sultan Hushang, p. 482.

Haibat Khan, son of Jam Salâh-ud-dîn, his death, p. 780.

Haibat Khan, son of Sultan Qutb-ud-dîn, p. 643.

Haibat Khan Niyâzi, settlement with Islâm Khan; made proposals for peace with Mirzâ Haidar, p. 713; his advance to conquer Kashmir; was slain, p. 723.

Haidar, son of Muhammad Khan, was appointed as the successor of Sultan Zain-ul-‘âbidin, p. 660.

Haidar, Mirzâ, Sultan of Kashmir, Humâyun permitted him to conquer Kashmir, p. 707; possessed Srînagar, p. 708; his victory over Kâjî Chak; suspicious about Râgî Chak; nominated his men to crush the rebels, p. 709; advanced to conquer Tibet; seized the fort of Kûsûr; welcomed the ambassador of Kâshgâr at Lâr, p. 710; his reply to ‘Idî Zinâ; advanced from Lâr to Kishârvar, skirmishes with the Kishârvar army, p. 711; advanced towards Tibet; appointed Muhsin as the governor of Tibet; granted the prayer of Âdam Kâkhar, p. 712; returned to Kashmir; proposals of Haibat Khan for peace, p. 713; Kashmîris separated from Haibat Khan; sent an ambassador to Islâm Khan; sent back the ambassador of Islâm Khan; appointed the governor of Bahramal; representation of the Mughals, p. 714; refused to listen to ‘Ali Mâkri; conflagration in Indikot; message of Qarrâ Bahûdûr; battle between the Mughals and the men of Bahramal; appointment of agent; news about the arrival of Mullâ ‘Abd-ul-lah, p. 715; came out of Indikot; the Mughals joined him and resided at Shîhâb-ud-dîn pur; his encampment; destruction of Indikot, p. 716; took up his residence in Kûsûr; the Kashmîris came to Adanpur; made a will for his brother; started to attack his enemy; account of his death, p. 717; flight of the Mughals; the Kashmîris buried his corpse; peace between the Mughals and the Kashmîris; period of reign, p. 718.

Haidar Chak, went with ‘Ali Khan, p. 755; helped Lôhar, p. 757; fought but was defeated by Yusuf Khan; went to Râjâ Mân Singh, p. 759.

Haidar Chak, son of Ghazi Khan, his message to Habib Chak, p. 728; his execution, p. 736.

Haidar Kâshgârî, Mirzâ, was sent to invade Kashmir, p. 701; fought with the Kashmîris, p. 703.

Haidar Khan, son of Muhammad Shâh, his arrival in Nau Shahr for the conquest of Kashmir, p. 750; was deceived by Muhammad Khan Chak, p. 751.

Haidar Khan, son of Yusuf Khan, went to wait on Akbar, p. 758.

Haidar Shâh, Sultan, son of Sultan Zain-ul-‘âbidin as Hâji Khan revolted against his father, p. 663; his defeat, p. 664; was sent for by his father, p. 666; obeyed the farman of his father, p. 667; was made the successor of his father, p. 668; his illness, p. 669; was summoned by the amirs to occupy the seat of his father, p. 671; his accession, p. 672; his heir; allotment of fiefs; character and habits, p. 673; illness, p. 674; death; period of reign, p. 675.
Hājī, Malik, one of the adherents of Mahmūd Shāh, p. 239; made an attack on the rebels, p. 241; was given the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 242; was sent to Idar by Mahmūd Shāh; induced two servants of Bahā-ul-mulk to confess to the murder of Ādam Silāḥdār; reported to Mahmūd Shāh that he had brought the murderers of Ādam Silāḥdār, and Bahā-ul-mulk had fled into Idar; caused the execution of the two servants of Bahā-ul-mulk; was executed by the order of Mahmūd Shāh, p. 248.

Hājī 'Alī, Malik, Tāj Khān and Maṣāfūr Khān fought with him, p. 504.

Hājī Kamāl, Malik-ul-umarā, government of Chandīrī was transferred from Naqrat Khān to him, p. 501; rebellion in his country, p. 502.

Hājī Kashmīrī, Khwājah, was nominated to crush the rebel Bahārām Chak, p. 709; went to the spot where Mirzā Haidar was lying wounded, p. 718; one lakh donkey-loads of paddy allotted to him, p. 719; went to Islām Khān, p. 725.

Hājī Khān did not take part in the battle between ʿImād Khān and the Fūlādīs; joined the Fūlādīs who demanded his jāgīr from ʿImād Khān, p. 400.

Hājī Khān, son of Sulṭān Zain-ul-ʿabīdīn, see Haidar Shāh, Sulṭān, son of Sulṭān Zain-ul-ʿabīdīn, Sulṭān of Kashmīr.

Hājī Khān Sulṭānī, was appointed to Dhār, p. 621; informed Shujāʿ Khān about the advance of Mallū Khān, p. 623.

Hājījāj, son of Yūsuf, sent Muḥammad Hārūn towards India, p. 761; his letter to Rāy Dāhir, p. 763; sent Badīl to conquer Débul; sent Muḥammad Qāsim for the conquest of Sind, p. 764.

Hākim 'Alī, was welcomed by Yūsuf Khān, p. 759.

Hāmid Bukhārī, Saiyīd, satisfied Shāh Khān by answering his question, p. 413.

Hāns, Rāja of Bhūmbar, fought with the army of Tātār Khān, p. 685.

Harāwī, Amīrīdāh-i, was removed by Sulṭān Mahmūd from Qasawj, p. 450.

Harjū, went to bring Sankar Chak, p. 720.

Harkhūkhā, his son asked help from Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 298.

Har Rāy, prayed ʿĀḥmad Shāh for the pardon of his offences, p. 211; was forgiven by ʿĀḥmad Shāh and was taken into the circle of loyal adherents; was asked to pay tribute; this was delayed; was pursued; fled from the place, p. 212; presented his daughter in the shape of tribute to Muḥammad Shāh; Muḥammad Shāh gave him the fort of Idar at the request of his daughter, p. 224.

Harsingh Rāy, was the Rāy of Kehrla who made his submission to Fīrūz Shāh and accepted his sovereignty, p. 36.

Ḥasan, informed Sulṭān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn about the raid of Bahālū Luḍī, p. 546.

Ḥasan, son of Shār Āshāmak, was banished with his brother by Shār Āshāmak, p. 642; was imprisoned by Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 643.

Ḥasan, Malik, was given the title of ʿAfsīdār-ul-mulk by ʿĀḥmad Shāh and was left in ʿĀḥmadnagar, p. 212.

Ḥasan, Malik, was sent by Ḥeṣānin Khān to seize Ẓafār Minjumā, p. 487.

Ḥasan, Saiyīd, son of Saiyīd Nāṣīr, was sent for and entrusted with the reins of authority by Sulṭān Ḥasan;
turned the mind of Sultān Hasan against the Kashmiris, p. 681; accepted the will of Sultān Hasan for his successor; placed Muhammad Khan on the throne of his father; was slain, p. 682.

Hasan, Sultān, son of Ḥāji Khān Ḥaidar Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, his accession, p. 675; residence; entrusted the administration to Ahmad Aswad; revived the rules of Sultān Zain-ul-ʿabidīn; act of mischievous persons, p. 676; sent Malik Tāj Bhat against Bahrām Khān, p. 677; imprisonment of Bahrām Khān and Zain Badr, p. 678; enmity between the amirs; disturbances created by the amirs, p. 680; imprisonment of Ahmad Aswad; made over the reins of authority to Saiyid Hasan; attacked by disease; made will for his heir and successor, p. 681; period of reign, p. 682.

Hasan ʿAlli, his father; his appointment as nāyīb; was conferred the title of Mirzā Khān; his activities as the vakil of Murtada Niẓām Shāh; declared Mirān Husain to be the Sultān, p. 150.

Hasan ʿAll Khān, p. 114.

Hasan Chak, went to Haibat Khān Niyażī, p. 713.

Hasan Dakīnī, Malik, was known as Malik-ut-tujjār; Shāhzāda Zafar Khān was sent by Ahmad Shāh to destroy him; his tyranny, p. 215; built a barricade along the shore of Mahāim; fought with the army of Gujrāt; fled and got within the barricade; after the reinforcement of the army of Gujrāt he prayed Sultān Ahmad Bahmani for help; was reinforced by the army of Sultān Ahmad Bahmani and advanced towards Thāna; fought with Shāhzāda Zafar Khān and was defeated, p. 216.

Hasan Gāngū see ʿAlā-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh.

Hasan Kachhī, favoured Ḥāji Khān, p. 671; his execution, p. 674.

Hasan Khān, made strong terms of engagement with Amīrzāda Ḥabībul-lah; gained the favour of the soldiers, p. 82; was deceived by Sirāj Khān; receiving a safe conduct went to the besiegers, p. 83.

Hasan Khān, son of Ḥāji Khān, joined his father, p. 672; Kamrāj allotted as his jāgīr, p. 673; came to Kashmir but was not welcomed by his father, p. 675.

Hasan Khān, son of Kājī Chak, his marriage, p. 721.

Hasan Khān, son of Saiyid Mubārak Khān, was slain, p. 753.

Hasan Khān, son of Sultān Firūz Shāh, p. 38.

Hasan Khān Shāhzāda, youngest son of Sultān ʿAlā-ud-dīn, was supported by Saif Khān, Mallū Khān and other amirs in taking the throne of Humāyūn Khān; at the time of sitting on the throne he saw Humāyūn Khān coming to the palace; became afraid, p. 75; came down from the throne, p. 76; was taken to the house of one of the conspirators, p. 239.

Hasan Mākrī, defeated the Niyażīs, p. 723; joined Ghāzī Khān, p. 726.

Hasan Matū, family of Mirzā Ḥaidar was placed in his house, p. 719.

Hastī Chak, helped Lōhar, p. 757.

Hastī Khān, joined the enemy of Ghāzī Khān, p. 731.

Hastī Tarīq, seized Ḥabīb Chak, p. 731.

Ḥātim, Malik, attained martyrdom at the hands of Rānā Sānkā, p. 310.
Hayât Kháthún, wife of Sultan Hasan of Kashmir, gave birth to a son named Muḥammad, p. 680.

Hazar Kháñ, p. 563.

Hámkarán, was sent to crush Muḥáfīz Kháñ, p. 594.

Himmat Kháñ, joined Naṣir-ud-din, p. 559.

Hindal, see Qutb-ud-din, Sultan, son of Sultan Shams-ud-din, Sultan of Kashmir.

Hindal Mírzá, was sent by Humâyūn Bâdshâh to crush Tádâr Kháñ, p. 371.

Hindú Bâg Qulohin, entered the fort of Mandu, p. 374; was sent with Mírzá Askarl, p. 376; was appointed to the government of Baroda by Humâyûn Bâdshâh, p. 377; relinquished the country of Gujrat, p. 378.

Hisám-ud-din, went to his brother Rukn-ud-din, p. 241.

Hisám-ud-din, Malik, p. 203.

Hisám-ud-din, Qâdî, went to Châmpânîr from Ahmadâbâd for negotiations; p. 232.

Hisám-ud-din Maghûl, Malik placed Khânzâda ‘Alâm Kháñ on the throne of Asir and Bûrânpûr, p. 283; joined the camp of Mahmûd Shâh and was honoured by him, p. 284; was given the title of Shahryâr and the mouqâh of Dhanûra, and was permitted to go back by Mahmûd Shâh, p. 285; left Bûrânpûr and resided in Thânâr; joined Niżám-âl-mulk Bahri in rebellion; came towards Bûrânpûr with four thousand horsemen; came with pride to A’zam Humâyûn; was slain by Daryâ Kháñ, p. 286.

Hisám-âl-mulk Hândârî, was summoned by Mahmûd Khábilj, p. 502.

Humâyûn Bâdshâh, Jinnât Ahsânî, sent letters to Sultan Bâhâdûr to expel Muhammad Zamân Mîrzá from his dominions; advanced to crush Sultan Bâhâdûr, p. 371; met with the army of Sultan Bâhâdûr in the vicinity of Mandisâr, p. 372; pursued Sultan Bâhâdûr to the fort of Mandû, p. 374; came to Bângâla in pursuit of Shâh Khân, p. 448. Sultan Bâhâdûr came to him; account of the rule of deputies in Mâlwa, p. 616; left Mâlwa and went to Agra; turned towards Bângâla, p. 617.

Humâyûn Shâh, Sultan (son of Sultan ‘Alâm-ud-din), ascended the throne and appointed a wise vazir, p. 76; entrusted the duties of the vazir to Khwâjah Na’îm-ud-din Qâran Gilânî; determined to march to Mâlkunda; sent Khân Jahân in advance of himself, p. 77; fought; became victorious; returned to the capital; conferred the title of Khwâjah Jahân on Malik Shâh, p. 78; sent Khwâjah Jahân with Niżám-âl-mulk Ghûrî to the country of Tîlân and followed himself, p. 79; turned against Niżám-âl-mulk; cast off the Khwâjah from his favour; determined on the conquest of Tîlân, p. 80; understood the policy of Hâsan Khân; killed friends and strangers, p. 82; became a slave of lust; put members of his harem to death, p. 84; was slain; period of reign, p. 85.

Hûsain, Mir, was slain in the battlefield, p. 703.

Hûsain, Shâh, ruler of Sind, account of his reign, p. 783.

Hûsain, Sultan, son of Mahmûd Shâh Sharqi, succeeded his brother; advanced towards the country of Orissa; conquered the country of Tirhût; levied tribute, p. 459; returned to Jaûnpûr after victory; put the fort of Benâres into repair;
sent amirs to capture the fort of Gwalior; advanced to conquer Delhi; seized the territory, p. 460, appertaining to Delhi; rejected the request of Sultan Bahadur; defeat by Sultan Bahadur, p. 461; refused to accept the request of Sultan Bahadur; was defeated on every occasion; had to content himself with a section of his territory; induced Bahrak Shāh to advance on Delhi, p. 462; fled and found an asylum with the ruler of Bengal; period of reign; end of the Sharqi Empire, p. 463.

Husain, Sultan, son of Sultan Mahmūd, Sultan of Multān, his accession; siege of Multān by Mirzā Shāh Husain, p. 806; description of Maulānā Sa'd-ul-lah Lāhori put the siege of Mirzā Husain, p. 807; account of Maulānā Sa'd-ul-lah about himself after the victory of Mirzā Husain over Multān, p. 808; his imprisonment; Multān under the possession of Langar Khān, p. 810; Multān in the possession of the Sultāns of Delhi; a final statement by the author, p. 811.

Husain, Sultan, son of Sultan Qutb-ud-din, Sultan of Multān, succeeded his father, p. 791; conquest of the fort of Shōr, p. 792; possessed the fort of Khānāwāl; returned to Multān; brought the country as far as the boundary of the fort of Dhanbāt into possession; rebellion of Sultan Shihab-ud-din; seized Sultan Shihab-ud-din; entered the fort of Multān, p. 793; flight of the Delhi army, p. 794; jagir conferred on Malik Subhāb; arrival of the Balūchis; his grants to the Balūchis; Jām Bāyazid and Jām Ibrāhīm entered his service, p. 795; his letter to Sultan Sikandar, p. 796; peace and agreement with Sultan Sikan- dar; sent an ambassador to Sultan Muṣaffar Gujurat; description of Qādī Muhammad about the palaces of the Sultāns of Gujurat; speech of 'Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak, p. 797; raised Fīrūz Khān on the throne, p. 798; his lamentations after the death of his son, again occupied himself with administration; sent for Jām Bāyazid and instructed him to avenge the murder of his son, p. 799; appointment of Jām Bāyazid as vazir; his death; period of reign, p. 800.

Husain Arghun, Mirzā Shāh, a farman of Bābar; an ambassador of Sultan Mahmūd came to him, p. 805; besieged the fort of Multān, p. 806; began to destroy Multān, p. 808; made over Sultan Husain to the guards; treatment of Shujā' ul-mulk; returned to Thatha, p. 810.

Husain Khān, brother of Ghazi Khān, Sultan of Kashmir, was made the commander of the army of his brother, p. 735; requested Ghazi Khān to pardon the offenders of his enemies, p. 738; accession, p. 740; divided the country of Kashmir; sent a large force against Sankar Chak; plans for murdering him, p. 741; sent a message to his enemies; imprisoned his enemies; sent a large army to attack Sankar Chak, p. 742; his disposition against Khān Zamān; attack of Khān Zamān, p. 743; execution of Khān Zamān; founded a college, p. 744; ordered Mubāriz Khān to be imprisoned; consultation with the lawyers of Shaista, p. 745; reply to Yūsuf's partisans; welcomed the ambassadors of Akbar; execution of the Mufsits; sent his daughter for the service of Akbar, p. 746; illness; his message
to 'Ali Khan, p. 747; handed over government to 'Ali Khan; died, p. 748.

Husain Mākūri, was sent with Qarrā Bahādur; sent his brother with a message to Mirzā Haider, p. 714.

Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk, (son of Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk), succeeded his father Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk, p. 140; attacked Rām Rāj of Bijānagar with 'Ādil Khān, Quṭb-ul-mulk, and Malik Barīd; Rām Rāj advanced to meet them with, p. 141, a large army, p. 142; Rām Rāj was killed, p. 143; ruled for thirteen years; left two sons, p. 144.

Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk, son of Murtada Niẓām-ul-mulk, was released by Ḥasan; was made the successor of his father by Ḥasan Alt, p. 150; Mirzā Khān in his government; spent his time in luxury; āmirā of the Deccan envious of Mirzā Khān decided to get rid of Mirzā Khān; arrangement of a feast, p. 151; invitation to Mirzā Khān and his refusal; Saiyid Murtada Sharwānl complained that he was poisoned; report and suggestion of Mirzā Khān to Husain Niẓām-ul-mulk about Saiyid Murtada Sharwānl; his imprisonment by Mirzā Khān, p. 152; Mirzā Khān imprisoned Ankās Khān; Mirzā Khān sent Mir Tāhir to the fort and brought Iṣmā'īl out of prison; Jamāl Khān Gujrātī and Yāqūt declared, war against Mirzā Khān, p. 153; his massacre; announcement about Iṣmā'īl Niẓām-ul-mulk for the succession of Husain; flight of Jamāl Khān and the other āmirā with Mirzā Khān; Mirzā Khān's defeat and end; his period of rule, p. 154.

Husain Qūl Khān, p. 749.

Husain Sabezwārī, Sultan, father of Ḥasan ‘Alt, p. 150.

Husain Sharwānl, went with an army to reinforce Kājī Chak, p. 708.

Hūshang, Sultān, son of Dilāwar Khān, Sultān of Mālwa, invaded the country of Narsingh Rāy; fought with Sultān Aḥmad by the side of Narsingh Rāy; was unsuccessful, p. 52; advanced to give battle to Muṣafar Shāh; fled to the fort of Dhār; saw Muṣafar Shāh, p. 185; was imprisoned by Muṣafar Shāh, p. 186; was released by Muṣafar Shāh, p. 187; was requested by Firūz Khān for help, p. 189; advanced from Dhār to help Firūz Khān, p. 190; returned to his country, p. 191; advanced towards Gujrāt; returned to his country; retreat of Sultān Hūshang, p. 195; his arrival at the town of Mahīrās; could not face the army of Sultān Aḥmad Shāh and returned to his own country, p. 197; his repeated invasions of Gujrāt; met the army of Aḥmad Shāh, p. 199; was defeated and fled from the battlefield, p. 201; his offences were forgiven by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 203; left Mālwa, p. 204; returned from Jājnagar and entered the fort of Mandū, p. 205; went to Sārangpur and agreed to pay tribute to Aḥmad Shāh; his attack on the camp of Aḥmad Shāh, p. 206; plundering of the camp of Aḥmad Shāh by his army; army of Aḥmad Shāh met with his army and wounded him, p. 207; was defeated by Aḥmad Shāh and retired to Sārangpur; fought with the army of Aḥmad Shāh and was defeated, p. 208; succeeded his father and gave himself the title of Sultān Hūshang; the āmirā and the great men of Mālwa rendered homage to him; heard the news of the arrival of Sultān Muṣafar Gujrātī at
Ujjain, p. 468; fought with Sultan Muzafrar in the vicinity of Dhār but was defeated and arrested; army of Mālwa carried Naṣīr Khān out of Dhār, p. 469; armies of Mālwa left Dhār and resided in the fort of Mandū and made Mūsā Khān their chief; sent a petition to Sultan Muzafrar; Sultan Muzafrar granted permission to Shāhzhāda Aḥmad Shāh to reinforce him; sent a man to the fort of Mandū to summon the amīrs, p. 470; amīrs could not join him; went to the town of Mahāsar but could not conquer it; his cousins came out of the fort of Mandū and joined him, p. 471; entered the fort of Mandū; conferred the title of Malik-uh-Shārūn on Malik Mughīth and appointed him as his vazīr and representative; advanced to destroy the country of Gujārāt but without fulfilling his aim returned to Dhār; while Sultan Aḥmad Gujrātī was attacking the Rāja of Jhālāwār he turned towards Gujārāt, p. 472; could not withstand Aḥmad Shāh and returned to his own country; on the petitions of the Zamāmindārs and the Rājas of Chāmpānūr, Nādūt and Ḥdār advanced to conquer Gujārāt but was unsuccessful, and had to return to his own country, p. 473; fought with Sultan Aḥmad in the vicinity of Kāliḍah but fled and took shelter in the fort of Mandū; conferred the title of Māḥmūd Khān on Malik Māḥmūd and granted him a share in the government of his father; whenever he went on any expedition he left Malik Mughīth as his deputy and took Māḥmūd Khān with him, p. 477; advanced towards Jājnagar, p. 475, as a merchant to buy some elephants, p. 476; attacked the Rāy of Jājnagar and imprisoned him; the vazīrs of Jājnagar sent 75 elephants to him; returned to his own country; released the Rāya of Jājnagar, p. 477; made a night attack on the army of Sultan Aḥmad, p. 478; fought with Sultan Aḥmad and fled to the citadel of Sārangpūr; when Sultan Aḥmad turned his face towards his own country he pursued him and again gave battle, but being defeated took shelter in the fort of Sārangpūr; went from Sārangpūr to the fort of Mandū; conquered the fort of Kākrūn; advanced to conquer Gwāliar and took possession of its neighbours territory; advanced to meet Sultan Mubārak Shāh, p. 479; peace with Sultan Mubārak Shāh; advanced to aid the Rāy of Kehla; attacked Aḥmad Shāh Bāhmanī and fled towards Mandū; his wife fell into the hands of Sultan Aḥmad who sent her to Mandū; marched to conquer Kālpī, p. 480; after fighting with Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqī obtained possession of Kālpī, p. 481; summoned Uṭhmān Khān Shāhzhāda with his two brothers and gave orders for their confinement; destroyed the men of Jātba, p. 482; plundered the Rāja of Bhīm and went to the fort of Ḥūshangābād; told an allegorical story of his death to the amīrs; declared his son Ghaznīn Khān as his successor, p. 483; gave directions to the amīrs; gave counsel and advice to Māḥmūd Khān; some amīrs represented to him in favour of Uṭhmān Khān; his reply to the amīrs, p. 484; he asked for his quiver and called for the amīrs, p. 488; his death, p. 490; period of reign, p. 491.
Index.

Hūshang Shāh, adopted son of Shihāb-ud-din, was placed on the place of Sultān Shihāb-ud-din; was attacked and fled, p. 581.

I

Ibrāhīm, was slain, p. 327.
Ibrāhīm, son of Jahāngīr Mākri, persuaded Muhammad Shāh to invade Kashmir; his rank in the court of Muḥammad Shāh, p. 691; was imprisoned by Malik Kājī, p. 693.
Ibrāhīm, Jām, joined Sultān Ḥusain, p. 795; bestowal of Čeh by Sultān Ḥusain on him, p. 796.
Ibrāhīm, Saiyid, was seized by Ḥadi Zinā, p. 721; fled from custody and joined Daulat Chak, p. 722.
Ibrāhīm ʿAdil Khān, son of ʿIsāʾī Khān, succeeded his father; request of Mallū Khān to Asaʿd Khān, p. 161; Mallū Khān’s reign; repentance of Asaʿd Khān; he imprisoned and punished Mallū Khān and Ulugh Khān; fight with Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk; period of reign, p. 182.
Ibrāhīm ʿĀdil Khān, son of Ṭahmāsp; when and how he ascended the throne, p. 165; Kishwar Khān slew Kāmil Khān; the end of Kishwar Khān and Muṣṭafā Khān; abolished the established form of religion; establishment of a new religion; Dilāwar Khān as a vakil in the administration, p. 166; attacked Dilāwar Khān; instigation of Dilāwar Khān to Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk to attack ʿĀdil Khān; summoned Dilāwar Khān; and blinded him; period of reign, p. 187.
Ibrāhīm Ḥusain Mirzā, reinforced Ch’engiz Khān, p. 403; went with his brother towards Barōda and Bahrōj, p. 413.

Ibrāhīm Khān, son of Ghazi Khān; his faith in Shāh ʿArif, p. 749; his execution, p. 750.
Ibrāhīm Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, see Ibrāhīm Shāh, Sultān, son of Muhammad Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir.
Ibrāhīm Khān, Saiyid, p. 697; as the commander of the army of Ibrāhīm Shāh, p. 698.
Ibrāhīm Niẓām, Saiyid, instigated Faṭḥ Khān to join his brothers; entitled Rukan Khān; made arrangement to defend the fort of Mahrāsa, p. 192; his treachery in conjunction with the amirs of Ahmad Shāh; his execution, p. 193.
Ibrāhīm Quṭb-ul-mulk, became the ruler of Gōlconda; his character and habits; period of reign, pp. 169-170.
Ibrāhīm Shāh Sultān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, was placed on the throne of his father by Malik Kājī, p. 695; accession; his vażīr; rise of Abdal Mākri and his advance towards Kashmir, p. 696; message of Abdal Mākri to Malik Kājī, p. 697; victorious fight of Abdal Mākri; period of reign, p. 698.
Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, brother of Nāzuk Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, accession, p. 725; hostility between Ghāzi Khān and Daulat Chak, p. 726; settlement between Ghāzi Khān and Daulat Chak; destruction of Tibet, p. 727; earthquake in Kashmir, p. 728.
Ibrāhīm Sharqī, Sultān, advanced from Jaunpūr to capture Delhi but returned to his country on hearing of the advance of Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 186; was reinforced by the arrival of Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān, p. 321; had an interview with Bahādur.
Shāh, p. 330; succeeded Mubārak Shāh; condition of Jaumpūr, p. 449; literary works which were written in his name; personal qualifications; advanced to destroy Sulṭān Māhmūd and Māhūr Iqbal Khān, p. 450; laid siege to Kanauj; conquered Kanauj and made it over to Iktītiyār Khān; captured Sanbal and entrusted, p. 451, it to Tātār Khān; seized the town of Baran and made it over to Malik Mārjān; returned towards Jaumpūr; fight and peace with Khādīr Khān; advanced to conquer Kālpī, p. 452; returned towards Jaumpūr hearing of the advance of Mubārak Shāh; died; period of reign, p. 453.

Idt Zinā; his anger on the murder of Ūjā Bahram, p. 710; fought with the Kishthwārī army as the commander of Mirzā Ḥaider's troop, p. 711; fight with the Mughals, p. 715; his house at Srinagar was burnt, p. 716; his daughter was married to Ḥabīb Chak; rise of his power, p. 719; settlement with Ghāzi Khān, p. 720; released the Mughals, p. 721; fight with Ghāzi Khān, p. 722; his victory over the Niyāzīs, p. 723; was defeated by Daulat Chak; his death, p. 724.

Iftikhr-ul-mulk, Malik, was granted Muḥammadpur by Ahmad Shāh as his feef, p. 205; was sent with an army by Ahmad Shāh; his victorious fight, p. 208; was sent with Shāhzāda Muḥammad Khān by Ahmad Shāh, p. 213; seized a large elephant as booty on the destruction of Sulṭān Ašā-ud-dīn, p. 214; was sent by Ẓafar Khān to surround Thāna, p. 215.

Iktītiyār Khān, was sent by Māhmūd Shāh to meet Rāy Bāṭā, p. 272; joined Sulṭān Bahādur in the town of Dhār, p. 355; the charge of the government of Mandū was placed in his hands, p. 356; was left to carry on the siege of the fort of Rāisin, p. 363; was sent by Sulṭān Bahādur to capture the fort of Māndīsr, p. 368; was enlisted among the courtiers of Hūmāyūn, p. 375; Kanauj was made over to him by Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, p. 451; was entrusted with the government of Mandū by Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 616.

Iktītiyār Khān Gujrātī, became powerful but was put to death, p. 385.

Iktītiyār-ul-mulk, was sent to reassure the citizens of Dhār, p. 298; attacked Sayyid Mubārak, p. 305; advised I'mād Khān to leave Ahmādābād, p. 404; arrived at Ahmādābād, p. 407; proposed to conquer Bahrūj, p. 410; was enlisted in the band of the loyal servants, p. 414.

Iktītiyār-ul-mulk, Malik, was made 'Imād-ul-mulk by Māhmūd Shāh and was appointed as naʿīb ghaibat; all the soldiers of Malik Hājī were made over to him by Māhmūd Shāh, p. 248.

Iliyās, Hājī, Sulṭān of Bandāla, slew Sulṭān 'Alā-ud-dīn; his possessions; gave himself the title of Sulṭān Shams-ud-dīn; had public prayers read in his name; marched to Jānjagar, p. 421; his administration, p. 422; fled to the fort of Ekdāla; fought with Sulṭān Fīrūz and fled; sent tribute to Fīrūz Shāh and prayed for pardon; sent Malik Tāj-ud-dīn to Delhi with tribute, p. 423; died; period of reign, p. 424 (and see note 4 of p. 424).

'Ilm-ud-dīn, Sayyid, p. 327, became a martyr, p. 328.
'Imād, Maulānā, brought a gift to Mahmūd Khālīj, p. 539; joined Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 558.

'Imād-ud-dīn Ghūrī, Malik; joined the army of Muḥammad Khān on the bank of the river Krishna; was put to death by Muḥammad Khān, p. 59.

'Imād-ud-dīn Khurāsānī, Maulānā, fought against Sāhib Khān, p. 586.

'Imād-ul-mulk, was appointed by Sultān Muḥammad to subdue Ḥasan; Ḥasan defeated and slew him, pp. 9-10.

'Imād-ul-mulk, son of 'Imād-ul-mulk, with his help Malik Barīd dethroned Ahmad Shāh, p. 133; was sent by Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī to fight with Sultān Hūshang; seized all those who had joined Hūshang and brought them to Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī, p. 191; was appointed by Muẓaffar Shāh to crush Rānā Sānkhī; taking Qawām-ul-mulk went to Pārāntāj, p. 311; was deputed by Sultān Bahādur for revenue collection; fought with Mīrzā 'Askarī and was defeated, p. 376; enmity arose between him and Daryā Khān; went as a suppliant to Mīrir Muḥārak Shāh; being defeated by the army of Gujrāt fled from Būrānpūr, p. 386; attacked 'Imād Khān, p. 396; news of his encampment reached Mahmūd Shāh, p. 592; sent a message to Bihjāt Khān, p. 593; entered the fort of the Rājpūts and vopped the gate to his soldiers, p. 603.

'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwil, Malik, submitted himself to Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt and instigated him to invade the Deccan, p. 4; Sultān Muḥāmmad Ḥashkārī granted him Kāwil as jādīr, p. 94; took up the duties of vazīr of Mahmūd Shāh; consulted Mālka-i-Jahān in administration; was attacked by Dilāwar Khān, p. 112; went to Kāwil, p. 113; invited Mahmūd Shāh to come to Kāwil; advanced to crush Malik Barīd; met the army of Malik Barīd, p. 131; returned to Kāwil, p. 132; reinforced Muḥammad Khān of Aṣir and Būrānpūr; fought with the amīrs of the Deccan; fled to Aṣir and Būrānpūr; regained possession of his dominions with the help of Bahādur Shāh Gujrātī, p. 135; his hospitable transaction with Ismā'īl 'Adil Khān, p. 161; sent a representation to Sultān Bahādur, p. 346.

'Imād-ul-mulk Samarraqdī, Malik, was sent with an army to meet Sultān Hūshang by Ahmad Shāh; arrested some of the disturbers, p. 195.

'Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī, helped to place Sikandar Khān on the throne, p. 323; determined to dethrone Sultān Sikandar, p. 326; his entrance into the palace of Sultān Sikandar, p. 327; placed Naṣir Khān on the throne of Sultān Sikandar, p. 328; dispatched letters to various powers for help, p. 329; collected troops to meet Bahādur Shāh, p. 331; paid wages for one year to the soldiers, p. 332; sent men towards Barōda, p. 334; took shelter in the house of Shāh Jīū Shādiql; was seized and ordered to be hanged, p. 335; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to attack Būrubat, p. 357; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to chastise Būrubat and Rānā, p. 362; fought with Fūran Mal and made him run away, and imprisoned some of the Pūrbānīs; submitted a report to Sultān Bahādur, p. 363; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to capture the fort of Mandisōr, p. 368.
Iqbal Khan, was sent to fight against Mubarak Khan by Mahmud Khalji, p. 527; was appointed to get rid of Shahr Khan, p. 567; pursued Khwajah Suhail and Mahabat Khan, p. 568; went to defend Asir and Burhanpur, p. 570; sent a message to Mahmud Shah, p. 577; was summoned by Mahmud Shah; his flight from his house, p. 579; sent the corpse of Shahab-ud-din to Shahabuddin, p. 580; his petition to Mahmud Shah, p. 581; joined Mahmud Shah, p. 582; was slain by the order of Mahmud Shah, p. 587.

Iqbal Khan Suri, was left in the town of Ujjain by Islam Khan, p. 627.

Isa Salar, Malik, rose in revolt, p. 194.

Isa Tarkhan, Mirza, ruler of Sind, defeated the Jam's army, p. 778; account of his rule in Sind, p. 784.

Isfandiyar, p. 4.

Ishaq, Malik, son of Qutb-ud-din, sent a petition to Mahmud Khalji, who conferred the title of Daulat Khan, wealth and honour on him, p. 504.

Ishaq, Qadil Pir, was sent to reinforce Malik Shaikh; fought with Alf Khan, p. 280 (and see also note 1 on p. 280).

Ishq Mullai, went as an ambassador to 'Ali Shah, p. 750.

Iskander, Jam, son of Jam Fath Khan, ruler of Sind; account of his rule, p. 777.

Iskander Kakhari, reinforced Muhammad Shah, p. 692.

Iskander Khan, was made successor to the throne by Muhammad Shah, p. 691; skirmishes with Muhammad Shah, p. 694.

Islam Khan, the possessions of Shahr Khan devolved on him, p. 623; placed the reins of Malwa in the hands of Shuja Khan; his anger with Shuja Khan, p. 624; a message from Shuja Khan, p. 625; went to enquire about Shuja Khan, p. 626; rewarded Shuja Khan; detached soldiers to pursue Shuja Khan; took possession of Malwa, p. 627; pardoned the offenders of Shuja Khan and bestowed Sargapir and Rasain on the latter; his death, p. 628.

Islam Khan of Kashmir, made an amicable settlement with Haibat Khan Niyazi, p. 713; an ambassador came from Mirza Haider, p. 714; was slain by Muhammad Khan Chak, p. 761.

Ismail, p. 162, was blinded by his brother 'Ali 'Adil Khan, p. 163.

Ismail, son of Mir Bihishti; relations with Fattu; his rank in service; imprisoned Salabat Khan; showed a written letter to Salabat Khan, p. 149; his rise to power; his cruelty, p. 160.

Ismail, Shah, the Badshah of Iran, sent Yadgar Beq Qazibagh to Mahmud Shah with presents, p. 290.

Ismail 'Adil Khan, succeeded his father; his character; his achievements; received a title, p. 160; description of his soldiers; sent ships to Hormuz and summoned men from 'Irak and Khurasan; transaction with Imam-ul-mulk Kawi; his wars with Nizam-ul-mulk and their results; period of reign, p. 161.

Ismail Afghani, p. 9.

Ismail Fath, was placed on the throne by Hasan Gangi with the title of Naqir-ud-din, p. 8 (and see note 3 on pp. 8-9); crept into the fort of Dharagarh, p. 9.

Ismail Hayat, went to bring Sainkar Chak, p. 720.

Ismail Khan Kalpi, p. 507.
Index.

Ismā'īl Niżām-ul-mulk, Jamāl Khān as an all in all in his government; his attitude towards the white skinned people; Jamāl Khān invaded the ‘Ādil Shāhī country and became victorious, p. 155; arrival of Burhān in the Deccan, p. 158; Burhān took the possession of Berār; opposition of Jamāl Khān; Burhān possessed Aḥmadnagar; period of reign, p. 157.

Ismā'īl Ṣafvi, Shāh, sent an ambassador to Gujrat, p. 586.

Ismā'īl Shāh, brother of Ibrāhīm Shāh, Sūltān of Kashmir, accession, p. 729.

I'tmād Khān, refused to believe the message of Burhān summoning him, p. 390; was appointed by Sūltān Maḥmūd as the attendant of his harem, p. 393; placed Raḍī-ul-mulk on the throne of Sūltān Maḥmūd; kept the affairs of Kingdom in his own hands and kept Raḍī-ul-mulk confined in his house; fought and defeated Sūltān Ahmad, p. 395; confined Sūltān Ahmad in his house; put Sūltān Ahmad to death, p. 396; declared on oath that Nanū was the real heir of the throne of Sūltān Ahmad, p. 397; remained as vazīr in the reign of Sūltān Muṣẓaffar, p. 398; kept Sūltān Muṣẓaffar Nānū in a state of imprisonment; attacked the Fūlādīs, p. 399; refused the demands of the Fūlādīs; was defeated by the Fūlādīs; met Mūsā Khān and Shāh Khān but was defeated; gave up the possession of the jāği of Ḥāji Khān and took up his quarters at Aḥmadābād; received a message from Chengiz Khān, p. 400; sent a reply to the message of Chengiz Khān, p. 401; sent a reply to Chengiz Khān inducing him to conquer Nadarbār, p. 402; commenced to equip his army; after receiving the message of Chengiz Khān left the city and encamped in the vicinity of Bātūh; on the arrival of Chengiz Khān took Muṣẓaffar Shāh to the battlefield but being frightened fled towards Dūngarpūr, p. 404; arrived at Aḥmadābād bringing Muṣẓaffar Shāh with him; wrote a letter to Shāh Khān for the evacuation of Bahdar, p. 410; did not accept the agreement which was settled among the amīrs, p. 411; deceived Juhjār Khān; sent a letter to Shāh Khān stating that Nanū was not the son of the Sūltān, p. 412; summoned the Mīrzās from Bahrūj; sent a petition to Khālfā-i-Ilāhī requesting him to conquer Gujrat, p. 413.

J

Jādā, was appointed by Shāikh Shujā'-ul-mulk; plundered the house of a poor man, p. 807.

Ja'far Khān, was sent by his father to Sūltān Bahādur of Gujrat with a request; took permission to visit the city of Aḥmadābād, p. 346.

Jāgū, moved about in the hills; went for protection to Ratan Seīn, p. 348; was sent for by Sūltān Bahādur, p. 349.

Jahān Khān, his letter to Ahmad Shāh informing him of the intention of Sūltān Husain, p. 197.

Jahāngīr Badrah, as the vazīr of Fath Shāh; joined Muhammad Shāh, p. 692.

Jahāngīr Mākri, fled from Kashmir, p. 681; came to strengthen the Kashmiris, p. 684; persuaded Muhammad Shāh to come out of Kashmir, p. 686; fought with the army of Fath Khān and defeated it; advanced for the second time to meet Fath Khān, p. 687; his message
to the Râja of Râjauri; summoned the Saiyids; fight with Fath Khan, p. 688; his seclusion, p. 689; as the commander of the army of Fath Shâh; was killed, p. 692.

Jahângir Mâfri, agent of Mirzâ Hâidar, was awarded the sief of Hûsain Mâfri, p. 115.

Jahângir Qulâ Bâg, ruled Bangâla on behalf of Humâyûn Bâdevâh; was slain by Shâr Khan, p. 445.

Jâlidâh, Saiyidh, p. 301; fled from Mandû and complained about the power and violence of Fûrabba Râjpûta to Mu'azzar Shâh, p. 302; received a letter to Sulţân Mahmûd Sharqi, p. 456; sent a letter to Sulţân Mahmûd Khalji, p. 457; by his exertions peace was effected between Mahmûd Khalji and Mahmûd Sharqi, p. 519.

Jai Singh, account of his rebellion against Mahmûd Shâh, p. 257.

Jai Singh Rây, proprietor of the fort of Birâkar, p. 99.

Jâkar Zand, Mir, arrival in Multân, p. 803; was respected by Jâm Bâyazid, p. 804.

Jâlûl Bukhârî, Saiyid, p. 327.

Jâlûl Khân Bukhârî, shut himself in the fort of Mâlkonda, p. 78; was released from the prison of Humâyûn Shâh; was put to death by a kotwâl, p. 82; incited Mahmûd Khalji to seize the fort of Mâhûr, p. 526.

Jâlûl Kûkhâr, Malik, was displaced by Á'tâm Humâyûn, p. 184.

Jâlûl-ud-din, Saiyid, asked for the help of Mahmûd Khalji against the oppression of Ghâzi Khân, p. 533.

Jâlûl-ud-din, Sulţân of Bangâla, became a Musâlmân; assumed the name of Sulţân Jâlûl-ud-din; died; period of reign, p. 432 (and see note 3, p. 432).

Jalâl-ud-din Quraishî, Saiyidh, was respected by Jâm Bâyazid, p. 796; a wonderful story which was narrated by him, p. 804.

Jamâl, Saiyidh, father of Saiyidh 'Abd-ul-haf, p. 621.

Jamâl Khân Gujrâtî, his fight; his rank in service, p. 153; sentenced Mirzâ Khân to death, p. 154; placed Ismâ'il Nişâm-ul-mulk on the throne; kept Ismâ'il as a puppet and himself rose in power; invaded the 'Adil Shâh country, p. 155; attacked Burhân-ul-mulk and was killed, p. 157; defeated 'Adil Khân; fought with Râja 'Ali Khân; his death, p. 158.

Jalâl-ud-din, Malik, was given the title of Mu'hâfiz Khân by Sulţân Mahmûd Gujrâti, p. 255; was appointed as Shâhna and kotwâl and posted to Ahmadâbâd; satisfactory discharge of his duties improved his honour, wealth and rank, p. 256; was promoted to the rank of vazir, p. 257; was ordered to execute Bhtm Rây, p. 262; was directed by 'Imâd-ul-mulk to attend on Prince Ahmad Khân and to guard the city on the day of 'Id, p. 265; was transferred to the post of 'Imâd-ul-mulk, p. 271; his charge when the fort of Châmpânir was besieged by Sulţân Mahmûd, p. 273; reported to Sulţân Mahmûd about the cure of Rây Batâf; charge of the erection of Jalân Panâh citadel was given to him, p. 276; was sent to receive and welcome Sâhib Khân by Mu'azzar Shâh, p. 293; fled and sought the protection of Rây Singh, p. 336; joined Laţûf Khân, p. 337.

Jalâl-ud-din, Astrâbâdî, Khwâjah; went with presents to Mahmûd Khalji, pp. 540-41.
Jām Firūz, left Thatha and joined Sultan Bahādur, p. 345.

Jāmil, p. 561.

Jamil Hāfiz, Mullā, received favours from Sultan Zain-ul-Abidin, p. 657.


Jamshid Khan, p. 153; his decision; his proclamation; was put to death, p. 154.

Jamshid Qutb-ul-mulk, succeeded his father; period of reign, p. 168.

Jān Bābā, was defeated by his brother, p. 785.

Jānī Beg, Mirzā, ruler of Sind, account of his reign, p. 786.

Jārīlah, mother of Nanū, p. 397.

Jārūd; helped Saiyid Ibrāhīm and Saiyid Ya'qūb in their release, p. 722.

Jasrat Khokhar, p. 651; became powerful in the Punjab and brought it into his possession, p. 652.

Jāwaž Khan, was sent to crush Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 575; despatched a report to Muhmūd Shāh and was summoned back, p. 576; was given a title and sent to crush Mukhtarā Khan and Iqbal Khan, p. 580; was summoned by Muhmūd Shāh, p. 582.

Jāy Sinha, Rahzāda, his flight, p. 765; his fight with Muhammad Qasim, p. 769.

Jesús, p. 547.

Jahājī Muḥammad, his title, p. 238; for further account see Kabir Sultanī, Malik.

Juhjār Khan, attacked Saiyid Mubarakah, p. 395; advised I’tmād Khan to leave Ahmadābād, p. 404; took Sultan Muṣaffar to Dungarpūr and made him over to I’tmād Khan, p. 406; explained his position, p. 407; started for the chagān field with Chengiz Khan, p. 408; killed Chengiz Khan, p. 409; went to I’tmād Khan, p. 412.

Juhjār Khan, defeated Malik Muhmūd, p. 593.

Jū, Shāh Shaikh, the descendant of Qūtb ‘Alam Shaikh Burhān-ud-dīn, p. 324; was slain in the house of Qadr Khan, p. 336.

Jivan Dās Khattry, was appointed to the post of vazir by Sultan Ahmad Shāh, p. 182.

Jüna, Malik, came out of the camp with Ahmad Shāh; was sent by Ahmad Shāh to make an enquiry; informed Ahmad Shāh about Sultan Hūshang and his army, p. 207.

Jūnān, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 773.

K

Kābīr Sultanī, Malik, his title; prepared to create disturbances; resolved to remove Malik Sha’bān ‘Imād-ul-mulk from his office, p. 238; went to his house, p. 239; his amazement, p. 240; fled from the darbār; went among the grasias was slain by them, p. 241.

Kājī Chak, Malik, as the vazir of Muḥammad Shāh; his power of judgment; imprisoned Ibrāhīm Mākri, p. 693; fought against Iskandar Khan; went to Rājauri, p. 694; as the vazir of Muḥammad Shāh; imprisoned Muḥammad Shāh and raised Ibrāhīm Khan to the throne, p. 695; as the vazir of Ibrāhīm Shāh, p. 696; went to the village of Sullāh to meet Abdāl Mākri; a message from Abdāl Mākri, p. 697; his defeat and flight, p. 698; his defeat by Abdāl Mākri, p. 700; owing to the treason of Abdāl
Mākri went to Hindūstān, p. 701; his defeat and flight, p. 702; fought with the Kāshghars, p. 703; his residence, p. 705; disputes with Abdāl Mākri, p. 706; defeat by Mīrzā Ḥaidar; brought reinforcements from Shīr Khān Afghān, p. 708; fight with Mīrzā Ḥaidar; advanced to crush Mīrzā Ḥaidar, p. 709; his flight; death, p. 710.

Kahm-ul-lah, (son of Maḥmūd Shāh), was placed in place of Wali-ul-lah Sulṭān by Malik Barīd; his imprisonment in Bīdar, p. 134; Ḥmad-ul-mulk Kāwli went to the aid of Muḥammad Khān; fought with Niẓām-ul-mulk, Malik Barīd, Khuḍawand Khān and the amirs of the Deccan; fled to Asir and Burhnāpūr; with the help of Sulṭān Bahādur of Gūrāt Ḥmad-ul-mulk regained his possessions and read the Khūṭba in the name of Sulṭān Bahādur in the parganas of his territories, and invited him to invade the Deccan; Niẓām-ul-mulk, Malik Barīd, and other amirs could not withstand the Sulṭān Bahādur of Gūrāt and read the Khūṭba in his name in Aḥmadnagar and all the provinces of the Deccan were divided among the four amirs, p. 135.

Kālū, Malik, one of the adherents of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 239; was sent by Maḥmūd Shāh to seize the murderer of Aḥmad Sulṭān; was executed by the order of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 248; was defeated by Muṣaffar Ibrāhīm, p. 518.

Kānhā, Rāja, Rāja of Jhālāwār, p. 212; hearing of the marches of Aḥmad Shāh left his country; brought a force from Sulṭān Aḥmad Bahmanī; plundered parts of Nadarhār, p. 213; joined Sulṭān Ḍāʿud-dīn, p. 214.

Kāmāl, Mīr, was slain in the battlefield, p. 703.

Kāmāl Khān with Ṣaḍar Khān went to punish Bahādur Gilḥān; they fought and were wounded; fell into Bahādur’s hands; and were sent to Dābul, p. 117 (and see note 1, p. 160).

Kāmāl Kākā, a tradition about his name, p. 718.

Kāmāl-ud-dīn, Maulānā, p. 745.

Kāmāl-ud-dīn, Saiyīd, was slain by Ghāzi Khān, p. 533.

Kāmāl-ud-dīn Māwī, Shāikh, pp. 299, 588.

Kāmīl Khān, Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Khān was placed on the throne by his help, p. 165; was slain by Kishwar Khān, p. 166.

Kāmārān, Mīrzā, sent an army to conquer Kashmir, p. 700.

Kaniyā, Rānī, wife of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 600.

Kānḏ, Rāy, fought with Sulṭān Muḥammad; asked Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khāliji for aid, p. 225.

Kāns, Rāja, how he acquired power; his son became a Musalmān and sat on the throne, p. 430; period of his power, p. 431 (and see note 3, p. 430).

Kāpūr Chand, brought a message from Sulṭān Bahūl Lūḍī to Maḥmūd Khāliji, p. 542.

Kān, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 776.

Kārsāshah, father of Tāhir Āl, p. 633.

Khādana Khān, p. 124.

Khāli Ḥasan ‘Arab, Maḥli-ul-tujjār, was appointed to conquer Maḥām by Aḥmad Shāh, p. 49; possessed Maḥām; fought with Ṣafar Khān but was defeated, p. 50; opposed Nāṣr Khān as far as Asir and raided part of that territory, p. 58; advanced to capture the fort
of Sangasar; seized the fort of Raja Sarka and made him prisoner, p. 61; forgave Sarka; made Sarka the leader of his army; Sarka led him to a place where the whole army was murdered, p. 62; p. 65 n.

Khalfa-i-Ilahi, His Majesty, sent Pahrau Khan to give an account of the administration of Murtada Nizam Shah, p. 147; Murtaza Nizam Shah in his service; showed favour to Burhan; gave shelter to the 'amirs of Berar, p. 148; issued farman to the amirs and Zamindars in favour of Burhan Nizam-ul-mulk, p. 158; was requested by I'timad Khan to invade Gujerat; sent Khan Kalan to conquer Sirohi; marched towards Gujerat, p. 413.

Khalil Khan, Shahrzada, was given the country of Sora, forts of Junagarh and Karnal by Mahmud Shah, p. 277.

Khannam, widow of Mirza Haidar, her advice to the Mughals, p. 718.

Khannamji, sister of Mirza Haidar, went to Kashgar, p. 723.

Khan Jahan, marched towards Malkonda; was attacked and defeated by Sikandar Khan, p. 77; watched the city, p. 115; was sent by Sultan Ahmad Bahmani to fight with Shahrzada Muhammad, p. 213; went to reinforce Malik-ut-tujjar, p. 216; ruled Bangala after Khan Khannan and slew Daud, p. 446.

Khan Jahan Shiraft, took possession of Nausari, p. 377.

Khan Jahan, Sultan; through his intervention Har Ray asked Ahmad Shah to be pardoned, p. 211.

Khan Khannan, his decision; his proclamation, p. 154; defeated Daud and conquered Bangala, p. 446.

Khan Khannan Ahmad Khan, see Ahmad Shah Bahmani, Sultan.

Khan Zamun; defeated Sankar Chak, p. 742; attacked Husain Khan, p. 743; his execution, p. 744.

Khanwaz Khan; did not admit Shihab-ud-din, 574.

Khizr, Maulana, his title, p. 238; was imprisoned, and sent to Dip, p. 242; and see Kabir Sultan, Malik.

Khizr, Malik, took tribute from the Rajas of Bazar, Idar, and Sirohi, p. 257; consultation by Malik Mughith; was celebrated as Miyam Agha; joined Sultan Hushang, p. 471.

Khizr Khan, slew Mallu Khan, p. 451; ruled in Delhi; fight and peace with Sultan Ibrahim, p. 452.

Khudawand Khan, Mahmur was conferred on him by Sultan Laashkar, p. 94; fought with Imad-ul-mulk Kawilli, p. 135; his designation in the time of Murtaza Nizam Shah; an event, p. 147; his performance, p. 148; was sent to Shaikh Muhammad Qasim Budhu by Muazzar Shah, p. 187; was appointed as the exift of the kingdom by Mahmud Shah and was left in attendance on Shahrzada Ahmad Khan at Ahmadabad; private talk with Ray Rayan to unite with Imad-ul-mulk and to place Shahrzada Ahmad Khan on the throne, p. 264; sent for Ray Rayan and explained his views about Imad-ul-mulk; kept his intention in secret, p. 286; was fined by Mahmud Shah, p. 270; was ordered to be arrested, p. 271; was left by Muazzar Shah to guard the camp, p. 300; gave advice to Muazzar Shah, p. 319; was ordered to summon Bahadur Khan, p. 322; helped to place Sikandar Khan on the throne, p. 323; sought to be ahead of the others, p. 329; rendered homage to Sultan Bahadur, p. 335;
was sent to Bākar by Sultān Bahādūr, p. 347; waited upon Sultān Bahādūr, p. 348; was left to accompany the camp, p. 357; was murdered by Būrān, p. 390.

Khurṣān Khān, deserted Sultān Bahādūr and joined the army of Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 372.

Khurram Khān, welcomed Bahādūr Shāh, p. 331.

Khurshīd, Rānī, p. 545, took the side of Shujā‘at Khān in the latter’s fraternal dispute, p. 552; made over the treasures of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din to Nāṣir Shāhī agents, p. 553; her report against Sultān Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 554; took the affairs of the kingdom in her hands; narrated the death of Mūnjā Baqāl to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din, p. 555; representation to Ghiyāth-ud-din, p. 556; her order to the pay-mastor; sent an army in pursuit of Shaikh Ḥābib and Khwājah Suhail, p. 557; sent a report about the power of Nāṣir-ud-din to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-din, p. 559; her advice to Shujā‘at Khān, p. 561; dismissed ‘Alī Khān and appointed Malik Piyārā, p. 562; she was seized by the amirs of Nāṣir Shāh, p. 563; was made over to custodians. p. 564.

Khusūsh-Qadām, Malik, was given the title of ‘Imād-ul-mulk by Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 293.

Khwājah Bābū, was imprisoned but was released by the order of Sultān Bahādūr, p. 340.

Khwājah Jahān, went to protect Astr and Būrānpūr, p. 570.

Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk, taking the bridle of the horse of Niẓām Shāh went to Bīdar, pp. 244, 635.

Kishtan Rāy, p. 20; surrendered his fort to Mujāhid Shāh, p. 21.

Kishwar Khān, p. 165; slew Kāmil Khān; became the vakil of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Khān; was put to death, p. 166.

Kobī Zunnārdār, Malik, was sent by Rāja of Idar to Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 297.

Kūnbhā, his defeat by Muḥmūd Khaļīf, p. 514; attacked Muḥmūd Khaļīf but was defeated by the latter, p. 515; agreed to pay tribute to Muḥmūd Khaļīf, p. 520; sent tribute to Muḥmūd Khaļīf, p. 527; sent a message to Muḥmūd Khaļīf for the pardon of his offences, p. 528; sent troops to confront the army of Muḥmūd Khaļīf, p. 529.

Kūpa Dīvī, wife of Rāja Adwan, her message to Shāh Mīr; attacked Shāh Mīr; conversion to Islām; her imprisonment, p. 635.

Kūpwarī, sister of Yūsuf Chak, was married to Gḥāzi Khān, p. 721.

L

Lādan Khaļīf, Malik, his hostile attitude towards Malik Ḥīsām-ud-din Maḥūl; had an interview with Āṣaf Khān and welcomed him; was given the title of Khān Jahān by Muḥmūd Shāh, p. 284; the village of Banās was given to him by Muḥmūd Shāh, p. 285.

Lājin, Malik, was sent by Sultān Tughlaq to summon the amirs of hundreds of Dauletābād; was slain by the amirs of hundreds, p. 2.

Lakhan Sēn, strengthened the citadel of Rāisnān and was ready for battle, p. 359; his advice to Siḥādīf, p. 361; sent two thousand Pūrābṭas to fight with the army of Gujrāt, p. 362; agreed to evacuate the fort of Rāisnān if Sultān Bahādūr would excuse the offences of Siḥādīf and summon him from the fort of Mandi; a request to Sultān Bahādūr, p. 365.
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Lalitādat Devharah, Rāja, the temple which was built by him, p. 648.

Lang, Shāhzāda, joined Mīrzā Ḥaidar, p. 716; his release, p. 722.

Langar Khān, p. 805; joined Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain, p. 806; gained possession of Mūlān; was summoned by Mīrzā Kamrān, and was granted the territory of Bābāl by the latter, p. 810.

Laṭīf, entered the service of Bahādur Shāh, p. 331.

Laṭīf, Ustād, accompanied Yusuf Khān, p. 761.

Laṭīf Khān, was sent by Ahmād Shāh to punish Malik Shāh Malik; defeated Malik Shāh Malik, p. 195.

Laṭīf Khān Bāritwāl, Malik, Sulṭān Sikandar conferred on him the title of Shārzaḥ Khān; advanced to put down Shāhzāda Laṭīf Khān but was slain, p. 325.

Laṭīf Khān, Shāhzāda, his intention to seize the throne of Sikandar Khān, p. 325; went as a suppliant to Fath Khān, p. 331; remained concealed at Chāmpānīr, p. 336; his arrival at Āwās, p. 338; fought and died, p. 341.

Laṭīf Zakariyā, placed Shāhzāda Masūd Khān on the throne of Mālwa, p. 494.

Loār, was sent to conquer Loharkāt by Sulṭān Qutb-ud-din and was slain, p. 642.

Lōdhī, governor of Kandīyah, p. 586; attacked Shāhīb Khān, p. 587; was nominated to punish Sikandar Khān, p. 591; was murdered, p. 592.

Lōhār Chak, was sent with an army to Rājaur; was seized by Muḥammad Khān Chak, p. 760; imprisoned ‘Alī Khān; intention of the Kaḥmurīs about him, p. 755; Kaḥmūr came under his power, p. 758; his defeat and imprisonment; was blinded, p. 757.

Lōhar Mākri, his share in Kaḥmūr, p. 699.

Lūlī Laund, Malik, made proposals of peace, p. 742; his imprisonment, p. 745; fled to ‘Alī Khān, p. 748.

M

Mādarī, Rāy, was sent by Sulṭān Sikandar to Tibet; his rebellion; death, p. 645.

Mādhū Singh, received Yusuf Khān, p. 761.

Māghīth, Malik, father of Maḥmūd Khān, p. 221.

Maḥābat Khān, the governor of Chandīrī; was killed on the battlefield, pp. 88, 535.

Maḥābat Khān, joined Shēr Khān, p. 565; instigated Shēr Khān to battle, p. 566; taking the wounded Shēr Khān with him fled from the battlefield, 568.

Maḥādīvī, p. 648.

Mahdī Kōkāh, accompanied Yusuf Khān, p. 761.

Maḥmūd, Malik, was defeated by Jhujār Khān, p. 593.

Maḥmūd, Malik, son of Malik Māghīth, see Maḥmūd Khaljī, Sulṭān, Sulṭān of Mālwa.

Maḥmūd, Sulṭān, the ruler of Bhakkar, ruler of Sind, account of his reign, p. 786.

Maḥmūd, Sulṭān, son of Ibrāhīm Sharīf, succeeded his father; sent an ambassador with presents to Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 453; asked permission to punish Naṣīr Khān Jahān for his cruelty and disobedience; reply of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 454; advanced towards Kālīpt, p. 455; started for Kālīpt to meet Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khaljī; sent troops to raid the country of Barhār;
joined the detachment which was sent to Barhār; sent a letter to the Shaikh-ul-İslām, Shaikh Jalâldah, p. 456; his emissary was sent to Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khalji by Shaikh Jalâldah with a note of advice; acceptance of the proposals, p. 457; returned to Jaunpūr; treatment of his people; conquest of Chunār advanced into the country of Orissa; period of reign, p. 458.

Maḥmūd, Sulṭān, son of Sulṭān Firūz, Sulṭān of Multān, his accession, p. 800; his associates; his disposition towards Jām Bāyazīd, p. 801; was wounded by ʿĀlam Khan; nominated amīr to punish Jām Bāyazīd, p. 802; peace with Jām Bāyazīd, p. 803; a wonderful story which was narrated by Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishi, p. 804; farmān of Bābār Bādshāh to Mirzâ Shāh Ḥusain Arghūn; collected his troops and sent an ambassador to the latter; his death, p. 805.

Maḥmūd Barkī, Malik, was sent by Aḥmad Shāh to punish Naṣīr; captured Nādīt, p. 199.

Maḥmūd Garjistānī Khvājah, sold ʿĀdil Khan to Maḥmūd Shāh Bahmanī, p. 169.

Maḥmūd Gīlānī, Khvājah, Malik-ut-tujjār, defeated the Mandū army, p. 535.

Maḥmūd Khalji, Sulṭān, Sulṭān of Mālwa, on the invitation of Sikandar Khan Bukhārī came to conquer Berār, p. 70; besieged Māhūr; after the arrival of Alā-ud-dīn Shāh, Khalji retired towards Mandū; p. 71; at the instigation of Niẓām-ul-mulk Ḥūrfī invaded, p. 87, the Deccan; fought but was defeated by Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 89; appeared before Niẓām Shāh’s army and after defeat; pursued, p. 89, it as far as Bidar; on the arrival of Maḥmūd Gujrātī started for Mandū, p. 90; advanced to conquer, p. 91, the Deccan; arrived on the frontier of Daulatbābād; heard that Maḥmūd Gujrātī was approaching, marched towards Māl- konda, p. 92; wanted to help Rāy Kank Dās, p. 225, but did not advance to support him, p. 226; started to conquer Gujrāt; ordered destruction of Barnāma; invaded Gujrāt, p. 227; met Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn in Kaparbanj; wrote a couplet to Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 228; was defeated by Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn and went back to Mālwa, p. 229; attacked Niẓām Shāh, p. 243; travelled by way of Gondwānā towards Mālwa, p. 244; invaded the Deccan; plundered the neighbourhood of Daulatbābād; retired to his own country; a letter from Sulṭān Maḥmūd Gujrātī; reply to Maḥmūd Gujrātī, p. 251; came from Mandū to Dāhrī and prayed for help from Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 306; marched with Aṣaf Khan against Bhum Kāran Pūrbī; fought, was wounded and taken prisoner, p. 307; sent Sharzah Khan to plunder the towns in the territory of Chītōr; sent Daryā Khan with a message to Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 350; conferred the title of Sulṭān Ghīyas-ud-dīn on his son and neglected to see Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 352; came out to give battle, p. 353; was treated with respect by Sulṭān Bahādur but owing to his harsh attitude was arrested, p. 354; wrote a letter in reply to Sulṭān Maḥmūd Sharqī, p. 454; despatched a note in favour of Naṣīr Khan to Sulṭān Maḥmūd Sharqī, p. 455; advanced towards Chandāri and Kālpī; struggle between the army of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Sharqī, p. 456;
proposing some conditions made peace with Sultan Mahmud Sharqi, p. 457; was granted favours and title by Sultan Hushang, p. 474; Ghazin Khan was placed in his charge by Sultan Hushang; his guarantee for faithfulness to Ghazin Khan; his interview with other sardars, p. 485; his reply to Malik Uthman Jalal, p. 486; informed Ghazin Khan about the intention of Zafar Minjumla, p. 487; attended on Sultan Hushang during his last illness; sent a reply to Ghazin Khan, p. 488; became watchful for the death of Hushang; his orders, p. 489; declared Ghazin Khan as the heir of Sultan Hushang; after rendering homage confirmed the accession of Ghazin Khan, p. 490; result of his skill in administration, p. 491; his reply to the suspicions of Sultan Muhammed, p. 493; caused the murder of Sultan Muhammed; sent a reply to Malik Bayazid Shaikh, p. 494; kept his men ready; fought with the amirs and defeated them, p. 495; sent a message to Khan Jahhan, p. 496; accession on the throne of Malwa; description of his reforms and benevolence, p. 497; contributions to education; attempt of Hushang Shahl amirs to injure him; wounded some of the conspirators, p. 498; punished the conspirators; excused Shahlza Ahrum Khan as well as the others who took part in the conspiracy on the request of A'zam Humayun; sent A'zam Humayun Khan Jahhan to suppress the rebels of Islaamabad, p. 499; sent out detachments to fight with Sultan Ahmad, p. 501; his generosity towards the poor; summoned some amirs who were hostile to Sultan Ahmad, p. 502; made a night attack on the camp of Sultan Ahmad; held a consultation and its decision, p. 503; sent Taj Khan and Mansur Khan in advance of himself to Sarangpur; a petition of Malik Ishaq reached him; arrived at Sarangpur and conferred favours on Malik Ishaq and on others, p. 504; defeated and sentenced Shahlza 'Umr Khan to death, p. 505; a message from the leaders and commanders of the army of Chandri; sent an army to crush Malik Sulaiman; arrived at Chandri and fought with Malik Sulaiman, p. 506; captured the citadel of Chandri; allotted Chandri as a jagir to Malik Muzaffar Ibrhim, p. 507; relieved the city of Narwar from the siege of Dungar Sen and returned to Shadlabad; erected the tomb of Hushang Shahl and the Jama Masjid of Hushang Shahl near the Ram Sarai gate, p. 508; petitions from the amirs of Mewat and the great men of Delhi; advanced towards Delhi; encamped in the village of Panna; Sultan Ahmad took up a position with Tughlaqabad at his rear, p. 509; sent troops against the army of Sultan Muhammed; his dream; agreed to a pacific settlement with Muhammed Khan and returned to Malwa, p. 510; his stay and benevolences in Shadlabad; advanced towards Kampil for the destruction of Nasir Shah, p. 511; accepted the petition of Nasir Shah and turned towards Chitir; devastated the temples; encamped at Komhalmir, p. 512; seized the fortifications of the Rajput; destruction of the temples and the idols of the Rajput, p. 513; seized a fort at the foot of the Chitir hill; besieged Chitir; defeated Komhal; sent...
detachments for ravaging Chitôt; summoned A'zam Humâyûn Khân to capture the possessions of the Râjput; his grief on the death of A'zam Humâyûn; appointed Tâj Khân in the place of A'zam Humâyûn; opposed the attack of Kônbbâh and defeated him; returned to Shâdiábâd; a message from Sulțân Mahmûd Sharqî regarding the religious disobedience of Nașîr, p. 515; gave permission to Sulțân Mahmûd Sharqî to chastise Nașîr; request of Nașîr; sent ʿAli Khân to Sulțân Mahmûd Sharqî and, p. 516, the latter's reply; advanced to protect Nașîr, p. 517; after fighting with the army of Sulțân Mahmûd Sharqî returned to Fathâbâd; sent Muṣaffar Ibrâhîm to suppress Mubârak Khân, p. 518; peace with Sulțân Mahmûd Sharqî; establishment of a hospital; advanced to capture the fort of Mandalgarh, p. 519; agreed to a peace with the Râjputs and returned to his own dominions; conferred favours on Saiyid Muḥammad Khân; captured the town of Alhanpûr, p. 520; took tribute from the Râja of Kôtah and returned to Shâdiábâd; request of Gangdâs; advanced to help Gangdâs, p. 521; besieged the town of Sulṭân-pûr; granted rank and title to Malik ‘Alâ-ud-dîn; his grief on the death of Sulțân Muhammad, p. 522; ravaged the town of Barôda; fought with Sulțân Qûṭb-ud-dîn and its result, p. 523; appointed Sulțân Ghiyâth-ud-dîn to raid the town of Sûrat; made peace with Sulțân Qûṭb-ud-dîn, p. 525; punished the Râjputs of Mahôlî; changed hostility between Yûsuf Khân Hin-daun and the governor of Bîyânâ into friendship; left the government of the fort of Rantambhôr and Hârauti in the charge of Qadam Khân; besieged Mâhûr but fled, p. 526; turned Mubârak Khân out of Baklâna; sent Sulțân Ghiyâth-ud-dîn to put down Mubârak Khân; advanced towards Chitôt, p. 527; appointed Maŋšûr-ul-mulk to destroy Mandisîr; took tribute from Kônbbâh and turned towards Shâdiábâd; his advance towards Mandisîr; his sudden advance towards Ajmîr, p. 528; gave up the idea of conquering the fort of Mandalgarh and returned to Shâdiábâd, p. 529; captured the fort of Mandalgarh, p. 530; sent Shâhzâda Sulțân Ghiyâth-ud-dîn to raid Kilwârah and Dilwârah; nominated Shâhzâda Qadam Khân and Tâj Khân to capture the fort of Bûndî; appointed Sulțân Ghiyâth-ud-dîn and Qadam Khân to raid the countries of Kilwârah and Dilwârah; encamped in the vicinity of Kônbbâmîr, p. 532; took tribute from the Râja of Dûngarpûr; returned to Shâdiábâd; marched towards Asîr, p. 533; forgave ʿAdîl Khân's offences; march against Niẓâm Shâh, p. 534; after defeat by Niẓâm Shâh retreated to his own territory, p. 535; sent Maqûbîl Khân with an army to suppress the disturbances in the fort of Kehria; advanced towards Daulatábâd, p. 536; having raided some villages of Mâlkûnda returned to Shâdiábâd; sent Maqûbîl Khân to plunder Elichpûr, p. 537; treaty with the ruler of the Deccan, p. 538; received Shaikh Nûr-ud-dîn with respect; welcomed the arrival of Maulânâ 'Irâm-ud-dîn, p. 539; sent Tâj Khân and Ahmad Khân to put down Maqûbîl Khân; started towards Mahmûdâbâd; appointed Malik Dûd to chastise the tribe
which had given shelter to the Rāyāzāda, p. 540; accepted the presents of Mīrzā Abū Saʿīd and sent various gifts in return; planned the erection of the fortress of Jalālpūr and placed Mīrzā Khān in charge of it, p. 541; agreement with Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī; his death and period of reign, pp. 251, 542.

Māhmūd Khān, p. 198; was nominated to proceed to the country of Sūrath by Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī; recovered tribute from the zamīndārs of Sūrath, p. 199.

Māhmūd Khān, commander of Aḥdāl Mākri, p. 696; his representation to Mīrzā Kāmirī, p. 700.

Māhmūd Khān, Shāhīzāda, country of Māhūr was conferred on him by Ahmad Shāh Bahmani, p. 48.

Māhmūd Khādīr, Malik, went in pursuit of the conspirators, p. 498.

Māhmūd Kāṣvād, Malik, p. 554; was killed by Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, p. 555.

Māhmūd Naʿmān, Shaiʿīb, took a man to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, pp. 548-49.

Māhmūd Nāmī, Malik, 'Umdat-ul-mulk, was sent by Ghaznīn Khān to wait on Māhmūd Khān, p. 484; was sent a second time to wait on Māhmūd Khān, p. 485; told the news of Māhmūd Khān to Ghaznīn Khān, p. 487; was sent to Māhmūd Khān with the message of Ghaznīn Khān, p. 488; took the message of Māhmūd Khān to Ghaznīn Khān, p. 489.

Māhmūd Shāh, Sultān of Bangālā, succeeded his father, p. 440 (and see note 1, p. 440); his martyrdom; period of reign, p. 441.

Māhmūd Shāh Sultān, son of Māhmūd Shāh Shārqi, succeeded his father; proved unfit for the throne; dethronement; time of reign, p. 459.

Māhmūd Shāh, Sultān, Gujrātī, son of Muḥammad Shāh; sent a letter to Māhmūd Shah Bahmani giving an account of the treachery of Bahādur Gilānī, p. 118; his flight from Amīr Taimūr, p. 181; date of accession to the throne of Gujrāt, p. 237; attitude towards his people; plot to cause disturbance, p. 238; ordered that the creators of disturbance be arrested; evil of the conspirators; suppression of disturbances, pp. 239-242; marched in the direction of Kaparbanvī; regulated the administration of the thānas and of the purgauna; started from Ahmadābād; encamped on the bank of the river Khārī; letter from Nigel Shāh for assistance; advanced to help Nigel Shāh against Sultān Māhmūd Khalījī, pp. 90, 92 and 243; directed attention towards the Deccan; advanced into the country of Asīr and Burhānpūr; encamped in the neighbourhood of Tāūrī; army of Sultān Māhmūd Khalījī suffered hardships, p. 244; returned to Ahmadābād; Jāfīra of the soldiers of Gujrāt; the march towards the Deccan made Māhmūd Khalījī fly after ravaging the neighbourhood of Daulatābād; turned back to Ahmadābād accepting the presents of Nigel Shāh; warning to Sultān Māhmūd Khalījī, p. 245; report about the infiction of the Zamīndārs of Hāwar and of the fort of Dūn; punished and deflected the rebellious chiefs, p. 246; returned with success to Ahmadābād; Bahāʿ- ul-mulk killed Adam Silākādā, p. 248; execution of 'Imād-ul-mulk and 'Aṣd-ul-mulk; Malik Ikbāliyarul-mulk was made 'Imād-ul-mulk; marched to conquer the fort of Karnāl, p. 248; on the way to
Jūnāgarh ravaged the country of Sōrath; arrived near the hill of Karnāl, p. 249; defeated the Rājpūts; ravaged the surrounding country; besieged the fort of Karnāl; Rāy Mandalik asked for pardon; went back to Ahmadābād; appointed soldiers to punish Rāy Mandalik, p. 250; Rāy Mandalik was defeated by the soldiers of the Sulṭān and paid a tribute, p. 251; rejected the counsel of the amirs in connection of the conquest of Mālwa on receiving the news of the death of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khāliji; sent armies to plunder Sōrath; was wounded by an elephant, p. 252; advanced to conquer the fort of Jūnāgarh and the hill of Karnāl; distribution of five krośas of gold among the soldiers; sent troops in every direction to plunder the country; determination for the upliftment of Islam in Jūnāgarh, p. 253; fight with Rājpūts for the fort of Jūnāgarh; surrendered the fort of Jūnāgarh; besieged the hill of Karnāl, p. 254; Rāy Mandalik became humble and surrendered the hill of Karnāl to the Sulṭān; Rāy Mandalik was converted to Islām and received the title of Khān Jahān; foundation of the city of Muṣṭafā-ābād, p. 255; gave up the idea of conquering Chāmpānīr marched against the country of Kach, p. 257; accepted the excuses of the people of Kach; marched towards Sind, p. 258; possession of Sind, p. 259; marched towards Jagat to release the Musalmāns from the oppressions of the Kāfsārs; arrived at Jagat, p. 260; ravaged the temple of Jagat; started for the island of Beyt; captured the citadel of Beyt; Rāy Bhīm fled; entered the city of Beyt; released all the Musalmāns from prison; left Malik Tūghān as the thānādār of Beyt; returned to Muṣṭafā-ābād, p. 261; Rāy Bhīm was arrested and brought to the Sulṭān; sentenced Rāy Bhīm to death; started towards the fort of Chāmpānīr, p. 262; sailed to punish the Malābāris; arrived at the port of Kanbāyat; attacked Chāmpānīr; returned to Ahmadābād; despatched his amirs to the thānas of various countries, p. 263; appointment of vazīr and engagement with the administration; conspiracy of Khudāwānd Khān with Rāy Rāyān, p. 264; effort of Rāy Rāyān to include 'Imād-ul-mulk in the conspiracy; confidential activities of 'Imād-ul-mulk against the conspiracy, p. 265; failure of the conspiracy; a rumour in Muṣṭafā-ābād, p. 266; investigation about the rumour; made a plan to deceive his opponents and his activities according the plan, pp. 267-269; 'Imād-ul-mulk disclosed the story of conspiracy; punishment of Khudāwānd Khān; went to Nahrwāla; sent 'Imād-ul-mulk to conquer Jālōr and Sājōr; Mujāhid Khān murdered Qaisar Khān, p. 270; punishment of the murderer of Qaisar Khān; favours for the family of 'Imād-ul-mulk after the latter's death; famine in Gujrat, p. 271; Rāy Batai defeated and killed Malik Sadhā; marched towards Chāmpānīr; Rāja of Chāmpānīr submitted for the pardon of his offences which was not granted; encamped in the village of Karmārī, p. 272; conflicting attitude of the Rājpūta; siege of the fort of Chāmpānīr; petition of apology from Rāy Batai to the Sulṭān; Rāy Batai asked Sulṭān
Ghiyāth-ud-din for help, p. 273; after consulting the learned men Sultan Ghiyāth-ud-din gave up the idea of helping Rāy Batai; measures and activities for the conquest of the fort of Chāmpānīr; conquest of the fort of Chāmpānīr, pp. 274–276; gave the name of Muḥammadābād to Chāmpānīr; execution of Rāy Batai and Dūngarī; order for the construction of citadel, palaces, and gardens in Chāmpānīr, p. 276; jaghr for Khāli Khān Shāhzāda, p. 277; a farman to the Rāja of Abū in regard to the merchants who were looted by him; news about the disobedience of Bahādur Gilānī, p. 278; sent Malik Qawām-ul-mulk to punish Bahādur Gilānī; Sultan Muḥammad Bahmanī marched from Bīdar, defeated, and slew Bahādur Gilānī; marched towards Mahrāsa; flight of Alī Khān; sent Sharf-i-Jahān to reassure Alī Khān, p. 279; sent Qādi Pir Ishaq to reinforce Malik Shaikhra; Alī Khān fought with Qādi Pir Ishaq; on the request Alī Khān was excused; owing to the murder of nāb-i-‘ard Alī Khān was imprisoned and he died, p. 280; on arrival of the Sultan ‘Adil Khān Fārūqī paid tribute and was pardoned, p. 281; postponed his march towards Mālwa; after hearing the victory of his slave Āyūz over the Fīrāqī returned from Dūn to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr, p. 282; agreed to bestow the dominions of Asir and Burhānpūr on ‘Adil Khān, son of Ḥasan Khān; marched towards Asir and Burhānpūr; heard of the activities of Ḥisām-ud-din Maghūl, p. 283; advanced to Thālnīr; sent Āṣaf Khān, and Malik ‘Aziz-ul-mulk to punish Malik Ḥisām-ud-din and ‘Alam Khān; bestowed the government of Asir and Burhānpūr on ‘Adil Khān, p. 284; marched towards Sultanpur Nadarbār, p. 285; after hearing of the homicidal accounts of his subordinates he ordered destruction of those who did not observe the rights of salt; a petition from Aẓam Humāyūn detailing the hostile account of Shīr Khān and Saif Khān and his siege of the fort of Asir, p. 287; grant of money to Aẓam Humāyūn; assurance of royal aid in case of necessity to Aẓam Humāyūn; request of Nizām-ul-mulk Bāghī for ‘Alam Khānādā, p. 288; reply to Nizām-ul-mulk; Sultan Sikandar Lūḍī of Delhi sent presents to the Sultan; travelled towards Nahrwāla, p. 289; paid a visit to the tombs of mufis; summoned Shāhzāda Muṣaffar Khān; became ill, p. 290; died; period of reign; titles after death, p. 291; came as a supplicant to Naṣīb Shāh, p. 444; bestowed the title of Sultan-ush-sharq on Malik Sarwar and conferred on him the government of Jaunpūr, p. 447; joined Sultan Ibrāhīm but was not honoured by the latter; went to Kanauj; removed the thānādār of Kanauj; possessed Kanauj, p. 450; opposed Mallū Khān bravely; came and sat on the throne of Delhi; marched to engage Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqī, p. 451; made over the government of Sanbal to Aẓīd Khān Lūḍī and returned to Delhi, p. 452.

Muḥammad Shāh, Sultan of Gujrat, p. 383, son of Lattī Khān, son of Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh sent Muḥammad Khān to Gujrat; was placed on the throne of Gujrat with the title, p. 384, of Muḥammad Shāh;
Daryā Khān took the Sultān to Chāmpānīr, p. 385; Imdād-ul-mulk advanced against the Sultān; advanced towards the country of Sūrath to crush Imdād-ul-mulk; advanced towards Burhānpūr in pursuit of Imdād-ul-mulk; Mīrān Mubārak was defeated; Daryā Khān’s administration and his actions as the bādshāh, p. 386; came out of the fort of Ahmādābād and went to ‘Alam Khān Lūdī; ‘Alam Khān Lūdī helped the Sultān; march of Daryā Khān towards Dūlqa; fight between ‘Alam Khān and Daryā Khān and the defeat of the latter, p. 387; departure of messengers to bring Sultān Māḥmūd; arrived at Ahmādābād and flight of Daryā Khān to Shār Khān Afghān, p. 388; set himself to manage the government; favourable treatment for his men; how Burhān murdered the Sultān and others, p. 389; proclamation that Burhān was the heir to the throne; murder of Burhān; period of reign, p. 391; character of the Sultān, p. 392; his constructive works and peculiar tastes; abolished the improper customs of Gujrāt, p. 393.

Māḥmūd Shāh, Sultān, son of Nāṣīr Shāh, Sultān of Mālwa, was summoned by his father, p. 571; was made the heir with the title of Sultān Māḥmūd Shāh, p. 572; was pained at heart after the speech of Nāṣīr-ul-dīn Shāh, p. 573; his accession on the throne, p. 574; sent Jāwāsh Khān to crush Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn; ascended the throne of Khājī Sultāns, p. 575, a report from Jāwāsh Khān; entrusted the management of the affairs of the Kingdom to Basant Rāy, p. 576; pride and death of Basant Rāy; message by Ṣadr Khān and Afdal Khān about the removal of Naqūl-ul-mulk, p. 577; false report of Muhāfīz Khān against Iqāb Khān and Mukhtās Khān which incited him to issue an order for their execution, p. 578; Mukhtās Khān and Iqāb Khān escaped the deceitful attempt of Muhāfīz Khān, p. 579; sat on the throne and sent Afdal Khān and Jāwāsh Khān to put down Mukhtās Khān and Iqāb Khān; death of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 580; title of Hūshang Shāh for the adopted son of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn; sent Nizām Khān to reinforce Dastūr Khān; flight of Hūshang in the hills of Bahār Bābā Hājī; petitions from Iqāb Khān and Mukhtās Khān about the wickedness of Muhāfīz Khān, p. 581; statements of his servants about the evil aims of Muhāfīz Khān; on the order of punishment Muhāfīz Khān revolted against him and attempted to seize him; fled to the town of Ujjain; Muhāfīz Khān placed Shāhāzādā Shāhīb Khān on the throne, p. 582; contracts of Shāhīb Khān with Ṣadr and Afdal Khān; rise of Shāhīb Khān; his victory over Shāhīb Khān, p. 583; advanced towards Shāhīdābād, p. 584; fought with and defeated Shāhīb Khān; sent a message to Shāhīb Khān for settlement, p. 585; refusal by Shāhīb Khān of his peace offer; defeat and flight of Shāhīb Khān; promise of Sultān Muḥammad Khān to Shāhīb Khān, p. 586; evil aims and actions of Mādīnī Rāy which promoted rebellion; ordered the execution of Afdal Khān and Iqāb Khān; rebellion of Sikandar Khān, p. 587; entrusted the office of the vazīrāt to Mādīnī Rāy; wrote to Mansūr Khān to put down Sikandar Khān; Mansūr Khān and Sanjār
accepted the request of Mādīnī Rāy; disobedience of Sālbāhān, p. 598; had a consultation for the execution of Mādīnī Rāy and Sālbāhān; combat with the Rājpūts, p. 599; suppression of the tumult; his conclusion from the message of Mādīnī Rāy; being fed up with the Rājpūts fled to Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī, p. 600; the efforts of Sultān Muẓaffar brought him again to Mālwa putting the enemies to death, p. 602; retreat of Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 604; invited Sultān Muẓaffar to come to the fort of Shādībād; departure of Sultān Muẓaffar; summoned his amīrān, sardās and soldiers; advanced to attack Hāmkaran in the fort of Kākrūn, p. 605; his defeat in the fight with Rānā Sāṅkā and the latter's kindness to him, p. 606; retirement of the Gujrātī troops from Mālwa; the whole of his territory was occupied by his enemies, p. 608; a portion of Mālwa under the possession of Rānā Sāṅkā; ended the violence of Silhādīl; returned to Mandū; submission of Silhādīl, p. 609; showed respect to Chānd Khān; efforts of Raḍī-ul-mulk to transfer the rule of Gujrāt from Sultān Bahādūr to Chānd Khān; Ratan Sūn advanced into Mālwa; summoned Muʿīn Khān and Silhādīl to his aid; conferred a title and honour on Muʿīn Khān, p. 610; gave some parganas to Silhādīl; sent Daryā Khān to wait on Sultān Bahādūr with a message; reply of Sultān Bahādūr; marched from Ujjain towards Satwās; his servants joined Sultān Bahādūr, p. 611; invasion of Sultān Bahādūr and the latter's victory, p. 612; was kept in imprisonment with all his sons; attack of Rāy Singh on the camp of
Aṣaf Khān and Iqbal Khān; attained martyrdom, p. 614; period of reign, p. 615.
Mahmūd Turk, Malik, p. 203.
Mahram Bég, was sent to conquer Kashmir by Mirzā Kāmrān, p. 700.
Mahta, Malik, joined Naṣir-ud-din, p. 558; was nominated by Naṣir-ud-din to crush Yakān Khān, p. 560; was sent to bring Miyān Manjha, p. 564.
Majd-ud-din, Khwājah, p. 124.
Mājhi Khokhar, Malik, surrendered the fort of Khānawal, p. 793.
Makhdūma-i-Jahān, directed all her energies in furnishing the bed of equity and justice; administration of Niẓām Shāh was entrusted to her hands, p. 86; refused to send Shāhzāda Fath Khān for the throne of Dāūd Shāh, p. 237; design of Mahmūd Shāh for the possession of her territory, p. 259.
Makna Mughal, fought with the Kishwar army as the commander of Mirzā Haidar’s troops, p. 711.
Makta, Mr., joined Mirzā Haidar, p. 716.
Māl, Rāy, Rāja of Idar, retired to the hills of Bījānagar; had a fight with Niẓām-ul-mulk, p. 300; advanced to Idar, p. 301; the news of his raid reached Muṣaffar Shāh; his territory was destroyed by Muṣaffar Shāh, p. 306.
Mālūn, Malik, defeated the army of Shujā’at Khān, p. 559.
Malik Shāh Turk, Khwājah Jahān, was given the title of Khwājah Jahān and sent to Tilang by Humāyūn Shāh; besieged the fort of Deor Konda; did not appreciate the opinion of Niẓām-ul-mulk; was defeated by the Rāy of Orissa; joined Humayun Shāh and gave a false reason for his defeat, p. 79; was made over to a jailor by Humayūn Shāh, p. 80; was made over to the army of Niẓām Shāh, p. 88; seized the bridle of the horse of Niẓām Shāh and turned towards Bīdar, p. 89; was sent with a large army to fight with Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī, p. 90; pursued Mahmūd Khaljī; returned via Gondwārā; ordered the Rājas of Gondwārā to be put to death, p. 91.
Malik-ul-Mashāikh, Qādī, his son fought with As’ad Khān, p. 280.
Malik-us-Sharq, p. 486; was summoned by Mahmūd Khaljī, p. 502.
Malik-ut-Tujjār, the son of Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk, and the governor of Junr; went with his father to Gujrat, p. 75 (and see note on p. 75).
Malik-ut-Tujjar, Khwajah Jahān Khwajah Mahmūd Gilani, plundered the Khalji camp, p. 88; was sent by Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī to conquer the territory of the Rāy of Sangīsar and Kōkan; was reinforced by As’ad Khān and Kishwar Khan in Kolāpur; fought with the enemy in the vicinity of Kaikanta, p. 97; seized the fort of Ranat; captured the fort of Māchal; message of submission by the Rāy of Sonkar, p. 98; conquered the island of Goa; came to the capital where he was granted the title of A’ẓam Humayūn Khwajah Jahān, p. 99; informed Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī about the disobedience of Birkāna Ray, p. 101; the territory of Birkāna Ray was entrusted to him by Muhammad Shāh, p. 102; conspiracy which resulted in his murder, p. 107; his literary qualification and work, p. 108.
Malitha, Jām; ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 774.
Malkah-i-Jahān, mother of Nizām Shāh, being apprised of the treachery of Khwājah Jahān entrusted the defence of the fort of Bidar to Mallū Khān and took Nizām Shāh with her to Fīrūzābād, p. 89 (and see note 1, p. 89), p. 535.

Malka-i-Jahān, mother of Sulṭān Shiḥāb-ud-dīn Maḥmūd, p. 112.

Malka-i-Jahān, wife of Sulṭān Husain Shariq, instigated Sulṭān Husain for the conquest of Delhi, p. 460; was seized by the men of Sulṭān Bahūlī who sent her to Sulṭān Husain; induced Sulṭān Husain to fight with Sulṭān Bahūlī, p. 461.

Mallū Iqbāl Khān, advanced towards Jaunpūr; on the way arrived at Kanauj; again advanced towards Kanauj; took Sulṭān Maḥmūd with him, p. 449; ran away from his own camp, and joined Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, p. 450; went to Jaunpūr and Delhi, leaving Kanauj to Sulṭān Maḥmūd; again came to besiege Kanauj; returned unsuccessful to Delhi; was slain by Khīḍr Khān, p. 451.

Mallū Khān, see Mallū Khān, Qādir Shāh, Sulṭān of Mālwa.

Mallū Khān, brother of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān, request to Asa'd Khān, p. 161; was made Sulṭān by Asa'd Khān; was arrested by Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān and blinded, p. 162.

Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, see Mallū Khān, Qādir Shāh, Sulṭān of Mālwa.

Mallū Khān, Qādir Shāh, Sulṭān of Mālwa, was appointed as the defendant of the fort of Bidar by Malkah-i-Jahān, pp. 89, 535; was given Sārangpūr by Sulṭān Bahādur, pp. 358, 616; gave protection to Imād-ul-mulk, p. 386; was appointed by Nāṣir-ud-dīn to defeat Shīr Khān, p. 567; gave himself the title of Qādir Shāh; took the town of Bhūta in the vicinity of the Nerbāda river into his possession; Bhūpat Rāy and Pūrūn Māl took possession of the fort of Rāṣīn; development of his power; a farmān from Shīr Khān of Bengal, p. 617; reply to Shīr Khān; representation of Saif Khān Dehlavi; his reply to Saif Khān, p. 618; period of his occupation of Mālwa; advice of Saif Khān; his submission to Shīr Khān; in favour with Shīr Khān, p. 619; brought his family to Ujjain; his flight from Shīr Khān; period of reign, p. 620.

Mallū Qādir Khān, governor of Mālwa; fled towards Manūd, p. 374.

Mān Rāy, the Rāy of Orissa left him in the fort of Rājmandir; surrendered the fort to Sulṭān Laḥkāri, p. 104.

Mandalk, Rāy, asked pardon for his offences from Maḥmūd Shāh; the news of his pride reached Maḥmūd Shāh, who sent a strong army against him, p. 250; presented valuable ornaments and large tribute to the amīr of Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 251; his humble representation to, and the reply from Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 253; fled and retired into the fort of Jūnāgahr; fight with the army of Maḥmūd Shāh; proposal of peace which was accepted; surrendered the fort of Jūnāgahr and took shelter in the hills of Kārnāl, p. 254; joined the service of Maḥmūd Shāh and surrendered the hills of Kārnāl; his wish to become a Musal-mān; was granted the title of Khān Jahān by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 255.

Māhī Khān, was sent with a message to Nāṣir-ud-dīn by Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, p. 556.

Mānik Dēv, Rāja of Jammū; was reinforced by Ādam Khān, p. 674.
Mān Singh, Rāja, Yūsuf Khān had an interview with him, p. 756.

Maṣūr Khān, informed Sultan Ahmad of the advance of Māhmūd Khālji, p. 504; reply of Mādīnī Rāy; joined Bihjat Khān, p. 588; proclaimed Sāhib Khān as the Sultan, p. 592; his agent plundered the army of Māhmūd Shāh, p. 593.

Maṣūr-ul-mulk, was appointed to destroy Mandisōr by Māhmūd Khālji, p. 528.

Māqūl Khān, was sent by Māhmūd Khālji towards the fort of Kehrla, p. 536; his victory over Ghāzī Khān, p. 537; news of his revolt reached Māhmūd Khālji, p. 540.

Marjān, Malik, was sent with presents to Sultan Bahādur of Gujrat by Naṣīr Shāh, p. 444; joined Sultan Ibrāhīm, p. 451.

Masa'ūd Khān, fled from Mālwa and came to Ahmād Shāh for protection, p. 222.

Mashhadī, Saiyid Mīrzā-i, p. 114.

Mashir-ul-mulk; took a message from Qhiyāth-ud-din to Nāṣir-ud-din, p. 556; was sent to arrange for peace, p. 561.

Mashir-ul-mulk, Malik, placed Shāh-zāda Mas'ūd Khān on the throne of Mālwa, p. 494; was given the title of Niẓām-ul-mulk and the post of vāzirāt by Muhmūd Khālji, p. 497; went in pursuit of the conspirators, p. 498; was sent to reconnoitre the roads, p. 505; his hostility, p. 525; was sent by Māhmūd Khālji to the Deccan for confirmation of peace, p. 538.

Mas'ūd, was killed by Shēr, p. 660.

Mas'ūd, son of Malik Kājī, attacked Iskandar Khān and was slain, p. 694.

Mas'ūd Khān, Shāhzāda, was placed on the throne of Mālwa by the efforts of amirs and sardārs, p. 494; took sanctuary with Shāikh Fālidh, p. 495; was sent by Sultan Ahmad Gūjrātī to conquer Mālwa, p. 501; Sultan Ahmad promised to recover Mālwa for him next year, p. 506.

Mas'ūd Nāyak, Khwājah, defeated Sankar, p. 741; slew Bahādur Khān; seized Khān Zamān; bestowal of the title of Ḥusain Khān on him, p. 744; his imprisonment, p. 745.

Mawādāb Khān, fort of Shāhdābād under his control, p. 583.

Mādīnī Rāy, hearing of the advance of Muzaffar Shāh proceeded to Dāhār; went to Rānā Sāṅkā to beg for help; sent a letter to Rāy Pithōrā giving an account of his preparations, p. 303; brought Rānā Sāṅkā to aid Bihām Karan Pūrabīs, p. 307; was sent to Silhādī with a message by Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 315; joined Māhmūd Shāh, p. 583; wounded Sāhib Khān, p. 585; his false representation to Māhmūd Shāh against the Amir, p. 587; was made vazir; his reply to Maṣūr Khān; was sent to put down Sikandar Khān, p. 588; his wicked instigation of Māhmūd Shāh and its results, p. 596; his advice to the Rājpūta in connection with rebellion, p. 597; his submission to Māhmūd Shāh, p. 598; was wounded by a servant of Māhmūd Shāh, p. 599; suppressed the tumult of the Rājpūta; sent a petition to Māhmūd Shāh and was reappointed to his post, p. 600; went to Chitōr to bring Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 602; request to Rānā Sāṅkā, p. 606.

Mīrāk Haṟavī, Khwājah, minister of Murtuḍa Niẓām Shāh, p. 145; was given the title of Chengiz Khān; conquered Berār and annexed it to the territories of Murtuḍa Niẓām.
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Shāh; his death, p. 146 (and see note 2, p. 146).
Mīrak Mīrzā, Ḵān, killed Ujj Bahram, p. 710; joined Mīrzā Ḥaidar, p. 716; his release, p. 722.
Mīrān, Saiyid, placed the imperial crown on the head of Nanū, p. 397; possessed Dūlqa and Dandūka, p. 398.
Mīrān Ḥusain, see Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk, (son of Murtadā Niẓām-ul-mulk).
Mīrān Ḵān, bestowal of Sultān Sikan-
dar on him, p. 649.
Mīrzā Ḵān, nephew of Kishwar Ḵān, in the administration of Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk; envy of the amirs of the Deccan, p. 151; invitation to a feast; had an interview with Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk and requested him to keep the sick Saiyid in the fort; imprisoned Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk, p. 152; imprisoned Ankas Ḵān; released Ismā'īl; his fight, p. 153; his decision; proclamation; tried for peace; flight; was sentenced to death by Jamāl Ḵān, p. 154.
Mīrzā Ḵān, Jalālpūr was placed under his charge by Maḥmūd Ḵaljī, p. 541.
Miyān, Malik, was asked by 'Imād-ul-mulk to have an interview with him, p. 265.
Miyān Bāyazīd, son of Shujā' Ḵān, was entrusted with the government of Handiyah and Rālaḥ by Shujā' Ḵān, p. 628.
Miyān Jiw, was nominated to crush 'Yakān Ḵān by Nūṣir-ud-dīn, p. 560.
Miyān Manjhla, was appointed as the heir of Nūṣir-ud-dīn with the title of Sultān Shihīb-ud-dīn; his residence, p. 564; his rebellion, p. 570; fought but was defeated and fled; his father's instructions, p. 571; attempted to enter Naṣratābād, p. 574; retired despondent towards Kandāsh, p. 575; his death, p. 580.
Mu'āẓam Ḵān, waited on Sultān Bahādur, p. 333.
Mubārak, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his rule, p. 777.
Mubārak Bukhārī, Mīrān Saiyid, helped I'tmād Ḵān in placing Raḍī-ul-mulk on the throne; was attacked by I'tmād Ḵān and slain, p. 395.
Mubārak Ghāzī, Malik; went to wait on Maḥmūd Ḵān, p. 485; told 'Umdat-ul-mulk to inform Ghazānīn Ḵān about the idea of Maḥmūd Ḵān, p. 487.
Mubārak Ḵān, joined Nūṣir-ud-dīn, p. 559; was sent to conquer the fort of Mandū; p. 563; was sent to reassure Shīr Ḵān, p. 564; was made over to the men of Shīr Ḵān, p. 566; attacked and killed Sultān Muḥammad, p. 778.
Mubārak Ḵān, ruler of Astr, invaded the country of Baklāna but was defeated by Maḥmūd Ḵaljī, p. 527.
Mubārak Ḵān, son of Junaid Ḵān, was seized by Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, p. 517; complained of his tyranny to Maḥmūd Ḵaljī, p. 518.
Mubārak Ḵān, Saiyid, took a message to Abdāl Ḵān, p. 752; his report to Yūsuf Ḵān; his revolt, p. 753; after the defeat of Yūsuf Ḵān sat on the throne; fight with Yūsuf Ḵān; his letter to Yūsuf Ḵān, p. 754; went to the Khānqāh of Bābā Ḵallī, p. 755.
Mubārak Ḵān Sarwānī, released Shujā', Ḵān, p. 622.
Mubārak Shāh, Mīrān, helped 'Imād-ul-mulk; fought with the Gujrat army but was defeated; rendered homage to Sultān Maḥmūd, p. 386.
Mubārak Shāh, Sultān, son of Ḵādīr Ḵān, intended to conquer Jauhpūr, p. 453; marched to aid the Rāy of
Gwāliar, p. 479; agreement of peace with Sultān Hūshang, p. 480.
Mubārak Shāh Sharqī, succeeded Sulṭān-ush-Sharq, p. 448; collected an army to oppose Mālli Iqbāl Khān; both retired without an engagement to their countries; on hearing of the advance of Mālli Iqbāl Khān he again began to collect an army; his death; period of reign, p. 449.

Mubāriz Khān 'Adalī, conferred the country of Mālwa on Shujā‘ Khān, p. 628.

Mubāriz-ul-mulk, Malik, was appointed to the government of Idar by Muẓaffar Shāh; heard about the bravery of Rānā Sānkhā from a bard; gave the name of Rānā Sānkhā to a dog and kept it tied up at the gate of Idar, p. 307; sent an account to Muẓaffar Shāh about the violence of Rānā Sānkhā; was condemned by the vazīrs of Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 308; instead of fighting with Rānā Sānkhā, he, according to the advice of the sandārs came to Aḥmadnagar; advice of a bard to him; his reply to the bard; his fight with Rānā Sānkhā in which he was wounded, p. 309; retired to Aḥmadābād, p. 310; came with an army to Aḥmadnagar to bury the martyrs; was attacked by the kūlīs and the grāśias but was victorious, p. 311; advanced to fight with Rānā Sānkhā, p. 316.

Mufarrah Pidār Ḥabshi, was sentenced to death, p. 564.

Mugḥīth, Malik, Khān Jāhān, decided to support Sultān Hūshang; the request of Mūsa Khān, p. 471; was given a title and rank by Sultān Hūshang, p. 472; requested Sultān Hūshang to pardon Shāhzāda ‘Uthmān Khān; kept Fatḥ Khān, ‘Uthmān Khān and. Hālbat Khān in confinement under the orders of Sultān Hūshang, p. 482; rendered homage to Ghaznīn Khān; was given the title of Masnad-i-‘Ali Khān Jāhān by Ghaznīn Khān, p. 491; was nominated by Sultān Muḥammad Shāh to punish the Rājpūts of Hārūti, p. 492; his reply to Muḥmūd Khān in connection with the accession to the throne of Mālwa, p. 496; was given the title of Aʿzam Hūmâyūn and honour by his son Muḥmūd Khālji, p. 497; requested Muḥmūd Khālji to pardon the conspirators; was sent to suppress the rebels by Muḥmūd Khālji, p. 499; sent wise men with advice to Ahmad Khān; advanced to overthrow Malik Ančhā, p. 500; asked the Saiyids to describe the behaviour of Naṣrat Khān; transferred the government of Chandārī from Naṣrat Khān; entered the fort of Mandū, p. 501.

Mugḥīth Khālji, Malik, p. 238.

Muḥāfīz Khān, was put to death by Rānī Khurshīd and Shujā‘at Khān, p. 562.

Muḥāfīz Khān, Khwājāh Sarā, did not allow Shīkhāb-ud-din to enter the gates of Naṣratābād, p. 574; his report to Muḥmūd Shāh against the amīrs, p. 578; instigated Muḥmūd Shāh to seize Mukhtār Khān and Iqbāl Khān, p. 579; was given a rank and title, p. 580; his victorious revolt; placed Shāhzāda Sāhīb Khān on the throne of Muḥmūd Shāh, p. 582; his flight from Shahrāī, p. 584; his defeat and flight, p. 586; his fatal defeat, p. 594.

Muḥāfīz Khān Jadīd, was sentenced to death, p. 564.

Muḥammad, son of Sultān Ḥasan, his education was entrusted to Malik Yārī Bhat, p. 680.
Muḥammad, Malik, son of ʿAlīnābād, was summoned by Muḥammad ʿAlīqādī, p. 502.

Muḥammad, Qādī, went as an ambassa-
dor to Sulṭān Muṣṭafār Gujrātī; his description of the palaces of the Sulṭān of Gujrat, p. 797.

Muḥammad, Saiyid, was honoured by Sulṭān Sikandar, p. 647.

Muḥammad, Saiyid, Qutb-i-ʿĀlam, Sulṭān Qutb-ud-din went to see him, p. 234; said to Sulṭān Qutb-ud-din that the dynasty of Muṣṭafār Shāh would be maintained by his younger brother, p. 235.

Muḥammad, Saiyid, son of Saiyid ʿAbdul Muḥammad ʿAbdul Muḥammad, p. 683; his fortifications, p. 686; joined Fath ʿAbdul Khān, p. 689.

Muḥammad, Sulṭān, Sulṭān, was left in the fort of Sīwī by Shāh Bāg; was killed by Mubārik Khān, p. 778.

Muḥammad Atka, Mir, celebrated Khān Kalān, was sent by Khālifa-i-
īlāhī to conquer Sīrūbī, p. 413.

Muḥammad Bākhā, Malik, was given the title of Ghāzī Khān by Muḥammad Shāh and was sent in attendance on Aʿẓām Humāyūn, p. 285; left Burhānpūr and took his residence in Thālnīr; fled, p. 286; was slain, p. 287.

Muḥammad Bāqi, ʿAlī, ruler of Sind, account of his reign, p. 785.

Muḥammad Bhat, incited Yūsuf to rebel against Husain Khān, p. 747; his imprisonment, p. 750; brought Lōhar to the presence of Yūsuf ʿAlī Khān, p. 757.

Muḥammad Chak, son of Kājī Chak; his death, p. 710.

Muḥammad Farmān, Yūsuf, brought a message from Sulṭān Bahūlūl Lūdī to Muḥammad Khān, p. 542.

Muḥammad Guli-dārāz, ʿAlīnābād, a great Sūfī of the time, and the disciple of Shaikh Naṣīr-ud-dīn Muḥammad Dāndī, came from Delhi; Sulṭān Fīrūz Shāh welcomed him; his holiness the Saiyyād settled down at Gulbarga, p. 37; the Saiyyād informed Fīrūz Shāh that Khān Khānān Shāhīzāda ʿAlīnābād was destined to succeed him instead of his son ʿAbdul Khānīn, p. 38.

Muḥammad Ḥaḍar, his flight, p. 734.

Muḥammad Hārūn, advanced towards Mekrān, p. 761; sent the letter of Ḥajjājī to Rāy Dāhir, p. 763.

Muḥammad Khān, was directed to obey Shāh Khān, p. 650; was made a councillor by Sulṭān Zain-ul-
ʿAbīdīn, p. 652; was appointed as the successor of Sulṭān Zain-ul-
ʿAbīdīn, p. 660; was made the commander of a detachment, p. 698; his representation to ʿAlīnābād, p. 700; his imprisonment, p. 757; was seized and punished, p. 758.

Muḥammad Khān, son of Shāh Khān FūĪlādī, came into the city of ʿAlīnābād and offered congratulations to the murderers of Chengi Khān, p. 499; governed Bangāla for a time; his son gave himself the title of Sulṭān Bahādur and ruled there, p. 445.

Muḥammad Khān, son of Sulṭān Allāh ʿAlīnābād, was made over to Shāhīzāda ʿAlīnābād, p. 48 (and see note 2 on p. 48); was sent by Sulṭān ʿAlīnābād to conquer Bījnagar, p. 58 (and see note 1 on p. 58); put the innocent Malik Imlād-ud-mulk to death; was defeated by ʿAlīnābād; fled in disgrace, p. 59; received farmān of ʿAlīnābād; went to Rājījūr and retired there, p. 69.

Muḥammad Khān, son of ʿAdīl Khānīn, the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr, was
reinforced by 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwilt, p. 135.

Muḥammad Ḵān, Saiyid, rendered tribute to Maḥmūd Khalji, p. 520.

Muḥammad Ḵān, Shāhzhāda, was appointed by Ahmad Shāh to inquire about the act of plundering of Kānhā; defeated the Dakinī troops, p. 213; advanced towards Daulaṭābād to give battle; fought with Sultān ʿAlā-ud-dīn and defeated him; returned from Daulaṭābād and halted in the town of Nadarbār from where he informed his father and received his directions, p. 214; received a special favour from Ahmad Shāh; sent a representation to Ahmad Shāh, p. 217.

Muḥammad Ḵān, Shāhzhāda, son of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī; his advancement towards Sārangpūr, p. 503; left Sārangpūr for Ujjain, p. 504.

Muḥammad Ḵān Asīrī, waited upon Sultān Bahādur at Samba, p. 351; was posted to the west of the battery of Shāhpūr, p. 353; was sent by Sultān Bahādur for the chastisement of Bhūpat and Rānā, p. 362; arrived in the vicinity of Kahrār and informed Sultān Bahādur about the enemy in that place, p. 363; was appointed to capture the fort of Kākrūn by Sultān Bahādur, p. 367.

Muḥammad Ḵān Chak, seized Lōhār Chak; went to Ḥaidar Ḵān, p. 750; slew Islām Ḵān, p. 751; was slain, p. 753.

Muḥammad Ḵān Mākrī, went with a message of Saiyid Mubārak Ḵān to Yūsuf Ḵān, p. 754; joined the enemies of Mubārak Ḵān, p. 755.

Muḥammad Ḵān Mākrī, son of Aḥmād Mākrī, his marriage, p. 721; was granted a fief by Ḥusain Ḵān; his plans against Ḥusain Ḵān, p. 741; his imprisonment, p. 742; was blinded, p. 744.

Muḥammad Ḵān Qandahārī, Shāh; was sent to conquer Mālwa by Akbar, p. 631.

Muḥammad Lārī Khwāja, author of Sirāj-ut-Tawārīkh, p. 4.

Muḥammad Mākrī, fought with Kishtrwārī army as the commander of Mīrzā Ḥaidar’s troop, p. 711; was slain with his son, p. 712.

Muḥammad Nazr, Rājaurī was made over to him by Mīrzā Ḥaidar, p. 712; his imprisonment, p. 715; his release, p. 722.

Muḥammad Qāsim, ‘Imād-ud-dīn, was sent to conquer Sind, p. 764; his victories, p. 765; defeated Bahbhrā, p. 766; his fight with Ṣayyid Dāhir, p. 767; conquest of Rāwar, p. 770; account of his death, p. 771.

Muḥammad Qāsim Budhū, Shāikh, was requested by Muṣaffar Shāh to pray for the victory of Islām, p. 187.

Muḥammad Qult Qub-ul-mulk; his succession to the throne; fell in love with a prostitute; laid the foundation of Bhāgnagar; his period of reign, p. 171.

Muḥammad Rūmī, p. 718.

Muḥammad Ṣaddūr, was killed by Ḥaidar Chak, p. 736.

Muḥammad Šāliḥ ‘Aqil, went as an ambassador to Yūsuf Ḵān, p. 758.

Muḥammad Šāmargandī, Maulānā, p. 259; narrated his story to Maḥmūd Shāh of having been looted; was treated kindly, sent to Aḥmadābād, and helped financially by Maḥmūd Shāh; was assured and consoled by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 260; was sent for by the order of Maḥmūd Shāh from Aḥmadābād, p. 262.

Muḥammad Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, ascended the throne of Dakīn;
gave himself the title of Muḥammad Shāh Laakhkār, enlisted a thousand Turkī slaves among his servants; granted, p. 93, Kāwil to ‘Imād-ul-mulk, Junīr to Niẓám-ul-mulk, and Māhūr to Khudāwānd Khān as Jāḥṣīb, p. 94; appointed Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk to conquer the fort of Kehrla, p. 95; sent Malik-ut-tujjār to conquer the territory of the Rāy of Sonkar and Kokan, p. 97; Rāy of Sonkar surrendered the fort of Kaikana to Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 98; conferred the title of Aḵām Humāyūn Khwājah Jahān on Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 99; sent ‘Adil Khān to capture the fort of Bīrakār; conferred that territory on ‘Adil Khān as Jāḥṣīb, p. 100; Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahān reported about the rebellion of Birkāna Rāy; besieged the fort of Birkāna, p. 101; the Rāy offered allegiance, excused the Rāy; entrusted the country of the Rāy to Khwājah Jahān and returned to the capital; the Rāy of Orissa, p. 102, plundered and devastated part of the Deccan and retired to his country; sent Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk to punish the Rāy of Orissa; instead of going, p. 103, towards Orissa Niẓām-ul-mulk went towards Zirbād; marched and arrived near Rājmundrī; left Khwājah Jahān in attendance on the Shāhzhāda went to Rājmundrī; arrived on the bank of the river; nominated DāryāKhān to pursue the Rāy of Orissa; encamped around the fort of Rājmundrī; Rāy Mān asked for protection and surrendered the fort; confirmed Rāy Mān in the possession of the fort and its neighbourhood; returned to the capital, p. 104; started for Tilang; besieged the fort of Kandār; thānādār of Kandār became loyal and surrendered the fort; advanced to the portas of Narasingh Rāy; took tribute from the Rāy and retired to his capital; ordered erection of a fort for thānādār; vāzīr reported about Kānjī, p. 105; arrived at Kānjī; the soldiers ravaged Kānjī; returned to the capital; heard a rumor against Khwājah Jahān, p. 106; the enemies of Khwājah Jahān proved the rumor by a forged letter; without asking explanation the Khwājah was put to death, p. 107; fell ill and died; period of reign, p. 109. Muḥammad Shāh, son of Hūshang Shāh Gōṛū, Sultān of Malwa, helped Naṣir in besieging the fort of Tāhrīr, p. 198; on the arrival of Aḥmad Shāh’s army retorted to his country, p. 199; killed the elephant of Aḥmad Shāh’s army, p. 200; treatment of his brother, p. 481; was declared as the heir of Sultān Hūshang, p. 483; sent a message to Mahmūd Khān, p. 484; having heard about the intention of the amīr, sent another message to Mahmūd Khān, p. 485; fled to Kākrūn; sent a message to Mahmūd Khān; wrote a letter to Malik Mughīṭh, p. 488; enshrouded the corpse of Sultān Hūshang by the order of Mahmūd Khān and was proclaimed as the successor of Sultān Hūshang; confirmation of his accession, p. 490; succeeded his father by the exertions of Malik Mughīṭh and Mahmūd Khān and received the title of Muḥammad Shāh; conferred the title of Masnad-i-‘Alī Khān Jahān on, p. 491, Malik Mughīṭh and kept him in the rank of vāzīr; shed much unrighteous blood which caused the downfall of his empire; the Rājpūt revolted against him; nominated Khān Jahān to punish the
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Râjpûts, p. 492; had a conversation with Mahmûd Kân about the conspiracy of which he had heard, p. 493; he was killed by being poisoned, p. 494.

Muhammad Shâh, Ghiyâs-ud-dunyâwad-din, Gujût, succeeded his father; description of the day of coronation; known as Zar-bakhsh; had a son born to him, p. 223; advanced to Idar to devastate it; Rây Har offered his daughter in the shape of tribute; gave the fort of Idar to Har Rây; advanced towards Bâkur; Ganêsâ, the Râja of Dûngarpûr, did homage to the Sulûtân; returned to Ahrmadâbâd, p. 224; advanced to conquer the fort of Châmpânir; Rây Kank Dâs fought with the Sulûtân but fled and re-entered the fort, p. 225; retired towards Ahrmadâbâd; stopped in Kothrah; collected re-inforcements; death; period of reign; title after death, p. 226.

Muhammad Shâh, Mirân, ruler of Asir and Burhânpur, p. 381; according to the wish of Sulûtân Bahâdur, Mirân Muhammad Shâh was selected as the Sulûtân, p. 382; the Khubâ was read and the Sîkka was struck in his name in his absence; died of natural death, p. 383.

Muhammad Shâh, Mirân, son of Mirân Mubârak Shâh, advanced to defeat Chengiz Kân, p. 402; pursued Chengiz Kân as far as Nadarbûr, p. 403; advanced to conquer the kingdom of Gujût but was defeated by Chengiz Kân, p. 405.

Muhammad Shâh, Sulûtân, son of 'All-ud-din Hasan Shâh, succeeded his father; assumed the title of Sulûtân Muhammad Shâh, p. 11; advanced towards Bilampatan; seized and annexed many villages and towns, p. 13; the Rây of Bilampatan shut the gates of the fort; conquest of the fort of Bilampatan; returned to Gulbarga, p. 14; news of the rapid advance of and seizure of the Rây of Bijânagar, p. 15; advanced to punish the Rây of Bijânagar; the Rây fled and took shelter in a fort; besieged the fort; fought with the Rây; and he returned after success to Gulbarga; the rebellion of Bahram Kân and Govind Rây, p. 16, brought him to Deogarh; Bahram Kân and Govind Rây went to Shaitkh Rukn-ud-din, p. 17; visited Rukn-ud-din at Daulatabâd; excused Bahram Kân and Govind Rây on the recommendation of Rukn-ud-din; Bahram Kân and Govind Rây went away to Gujût; made arrangements at Deogarh; returned to Gulbarga; pleased his subjects; account of death, p. 18; period of reign, p. 19; and see note 2, p. 18.

Muhammad Shâh, Sulûtân, (grandson of Bahman Shâh), succeeded Dâud Kân, p. 22; the thânadær, p. 23, of the fort of Sâghir rebelled against him; marched against the thânadær and defeated him; his death; period of reign, p. 24.

Muhammad Shâh, Sulûtân, son of Sulûtân Hasan Shâh, Sulûtân of Kashmîr, attained to sovereignty; disputes between the Saiyids and the Kasîmlîris, p. 682; banished Saiyid 'Ali Kân and other Saiyids from Kashmîr; efforts of Fath Kân to regain his ancestral dominions, p. 686; fight with Fath Kân and the latter's defeat; invasions of Fath Kân, p. 687; was imprisoned by Fath Kân; period of reign; treatment of Fath Kân, p. 689; was released and escaped,
p. 690; defeated Fath Shâh and ascended the throne of Kashmir for the second time; his vazir; his successor; not being able to oppose Fath Shâh, took to flight, p. 691; period of his reign for the second time; attacked Fath Shâh and defeated him; his accession for the third time, p. 692; order for the executions of the amirs of Fath Shâh; order for the corpse of Fath Shâh, p. 693; skirmishes with Iskandar Khan; turned against Malik Kâji, p. 694; entrusted the post of vazârat to Malik Kâji; blinded Iskandar Khan; his imprisonment, p. 695; period of his reign for the third time, p. 696; his accession to the throne of Kashmir for the fourth time, p. 699; agreement of peace with Kâshgharîs, p. 704; his death; period of reign, p. 704.

Muhammad Shâh Lashkari, see Muhammad Shâh (son of Humâyûn Shâh).

Muhammad Tughlaq Shâh, Sultan, various kinds of disturbances in his kingdom and their causes, p. 1; rebellion of amirs Sadhâ; advanced towards Gujrat in order to suppress the rebellion; sent Malik Lâjin to summon the amirs of hundreds of Daulatâbâd; amirs of hundreds slew Malik Lâjin and seized all the property of Dârâgarh, p. 2; could not suppress 'Ala-ud-din; died 798 A.H. in the neighbourhood of 'Thâtha,' pp. 3, 177; hearing the jews of the sovereignty of Ismâ'il Fath marched from Bahârj to put him down; fought with the rebels and defeated them; halted at Dârâgarh; nominated 'Imâd-ud-mulk for overthowing Hasan; left some amirs for protecting the fort of Dârâgarh; marched towards Guj-
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p. 229; was unable to defeat Râna Kûmbhâ; asked help from Sultân Mahmûd Khâlij, p. 230.

Mujâhid Khân, son of Khudâwand Khân, in concert with Şâhib Khân he murdered Qaisar Khân, p. 270; fled with his family, p. 271.

Mujâhid Shâh, son of Sultân Muham-mad Shâh, succeeded his father; attitude towards his subjects; marched towards Bijânjâr, p. 19; age of his accession, p. 19, n. 1; plundered portion of Bijânjâr; Khâhan Rây, p. 20, became submissive and surrendered the forts of Bijânjâr; on the way to his kingdom plundered the rebels who were stationed on a hill; the cause of the hostility of Dâûd Khân and its result; period of reign, p. 21; difference of opinion about his reign and the real cause of enmity of Dâûd Khân, p. 21, n. 1.

Mujâhid-ul-mulk Gujrât, was left in the service of Â'âm Humâyûn by Mahmûd Shâh, p. 285.

Mukhlîs, was sent to the frontier district of Bangâl by Sultân Fakhruddîn, p. 419.

Mukhlîs-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent by Ahmad Shâh to punish Naqir; captured Nâdût, p. 199; was granted Dînpûr Banharta by Ahmad Shâh as jagir p. 295; was ordered by Ahmad Shâh to attend on Zafar Khân with ships collected from all ports; came and waited on Zafar Khân with ships from various ports in the neighbourhood of Mahâmîn, p. 215.

Mukhtâs Khân, sent a message to Mahmûd Shâh, p. 577; his flight from his residence, p. 579; sent the corpse of Shihâb-ud-dîn to Shâhâb-bâd, p. 580; sent a petition to Mahmûd Shâh, p. 581; joined Mahmûd Shâh, p. 582; was sent with a large army to Chandârî, p. 590; fled towards Chandârî, p. 592.

Mûkul, Râna, the Râja of Dilwâra, fought with Frûz Khân, p. 194; was destroyed by Ahmad Shâh, p. 220.

Munjâ Baqâl, complained to Rânî Khurshid, p. 554; was slain, p. 555.

Muqbal Khân, was sent to Châmpânîr to punish Silhâfî, p. 355.

Muqbil Khân, his flight from Mandesîr, p. 565.

Muqûn, Mirzâ, his arrival at Kashmir; insulted and tortured the Muftis who had decided the execution of Yusuf, p. 746; his execution, p. 747.

Murtâda, Mir, his designation; his actions, pp. 147, 148.

Murtâda Niżâm-ul-mulk; succeeded his father; Khwâjah Mirâk Harîvi (of Herât) who was his minister, p. 145; was known as Changiz Khân; conquest of Changiz Khân for Murtâda Niżâm-ul-mulk; death of Chêngiz Khân; relationship with Muşâhib Khân, his vakîl; actions of Muşâhib Khân towards the subjects and the amîrs, p. 146; death of Muşâhib Khân led Murtâda Niżâm Shâh to a state of madness; separated himself from the administration and retired in Bâgh-i-Bihisht; Khalifa-i-îlâhî sent Pîshrô Khân to the Deccan, p. 147; interview of Asad Khân Rûmi with Pîshrô Khân; Murtâda Niżâm Shâh offered his faithful services to Khalifa-i-îlâhî; rebellion of Bûr-hân; defeat of Bûr-hân; Bûr-hân received imperial favours from Khalifa-i-îlâhî; Murtâda Niżâm Shâh again secluded himself in the garden in the year 996; Sâlîbat Khân became the minister of Murtâda; enmity of Jâgîrdâr, amirs of Berût against Sâlîbat Khân and its result, p. 148;
Murtada Nişām-ul-mulk became enamoured of a prostitute by the name of Fattû; Ismâ'il became the vaqîl of Nişām Shâh and put Şalābat Khân in prison, p. 140; Ismâ'il and Fattû assumed full power; Mirzâ Khân his nāyîb made himself the vaqîl of Murtaza; released his son Mirnân Hūsâin, p. 150; death of Murtaza and the period of his reign, p. 151.

Murtaza Sharwânî, Saiyid, a friend of Mirzâ Khân; his action in a feast; settlement with Mirzâ Khân, p. 152; his duties in the fort, p. 153; his decision; his proclamation; was put to death, p. 154.

Mūsâ, Maulānâ, p. 202; his request to Ahmad Shâh not to fight with Sultân Hūshang, p. 203.

Mūsâ, Qâdî, brought Lōhar, in the presence of Yūsûf Khân, p. 757.

Mūsâ Khân, was made leader by the people of Mâlwa, p. 187; was made the chief of the Mâlwa army, p. 470; his disappointment and message to Malik Mughîth, p. 471; evacuated the fort of Dhâr, p. 472.

Mūsâ Khân Fâlâdî, joined Sultân Ahmad, p. 395; the district of Pattan as far as Karl came into his possession, p. 393; defeated I’tmây Khân, p. 400.

Mūsâ Zinâ, ‘Id Zinâ was buried in his inauleum, p. 725.

Muṣḥab Khân, his reality; his relations with Murtaza Nişām Shâh; his rank; ‘his attitude towards the common people and the amîs, p. 146; his attacks on the amîs of Beriir; his death, p. 147.

Muṣṭafâ, Malik, son of Shujâ’ Khân, bestowal of the title of Shujâ’ Khân on him, p. 628; was defeated by Bâz Bahâdur, p. 629.

Muṣṭafâ Khân, was put to death, p. 166 (and see n. 1, p. 171).

Muṣṭafâ Rūmî, p. 347; he, with his men, was received with favour by Sultân Bahâdur, p. 348.

Muwâfiq Khân, joined Nâṣîr-ud-dîn, p. 562; was sent to conquer the fort of Mandû, p. 563.

Muţaffar, Sultân of Gujrat, was raised to the throne, p. 297; distribution of jâ‘îrs among the amîs of Gujrat, p. 398; attitude of I’tmây Khân towards the Sultân and his activities in administration; mutiny of the amîs, p. 399; went and took up his abode in his own palace, p. 410; went to Ulugh Khân at Qhiyâspûr; a letter from I’tmây Khân to Shâh Khân about the Sultân, p. 412; Saiyid Hâmid rendered homage to the Sultân, p. 413; period of reign, p. 414.

Muţaffar Ibrâhîm, Malik, Malik-ush-sharq, Chandîrî was allotted to him in feiâ by Maḥmûd Khâlî, p. 507; defeated Malik Kâlî; seized the inhabitants of Râtah; advanced towards Barhâr, p. 518.

Muţaffar Khân, his attack on the army of Sultân Quṭb-ud-dîn, p. 524.

Muţaffar Khân, Shâhzâda, came from the town of Barîdâ and obtained seven lakhs of tankas towards the expenses of A’zâm Humâyûn from his father, p. 288; was summoned by Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 290.

Muţaffar Shâh, Sultân, Gujratî, succeeded his father; sent the body of his father to the tomb of Shâh Ahmad Khâtî; distributed wealth among the deserving; conferred honours and titles upon the amîs, p. 292; appointed Malik Rashâd-ul-mulk to the post of vazîr; sent the amîs and vazîr to welcome Yâdghar Bâg Qazîbâsh; favours shown to
Qazibáshas; changed the name of Muḫammadábád into Daulatabád; sent Muḥāfīz Khán to receive Šāhīb Khán, p. 293; entertained Šāhīb Khán at Barōda; ordered Qaṣar Khán to submit an account of the ruler of Málwa; expressed his wish to Šāhīb Khán to recover anyhow the kingdom of Málwa from Sultān Maḥmūd Khāliji and make it over to him, p. 294; intended to punish the Rājpūts who were creating disturbances; went to Ahmadábád, p. 295; advanced to Kōdráh and collected his troops there; hearing of the defeat of Ā'in-ul-mulk advanced towards Ídār; sent an army to plunder Maharása; devastated Ídār, p. 296; granted the request of the Rāja of Ídār; returned to Kōdráh; bestowed the presents of the Rāja of Ídār on Ā'in-ul-mulk; sent Sháhzháda Sikandar Khán to Muḫammadábád as an acting governor; ordered Qaṣar Khán to possess Dāhūd as far as the village of Dēvla, p. 297; advanced towards Dhrāgarh; gave assurance of safety to Harkhūkhā; did not allow his amirs to attack the kingdom of Sultān Maḥmūd when the latter had gone to put down the amirs of Chandīrī, p. 298; proceeded to Dhrā; visited the tombs of Shāhijs; the destruction of Pūrabías by Niẓām-ul-mulk greatly annoyed him; marched towards Gujrát, p. 299; appointed Niẓām-ul-mulk to recover the country of Ídār and make it over to Biḥār Mal; proceeded towards Ahmadnagar; went to Pattan leaving the title-holders to guard the camp; sent Biḥār Mal with Niẓām-ul-mulk; ordered Niẓām-ul-mulk not to prolong the war after recovering Ídār, p. 300; celebration of the marriages of Shāhzādas; advanced to visit Ídār; after hearing of the murder of Žāhir-ul-mulk by Rāy Mal sent farrānā to Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk to invade and devastate the country as far as Bhīmāna; representation from dārōgā of Dāhūd about the arrival of Sultān Maḥmūd Khāliji; sent precious gifts to and welcomed Sultān Maḥmūd as a bādshāh, p. 302; advanced into Málwa; fought with the Rājpūts near Mandū; besieged Mandū; a message from Rāy Pithòrā to the Sultān, p. 303; agreed to the request of Rāy Pithòrā; victorious fight with the Rājpūts of Mandū; general massacre in the fort of Mandū, p. 304; bestowed the fort of Mandū on Sultān Maḥmūd; advanced to meet Rānā Sāṅkā; accepted the invitation of Sultān Maḥmūd and went to Mandū with the Shāhzādas, p. 305; visited the palaces and buildings of Málwa; went back to Dhrā; leaving Aṣaf Khán Gujrātī started for Gujrāt; advanced towards Ídār to punish Rāy Māl and other disturbers; destroyed the territory of Rāy Māl; came back to Muḫammadábád Chāmpānīr, p. 306; went to Ídār for enjoyment; entrusted the government of Ídār to Malik Mubāriz-ul-mulk, p. 307; went to Chāmpānīr leaving Qiwām-ul-mulk at Ahmādābād for the control of grāssias, p. 308; after hearing of the ferocious activities of Rānā Sāṅkā appointed 'Imād-ul-mulk and Qaṣar Khán to crush him, p. 311; instructions to 'Imād-ul-mulk and Qaṣar Khán in connection with their march towards Chītōr; wanted to march to Chītōr but postponed it at the advice of Malik Ayyāj Sultān; arrived at Ahmadnagar, p. 312; sent Malik
Ayáz and Qawām-ul-mulk to chastise Rānā Sānkā; sent Tāj Khān and Niẓām-ul-mulk Sulṭānī to reinforce the Gujratī army, p. 313; detailed accounts of the chastisement of Rānā Sānkā, pp. 313–316; advice of Malik Ayáz to Rānā Sānkā; came to Ahmadābād to advance towards Chitār, p. 317; forgave the offences of Rānā Sānkā; present of Rānā Sānkā to the Sulṭān; spent some days in Jhālāwār and went to Ahmadābād; bidding farewell to the son of Rānā Sānkā went to Kāparbhanj; grieved at the death of Malik Ayáz and conferred a Jāghir on his eldest son; rode out from Chāmpānīr to chastise some rebels, p. 318; halted between the towns of Māhrāsa and Harāsīl; rebuilt the fort of Māhrāsa and returned towards Ahmadābād; excessive sadness on the death of a member of his harem; went to Chāmpānīr to refresh himself; request of ‘Alam Khān to the Sulṭān and, p. 319, its fulfilment; went through Chāmpānīr to Īdar; delay in fulfilling the expectations of Shāhzhāda Bahādūr Khān, p. 320; going round his dependencies Shāhzhāda Bahādūr Khān went towards Deltī; arrival of Bābar Bādshāh to conquer India; fight of Bahādūr Khān with the Mughals, p. 321; hearing of the arrival of Bābar Bādshāh and departure of Shāhzhāda Bahādūr Khān became sorrowful; ordered Khudāwānd Khān to summon Shāhzhāda Bahādūr Khān; famine in Gujrat; fell ill, p. 322; hearing of the division of the army enquired about the arrival of Shāhzhāda Bahādūr Khān; called Sikandar Khān to his presence and gave him some advice; died; period of reign, p. 323.

Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshī, Sulṭān of Bangāla, how he ascended the throne, p. 441 (and see n. 1, p. 441); his nature; how he was murdered; period of reign, p. 442.

N

Najm-ul-dīn Qarānī Gilānī, Khwājah, was entrusted with the duties of vazīr by Humāyūn Shāh; was given the title of Malik-ut-tujjār, p. 77.

Na‘mat-ul-lah, Khwājah, was given the title of Saif Khān by Muhāmmed Khalīfī, p. 520.

Na‘mat-ul-lah, Saiyид, Shāh Ḥabīb-ūl-lah’s great ancestor, p. 84.

Na‘amat-ul-lah Tabrizī, Khwājah, was sent by Bahādur to ask pardon of the latter’s offences from Muhāmmed Shāh, p. 121; wrote to Bahādur about the acceptance of his prayer by Muhāmmed Shāh, p. 122; was sent by Bahādur with a petition to Muhāmmed Shāh, p. 123; made a representation to Muhāmmed Shāh, p. 124.

Naqī-ul-mulk, his flight, p. 577; was expelled by the amīrī, p. 578.

Narsingh Rāy, one of the associates of Ahmad Shāh, p. 51; informed Ahmad Shāh about the invasion of Sulṭān Hūshang; summoned Hūshang to his aid when Ahmad Shāh had besieged the fort of Kehrla; agreed to pay Hūshang his daily expenses, p. 52; paid tribute to Muhāmmed Shāh Lashkārī, p. 105.

Nāṣīḥ Shāh, Sulṭān of Bangāla, succeeded his father; bestowed jāghirs on the amīrī of Afgānī and on Sulṭān Muhāmmed; prayed for the hand of the daughter of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm for himself; sent beautiful presents to Sulṭān Bahādūr of Gujrat, p. 444;

Naṣir, son of ʿĀdil Khān, see ʿĀdil Khān, ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr.

Naṣir, Saiyid, at the call of Sultān Ḥasan he was coming to help but died on the way near the valley of Pir Punjāl, p. 681.

Naṣir the slave, ruler of Bangāla, after the death of Sultān Ḥāmid sat on the throne; was put to death; period of reign, p. 434 (and see note 5, p. 434).

Naṣir Khān, (ruler of Asīr), accepted the proposal of Ḥāmid Shāh for the marriaghe of Shāhzāda ʿAlā-ud-din with his own daughter, p. 45; raided a part of the territory of the Dakini Kingdom, p. 57; was opposed by Malik-ut-tujjār and went back to Asīr; his death, p. 58; his possession of parts of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, p. 196; took possession of the fort of Tālnār; invaded the country of Sultānpūr, p. 198; prepared to defend himself in the fort of Tālnār; requested Ḥāmid Shāh to excuse his offenses; was given the title of Naṣir Khān by Ḥāmid Shāh, p. 199; gave shelter to Kānẖā in his kingdom, p. 213; joined Sultān ʿAlā-ud-din; fled to the hills of Kaland, p. 214.

Naṣir Khān, brother of Sultān Muẓaffar Gujratī, was left in the fort of Dhār by Sultān Muẓaffar Gujratī; his treatment of the raʾyats and the attack of Mālwa army, p. 469; different views about his name, p. 469, n. 4.

Naṣir Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, attacked Natī Khān, p. 621; fought against Shujāʾ Khān but was defeated and fled, p. 622.

Naṣir Khān, Sultān of Gujrat, Bahāʾ-ud-mulk placed Naṣir Khān on the throne and gave him the title of Sultān Muḥammad; amīra of Gujrat offered congratulations; ‘Imād-ul-mulk comforted the amīra, p. 328; arrival of Bahādur Shāh in Gujrat and the defence of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, pp. 329-332; period of reign, p. 333.

Naṣir Khān Jahān, son of Qādir Khān, on account of his cruel and high-handed actions, p. 453, requested Sultān Muḥammad Khalji to save his dominion from the attack of Sultān Muḥammad Sharqī, p. 455; waited on Sultān Muḥammad Khalji at Chandīpur, p. 456.

Nāṣir Kiynī, went to conquer Tibet, p. 738.

Naṣir Rāja, Malik, see Adil Khān, ruler of Asīr and Burhānpur.

Naṣir Shāh, son of ʿAbd-ul-qādir, news of his oppression reached Muḥammad Khalji, p. 511; submitted a representation to Muḥammad Khalji and was pardoned by the latter, p. 512; a message regarding his unorthodox views reached Muḥammad Khalji, p. 515; was expelled by Sultān Muḥammad Sharqī from Kālpī; his request to Muḥammad Khalji, p. 516; rendered homage to Muḥammad Khalji, p. 517; Rātaḥ and Mahōbāb were given to him by Muḥammad Sharqī, p. 519.

Naṣir Shāh, Sultān of Bangāla, the amīra placed one of the descendants of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Bhàngara on the throne and gave him the title of Naṣir Shāh, p. 434; died; period of reign, p. 435 (and see note 1, p. 435).

Naṣir-ud-dīn, this title was conferred on Ismāʾīl Fath by ʿAlā-ud-dīn Ḥasan Bahmani, p. 8.

Naṣir-ud-dīn, Sultān, Sultān of Mālwa, took the kingdom from Sultān
Qhiyāth-ud-dīn; on the advance of Maḥmūd Shāh he submitted to him, p. 281; was given the title of Nāṣir Shāh by Sulṭān Qhiyāth-ud-dīn and appointed as the heir of the latter, p. 544; dispute with Shujāʿat Khān, p. 552; his birth, p. 553; gained favour with his father; hostility of Shujāʿat Khān; supported his father; took all the affairs of the state in his own hands; an evil deed of Rānī Khūrshid and its result, p. 554; withdrew his hands from the duties of the vazirat; Rānī Khūrshid and Shujāʿat Khān took over the management of the affairs of the government of Sulṭān Qhiyāth-ud-dīn; an order of Sulṭān Qhiyāth-ud-dīn to seize the murderers of Mūnīyā Baqāl, p. 555; a message of his father; attended his father; left his father and went towards Dihār, p. 556; sent a petition to his father; order of Rānī Khūrshid for his destruction; amazement of the army, p. 557; encamped in the town of Thahnah; amīrs of the Qhiyāth Shāhī states joined him; moved to the town of Rājāwiyah; raised the royal umbrella over his head, p. 558; sent Malik Malhū to chastise the troops of Shujāʿat Khān; was reinforced by the amīrs; hearing of his strong position Qhiyāth-ud-dīn sent ambassadors to him; his reply to Qhiyāth-ud-dīn, p. 559; his victories over the troops of Shaʿdābād, p. 560; failure of Shujāʿat Khān and Rānī Khūrshid in their evil attempt; fight between Shujāʿat Khān and the effort of Sulṭān Qhiyāth-ud-dīn for peace, p. 561; his disputes with Shujāʿat Khān and their result, p. 562; sat on the throne of the empire; made over Shujāʿat Khān and Rānī Khūrshid to custodians; appointed his heir; his general announcement as the Sulṭān and punishment of the enemies; was allowed to do homage to his father; was recognized as Sulṭān by his father, p. 564; concentration of the enemies under Shēr Khān; hostility of Shēr Khān, p. 565; aggrieved on the death of his father, p. 566; suppressed the disturbance caused by Shēr Khān; instigation of Shaikhzādas prompted Shēr Khān to rebellion which caused the latter's death, p. 567; imprisoned Shaikh Habīb-ul-lah; occupied himself with pleasure and drinking; an example of his immorality; erection of a palace in Rāj Khirīz, p. 569; built a lofty and noble palace in Āgar; having chastised the rebels returned to his capital; accepted tribute from the Zamīndārs of Chitor; sent Iṣḥāq Khān Khwājah Jahan to Astr and Būrhanpur; rebellion of Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 570; unfavourable reply of Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-dīn to his father, p. 571; removed Sulṭān Shihāb-ud-dīn and made Aʿzam Humāyūn his heir; various diseases attacked him; his counsels and precepts to the amīrs and Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 572; his death and period of reign, p. 573.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn ʿAbd-ul-qādir, Sulṭān, see Nāṣir-ud-dīn, Sulṭān, of Mālwa.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn ʿAdd-ud-daulu, was directed to command the force by Ahmad Shāh, p. 200.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn ʿArab, Saiyid, was sent by Ahmad Shāh to Karbala to open out a stream; was insulted by Shēr Malik, p. 43.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn Dābir, Malik, his treachery with Maḥmūd Khalji, p. 498; was pardoned by Maḥmūd Khalji;
was given the title of Naṣrat Khān and a fief by Maḥmūd Khalji; his rebellion against Maḥmūd Khalji, p. 499; was relieved of the government of Chandīrī, p. 501.

Naṣir-ud-dīn Muhammad Dāūdī, Shāik, p. 37.

Naṣrat Chak, opinion of Ghāzī Khān, p. 729; his imprisonment, p. 731; his release; went to Khān Khānān Bahrām Khān, p. 736.

Naṣrat Khān, his plans against Ḥusain Khān, p. 741; his imprisonment, p. 742; was blinded, p. 744.

Naṣrat Khān, brother of Muẓaffar Shāh, was placed in charge of the government of Mālwa by Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 186; his harsh treatment of the raʾiyat; rebellion against him; was rescued by Khwājahdār and was sent to Gujrat, p. 187.

Naṣrat Khān, son of Iqbal Khān, went to bring Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 580.

Naṣrat-ul-mulk, Malik, was left in the service of Aʿẓam Hūmāyūn by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 285; was sent to Idar; was ordered by Muẓaffar Shāh to devastate as far as Bījānagar, p. 301; advanced to give battle to Rāy Mal, p. 306; was brought to Ahmadābād by Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 307; was slain, p. 327.

Naṣ-ul-lah Dābīr, Khwājah, representation of other āmīrs through his intervention to Sultān Hūshang, p. 484.

Naṣ-ul-lah Parniyānī, Khwājah, in concert with other āmīrs brought Shāhzāda Masʿūd Khān and placed him on the throne of Mālwa, p. 494.

Natū Khān, was appointed to the Sarkār of Hāndiyah, p. 621.

Naurūz Aswad, son of Ahmad Aswad, was made the chamberlain of Sultān Ḥasan, p. 676.

Naurūz Chak, his house was burnt, p. 716.

Naushīrvarw, the just, p. 82.

Naṣirī, the poet, friend, and companion of Amīrzāda Ḥabīb-ul-lah, p. 85.

Naṣr, Shāh, his statement about the death of Mirzā Ḥaidar, p. 717.

Naṣr Be Uzbek, was ordered to support Burhān; joined Burhān, p. 158.

Nāzuk Chak, his escape from Ghāzī Khān, p. 730; his rebellion, p. 731; his execution, p. 732.

Nāzuk Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, the Kashmiris brought the family of Mirzā Ḥaidar to Srinagar and divided the country of Kashmir among themselves; his accession, p. 719; an amicable settlement between Ghāzī Khān and Sankar Chak; groups which exercised power in Kashmir, p. 720; power of the Chaks; the Mākrīs went to Bāṅkal, p. 721; release of the Mughals; skirmishes between the Chaks and the Mughals, p. 722; victory of the Kashmiris over the Niyyāzī tribe, p. 723; hostilities among the Kashmiris, p. 724; period of rule for the second time, p. 725.

Nāzuk Shāh, son of Fāṭḥ Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, was given the title of Sultān by Abdāl Mākri, p. 697; accession; capital; his vazir; division of the country, p. 698; allotment of divisions; summoned Muhammad Shāh; accession of Muhammad Shāh for the fourth time; was appointed successor of Muḥarram Shāh; period of reign, p. 699; Malik Abdāl defeated Malik Kāji; Mirzā Kāmrān sent detachments for the conquest of Kashmir, p. 700; destruction of the Kashmiris by the Mughals; retreat of the Mughals; Malik Kāji retired to Hindūstān;
Index.

Sultān Saiyid Khān of Kāshghar conquered Kashmir and destroyed the Kashmiris, p. 701; fight between the Kāshgharīs and the Kashmiris, resulted, after a great loss, in peace, p. 703; agreement with the Kāshgharīs; famine in Kashmir, p. 704; illness of Muhammad Shāh and his death, p. 705.

Nāzuk Shāh, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn; succeeded his father but was defeated by Mīrzā Haidar, p. 707.

Nēkrūz, father of Karshāshāb, p. 633.

Nizām Khān, reinforced Dastūr Khān and attacked Hūshang, p. 581.

Nizām Mufarrāḥ, bore the title of Ashī Khān; was the governor of Gujrat under Sultan Mahāmmed; his cruelty, p. 173; received a letter from Zafar Khān, p. 175; reply to Zafar Khān; his advance to fight with Zafar Khān; his murder, p. 176.

Nizām Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, succeeded his father; administration was entrusted to the hands of Makhdūma-i-Jahān, p. 86; marched out with his amīr for the campaign; the army of Nizām Shāh fell upon the vanguard of the Rāys of Orissa; defeated them and made them return to their capital; p. 87; advanced to meet the army of Mandū; placed ten thousand horsemen in charge of Khwājah Mahmūd Gīlānī; made over the army of the centre, to Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk, p. 88; defeated the army of Sultān Jāh Shāh; came with Makhak-i-Jahān to Fīrūzābād, p. 89; wrote a letter to Sultān Mahmūd of Gujrat; sent Khwājah Jahān with a large army to fight against Sultān Mahmūd Khāljī, p. 90; advanced to fight with Mahmūd Khāljī; asked help from Sultān Mahmūd of Gujrat; offered him thanks for his help and died; period of his reign, pp. 92, 243, 244, and 245.

Nizām Shāh, nephew of Ghazān Kān; was blinded by Ghazān Kān, p. 492.

Nizām-ud-dīn, Jām, son of Shāh-ud-dīn, ruler of Sind; account of his government, p. 775.

Nizām-ud-dīn, Jām, i.e. Jām Nandā, ruler of Sind, accession on the throne of Sind; account of his reign, p. 778.

Nizām-ud-dīn, Shāhīk, went to Chāmpānīr from the side of Sultān Mahmūd Khāljī for drawing up the treaty, p. 232.

Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad, the author, the statement which he had heard from the friends of Shujā' Khān, p. 628; his statement about the tree of Kashmir, p. 717; his statement about the rulers of Sind, p. 771; his statement about the Sultān of Multān, p. 800; his final statement, p. 811.

Nizām-ud-dīn Dehlavi, Shāhīk, issued a general invitation for dinner during the reign of Sultan Tughlaq Shāh; Ḥasan Gāngū presented himself before him; told Ḥasan Gāngū symbolically that he will become a Sultān, p. 8.

Nizām-ul-mulk, Malik of Gujrat, p. 192; was sent to Badr 'Alā in order to assure the latter’s safety by Ahmad Shāh; was seized by Badr ‘Alā; was released by the people of Ahmad Shāh, p. 193; was sent to punish Malik Shāh, p. 195; Ahmad Shāh made him the regent of his kingdom during his absence and ordered him to punish the Rāja of Mandal, p. 199; was sent to hunt in the neighbourhood of Dilāwara; was defeated by the Pūrābī Rājpūts, p. 299; was appointed to recover the country of Idar; made over Idar to Bihār Mal;
fought with Rāy Mal, p. 300; his illness; was summoned to the presence of Muḥṣaffar Shāh; left Zahir-ūl-mulk at ʿAṣr and hastened towards Muḥammadad-ḍād, p. 301; was appointed to attack Muḥāfiz Khān by Sultān Bahādūr, p. 335.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk, Malik, was appointed vazīr by Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 110; made an agreement with the Turki amīrs; his fruitful flattery of Qiyām-ūl-mulk, p. 111; after the death of Qiyām-ūl-mulk took up the duties of vazīr; was wounded by Dilāwar Khān, p. 112; informed Malik Barīd about the hostile intention of Dilāwar Khān and started for Junīr, p. 113.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk, Malik, father of Malik Badeh, was sent to the thāna at Kīz by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 263; requested Maḥmūd Shāh to confer the thāna which, belonged to him, on his son and to take him with him for the performance of the Ḥaj; was advised by 'Imād-ūl-mulk to go alone for pilgrimage on behalf of all; was greatly liked by Maḥmūd Shāh; was sent to the amīrs to demand a reply to the Sultān's question, p. 269.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk, father of Malik-ūt-taṣṭā̀jīr, governor of Junīr, pp. 74, 75.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk, son of Malik Niẓām-ūl-mulk, informed Malik Barīd about the ambition of Sultān Alā-ud-dīn, p. 133.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk Bahrī, a slave of Brahman; was called Bahrī; his son Aḥmad had the ambition to rule; vazīrs of Sultān Kalīm-ūl-lah made Niẓām-ūl-mulk Bahrī a prisoner and put him to death, p. 138.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk Bahrī, ruler of Aḥmad-nagar, his death, p. 391.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk Bahrī, ruler of Kāwīl, helped Malik Ḫīṣām-ūl-dīn Maḥgūl in placing Khāṇzāda ʿĀlam Khān on the throne of Aṣr and Burhānpūr, p. 283; leaving horsemen with ʿĀlam Khān and Malik Ḫīṣām-ūl-dīn went to Kāwīl, p. 284; stationed near the border of Aṣr with ʿĀlam Khān with his army, p. 287; presented a petition to Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 288.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk Dakīnī joined Sultān Bahādūr and was given the title of Muḥammad Shāh by him, p. 355.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk ʿIoḥrī; Humāyūn Shāh sent him to the country of Tilāng; went away from the foot of the fort of Tilāng, p. 79; fled and joined Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 80; instigated Maḥmūd Khaljī to invade the Deccan, pp. 87, 533.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk Sultānī, was sent by Muḥṣaffar Shāh to join Malik Ayāz, p. 313; was sent with an army to Naʿlīcha, p. 590.

Niẓām-ūl-mulk Turk, Malik, father of ʿĀdīl Khān and Daryā Khān, appointed to take charge of the left wing of the army of Niẓām Shāh, pp. 88, 535; was given Junīr by Muḥammad Shāh Laškhārī as jāgīr, p. 94; was appointed to conquer the fort of Kehrlā, pp. 95, 536; attacked the Mandū army; on a petition of merey excused the Mandū army, p. 95; was made martyr by a Mandū soldier, p. 96.

Niẓām-ūl-Mulkīya; list of Sultāns, p. 7.

Nūḥ bīn Yūsuf-ūl-mulk, was given the title of Shams-ūl-mulk by Sultān Bahādūr, p. 333.

Nūr, Malik, son of Malik Aḥmad, Ḫūsain was entrusted to him by Sultān Ḫasan, p. 680.

Nūr Bahāsh, Saitīd Muḥammad, sent a gift to Maḥmūd Khaljī, p. 539.

Nūr Qūṭb ʿĀlam, Shaikh, p. 443.
Nūr-ud-dīn, Shaikh, was respected by Mahmūd Khaljī, p. 539.

P

Pandeı Brij, was the vazir of Rāja Bhōj; after accepting İslam he was known as Shaikh 'Abd-ul-lah Jangal, p. 299.
Pāṇḍus, p. 633.

Pars Rām, Rāja Bākar, entered the service of Sultān Bahādur, p. 348.

Parasārām, Rāja of Jammū, took part in the murder of Saiyid Hasan, p. 682; was sent back with gifts, p. 686.
Pāyinda Khān Afṣān, was permitted to go back to Jaunpūr, p. 330.

Piyārā, Malik, was appointed by Rāni Khurshid and was given the title of 'Ali Khān, p. 562; joined Shār Khān, p. 565.

Pārrah Ismā'īl, his title, p. 238; his execution, p. 242; and see Kabīr Sultānī, Malik.

Pir Khān, fought against Maqībūl Khān, p. 537.

Pir Muhammad Khān, was sent to conquer Mālva by Akbar, p. 631.

Pir Muhammad Khān, Mirzā, possessed Multān; seized Sārang Khān, p. 180.

Pishrā Khān, had an interview with Murtada Niżām Shāh; conveyed the order of Khaṣifa-i-Hāfi to Murtada Niżām Shāh; went back with the tribute presented by Murtada Niżām Shāh, p. 148.

Pithorā Rāj, was appointed by Mādnī Rāj to guard the fort of Mandū; sent a message to Muẓaffar Shāh, pp. 303, 590, 602.

Prithvī Rāj, was given half of the territory of Bākar by Sultān Bahādur, p. 349.

Pūrjā, an army was sent by Ahmad Shāh to attack him, p. 209; his attack; his submission to Ahmad Shāh which was not accepted, p. 210; his death, p. 211.

Pūran Mal, son of Sīhādi, possessed the fort of Rāṣān and its neighbourhood, p. 617.

Q

Qadam Khān, with the title of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, was given the command of the amīrs of Chandīrī, p. 523; was entrusted with the government of the forts of Hārauff and Rantambhār, p. 526; captured the fort of Bānī, p. 532; favours conferred on him by Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, p. 543.

Qādān, Qādī, surrendered the fort of Bhākkaṭ to Shāh Bēg, p. 778.

Qādī Khān, fought against Maqībūl Khān, p. 537.

Qādir Khān, ruler of Kālpā, p. 481.

Qadr Khān, his fight with Malik Muẓarrab Ahmād Ayāz, p. 214.

Qaisār Khān, was summoned by Mahmūd Shāh; was sent with 'Imād-ul-mulk by Mahmūd Shāh for the conquest of Jālār and Sājār; was murdered by Mughīd Khān, p. 270.

Qaisār Khān, inkstand bearer of Sultān Hūshang, informed Ahmad Gujratī of the plan of Mahmūd Khaljī, p. 503.

Qaisār Khān, thānādār of Sultān Muẓaffar Gujratī, was sent by Muẓaffar Shāh to Dāhūd, 294; was ordered by Muẓaffar Shāh to take possession of the country as far as Dōvla, p. 297; Muẓaffar Shāh sent presents through him to Sultān Mahmūd, p. 302; was appointed to crush Hāna Sīnākā by Muẓaffar Shāh; taking Qawām-ul-mulk, went to Pārāntājī, p. 311; was appointed to punish the rebels by Sultān Sikandar, p. 320; sent a message to Lāṣīf Khān to leave Chāmpānīr, 336; sent a number of
retainers with Shujā-ul-mulk, p. 339; was imprisoned by the order of Sultan Bahādur, p. 340; welcomed Sultan Mahmūd and treated him with great respect, p. 601.

Qarrā Bahādur Mirzā, was appointed the governor of Baharmal, created disturbance against the Mughals, p. 714; sent a message to Mirzā Ḥaidar; was imprisoned by the Kashmiris, p. 715; his release, p. 722; his fight with Ghazi Khān, p. 737.

Qāsim, Khwājah, was slain, p. 716.

Qāsim, Malik, was summoned by Mahmūd Khaljī, p. 502.

Qāsim, Mirzā, son of Khwājah Ḥājī, accompanied Yūsuf Khān, p. 761.

Qāsim, Mulla, little Tibet was given to him by Mirzā Ḥaidar, p. 712.

Qāsim, Shāh, teacher of Mir Shams, p. 689.

Qāsim, Saiyid, was left behind to collect tribute in Karnāl, p. 196; was sent with Shāhzhāda Muhammad Khān by Ahmad Shāh, p. 213.

Qāsim Ḫusain Sulṭān, was appointed to the government of Bahrōj by Humayūn Bādshāh; could not stand the attacks of Gijrātīs; went to Tarjī Bēg Khān, p. 377.

Qassāb, the name of an elephant, under whose feet Shir Malik was thrown by the order of Ahmad Shāh, p. 43.

Qawām Khān, see Yūsuf Qawām, Malik.

Qawām Khān Lankāh, joined Mirzā Shāh Ḫusain, p. 806.

Qawām-ul-mulk, son of Qawām-ul-mulk, was sent to encourage the citizens of Dhār by Muẓaffar Shāh; inflamed the desire of Muẓaffar Shāh to visit Dhar, p. 298; fought with great exertion and slew many Rājpūts, p. 303; was left in Aḥmād-dābād to control the grāssīās, p. 308.

Qawām-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent to the town of Kodhrā by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 283; crushed the Rājpūts, p. 275; was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to punish Bahādur Gilānī, p. 279; was sent by Muẓaffar Shāh to attack Rānā Sānkā, p. 304; went to Parāntēj, p. 311; was sent to join Malik Ayāz, p. 313; penetrated into the hills of Bāṅswālā and caused great destruction, p. 314; opposed Malik Ayāz in making peace with Rānā Sānkā, p. 316; enslaved theادر, p. 344; was sent by Muẓaffar Gijrātī to welcome Mahmūd Shāh, p. 601; was sent by Muẓaffar Gijrātī to punish Mūdīnī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā, p. 602.

Qiwām-ul-mulk, was appointed to attack Bahādur Gilānī by Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 117.

Qiyā Khān, was sent to conquer Mālwa by Akbar, p. 631.

Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk. Malik, was appointed vazīr by Sultan Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 110; agreed to the proposal of Malik Niẓām-ul-mulk, p. 111; was killed by the Turki amīrs, p. 112.

Qulṭ Khān, Shāh, was appointed to invade Kashmir, p. 760.

Qulṭ Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī, Sulṭān, of the Quyun tribe and a vazīr of the Bahmanīs, p. 167; he sold himself to Sulṭān Mahmūd; he took possession of Gōlkonda; period of his reign, p. 168.

Qutb, officer in charge of the island of Mahāīm, p. 214; informed Sultan Ahmad about the tyranny and oppression of Malik Ḥasan, p. 215.

Qutb 'Alām Shāikhl Fārīd-ud-dīn Mas'ūd Shakarganj; was sent to wait on Mahmūd Khaljī by Ghazi Khān, p. 533-34.

Qutb Khān, joined Sultan Bahādur, p. 348; was sent by Sultan Muhammad
to fight against Mahmūd Khālji, p. 510.

Quṭb-ud-dīn, Sultān, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmir, accession; character; sent Loār for the conquest of the fort of Loharkōt, p. 642; execution of Rāy Rāval and imprisonment of Ḥasan; period of reign, p. 643.

Quṭb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh, Sultān, Gujurāt, succeeded his father; received the title of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh; currency of the rite of Niḍār; bestowed jāpīr upon the amirs, p. 226; Sultān Mahmūd Khālji advanced into the country of Gujurāt; consultation with a bagāl; advice of the bagāl; amirs took him along to carry on the war with Sultān Mahmūd; gained victory, p. 227; met Sultān Mahmūd in Kaparbanj; Malik 'Alī-ud-dīn Suhrāb joined him, p. 228; communication with Sultān Mahmūd by a couplet; returned to Ahmadābād with triumph, p. 229; Shams Khān went to Ahmadābād; conferred favours on Shams Khān and married his daughter in the nikkāh form, sent reinforcements to Nagār; devastation of the men of Nagūr by Rānā Kūmbhā, p. 230; advanced against the fort of Kūmbhālmīr; Gītā Dēōrāh did homage; appointed Malik Sha'ban Sultānī in charge of the fort of Abū; sent a messenger to summon 'Imād-ul-Mulk; advanced to capture the fort of Sirōhī; defeated the Rāja of Sirōhī; invaded the country of Rānā Kūmbhā, p. 231; Kūmbhā offered tribute; returned to Ahmadābād; peace and settlement with Sultān Mahmūd Khālji, p. 232; marched to invade Kūmbhālmīr; took the fortress of Abū; delivered it to Gītā Dēōrāh; from Abū advanced towards Kūmbhālmīr; Rānā Kūmbhā retired to the fort of Chitōr; Rānā being defeated begged for pardon; returned to Ahmadābād, p. 233; resolved to punish the Zamin-dārs; marched to Sirōhī; destroyed various towns; sent armies to ravage the dominions of Rānā Kūmbhā; giving up the siege of the fort of Kūmbhālmīr advanced towards the fortress of Chitōr to help Sultān Mahmūd; plundering the surrounded country went to Ahmadābād; forgave Rānā Kūmbhā at his request; his illness; interview with Saiyid Muḥammad, p. 234; prophecy of Saiyid Muḥammad; date of death; title after death; period of reign; special characteristics; amirs put Shams Khān to death, p. 235.

Quṭb-ud-dīn Lankāh, Sultān of Multān, sent a message to Shaikh Yūsuf, gave his daughter in marriage to Yūsuf, p. 789; defeated Shaikh Yūsuf and ascended on the throne of Multān; sent Shaikh Yūsuf to Delhi, p. 790; raised the standard of sovereignty; period of rule, p. 791.

Quṭb-ud-dīn Muḥammad Khān (Hasanavi; Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk came to him; was one of the amirs of Khalifa-i-Itāhī, p. 157.

Quṭb-ud-dīn Shaḥbanī, Malik, his treachery towards Mahmūd Khālji, p. 498; was punished by Mahmūd Khālji, p. 499.

Quṭb-ul-Mulkdīn, list of the Sultāns, see p. 7.

Qutlaqā Khān, brother of 'Alam-ul-mulk, p. 8.

Rābe'a, Bibi, wife of Ḥaider Khān, her fight and death, p. 723.
Raḍī-ul-mulk, see Ahmad, Sultan of Gujrat.

Raḍī-ul-mulk, amir of Sultan Muhammad; his efforts to transfer the rule of Gujrat to Sultan Bahadur to Chánd Khan, p. 610.

Raft-ul-mulk, was given the title of ‘Imād-ul-mulk by Sultan Bahadur and was made ‘Ārif-i-Mumālik, p. 335.

Raja of Abdā, looted a caravan of merchants; received a farman from Mahmud Shāh; gave back what he had looted to the merchants and sent a tribute to Muhammad Shāh, p. 278.

Raja of Badhūl, p. 194; his petition to Sultan Hūshang, p. 195.

Raja of Chāmpānr, sent a representation to Sultan Hūshang, p. 197; did homage to Ahmad Shāh, p. 199; his submission to Ahmad Shāh, p. 201.

Raja of Gwāliar, his nephew entered the service of Sultan Bahadur, p. 346.

Raja of Idar, his rebellion; sent his vakil, p. 177, to Zafar Khan, p. 178; agreed to pay tribute to Zafar Khan, p. 180; evacuated the fort, p. 181; his rebellion; fought against ‘Āin-ul-mulk; became victorious; evacuated the fort of Mähras; fled to the hills of Bijānagar, p. 296; asked Muẓaffar Shāh to pardon him; sent a message to Muẓaffar Shāh; was excused by Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 297.

Raja of Kālna, sent tribute to ‘Ādil Shāh, p. 289.

Raja of Karnal, gave shelter to Shāh Malik; his fight with Ahmad Shāh; his defeat; fled to the hills of Karnal; asked pardon for his offences, p. 196.

Raja of Māhūr, joined Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, p. 402.

Raja of Mal, did not favour Latif Khan, p. 337.

Raja of Mandal, p. 194; instigated Sultan Hūshang to conquer Gujrat, p. 196; brought Sultan Hūshang to Gujrat, p. 197; his rebellion, p. 199.

Raja of Mandalgarh, his fight with Zafar Khan; his defeat; promise for the payment of a tribute, p. 179.

Raja of Nādūt, p. 194; his petition to Sultan Hūshang, p. 195; brought Sultan Hūshang into Gujrat, p. 197; asked pardon of his offences, p. 199.

Raja of Sirōh, fought with Sultan Qutb-ud-din and was defeated, p. 231; fled to the hills, p. 234.

Raja of Sūrāth, his negligence in the payment of a tribute, p. 197.

Raja Rustam, Niẓām-ul-mulk, was sent to Jālna by the Dakini vazir; his treatment of the Saiyyads, p. 65; became afflicted with leprosy, p. 66.

Rāmn, governor of Kākrūn, on the advance of Muḥammad Khan he evacuated Kākrūn and fled, p. 368.

Rāmn Chand Nāik, Rāy, was sent by Sultan Qutb-ud-din to reinforce Nāgor, p. 230.

Rām Rāj of Bijānagar, was attacked by Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk; advanced to meet Ḥusain Niẓām-ul-mulk, p. 141; was killed, p. 143.

Rām Shāh, Raja of Gwāliar, helped Mubārak Khan Sarwānī, p. 622.

Rānā Kūmbhā, his determination to recover Nāgor from Muḥāhid Shāh; marched against Nāgor; sent a message to Shams Shāh to carry out his promise; on the denial of Shams Shāh advanced towards Nāgor; fought and destroyed the men of Nāgor, p. 230; his fight with Sultan Qutb-ud-din, p. 231; after defeat paid tribute to Sultan Qutb-ud-din, p. 232; left Kūmbhāmir and retired to the fort of Chitōr; fought and was crushed by Sultan Qutb-ud-din;
made submission to Sultán Qutb-ud-din; attempted to destroy Nágór; hearing of the preparations of Sultán Qutb-ud-din withdrew his steps, p. 233; was besieged by Sultán Qutb-ud-din in the fort of Kûmbhalîr; prayed Sultán Qutb-ud-din for the pardon of his offences. p. 234. Rána Sânkâ, p. 299; helped Râya Mal; took possession of the country of Idar from Bihâr Mal and made it over to Râya Mal, p. 300; news of his arrival in the neighbourhood of Ujjain to aid and reinforce Mêdinî Rây, p. 304; treated Sultán Maḥmûd with kindness and sent him to Mándî; turned towards Idar, p. 307; ravaged Idar by the boundary of Sirôhî; came to Bâkâr and then to Dûngarpûr, p. 308; advanced against Idar; advanced against Ahmadnagar; a battle with Mubâriz-ul-mulk, p. 309; ravaged Ahmadnagar; advanced to Bêsalnagar and ravaged it, p. 310; went to help the ilânâdâr of Mânisîr, p. 314; sent a message to Malik Ayâz; sent a message to Siôhadt, p. 315; sent emissaries to Malik Ayâz, p. 316; a message from Malik Ayâz, p. 317; sent his son with tribute to Muţaffar Shâh; his offences were excused by Muţaffar Shâh, p. 318; paid tribute to Shâhâzâda Bahâdûr when he arrived at Chitôr, p. 321; his son rendered homage to Tâj Kân, p. 343; hearing of the defeat of Râya Pîthôrâ went back with Mêdinî Rây and Siôhadî to his own country, p. 604; advanced towards Kâkrûrûm; defeated Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 606; his kind treatment of Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 607; seized a part of the kingdom of Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 608. Radjân, Râja, son of Râja Sîrdâv, his vazîr; his successor, p. 634. Ranmal, Râja of Idar, was summoned by Firûz Kân to help him, p. 192; fled to the hills of Idar; his treachery towards Firûz Kân, p. 194; brought Sultán Hîshang into Gujràt, p. 197; asked pardon for his offences and did homage to Ahmad Shâh, p. 199. Ran Mal, Râja of Tibet, reinforced Habib Kân, p. 758. Rashid-ul-mulk, Malik, was given the title of Khudâûwâl Kân by Muţaffar Shâh, p. 293. Ratan Sën, son of Râna Sânkâ, prayed Sultán Bahâdûr for the pardon of Jagâ’s offences, p. 349; devastated the villages of Sîplâ and Balâvat; confronted Sultán Maḥmûd at Ujjain, p. 350; waited on Sultán Bahâdûr at the pass of Karchî; obtained leave to go to Chitôr, p. 351; advanced into Mûlwa, p. 610; made complaints about Maḥmûd Shâh to Sultán Bahâdûr, p. 611. Râwal, Rây, his execution, p. 643. Rây of Bhînâgûr, seized the fort of Badhûl and made martyrs of MuÎsalman, p. 15; hearing of the advance of Sultán MuÎhûmmad fled and took shelter in a fort, p. 16; posted himself on the other side of the river Krishna to confront Firûz Shâh, p. 30; was killed by Qâzî Sirâj, p. 31; plundered certain parganas of ‘Alâ-ud-din, p. 67; feeling himself unable to withstand ‘Alâ-ud-din asked pardon for his offences and gained safety, p. 69. Rây of Guwâhîr, paid tribute to Sultán Husain, p. 469. Rây of Mûhûnî, marriage of his daughter, p. 219. Rây of Mûhûnî; rose in rebellion; was defeated by Sultán Ahmad Shâh; became a loyal adherent of Ahmad Shâh, p. 47.
Ray of Orissa, defeated Khwaja Jahân and Nikâm-Âl-mulk Ghûrî, p. 79; came to ravage Bidar, p. 86; plundered and devastated a portion of the Deccan, p. 102; took the fort of Bakîr, p. 105; made his submission to Sultan Huseyn, p. 460.

Ray of Râhal, submitted, after fighting and killing the brother and son of Dilâwar Khan; sent his daughter with a large tribute to Dilâwar Khan, p. 67.

Ray of Sangâsar, sent a large tribute with his daughter to Dilâwar Khan and promised loyalty, p. 67.

Ray of Sonkar (Sangâsar), p. 97.

Ray Bâbû, Raja of Baklana, his son paid tribute to Sultan Shihbât-ud-din, p. 527.

Rây Singh, Râja of Mâl, p. 341; sacked the town of Dahûd, p. 342; suffered great loss from the invasion of Tâj Khan, p. 343.

Râyân, Rây, son of Médini Rây, his reply to Khudâwând Khan in connection with the conspiracy against Maâmûd Shâh; swore before 'Imâd-Âl-mulk on the Qur'an and achieved his agreement to the conspiracy, p. 265; communicated the message of the support of 'Imâd-Âl-mulk to Khudâwând Khan, p. 265; determination of the Râjpûts to place him on the throne, p. 597.

Râymâl Chitôrî, his relation with Bhawânkâdas, p. 570.

Rây-zâda of Kehrla, was defeated by Tâj Khan and Ahmad Khan, p. 540.

Râst Chak, sent a petition to Hamâyûn, p. 707; joined Mirzâ Hâidâr; took charge of the affairs of Srinagar, p. 708; his fight by the side of Mirzâ Hâidâr; suspicions of Mirzâ Hâidâr about him; joined Kâji Chak, p. 709; his flight; his fight and death, p. 710.

Rûkân Khan, see Ikbasîm Nikân, Saîyîd. Rûkân-ud-dîn, his flight with his brother Hîsâm-ud-dîn to Mâlwa, p. 241.

Rûkân-ud-dîn, Shâikb, through his intercession the rebels Bahram Khan and Govind Rây were pardoned by Sultan Muhammed Shâh, p. 17.

Rûmân Khan, fired the bastions of the fort of Râsîn, p. 360; his direction of the war, p. 372; joined with Khan Jahân Shâhâz and marched towards Bahroj, p. 377.

Rûpmatî, wife of Bâz Bahâdur, p. 631.

Rustam Khan, brother-in-law of Chengiz Khan, p. 398; his flight with the corpse of Chengiz Khan, p. 409.

Rustam Khan, governor of Sârangpûr, paid tribute to Nâqir-ud-dîn, p. 559.

S

Sa'âdat Khan, united with Firuz Khan, p. 189.

Sa'âdat Sulânî, Malik, defended the fort of Tambîl; fell upon the Dakhân army and slew many of them; attacked and defeated the Dakhân army, p. 218; was favoured by Ahmad Shâh, p. 219.

Sa'îd Khan Lûdî, news of his encampment reached Maâmûd Shâh, p. 592; sent a message to Bihját Khan, p. 593.

Sabr 'Ali, Raja urf was made over to him by Mirzâ Hâidâr, p. 712; joined Mirzâ Hâidâr; burnt down the edifices of Sultan Zain-ul-'Abîdîn, p. 716; his release, p. 722; was slain, p. 723.

Sa'd Bahît, Malik, was made Burhânpulkul-mulk by Maâmûd Shâh, p. 242.

Sadât Khan, joined Sultan Ahmad, p. 395; was sent to occupy Bahdar by Shîr Khan, p. 410; joined Shîr Khan, p. 412.

Sadhâ, Malik, attacked certain villages in Châmpânîr; fought with the Râja
of Châmpânîr and attained martyrdom, p. 272.

Sâdhû, the thânaâdâr of the fort of Shakar (Sâghir) helped Fizûz Khân in his attempt, p. 27.

Sâdîq Khân, was sent to conquer Malwa by Akbar, p. 631.

Sâdîq Muhammed Khân, was sent with Burhân to attack the Afghâns, p. 157.

Sadr Jahân, came to Châmpânîr to draft the treaty on behalf of Sultan Mahmûd Khalî, p. 232.

Sadr Jahân, Maḥdqâm A‘zâm, p. 125 and see n. 1, p. 125.


Sadr Khân, took a message to Mahmûd Shâh, p. 577; joined Sâhib Khân, p. 583; fled towards Chandârî, p. 592; decided to pay tribute to Mahmûd Shâh, p. 594.

Sadr Khân, governor of Râfat, advised Sultan Bahâdur not to raise the siege of Chitâr, p. 371; encouraged Sultan Bahâdur, p. 372; was taken in the service of Humâyûn Bâdadshâh, p. 375.

Sadr-ud-dîn, Qâdî, went as an ambassador to ‘Ali Shâh, p. 750.

Sa‘dul-lah Lâhârî, Maulânâ, his description of the siege of the fort of Multân, p. 807; description about himself after the victory of Husain Mirzâ, p. 808.

Sañdar Khân, devastated the country of the Râys of Koka; plundered the country of Râhal, p. 67; was sent by Mahmûd Shâh to help A‘zâm Humâyûn, p. 288; was wounded in the battle between Rânî Sânkâ and Mubâriz-ul-mulk, p. 309; retired to Ahmadâbâd, 310; was sent by Muqaffar Shâh to chastise the Râjpûts of Lakâkât; after ravaging Lakâkât rejoined Malik Ayâz, p. 313; heard about the plan of Udaya Singh; fought and defeated Udaya Singh, p. 314.

Sañdar Khân, Malik, was sent by Ahmad Shâh to guard the camp; faced the enemies and defeated them, p. 208.

Sañdar-ul-mulk, p. 9.

Sâhib Khân, cousin of Mujâhid Khân, assisted Mujâhid Khân in the murder of Qaïsâr Khân p. 270; ran away with his family, p. 271.

Sâhib Khân, Shâhzâda, (son of Sultan Naṣîr-ul-dîn); was placed on the throne of Mahmûd Shâh by Mujâhid Khân with the title of Sultan Mahmûd, p. 582; summoned Sadr Khân and Afdal Khân; his rise, p. 583; his flight from Shahrâfî, p. 584; received a wound in the battlefield; a message from Mahmûd Shâh, p. 585; his defeat and flight; interview with Yâdgâr Mughul; went to the village of Lorgûn, p. 586; was attacked by Lodhâ and sought shelter with the ruler of Kâwîl, p. 587; sent an army to conquer Sârangpûr, p. 593; his grief on the death of Muḥâfîz Khân, p. 594; agreed to the proposal of submission to Mahmûd Shâh and received favours from the latter, p. 595; after hearing of the treacherous plan of Bihjat Khân betook himself to Sultan Sikandar’s army, pp. 595-96.

Sañrah, Rây, see Quðt-ud-dîn Lankâh, Sultan of Multân.

Sañhûm, his literary work and qualifications, p. 658.

Sa‘d, Malik, was brought by ‘Ain-ul-mulk to the presence of Mahmûd Shâh Dakîn; was given the title of Bahâdur Malik by Mahmûd Shâh, p. 126.

Sa‘d-ud-mulk, Malik, was sent to Badr ‘Alâ by Sultan Ahmad Shâh; was seized by Badr ‘Alâ, p. 193; investigated the news of the welfare
of Shâhzâda Ahmad Khân and reported to Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 267.
Saïf, fought with the Saïyida, p. 684; obtained release and fought against Muḥammad Shâh, p. 688; Fâth Shâh's regard for him; his rank, p. 689; his execution, p. 693.
Saïf Khân, with the help of other amîras placed Shâhzâda Hasan Khân on the throne, p. 75; was executed by the order of Humâyûn Khân, p. 76.
Saïf Khân Dêhla'î, his representation to Qâdir Shâh, p. 618; his advice to Qâdir Shâh, p. 619.
Saïf Khwâjah, was sent to Badr 'Alâ by Sulṭân Ahmad Shâh, p. 193.
Saïf-ud-dîn, was ordered by Sulṭân Bahâdur to be hanged, p. 335.
Saïf-ud-dîn, Malik, Superintendent of the elephants, was sent with presents to Sulṭân Shams-ud-dîn by Fîrûz Shâh, p. 424.
Saïf-ud-dîn, Malik, was given the command of the fort of Ranthambhôr by Maḥmûd Khalîfî, p. 520.
Saïf-ul-mulk, advised I'tmâd to leave Ahmadâbâd, p. 404; arrival at Ahmadâbâd, p. 407.
Saiyid Khân was sent by Sulṭân Muḥammad to fight against Maḥmûd Khalîfî, p. 510.
Saiyid Khân, Sulṭân of Kâshghar, sent an army to invade Kashmir, p. 701.
Saiyid Khân of the Niyâzî tribe, advanced to conquer Kashmir but was slain, p. 723.
Saiyid Mirzá, his flight to Dâbil, p. 715.
Saiyid Sulṭân, was slain by Ghâzi Khân, p. 533.
Sajîwâl Khân, see Shujâ' Khân, Sulṭân of Mâlwa.
Shâlabat Khân, original; his rank in the service of Mu'taṣâda Niṣâm Shâh; envy of the amîras; fight; victory, p. 148; imprisonment; entrance into the fortress, p. 149; reply to the men in charge of the fort, p. 150 (and see note 4, p. 149).
Shâlab-ud-dîn, Jâm, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 775.
Shâlab-ud-dîn, Jâm, relative of Jâm Fîrûz, hostility with Jâm Fîrûz, p. 779; received reinforcements from Sulṭân Muṣâaffâr Gujrâtî; his death, p. 780.
Sâlîr Hamza, Mas'hûr-ul-mulk, was sent to Jâhna by the Dakînî vazîr; his treatment of the Saïyyads, p. 66; became afflicted with leprosy, p. 66.
Sâlbâhan, refused to accept the terms of Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 598; was killed by the servant of Maḥmûd Shâh, p. 599.
Salim, Sulṭân, 'Ali Shâh sent the daughter of his nephew to him, p. 750.
Sâmat Rây, Râja of Dandwâna, was killed by the soldiers of Sulṭân Hûshang, pp. 206, 479.
Sanbal Khân, was sent to help Jâm Fîrûz, p. 780.
Sân Dëvi, mother of Yusuf Khân, p. 683.
Sanjar, Jâm, ruler of Sind, account of his rule, p. 778.
Sanjâr Khân, joined Bihjat Khân, p. 588.
Sankar, was given a part of Kashmir and was made the revenue officer by Fâth Shâh, p. 690; as the revenue minister of Fâth Shâh, p. 692; his imprisonment; death, p. 693.
Sankar Chak, son of Kâj Chak, envy (which he bore) to Ghâzi Khân; refused the summons of Da'ijî Chak and Ghâzi Khân, p. 720; created disturbances, p. 733; his revolt, p. 741.
Sarandip, Malik, plunder of the gifts sent by him to Hajjâjî, p. 782.
Sarang, p. 697, fought against Nâzuk Shâh and was slain, p. 698.
Sārang Khān, was seized by Mīrzā Pir Muḥammad Khān, p. 180.
Sarka, Rāja, his fort was captured by the Malik-ut-tujjār; was imprisoned, p. 61; was pardoned and made the pioneer of his army; deceived Malik-ut-tujjār; and led them to the mouth of death, p. 62.
Sēv Dāsa Baqāl, was killed by Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, p. 555.
Sarwar, Malik, entered the service of Bahādur Shāh, p. 331; was given the title of Khwājah Jahān by Muḥammad Shāh; was granted the title of Sultān-ush-sharq by Maḥmūd Sultān and later appointed to the government of Jaunpūr by him, p. 447.
Sha'bān Imād-ul-mulk, Malik, the conspirators resolved to remove him from his office, p. 238; inference of Maḥmūd Shāh from his behaviour; his imprisonment; order of Maḥmūd Shāh to bring him; the denial of guards to leave him without the permission of 'Aṭīl-ul-mulk, p. 239; was appointed by Maḥmūd Shāh to drive away flies, p. 240; made an attack on the conspirators, p. 241; separated himself from the office of vazārat, p. 242.
Sha'bān Sultānī, Malik, was entitled Imād-ul-mulk; was appointed in charge of the fort of Ābū by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn; commenced a battle; was summoned by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 231.
Saḥī Shāh, Pūrābīyā, was sent by Rāy Pithorā to put down Imād-ul-mulk, p. 604.
Shahāb-ud-dīn, was the son of Malik Sha'bān Imād-ul-mulk, p. 238.
Shahbāz Khān Afghān, advanced to conquer Kashmir, p. 723.
Shāh Bég Arghūn, ruler of Sind, conquered the fort of Sāwī; possessed the fort of Bhakkar, p. 778; seized the fort of Sihwān, p. 779; possession of Thatha, p. 780; gained the rule of Sind, p. 781; his literary ability and bravery, p. 782.
Shāh Malik, Malik, rose in revolt, p. 104; his flight from the battlefield; a sudden attack on the camp of Shāhzāda Latīf Khān, p. 195.
Shāh Mīr, see Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmir.
Shāh Mīrzā, joined Chengtż Khān, p. 403.
Shāh Rukh, Mīrzā, was appointed to invade Kashmir, p. 780.
Shahdād, Mīr, arrived in Multān, p. 803.
Shāhī Bég Arghūn, helped Jām Fīrūz, p. 780.
Shāhī Bég Uzbek, his fight with Amīr Dhu‘ailnūn Bég, p. 781.
Shāhī Khān, was made locum tenens of ‘All Shāh, p. 650; retired to Stālkōt, p. 651; joined Ja‘rat; defeated ‘All Shāh; entered Kashmir as Sultān, p. 652.
Shaihk Malik, was sent by Ghaznīn Khān to seize Žafar Minjumla, p. 487.
Shaijkha, Malik, was reinforced by Qājī Pir Ikhbāq, p. 280.
Shaijkhan, Qājī, came from the Doojan to Maḥmūd Khalīf for peace, p. 538.
Shams, Mīr, his arrival in Kashmir, p. 689.
Shams Chak, helped Lōhar; his imprisonment, p. 757; fied from prison and joined Haider Chak, p. 758; his offences were pardoned by Yūsuf, Khān, p. 759.
Shams Dūbar, his advice to Khān Zamān, p. 743.
Shams Dūbī, his determination about Yūsuf Khān, p. 760.
Shams Khān, son of Fīrūz Khān, for fear of Mujāhid Khān fled to Rānā
Kūmbhā, p. 229; agreed to fulfil the conditions of Rānā Kūmbhā; took possession of the fort of Nāgūr; consulted with the amirs in connection with the fulfilment of the demands of Rānā Kūmbhā; refused to fulfil his promise; went to Ṣāḥīb-ud-dīn to seek for help; was favoured by Sultan Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 230; was put to death by the amirs of Sultan Qutb-ud-dīn, p. 235.

Shams Ḫān Dandānī, ruler of Nāgūr, was appointed to the office of vazir by Tutār Ḫān, p. 183; was favoured by Aʿzam Humāyūn, p. 184.

Shams Mughal, Khwājah, was sent as an ambassador to Ḫālam Ḫān, p. 714.

Shams Zinā, his imprisonment, p. 725; joined Ghāzū Ḫān, p. 726.

Shams-ull-mulk, was appointed to seize Add-ul-mulk by Sultan Bahādur, p. 335.

Shams-ud-dīn, Khwājah, was left in Multān, p. 810.

Shams-ud-dīn, Sultan, ascended the throne of Daku, p. 25; Shāhzādas Frīz Ḫān and Ahmad Ḫān attempted to regain their hereditary dominion; their success, p. 26; period of reign, p. 27.

Shams-ud-dīn, Sultan of Bangālā, p. 429; succeeded his father; how he passed his life; period of reign, p. 430 (and see note 3, p. 429).

Shams-ud-dīn, Sultan of Kashmir, his ancestry, p. 633; acquired power; message of Kōpā Dērvī; became the ruler of Kashmir, p. 635; accession; suppression of tyranny; rebuilt the kingdom of Kashmir, p. 638; meted out punishment to the Lūn tribe; left all affairs to Jamshid and 'Ali Shāh; period of reign, p. 637.

Shams-ud-dīn, Sultan, son of Sultan Muḥammad Shāh, Sultan of Kash-

mf, accession; disputes between Malik Kājī and Abdāl Mākīr, p. 706; was succeeded by his son Nāzuk Shāh, p. 707.

Shams-ud-dīn Shāh, Darvīsh, p. 255.

Shams-ud-dīn Tāriq, Malik, came to see Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 122.

Shah-i-Jahān, was sent by Maḥmūd Shāh to Alī Ḫān to reassure him of his safety, p. 279.


Shah-i-ulk, p. 343.

Shah-ul-mulk, Malik, was ordered by Maḥmūd Shāh to bring Sha'bān to the darbār; guards did not allow him to take Sha'bān, p. 239.

Sharg, Malik, advised Ḫān to leave Aḥmadābād, p. 404.

Shargi Sultanā, list of the rulers, p. 447.

Sharzah Ḫān, son of Bihjat Ḫān, was sent to attend on Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 584; was sent by his father to welcome Shaikh Aūliyā, p. 595; joined Sultan Bahādur, p. 612.

Sharzah Ḫān Sharwānlī, came with a message from Sultan Maḥmūd to Malik Ayāz, p. 315.

Sharzat-ulk-ul-mulk, fied from the fort of Mandū, p. 352.

Shār, was executed, p. 660.

Shār Aṣhānak, was conferred on powers by his brother, p. 639.

Shār Ḫān, asked Malik Mujāhid-ul-mulk for protection; went away to Kāwil, p. 289.

Shār Ḫān, father of Sallān Ḫān, Bangālā came under his possession after Naṭb Shāh; slew Jahlānīr Qulī Bāg, p. 445.

Shār Ḫān, son of Mūṣaffar Ḫān, ruler of Chandīrī, chastised Sultan Bahūl Lūḍī, pp. 546-47; his advance towards Chandīrī, p. 565; made over Mubārak Ḫān and ‘Alām Ḫān to his men;
turned to give battle to Nāsir-ud-din, p. 566; his flight; a letter from Shaikhzādas of Chandārī and his advance, p. 567; his struggle and death, p. 568.

Shēr Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, united Firūz Khān, p. 189.

Shēr Khān Afghān, received Daryā Khān with favour, p. 388; sent a farrān to Qādir Shāh, p. 617; his successful advance towards Mālwa; submission of Qādir Shāh, p. 619; gave the Sarkār of Lakhnauti to Qādir Shāh; his direction to Shujāʿat Khān, p. 620; hemistich composed by him on the flight of Qādir Shāh; gave the towns of Ujjain and Sārangpur to Shujāʿ Khān and also the government of Mālwa, p. 621.

Shēr Khān Fūlādī, the district of Pāttān as far as Kārī came into his possession, p. 398; arrived at Ahmadābād and offered his congratulations to Sultān Muẓaffar, p. 399; defeated Iʿtmād Khān, p. 400; sent a letter to Chengiz Khān, p. 401; ʿUsmānpūr, Khānpūr and Kālpūr came into his possession, p. 405; sent Sādāt Khān who possessed Bahdar; vacated Bahdar at the arrival of Sultān Muẓaffar, p. 410; agreed with the views of Iʿtmād Khān for suppressing the Mīrzās, p. 411; went to Sayyid Ḥāmid Būkhārī to enquire about the truth of the fact about which Iʿtmād Khān had written to him; on the arrival of Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī became exhausted and fled, p. 413.

Shērwān Khān, killed Būkhān, p. 391.

Shevās, father of Bhawānīdās, p. 570.

Shihāb-ud-din, Sultān, brother of Sultān Ḥusayn, his rebellion and imprisonment, p. 793.

Shihāb-ud-din, Sultān, son of Sultān Nāsir-ud-din, Sultān of Mālwa, see Miyān Majhīla.

Shihāb-ud-din, Sultān, son of Sultān Shams-ud-din, Sultān of Kashmir, accession; character and qualifications, p. 640; marched as far as Aṣhtnagar and slew his enemies; submission of the Rāja of Nagarkot; residence, p. 641; his heir; banished his sons; founded two cities; period of reign, p. 642.

Shihāb-ud-din Mahmūd Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh Lashkari, succeeded his father, p. 109; appointed Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk and Malik, p. 110, Nizām-ul-mulk as his vazīrs, p. 111; Dūlāwar Khān Ḥābāhī took permission for killing the vazīrs, p. 112; owing to the dispersion of all the amirs irregularities and weakness cropped in his affairs; Malik Barid kept him in imprisonment; became weak and the men of the city attacked him, p. 113; a body of ungrateful persons attacked him; ʿAzīz Khān Turk, Ḥasan ʿAlī Khān and Sayyid Mīrzā-Maḥṭḥādī fought against the rebels and saved him, p. 114; ordered Jahāngīr Khān to guard the gate and Khān Jahān to guard the city and bāzār; troops dispersed the rebels and destroyed them; ʿAdil Khān sent a representation about the rebellion in his territory, p. 115; ordered the amirs to march to the help of ʿAdil Khān to put down the rebels and himself also started; arrived in the vicinity of Rājmundri; fought and defeated the rebels; seized Dastūr-ul-mulk but pardoned his offences and confirmed his rank; returned to Gulkarga; marched towards the fort of Sunkar; besieged the fort and captured it; leaving one of his
trusted men there, returned to Bidar; defined the ranks of great and noble men, p. 116; hearing of the rebellion and oppression of Bahadur Gilaani he sent a farman to Bahadur in which he asked him to stop his oppression and to send back everything to the court of Sultan Mahmud Gujratii and to release Kamal Khun and Sadiar Khun; Bahadur sent him an improper reply, p. 119; advanced to punish Bahadur; arrived in front of the fort which was in the possession of Bahadur; seeing the grandeur of his army Bahadur fled; arranged the affairs of the place; arrived at Borkal; Bahadur took to flight from Borkal; the Raays or Zamindars enlisted themselves as the loyal adherents of Mahmoud Shah; the commander of the army of Bahadur posted himself in the fort of Mirich; his amirs taking him advanced to capture Mirich; fought with the men of Bahadur, p. 120; commandant of the fort of Mirich prayed for peace; making peace with the men of Bahadur occupied the fort of Mirich; turned towards the forts of Kalhar and Dabul; birth of his son at Malwa; gave the name Ahmad Shah to his son; Bahadur asked pardon of his offences, p. 121; Bahadur was excused and was asked to render homage and to pay tribute; Bahadur did not pay any attention to the order; advanced towards the fort of Jaktr; fight in the town of Kalhar; advanced towards Kalapur, p. 122; received the news of the preparations of Bahadur for war at Salala; arrived in the vicinity of Kalapur; most of the troops of Bahadur separated from him; Bahadur took to the path of his flight; sent Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk and Ain-ul-mulk to take charge of the fort of Panala; spent the rainy season in Kolapur; Bahadur demanded, p. 123, assurance of his safety and promised to remain loyal in his service; agreed to the request of Bahadur; sent learned men to assure Bahadur but his resolution changed again, p. 124; sent Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk to crush Bahadur; Fakhr-ul-mulk met with the army of Bahadur, fought bravely and became victorious, p. 125; conferred favours and the title of Khwaja Jahang on Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk; entered the fort of Panala; sent Malik Ain-ul-mulk to occupy the island of Goa and to take possession of everything belonging to Bahadur; properties of Bahadur were entrusted to Ain-ul-mulk; returned towards the capital; halted in the town of Bijapur, p. 126; showed favours to the ambassadors of Sultan Mahmud Gujratii; granted double the normal remuneration to the ambassadors; sent presents to Sultan Mahmud Gujratii; sent for all the adherents of Sultan Mahmud Gujratii and granted favours to them; ordered for making over twenty ships to the servants of Sultan Mahmud Gujratii which were taken by Bahadur, p. 127; returned from camp and took up his residence, p. 129, in Bidar; sardars went to their places; became powerless, p. 130; Malik Barid rose to power; made him into a puppet; informed Imad-ul-mulk who asked him to come to Kawil; fled to Kawil; was welcomed by Imad-ul-mulk; arrived in the city of Bidar with the soldiers of Imad-ul-mulk to crush Malik Barid, p. 131; joined the army of Malik Barid; complaint about the slave.
of 'Imād-ul-mulk; 'Imād-ul-mulk returned to Kāwīl; his miserable life; death; period of reign, p. 132; purchased 'Ādil Kān from Khwājah Maḥmūd Garjistānī, p. 159; marched from Bīdar to destroy Bahādur Gīlānī, p. 279.

Shirāz-ul-mulk, his petition to Maḥmūd Khalji, p. 536.

Shīr Malik, insulted Saiyyad Nāṣir-ud-dīn; Ahmad Shāh sentenced him to death; p. 43 (and see n. 1, p. 55).

Shītāb Kān, guardian of the seraglio, p. 84.

Shujā' Kān, Sultān of Mālwa, was entrusted with the government of Mālwa by Shīr Kān; appointment of Hājī Kān Sultānī and Natū Kān, p. 621; fought a victorious battle with Nāṣir Kān, p. 622; a letter from Hājī Kān Sultānī; advanced to reinforce Hājī Kān; defeated Malū Kān; brought the whole of Mālwa into his possession; attitude of Islām Kān towards him, p. 623; misdeeds of 'Uthmān Kān and the punishment which he suffered; became aggrieved at Islām Kān's actions, p. 624; was attacked and wounded by 'Uthmān Kān; sent a message to Islām Kān, p. 625; sent Fath Kān to collect tribute and bid farewell to Islām Kān, p. 628; departed from Islām Kān and arrived at Sārangpūr; his declaration in connection with fighting against Islām Kān; went away in the direction of Bānawālah; Islām Kān took possession of Mālwa, without causing any damage; came and rendered homage to Islām Kān; was given presents by Islām Kān; gave jāgīra to Daulat Kān Ajīyāla and Malik Muṣṭafā and Miyān Bāyazid; his death; period of reign, p. 628.

Shujā'at Kān, had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; dispute with Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn and his flight, p. 562; he, with all his sons, was beheaded, p. 553; hostility with his brother, p. 554; took the affairs of the kingdom in his hands, p. 555; sent an army in pursuit of Shaikh Ḥabīb and Khwājah Suhail, p. 557; sent a report to Khvāyāāt-ud-dīn about the power of Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 559; his flight with Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 561; his fight with Nāṣir Shāh and its result, p. 562; was seized by the amirs of Nāṣir Shāh, p. 563; was made over to custodians, p. 564; was ordered by Shīr Kān to watch on Qādir Shāh, p. 619.


Shujā'ul-mulk Bukhārī, Shaikh, took the administration of Sultān Ḥusain in his hand, p. 806.

Sikandar, Sultān of Gujrat, succeeded his father; buried the body of his father in the town of Sarkhāj, p. 323; arrived in the town of Bātūh and visited the tombs of the holy men; ill-treatment of the servants of Muẓaffar Shāh, p. 324; soldiers and ra'ṭyāts became annoyed on the unjustified bestowal of favours; people tried to bring Shāhzāda Bahādur Kān; knowing the avaricious intention of Shāhzāda Lāṭf Kān appointed Sharzah Kān to put him down; Malik Lāṭf Kān in pursuit of Lāṭf Kān met with the Rāja of Chitōr and was slain in a battle, p. 325; appointed Qaṣīr Kān for the punishment of the Rājūt of Chitōr; determination of 'Imād-ul-mulk to dethrone him; attempt of 'Imād-ul-mulk to murder the Sultān; did not believe reports against 'Imād-ul-mulk; news of the
advance of Bahadur Shâh caused him great mental worry; saw in a dream, p. 326, a number of Shaikhâs and Muzaaffar Shâh; entrance of Imad-ul-mulk into the palace; Imad-ul-mulk met Naqarat-ul-mulk and Ibrâhim; Naqarat-ul-mulk and Ibrâhim were slain, p. 327; one of the companions of Imad-ul-mulk made a martyr of the Sultan; period of reign, p. 328.

Sikandar, Sultan, son of Bahâlûl; a petition from Jam Bâyazîd; his farmân to Daulat Khân Lûdî, p. 302.

Sikandar, Sultan, son of Sultan Quth-ud-din, Sultan of Kashmir, accession, p. 644; sent Rây Mádâri to Tibet; defeat of rebels; relation of friendship with Amir Timûr, p. 645; Islâmic religion in Kashmir; showed honour to Saiyid Muhammad, p. 647; made arrangements for breaking images and pulling down the temples, p. 648; bestowal of title and kingdom; period of reign, p. 649.

Sikandar Khân, incited Ma&mûd Khalîjî to seize the fort of Mâhûr, p. 526; exhibited Shâh Khân’s body on the gallows, p. 568.

Sikandar Khân, governor of Satwâs, went to his Jâgîr; his rebellion, p. 587; sought pardon of his offences, p. 589; rose in revolt for the second time, p. 591; returned victorious to Satwâs, p. 592; brought Satwâs with its neighbourhood into his possession, p. 608; was made over to jailors by Shâh Khân, p. 620.

Sikandar Khân, son of Sultan Saiyid Khân, was sent to invade Kashmir, p. 701; fought with the Kashmiris, p. 703.

Sikandar Khân Bukhârî, p. 69; invited Sultan Ma&mûd Khalîjî to invade Berâr, p. 70; joined Ma&mûd Khalîjî; besieged Mâhûr; after the arrival of Sultan ‘Alâ-ud-din took the path of flight; met ‘Alâ-ud-din on the way and asked pardon of his offences, p. 71; raised a rebellion; went to Mâlkonda; defeated Khân Jahân, p. 77; was defeated by Humâyûn Shâh, p. 78; had to run away to Bîdar taking Ni zam Shâh with him, p. 243.

Sikandar Khân Satwâi, waited on Sultan Ba&mâdur and was received with favour, p. 350.

Sikandar Khân, Shâhzâda, was sent by Muzaaffar Shâh to act as the governor of Muhammadâbad, p. 297; heard the precious advice of Muzaaffar Shâh, p. 323.

Sikandar Lûdî, Sultan, son of Bahâlûl Lûdî, sent gifts to Ma&mûd Shâh, p. 289; sat on the throne of Delhi after the death of Bahâlûl Lûdî; defeated Bârbak Shâh, p. 462; purloined Bârbak Shâh; possessed Jaunpûr; defeated Sultan Husain and seized his territory, p. 483.

Sikandar Shâh, Sultan of Bangâla, succeeded his father by the exertion of the amirs with the title of Sikandar Shâh, p. 424; proclaimed the gospel of justice, p. 425; occupied himself with the duties of the Saltanat; sent a tribute to Sultan Firûz Shâh; being aware of the advance of Firûz Shâh fortified himself in the fort of Ekdâla but in the end paid tribute and asked pardon of Firûz Shâh; passed his life in pleasure, p. 426; period of reign, p. 427 (and see note 2 of p. 426).

Sikandar Shâh. Sultan of Bangâla, p. 436; the amirs placed him on the throne; his work as the Sultan (n. 3, p. 436); period of reign, p. 437.
Sikār, son of Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 543.

Sīlahādī, went to Chitōr to bring Rānā Sāṅkā to the aid of Rāy Pīthōrā, p. 602; occupied the boundary of Sārangpūr as far as Bhilsā and Rāsān, p. 608; end of his power and submission to Māḥmūd Shāh, p. 609; was summoned by Māḥmūd Shāh to his aid, p. 610; Māḥmūd Shāh granted some parganas to him; made complaints about Māḥmūd Shāh to Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 611; his death, p. 616. Also see Sīlahādī Pūrābā.

Sīlahādī Pūrābā, came with Sulṭān Māḥmūd to Mandīsār; message of Rānā Sāṅkā to him, p. 315; being aware of the intention of Sulṭān Māḥmūd sought protection of Rātān Sēn; went to Chitōr, p. 350; waited on Sulṭān Bahādur at the pass of Karchī, p. 351; left Bhūpat at Ujjain and waited on Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 356; news of his arrest, p. 357; sent a message to Sulṭān Bahādur expressing the wish to accept Islām, p. 360; advised Sulṭān Bahādur to postpone the matter of conquering the fort of Rāśīn which was accepted; went to the fort and inflamed the feeling of Rājpūṭs against Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 361; hearing of the death of his son fainted and was arrested, p. 362; fought with the Dakhīn army, p. 367.

Sīmā ‘Īmād-ul-mulk Sulṭānī, p. 324.

Ṣirāj, made Srinagar over to ‘Alī Shēr, p. 639.

Ṣirāj, Qādī, killed Rāy of Bījānagar, p. 30.

Ṣirāj Khān, received the title of Mu’āẓẓam Khān; treated Ḥasan Khān and Ḥābib-ul-lah with courtesy; took them into the citadel and attacked them; put Amīrzāda Ḥābib-ul-lah with his friends to death, p. 83; was afflicted with leprosy, p. 84.

Ṣirāj-ul-mulk, his son opposed Nizām-ul-mulk Turk but fled after a fight, p. 536.

Sīrdēv, Rājā, p. 632; his descendants, p. 634; sent tribute to Diljū, p. 637.

Ṣirkājā, Rāy, paid tribute to Māḥmūd Khaḷīfī, p. 536.

Ṣiyāh Bhat, his oppression: death, p. 650.

Ṣrī Bhat, his request to Sulṭān Zain-ul-‘Abidīn, p. 653.

Ṣūfī Khān, son of ‘Ālā-ul-mulk, was summoned by Māḥmūd Khaḷīfī, p. 502.

Suhail, Ḥwūjah, was allotted the management of Īkāla parganas, p. 554; killed Mūnjā Baqlī and fled, p. 555; fled from the palace of Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 556; waited on Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 557; was nominated to crush Yākān Khān, p. 560; was sent by Nāṣir Shāh to conquer the fort of Māundī, p. 563; favoured by Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 564; took the wounded Shēr Khān and fled, p. 568.

Ṣuhbār Dūdāī, Malik, joined Sulṭān Ḥusain; grant to Malik Ṣuhbār by Sulṭān Ḥusain, p. 795.

Ṣuhbār Sulṭānī, Malik, was sent by Ṣafar Khān to surround the country of Thānū, p. 215.

Ṣūkhāī, took a message to Ḥābib Chak; was punished by Ḥābib Chak, p. 728.

Ṣulājānīn, Malik, son of Malik Shēr-ul-mulk Ghūrī, was declared to be the ruler of Chandīrī by the amīrī; fight with Māḥmūd Khaḷīfī, p. 506; death, p. 507.

Ṣulājānīn Karārānī, his supremacy over Bangālā and Behār, p. 445, and Orīsa; assumed the title of Ḥudrat Ā’īd; after his death his son succeeded him, p. 446.
Index.

Sultān, Malik Mīr, was appointed by Ahmad Shāh to collect Khrāj, p. 221; through his intervention Ganēṣa did homage to Sultān Muḥammad Shāh; had the title of Khān Jahān, p. 224. Sultāns of Bangāla, list of, p. 418 (and see note 4 on p. 415).

Sultāns of Gujrat, list of, pp. 172-73.

Sultāns of Mālwa, list of, p. 465.

Sultāns of Multān, list of, pp. 787-88.

SultānMuhammad, his qualifications; was respected by Zain-ul-‘Abbīdīn, p. 656.

Sultān-us-Salāṭīn, Sultān of Bangāla, succeeded his father; his qualities; death; period of reign, p. 429 (and see note 2 on p. 429).

Sultān-us-Sharq, Sharqī Sultān, rise to sovereignty; extension of power, p. 447; death; period of reign, p. 448.

Sūrā, was sent by Rāy Bātātī to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Khalījī to ask for help, p. 273.

Sūrājmal, was sentenced to death, p. 562.

Syām Dās, Rāy, Rāja of Dūngarpūr; paid tribute to Maḥmūd Khalījī, p. 533.

T

Taghālījī, imprisoned and blinded Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn; placed Sultān Shams-ud-dīn on the throne of Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, p. 25.

Taghī, revolted in the neighbourhood of Nahrwāla Pattān; took possession of that place; besieged the fort of Bahrūjī, p. 9; Sultān Muhammad contemplated his subjugation, p. 10.

Tāhir, Mīr, was sent to the fort by Mīrzā Khān, p. 143.

Tāhir, Mīrzā, went as an ambassador to Yūsuf Khān, p. 758.

Tāhir, Saiyyīd, p. 84.

Tāhir, Shāh, came from Sulṭānīya to the, p. 197, Deccan; became a courtier of Burhān Shāh; adopted Imāmī religion, p. 138 (and see n. 4, p. 137); was respected by Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt, p. 139.

Tāhir Alī, father of Shāh Mīr, p. 633.

Tāhmāsp, p. 162; was blinded by his brother ‘Alī ‘Abbī Khān, p. 163.

Tāhmāsp, Shāh, p. 148.

Tāmūr Gūrgānī, Amir; his arrival in the neighbourhood of Delhī, p. 180; his oppression, p. 181.

Tīmūr, Amir, his friendship with Sultān Sikandar, p. 645.

Tāj Bhat, Malik, was sent to attack Bahārī Khān, p. 677.

Tāj Jamāl, Malik, was sent by Bahādur Shāh with a farmān, p. 331.

Tāj Khān, was sent by Sultān Maḥmūd Khalījī with a message of peace to Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, p. 232; was sent to meet Rāy Bātātī by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 272; was sent by Muḥaffar Shāh to join Malik Ayāz, p. 313; advanced with a well-equipped army, p. 329, to join Bahādur Shāh, p. 331; saw Bahādur Shāh, p. 332; was left on the bank of the river Bātrak by Bahādur Shāh, p. 334; was sent by Sultān Bahādur to attack ‘Imād-uldīn, p. 335; informed Sultān Bahādur about the hostility of Ulugh Khān and Qaiṣar Khān, p. 340; undertook the task of chastising Rāy Singh, p. 342; devastated the country of Māh, p. 343; was sent by Muḥaffar Gujrātī to welcome Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 601; climbed the hill on which the fort of the enemy was built,* p. 603.

Tāj-ud-dīn, Malik, Ahmad Shāh conferred on him the title of Muʿīn-uldīn and directed him to remain at Tālīnīr, p. 219; was sent to Delhī by Sultān Shams-ud-dīn with a tribute, p. 423.
Tamāchī, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 774.
Tāmīn Āngīrī, p. 772.
Tārī Bēg Kḥān, was entrusted with the charge of guarding the treasure by Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 376; was appointed governor of Chāmpānīr, p. 377; relinquished the country of Gujrat, p. 378; went to Āgra, p. 379.
Tātār Kḥān, Sulṭān of Gujrat, vazīr of Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, p. 175; came from Delhi to Gujrat owing to the violence of Mallū Kḥān; his request to his father; plundered the country of the Rāja of Īdar, p. 180; requested his father to help him in defeating Mallū Kḥān; reply of his father, p. 182; accession to the throne; assumption of the title of Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh; bestowal of wealth and honour; conferred the office of the vazīr on Shams Kḥān Dandānī; words of his monogram; march from Asāwal to conquer Delhi, p. 183; ravaged the villages and towns of Nādōṭ; halted in the town of Saniūr; period of his reign; title of Muḥammad Shāh after his death; after grieving for the death of Muḥammad Shāh Āʿzan Humāyūn made Malik Jalāl Kōkhar over to Shams Kḥān Dandānī and again sat on the throne; rumor of the latter having poisoned Muḥammad Shāh, p. 184.
Tātār Kḥān of Mālwa, was ordered to bring Nāṣir-ud-dīn to Ghīyāth-ud-dīn; advanced towards Bārah, p. 557.
Tātār Kḥān, governor of the Punjāb, sent his army to aid the Saiyids, p. 685.
Tātār Kḥān, son of Sulṭān ‘Alā-ud-dīn, was favoured by Sulṭān Bahādur, p. 369; seized Bīāna; fought with Mīrzā Hindāl’s army and was slain, p. 371.
Tātār Kḥān Lūdī, reinforced Bārbak Shāh, p. 793.
Tawalak, ‘Imād-ul-mulk, his address to Sulṭān Husain, p. 797; his rank in the time of Sulṭān Fīrūz, p. 798; caused the murder of Sulṭān Fīrūz, p. 799; his imprisonment, p. 800.
Tufāl Kḥān, was defeated by the minister of Murtadā Nīsān Shāh, p. 146; helped Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, p. 402.
Tughān, Malik, was made Farḥat-ul-mulk by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 242; was appointed as the thānādār of Beyt by Maḥmūd Shāh and left there, p. 261; was sent to the thānā at fort Beyt and Jagat by Maḥmūd Shāh, p. 263; arrived at the house of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, p. 285.
Tughlaq, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p. 777.
Tughlaq Kḥān, informed Maḥmūd Shāh about the preparations of the men of Karrāl, p. 249.
Tughlaq Shāh Fūlādī, Malik, brought the amīrs back from the way, p. 316.

U
Udai Singh, received Shāhzāda Bahādur with good wishes, p. 321; joined the service of Bahādur Shāh, p. 330.
Udaya Singh, Rāja of Māl, was defeated by Malik Ashā-ul-mulk and Saṭdar Kḥān, p. 314.
‘Udī Mūllā, was respected and favoured by Sulṭān Zain-ul-ʿābidīn, p. 657.
Ugar Sēn Pūrṣāh, was wounded in the battle between Udaya Singh and Saṭdar Kḥān; went to Rānā Sāṅkā
and related the story of the fight, p. 314.

Uj håh Bahârm, son of Mas‘ûd Chak, his proposals for peace with Khân Mirak Mirzâ; was killed by the latter, p. 710.

Ulugh Khân, did not abandon his hostile attitude, p. 339: was sent by Bahâdur Shâh against Latîf Khân; was imprisoned by the order of Sultân Bahâdur, p. 340; was posted to Bhîlpûr by Sultân Bahâdur, p. 353.

Ulugh Khân, advised I’tâmad Khân to leave Ahmadâbâd, p. 404: took Sultân Mu‘azzafar to Dîngarpûr and made him over to I’tâmad Khân, p. 406; became annoyed with I’tâmad Khân: came to Chengiz Khân; disapproved any idea of superiority among the servants of Sultân Mahmûd; heard of the intentions of Chengiz Khân in connection with his death, p. 407; went to the palace of Chengiz Khân, p. 408; invited I’tâmad Khân to Ahmadâbâd, p. 409; proposed to possess Bahrîj, p. 410; resolved to put down I’tâmad Khân, p. 411; hostility with Jhuhjâr Khân; went to Shêr Khân and informed him of the arrival of Sultân Mu‘azzafar, p. 412; enlisted his name in the band of the loyal servants, p. 413.

Ulugh Khân, brother of Mallû Khân, was blinded by Ibrâhîm ‘Adîl Khân, p. 162.

Ulugh Khân Hâbsh, attacked Burhân, p. 391; attacked Saiyid Mubârak, p. 395.

‘Umar Khân, joined Sultân Bahâdur and was highly honoured, p. 348.

‘Umar Khân, Shâhzâda, son of Sultân Hûshang, took to the path of flight, p. 493; was made the leader of rebels, p. 503; his attempt for conquering Sârangpûr proved fatal, p. 505.

‘Uthmân Khân, the punishment for his improper actions; complained to Islam Khân against Shu‘ja‘ Khân, p. 624; attacked and wounded Shu‘ja‘ Khân; was put to death, p. 625.

‘Uthmân Khân, Shâhzâda, his treatment of his younger brother, p. 481; was pardoned by Sultân Hûshang; was summoned and made over to custodians by the order of Sultân Hûshang, p. 482.

‘Uthmân Jalâl, Malik, sent sarvârû to wait on Mahmûd Khân, p. 485; his representation to Mahmûd Khân in favour of Shâhzâda ‘Uthmân Khân, p. 486.

W

Wajih-ul-mulk, father of Zafar Khân, p. 173.

Walî-ul-lah, was imprisoned in the cage of sovereignty by Malik Bârî; being led by an evil passion Malik Bârî poisoned him; period of his reign, p. 134.

Y

Yâdgar Bâg Qazīlbasî, came as an ambassador from Irân with presents to the court of Mahmûd Shâh, p. 290; could not see Mahmûd Shâh alive, p. 291; his arrival in the neighbourhood of Mu‘ammâdâbâd; was welcomed by Mu‘azzafar Shâh, p. 293; his house was looted, p. 295.

Yâdgar Mu‘gul Surkh Kûldû, inter., view with Shâhib Khân; death of his retainers, p. 586.

Yâdgar Nâşir Mirzâ, was sent with Mirzâ ‘Askarî, p. 376; was appointed to the government of Pattan Gujrat by Humâyûn Bâdshâh, p. 377; relinquished Gujrat, p. 378; was left in Gujrat by Humâyûn Bâdshâh, p. 616.
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Yaḥyā Khān, the Kotwāl of Humāyūn Shāh, seized him and put him to death, p. 82.

Yakān Khān, was allotted the management of the Ḳhāliṣa parganas, p. 554; was sent to seize the murderers of Mūnja Baqāl, p. 555; sent a message to Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 556; his fight against Nāṣir-ud-dīn, p. 560; was sentenced to death, p. 564.

Ya‘qūb, son of Bābā ‘All, his arrival at Kashmir, p. 746.

Ya‘qūb, son of Yūsuf Chak, went to the court of Akbar; his letter to Yūsuf, p. 759.

Ya‘qūb, son of Yūsuf Khān, was sent to Kashmir, p. 756; was made the commander of an army, p. 759.

Ya‘qūb, Makrī, Shaikh, his fief was confiscated, p. 757.

Ya‘qūb Kashmirī, Shaikh, went to wait on Akbar, p. 758.

Ya‘qūb Mīr, took the heads of Niyāzīs to Islām Khān, p. 723.

Ya‘qūb, Saiyid, was seized by ‘Īdī Zinā, p. 721; fled from custody and joined Daulat Chak, p. 722.

Yaqūt, bore the title of Khudawand Khān; his fight; his rank of service, p. 153.

Yārī, Malik, brother of Malik Kājī, seized Iṣkandar Khān and sent him to Muḥammad Shāh, p. 695; fought against Nāzuk Shāh and was slain, p. 698.

Yārī Bhat, Malik, was sent in the direction of Delhi by Malik Ahmad, p. 679; defeated Tāṭār Khān; devastated Stālkot; enmity with Malik Ahmad, p. 680; his imprisonment, p. 681; was sent to ravage the place of shelter of Fath Khān, p. 687.

Yaşn Afghān, went as an ambassador to Mirzā Ḥaidar, p. 714.

Yehayyī Zinā, marriage of his daughter, p. 721.

Yūsuf bin ‘Abbās, Mustanṣīd Bīlāh, brought a mandate from Egypt conferring imperial rule upon Maḥmūd Khalīf, p. 537.

Yūsuf, son of ‘Ali Khān, went to his father, p. 747; executed Ibrāhīm Khān, p. 750; was punished, p. 758.

Yūsuf, Malik, was given the title of Saif Khān by Maḥmūd Shāh and was sent in attendance on A’ẓam Humāyūn, p. 285; entered the service of Bahādur Shāh, p. 331.

Yūsuf, Mullā, gave the order for the execution of Yūsuf, p. 745; Yūsuf executed, p. 746.

Yūsuf, Shaikh, joined Sulṭān Ahmad; was conferred the title of A’ẓam Humāyūn, p. 395.

Yūsuf, Shaikh, Sulṭān of Multān, his election as the ruler of Multān; his administration; message of Ra’iy Sahrah; took the daughter of Ra’iy Sahrah in marriage, p. 789; message from Ra’iy Sahrah; deceitful victory of Ra’iy Sahrah over him; period of reign, p. 790.

Yūsuf ‘Adil Khān, founder of the dynasty; what he was; took possession of Shōlāpur, p. 169; also Bījpūr; period of his reign, p. 160.

Yūsuf Andāz, wounded Qāḍī Ḥabīb, p. 745.

Yūsuf Chak, his share in the division of Kashmir, p. 719; joined Daulat Chak with an army, p. 721; defeated the Niyāzīs, p. 723; fell from his horse, p. 726.

Yūsuf Kashmirī, joined Yūsuf Khān, p. 756; his fief was taken from him, p. 757.

Yūsuf Khān, was sent to fight against Mubārak Khān by Maḥmūd Khalīf, p. 527.
Yūsuf Khān, son of 'Ali Shāh, Sūltān of Kashmir, message to Abdāl Khān, p. 762; attacked Abdāl Khān; buried 'Ali Shāh and succeeded the latter; advanced against the rebels, p. 753; came to Hīrahpūr and Saiyid Mubārak Khān sat on the seat of authority; an attempt on Kashmir; went to the village of Barṣāl; message from Saiyid Mubārak Khān, p. 754; intention of the Kashmiris to raise Lōhar Chak on the throne, p. 755; went to Saiyid Yūsuf Khān Lāhōrī; sent Ya‘qūb to Kashmir; the government of Kashmir was confirmed on Lōhar; started to conquer Kashmir; took possession of Rājaurf, p. 756; entered the fort of Sūyyapūr; fought with Lōhar Chak; marched to Srinagar; rebels were cast into prison; divided the country of Kashmir; blinded Lōhar; imprisoned on suspicion, p. 757; welcomed the ambassadors of Akbar; visit to Lār, p. 758; sent an army to attack Ḥaidar Chak; returned victorious towards Srinagar; defeat of Ḥaidar Chak, p. 759; determination of his enemies about his son; advance of the army of Akbar towards Kashmir, p. 760; took up his station in the village of Nagar; made his submission to Akbar, p. 761.

Yūsuf Khān, son of Bahram Khān, was slain, p. 683.

Yūsuf Khān, Saiyid, Yūsuf Khān had an interview with him, p. 756.

Yūsuf Khān Hindauli, waited on Sūltān Mahmūd, p. 509; his dispute was changed into friendship with Dādī Khān by Mahmūd Khaļīfī, p. 526.

Yūsuf Khān Lāhōrī, Saiyid, Yūsuf Khān had an interview with him, p. 756.

Yūsuf Qawām, Malik, took part in the conspiracy against Mahmūd Khaļīfī, was given the title of Qawām Khān and the fief of Bhilsā by Mahmūd Khaļīfī, p. 499; fled from the camp of Āʿizam Humāyūn, p. 500, from Bhilsā, p. 501.

Yūsuf Shāh, Sūltān of Bangālā, the amirs placed him on the throne; died; period of reign, p. 436 (and see note 2, p. 436).

Yūsuf Turk, Malik, joined the associates of Amīrzāda Muḥibb-ud-dīn Ḥabīb-ul-lah; passed through the gates of the citadel, p. 81; cut off the head of the chief guard; released Amīrzāda Ḥabīb-ul-lah, the sons of the Sūltān, and Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, p. 82.

Yūsuf Zafī, p. 628.

Z

Zabardast Khān, son of Ḥazbar Khān, with his help the Mālpūr gate-keeper was slain, p. 563.

Zafar Khān, (Gujrātī), p. 184; sat on the throne in the town of Bīrpūr; assumed the title of Sūltān Muẓaffar Shāh; how he was described in the Khutba; distributed wealth and conferred honours; successive marches to the country of Mālwa; fought with Sūltān Hūshang in the neighbourhood of Dhar and defeated him, p. 185; put Sūltān Hūshang with his adherents into prison; installed Nāṣrat Khān in the government of Mālwa; Sūltān Ibrāhīm Sharqī came with the idea of seizing Delhi but owing to the opposition of Muẓaffar Shāh gave it up, and went back to Jaunpūr; came back to Gujrat; took Sūltān Hūshang with him in captivity; rebellion of rāṭīqts and soldiers of Mālwa, p. 186, against Nāṣrat Shāh;
Khwaśjahdär rescued Naṣrat Shāh from Dhār and sent him to Gujrat; people of Mālwa made Mīsā Khān their leader; released Sultān Hūshang from imprisonment; sent Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān to take possession of Mālwa and to deliver it to Sultān Hūshang; Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān took possession of Mālwa and delivered it to Sultān Hūshang; gathered a force to punish the Rājpūts of Kuhnakōt; sent Khudāwadd Khān to attend on Shai̇kh Muhammad Qāsim Budhū, p. 187; date of his illness at Naharwāla Pattan; placed Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān on his throne with the title of Nāṣir-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh; ordered that the Khutba should be read in the prince's name; date of his death; period of his reign; place of his tomb; title after his death, p. 188. Zafar Khān, Shāhzāda, received the farman of Sultān Ahmad of Gujrat at Sultānpūr Nadarbar; defeated Shāhzāda 'Alā-ud-dīn and the Malik-ut-tujiār, p. 50; was sent by Ahmad Shāh to destroy Malik-ut-tujiār; sent Iftikhār-ul-mulk and Malik Suhrāb Sultānī to surround Thāna; began to conquer the district of Thāna; fought with the governor of Thāna and made him leave Thāna; left a body of troops at Thāna; advanced on Mahāim, p. 215; defeated Malik-ut-tujiār and the Dakini army, p. 216; despatched wealthy offerings to Ahmad Shāh; took possession of the district of Mahāim and divided it among the amirs, p. 217. Zafar Minjumla, went to release 'Uthmān Khān, p. 487. Zahir-ul-mulk, fought with Rāy Mal and was slain, p. 301. Zahir-ul-mulk, vazir of Mahmud Khalji, was slain by the army of Niẓām Shāh, p. 535. Zain, Qādi, criticised the decision of the Muftis, p. 746. Zain Badr, pursued Adam Khān, p. 672; his death, p. 679. Zain Khān, cut off Bahādur Gilānī's head, and sent it to Mahmud Shāh, p. 125; was granted the horses and weapons of Bahādur Gilānī, p. 126. Zain-ud-dīn Haasan, Qādi, pp. 124, 125. Zain-ul-ʿabīdīn, Sultān, son of Sultān Sikandar, Sultān of Kashmir, accession; extension of empire; qualifications, p. 652; measures to stop robbery; order for the benefit of public; granted the prayer of Sri Bhat, p. 653; social, religious and administrative reforms, p. 654; attitude towards his subjects, religious freedom; wealth and expenditure, p. 655; treatment of the learned men of Islam and Yoga; example of his intelligence, p. 656; orders for the criminals; his abstinence; patronage of the men of skill and art; his literary work, p. 657; educational ability; gifts from various sovereigns, p. 659; his heir; his sons, p. 660; grant to the sons of Sri Bhat, p. 661; his recovery by the science of Yoga, p. 662; defeated Hāji Khān, p. 663; famine in Kashmir, p. 665; attack of Adam Khān; sent for Hāji Khān, p. 666; destruction of Adam Khān, p. 667; his heir, p. 668; arrival of Adam Khān; illness; rejected the suggestion of the amirs; hostility among his sons; his last days, p. 670; period of reign, p. 672. Ztrak, servante of Fath Khān, released the imprisoned amirs, p. 687.
II. GEOGRAPHICAL.
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Ābū, pp. 231, 233, 278.
Adanpūr, p. 717.
Āgar, pp. 570, 589.
Āgra, pp. 378, 379, 610, 616, 617, 618, 746.
Ahār, p. 532.
Ahlan, p. 738.
'Ājam, p. 108.
Ajmir, pp. 525, 528, 530.
Alhanpūr, pp. 520, 546, 547.
Ancha, p. 160.
Ankar, p. 160.
Ankhūr, p. 192.
'Arab, pp. 108, 238, 659, 767, 786, 789.
Arankan, p. 38.
Asāwal, pp. 177, 183.
Āshnagar, p. 641.
Āsha, pp. 358, 506, 564, 616, 628.
Ashtanagar, p. 302.
Āshtnagar, p. 641.
Atak, p. 761.
Āūdān, p. 687.
Āwās, p. 333.

B

Bābal, p. 810.
Bachhrā, p. 766.
Badaḵšān, p. 811.
Bādhal, p. 734.
Badhūl, pp. 14, 15, 32, 194.
Badnagar, p. 310.
Bādūkhī, 735.
Baghādād, p. 762.
Baglāna, p. 217.
Bāhr Bābā Ḥāji, pp. 581, 584, 589, 590.
Baharmal, pp. 714, 715.
Bahdar, pp. 408, 409, 410.
Bahmanābbād, p. 769.
Bahārūch, p. 447.
Bahrāmgala, p. 687.
Bahrāmgala, pp. 709, 710, 715, 716.
Bahrārah, pp. 648, 738.
Bahrūj, pp. 9, 184, 189, 190, 343, 377, 396, 398, 400, 402, 403, 406, 409, 410, 413, 472.
Bakankālū, pp. 557, 558.
Bākar, pp. 257, 308, 343, 347, 348, 349.
Bakīr, p. 105.
Baklaana, p. 527.
Bākur, p. 224.
Bālpūr, p. 634.
Balāvbat, p. 350.
Bālkūr, p. 163.
Balūchistān, p. 795.
Ban, pp. 713, 723.
Banās, pp. 285, 529.
Bāndhū, p. 195.
Bangālah, pp. 438, 445, 446, 463.
Bāngil, pp. 694, 697.
Banharīa, p. 356.
Bānīhāl, p. 723.
Bānkāl, pp. 721, 744.
Bānswāla, pp. 313, 314, 349, 351.
Bānswālah, pp. 623, 627.
Bārāh, pp. 275, 557, 727.
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Bārāmūla, pp. 647, 667, 690, 713, 714, 716, 734, 749, 750, 760.
Baran, p. 462.
Bārānsīr, p. 521.
Bardah, p. 811.
Barrār, pp. 468, 518.
Barnāma, p. 227.
Barsāl, p. 754.
Bāslūr, p. 163.
Bāṭrak, p. 334.
Batūh, pp. 234, 324, 337, 404.
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